

5-2017

Aspirations into action : navigating structures for community engagement at the University of Louisville.

Megan Faver Hartline
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hartline, Megan Faver, "Aspirations into action : navigating structures for community engagement at the University of Louisville." (2017). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2632.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/2632>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

ASPIRATIONS INTO ACTION:
NAVIGATING STRUCTURES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

By

Megan Faver Hartline
B.A., Abilene Christian University, 2010
M.A., St. Bonaventure University, 2013

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in English/Rhetoric and Composition

Department of English
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2017

Copyright 2017 by Megan Faver Hartline

All Rights Reserved

ASPIRATIONS INTO ACTION:
NAVIGATING STRUCTURES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

By

Megan Faver Hartline
B.A., Abilene Christian University, 2010
M.A., St. Bonaventure University, 2013

A Dissertation Approved On

April 24, 2017

by the following Dissertation Committee:

Mary P. Sheridan
Dissertation Director

Karen Kopelson

Bronwyn T. Williams

Beth A. Boehm

Steve Lamos

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to Susan Faver.

This roots of this project can be found in so many of our conversations—about your work in nonprofits, your volunteer and community outreach efforts, and your early encouragement of my interest in feminism and social justice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project began in Mary P. Sheridan's Community Literacy course, and she has helped me call into being, shape, and find my way through this work since August 2013. When no one else understood what I was doing, she could see and vocalize what I was trying to accomplish. Her consistent support, encouragement, and cheerleading combined with her unrelentingly high standards have gotten me to this point. I also want to thank my other committee members who all pushed me to think deeper and harder about my ideas: to Karen Kopelson for her hours of mentorship, care, and close reading along with the frequent talks about politics and life; to Beth Boehm for always reminding me to look for the good in institutional structures and how they are working for people; to Brownyn T. Williams for his healthy skepticism of systems and questions about how they work for those who are frequently left behind; and to Steve Lamos for guiding me through some of the early roadblocks of this project. Additionally, my writing group—Elizabeth Chamberlain, Michelle L. Day, Rachel Gramer, Keri E. Mathis, and Laura Tetreault—offered consistently excellent feedback paired with support and love as we all struggled through this process together. In the writing center, Amy Nichols let me (literally) lean on her as we spent hours and hours reading and revising and shaping my chapters. Thank you all for the ways that you have made this project the best it could be by sharing my excitement for this topic, challenging my ideas, and pushing me to be a better writer and deeper thinker.

There are so many others without whose support and encouragement I would not have made it this far. Kent and Susan Faver have never wavered in their support for my academic pursuits, whether buying me one million books as a child or offering me frequent advice and support over the phone as an adult. More than that, they modeled what it looks like to live a life in service of others; this project would not exist without their personal and professional examples. The rest of my family have offered so much: Macey Faver was my first (and favorite) student who always loves me and wants the best for me; Bill and Cloise Green have shown me what it means to be lifelong learners, always eager to read and learn more; Don Faver vigorously reads everything I publish, and he and Joyce Faver are unendingly excited for and proud of my accomplishments; Mel and Nancy Hartline and Richard and Allyson Kecker have been cheerleaders every step of the way. Thank you to Abigail and Michelle L. Day for inviting me into your family. Sundays and Thursdays with you helped me make this process joyful. And to the dear, dear friends who have listened, encouraged, sent care packages, and loved me—especially, Katie Barnard, Megen Farrow Boyett, Maribeth Cameron, Ryan Cameron, Carly Conklin, Francesca DiCillo, Nicole Garcia, Jamalin R. Harp, Andy Perkins, Katelyn Reed, and Rick Wysocki—thank you.

As my time as a student ends, I also want to thank the many, many teachers who have guided me to this point. Thank you to the long line of Lufkin Independent School District English teachers who encouraged and supported me, including: Becky Kelly, Peggy Bowser, Kathie Armstrong, Marcy Weibe, and, especially, John Mitchell, who pushed me to follow my dreams and be an English major and who I wish was here to share this moment with me. Thanks go to Darlene Atkinson who has always believed in me and been proud of me and to the amazing English faculty at Abilene Christian University and St. Bonaventure University who have helped shape me into the scholar I am today. Thank you, Daniel Ellis, for guiding me through the MA. And a special thank you to Bill and Laura Carroll—without your mentorship, friendship, and guidance, I would not be here.

Of course, this list is not complete without Garrison Hartline. Thank you for following me across the country to pursue my academic dreams; for making me laugh everyday; for loving me consistently. Your constant presence, support, encouragement, and dumb jokes made this grueling, difficult process so much better.

ABSTRACT

ASPIRATIONS INTO ACTION: NAVIGATING STRUCTURES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Megan Faver Hartline

April 24, 2017

This dissertation analyzes the affordances of university structures based on how they value and support community engagement, focusing on common issues for community-engaged scholars. In this case study of the University of Louisville as an institution developing stronger structures for community engagement, I show that current efforts represent important starting points for how institutions support engagement, but I argue that they, and scholarly discussion about them, need to be deepened to meet the needs of engaged scholars. Toward that end, utilizing an institutional critique methodology informed by scholarship in institutional ethnography, I combine analysis of university policies and documents with stakeholder interviews in order to explore the lived realities of these policies.

My findings detail how the complexities of three oft-cited challenges faced by engaged scholars—promotion and tenure, learning opportunities, and transdisciplinary projects—are often elided in scholarship, doing scholars and administrators a disservice by misrepresenting *how* to develop *what* institutional structures for engagement at a university. Through this study, I add dimension to the relatively flattened suggestions for solving the complicated problems of institutional structures for engagement by making

visible a deep professionalization structure beyond just promotion and tenure policy that devalues engaged research over the course of a scholar's career (Chapter 2); showing how individual scholars gain greater understanding of engaged research through community projects that combine meta and tacit learning (Chapter 3); and exploring how organizational infrastructure for transdisciplinary research can both sponsor individual projects and build institution-wide buy-in for community engagement (Chapter 4). Altogether, I argue that making the complications of institutional structures more visible will ease their navigability for emerging scholars interested in pursuing engaged research and help established scholars locate institutional changes that can be made to better support engaged scholarship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE : MAPPING EVOLVING INFRASTRUCTURE	1
CHAPTER TWO: BUILDING TO TENURE	27
CHAPTER THREE: CONNECTING META AND TACIT KNOWLEDGE	73
CHAPTER FOUR: CULTIVATING INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE	115
CHAPTER FIVE: TOWARD MAKING STRUCTURES VISIBLE	156
REFERENCES	174
CURRICULUM VITAE	191

CHAPTER ONE

MAPPING EVOLVING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community engagement has emerged as a central buzzword for how institutions want to shape their missions and values in response to the shifting landscapes of higher education that define what it means to be a 21st century college or university. In this higher education environment, universities and colleges are being held more accountable to their communities and to larger publics for their use of time and money and for what they are teaching undergraduates (Campus Compact, “Carnegie Community Engagement Classification,” Leachman and Mai). As students take on more debt to complete their degrees, the public is left wondering whether higher education is worth the cost, and these questions are seeping into government policy even as public universities continue to be defunded by their state governments. Community engagement is one way that higher education institutions are responding to the growing pressures they face about their place in society, showing how they continue to do good work for people within their local communities. And as universities work to respond to their changing context, they are also changing their discourse about community engagement. Both recent white papers (Orr, Wittman and Crews) and scholarly articles (Holland et al., Gilvin et al, Jaeger et al.) note a shift in how institutions are practicing community engagement, often focusing on interdisciplinary projects and economic stimulus for local communities. As the way institutions talk about and practice community engagement shifts and changes, what is less clear is what that means for university members actually carrying out the work,

particularly in how it is valued. For many faculty members, gaining institutional support for community engagement is difficult and leaves many scholars clashing with departmental and college supervisors over what research/knowledge-making practices look like, funding, and time commitments (Ellison and Eatman; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., Ward, and Buglione; O’Meara, “Rewarding;” Sobrero and Jayatrane). Several institutions stand out as having incorporated community engagement fully into their institutional ethos and are well known by engaged scholars—Michigan State University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and University of Memphis, among others. But for many institutions, the work of learning how to value and support community engagement is a process that has only just begun.

As schools begin these efforts, insufficient institutional infrastructure for community engagement remains a recurring theme within scholarship on community engagement in rhetoric and composition, an area of inquiry often referred to as community writing, as many scholars point to the struggles to align their projects with institutional structures for engagement. Within detailed, micro-level projects, scholars note the misalignments with university macro-structures. For example, Paula Mathieu, in *Tactics of Hope*, describes why it is important that her project Kids’ 2 Cents, a series of art and writing workshops for homeless children that began as an experiential learning opportunity in a course, exists outside of university structures. She asserts, “Since neither the course nor the project was defined by institutionalized service-learning structures, it could be adaptable in seeking to negotiate the timeframe between the university schedule and the organic needs of the project itself—the best way to build trust, continuity, and enough momentum” (109). Similar conversations about sustainability and

institutionalization of projects occur in Ellen Cushman’s “Sustainable Service Learning Programs,” Margaret Himley’s, “Facing (Up To) ‘The Stranger’ in Community Service Learning,” and Shari J. Stenberg and Darby Arant Whealy’s “Chaos Is the Poetry: From Outcomes to Inquiry in Service-Learning Pedagogy.”

What scholars have spent less time exploring, however, is how universities construct institutional structures for community-engaged research and how current and evolving structures influence engaged projects in our field. Conversations about macro-level community engagement structures are happening to a greater extent now than they have in the past, particularly through Restaino and Cella’s *Unsustainable* and recent special issues of *Community Literacy Journal* (11.1 “Envisioning Engaged Infrastructures for Community Writing”) and *Reflections* (16.1 “Sustainable Communities and Environmental Communication”) drawn from the inaugural Conference on Community Writing, all of which consider elements of infrastructure for and institutionalization of community writing projects. But these conversations need to grow through discussions of how scholars’ community work happens at their institutions—how it is a part of (or not) structures for engagement and how it is visibly valued—in order for scholars to make their scholarly work more legible and valued by their institutions. Our institutional structures shape our projects explicitly and implicitly, and through this examination of how infrastructure mediates university aspirations for community engagement and actual engaged projects, scholars in rhetoric and composition can better see how to navigate their university systems to make their projects better understood and supported at their home institutions. Further attention to these processes is especially needed because of community writing’s recent growth as a subfield, evidenced by the well-attended

Conference on Community Writing and a growing number of community-related sessions at the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

In this dissertation, I contribute to the growing body of community writing scholarship focusing on institutional contexts that enable and constrain engaged research as I illuminate structures for engagement at one university, mapping some of their complexities to provide a richer view of how they influence the work of engaged scholars. My analysis focuses on three commonly-cited challenges for engaged scholars that are noted broadly in community engagement and specifically in community writing scholarship: applying for promotion and tenure when policies do not recognize community-engaged research and teaching (Donnelly, Foster); learning how to form partnerships and engage with community members ethically and reciprocally (Day et al.; Fero et al); and finding ways to cross disciplinary boundaries (Amey, Brown, and Sandmann; Greenwood). I use the University of Louisville (UofL) as a case study to examine the intricacies of each of these challenges, presenting a robust view of how these issues are structured within one institution. UofL makes for a compelling case study because it is an institution that is in the process of strengthening support for community engagement, deepening and enacting the *aspirations* for engagement seen as a core element of the university's vision for its future ("The 2020 Plan"). Because UofL is still in the process of crafting engaged infrastructure, it shows how an institution with genuine interest in supporting engagement grapples with the lived realities of translating aspirational visions of the university into support for on-the-ground community-centered projects. In this study, I examine current structures (policies, procedures, general environment) connected with these institutional problems to complicate scholarly

understandings of such issues and find ways to expand UofL's involvement in the community while enabling engaged scholars' research processes. Toward that end, I ask two main questions: 1) How do UofL's institutional structures affect and shape community-engaged research? 2) How can and do people work within these structures—what are the connections between macro-level university goals for community engagement, meso-level institutional policies that direct faculty and graduate student work, and micro-level on-the-ground projects led by faculty and graduate students? To answer these questions, I utilize an institutional critique methodology informed by work in institutional ethnography that combines analysis of university policies and documents with stakeholder interviews in order to explore the lived realities of these policies. Analyzing institutional policy in this way is useful for seeing the extensive difficulties of working within these institutional systems, which are often elided in community writing scholarship because they are mentioned only briefly, if at all. This mapping project locates areas for future development to provide further study of how institutional structures might support engaged researchers. In this introduction chapter, I present an overview of scholarship, emphasizing conversations about institutional aspirations for and structures that enable engaged research; describe UofL's growing commitment to community engagement; explain my primary methodology and methods for my analysis of UofL's structures for engagement; and outline the chapters that follow.

Review of Literature

This dissertation builds on a decades-long conversation that involves scholars (across higher education and specifically in community writing) arguing for a fundamental change in how we make new knowledge that addresses pressing social needs

across communities beyond the university. In the 1973 report, *Scholarship for Society*, the Panel on Alternative Approaches to Graduate Education writes that they are “convinced that much more must be done to enable humanistic scholars and researchers in particular to perceive -- and fully participate in -- relationships between their knowledge and the problems facing a confused and fragmented society” (13). This report shows early discussion of addressing social issues with academic knowledge-making, but many posit the real starting point for current conversation about community engagement as Ernest Boyer’s seminal 1996 article, “The Scholarship of Engagement,” where he calls for academics “to serve a larger purpose—to participate in the building of a more just society and to make the nation more civil and secure” (22), “connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems” (32). Boyer and the Panel on Alternative Approaches to Graduate Education along with many other scholars (Cushman, “The Rhetorician;” Goldblatt, *Because We Live Here*; Park et al.; Bringle et al.) have contributed to decades of research showing *why* engaged research matters for universities. In this project, I focus on *how* institutions that are committed to answering these calls might create structures that allow them to better support community engagement.

Scholars across disciplines have advocated for different ways to frame and discuss community engagement over the years using varied terms, theories, and models for engaging their local communities, which leads to (sometimes drastically) diverse views of why and how to engage with community partners. Weerts and Sandmann emphasize the difference between outreach/service and engagement, referring to outreach/service as “one-way approaches to delivering knowledge and service to the

public” and engagement as “a two-way approach in which institutions and community partners collaborate to develop and apply knowledge to address societal needs” (632). A partnership-based approach that utilizes knowledge and expertise from all parties is seen as a central part of participating in community *engagement* rather than community *service*, and engaged scholars utilize this approach in their teaching and in their research. In community-engaged teaching, frequently called service-learning, instructors implement “a pedagogy of action and reflection, one that centers on a dialectic between community outreach and academic inquiry” (Deans 98). While community-engaged teaching has been a central point of discussion in community engagement scholarship (Barnett, Silver, and Grundy; Carpenter; Duchelle et al.) and, more specifically, in community writing (Cushman, Deans, Green), this dissertation focuses primarily on community-engaged research, which involves “knowledge discovery, application, dissemination, and preservation” that mutually benefits all partners (Fitzgerald et al. 13). Community-engaged research, also called engaged research or engaged scholarship, answers the calls by Boyer and others to make and circulate new knowledge that goes beyond university boundaries and addresses pressing civic and social issues by partnering with community members to identify local concerns and determine the best strategies for how to resolve them.

Many institutions are working to enact community engagement practices by creating stronger structures that support engaged research (and teaching) through organizational systems like offices, departments, and policies focused on advocating for the importance of this type of work. Too often, community engagement is relegated to a buzzword as an institution tries to show that they care about local issues beyond their

campus, while entrenched systems make it difficult for individual members of that institution to participate in the community-based work that might actually address local issues. The strength of “community engagement” as a buzzword can be seen in its frequent inclusion in university “vision statements” or “strategic plans” across a range of institutions, including: large public universities (University of Louisville, University of Texas), land grant universities (University of Illinois system, University of Tennessee system), private universities (University of San Diego, Willamette University), and liberal arts colleges (Williams College, Swarthmore College). Additionally, hundreds of universities are now officially classified as “Community Engaged” institutions via the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification, with more universities applying for the designation in each five-year application cycle. While this is not a problem in and of itself, it’s possible that the status of the classification can become more important than the community engagement itself. For example, in Florida, the State University System Board of Governors has set a goal for *all* Florida state colleges and universities to achieve the Carnegie classification by 2025 “as it is a premier national indicator of a public university’s commitment to community engagement” (“Florida Board of Governors Approves”). All of these vision statements and classification applications are accompanied by some amount of community-engaged work at these institutions. For instance, the Carnegie application is quite extensive and requires applying institutions to describe several measures for community-based research and teaching. Yet, vision statements or a particular Carnegie classification do not ensure that community engagement practices are deeply embedded within an institution through policy and structural support. Being an engaged institution requires more than aspirational

statements and a series of model individual projects; it also requires comprehensive support structures integrated into the institution.

Institutional structures within the university are especially relevant for scholars pursuing community engagement because they often have a difficult time navigating such systems to make their scholarship comprehensible as intellectual work to colleagues and administrators. Some exemplars of universities that connect their engaged aspirations with systemic action through structure building are Michigan State University, the University of North Carolina system, and Portland State University. Each of these institutions have modeled actions to ease challenges for engaged scholars, including: revising tenure policies, adding offices and organizations that can help interested faculty and students learn to engage with local communities, and creating institution-wide web resources for engagement efforts, whether mono- or transdisciplinary. For example, Michigan State University has a large Office of University Outreach and Engagement (with over 80 staff members) that creates and coordinates partnerships and projects across eight different areas (e.g, arts and culture, health and wellbeing, human-technology interaction); offers workshops and consultations to faculty and students interested in community engagement; and has published several well-received reports and guides about their practices (University Outreach and Engagement). Additionally, scholars at the university have published widely about institutional structures at MSU that help emerging and established scholars build and maintain community partnerships as well as their own professional identities within the institution (Doberneck et al., Matthews et al., McNall et al.). Institutions like MSU show how institutional structures can be built to support engaged researchers, but what is less visible is the *process* of creating such

support, which requires a thorough understanding of the challenges of community engagement and the time, energy, and commitment to shape systems that can support scholars in the full complexity of those issues.

Such processes are similarly occluded in community writing scholarship where conversations about navigating university systems are often left to lore, with scholarship more often focusing outside the university to examine systems and structures relevant to community partners rather than at scholars' home institutions. Paula Mathieu in *Tactics of Hope* describes her difficulties establishing herself as a partner to *Spare Change*, a street paper in Boston where she hoped to share expertise from her years of work at a street paper in Chicago. Instead, she found herself needing to learn the structures of *this* organization, putting in hours of work to build relationships. Relationship building also comes into play in Eli Goldblatt's *Because We Live Here* as he discusses trying to form partnerships among different organizations and institutions in Philadelphia to create vertical alignment between high school, community college, and university writing curricula. Similarly, Jeff Grabill in *Writing Community Change: Designing Technologies for Citizen Action* looks outside of his institution to think about infrastructure for change at various community organizations, and Mary P Sheridan-Rabideau in *Girls, Feminism, and Grassroots Literacies: Activism in the GirlZone* discusses the rise and fall of GirlZone, studying documents and the material conditions of the organization. All of these scholars are discussing structures and systems that are a part of their community engagement practices, but they leave out the process of working within their own university structures to make their work visible as scholarly inquiry.

More recently, as community writing continues to grow as an area of inquiry in rhetoric and composition, scholars have begun focusing on about how their home institutional contexts frame their work in this subfield. Laurie JC Cella and Jessica Restaino's collection *Unsustainable* contains chapters that describe misalignments between institutional structures and the realities of engaged projects, including: addressing difficulties that emerge when a project aims to serve community and pedagogical needs (Parks), finding the tactical successes in projects that lose institutional support (Feigenbaum, Douglas, and Lovett), and navigating the complications of committing to community engagement when moving from university to university (Deans). Restaino, in her conclusion to the collection, calls for a "radical reconfiguring of what university/community collaborations might look like and how they can be valued, given a university system whose scholarship and politics laud such collaborations, but whose infrastructure is not designed to reward or support them" (253). The inaugural Conference on Community Writing in 2015 took up this call as it worked "to build a national network of people, ideas, resources, and support structures—an engaged infrastructure—to make the work we do in and about our communities more sustainable, impactful, rewarding, and rewarded" (House, Myers, and Carter 1). Veronica House, Seth Myers, and Shannon Carter continued this work in the recent special issue of *Community Literacy Journal* on "Building Engaged Infrastructure" where scholars write about cultivating relationships (Feigenbaum; Jacobi), critiquing our role in problematic social structures (Kannan, Kuebrich, and Rodríguez; Rider), and developing pedagogies (McCarthy) and professional development opportunities (Savini) for engagement,

detailing a more expansive vision of community writing and crafting the engaged infrastructure that can support such a vision.

Despite these recent additions to community writing scholarship, much of the discussion about how engaged scholars can navigate university structures for community writing remains relegated to conversations with other scholars at conferences and via email. Community writing scholarship provides a deep well of information and analysis regarding forming partnerships and working within community-based structures.

Emerging engaged scholars *also* need a wealth of information about how to maneuver through the difficulties they might encounter in their university contexts, and developing this area of scholarship further can aid in the growth of the community writing subfield. As Jeff Grabill argues in “Infrastructure Outreach and the Engaged Writing Program,” structures for engagement must be made visible in order to understand “the rhetorical work that people do together;” he explains, “we must render visible the infrastructure that remains (or wants to remain) invisible and that supports, locates— participates in—that rhetorical work” (Grabill 21). My study’s work toward revealing the layering of visibility of institutional structures for engagement helps increase comprehension of *how* scholars at every level can navigate university systems and allows them to see leverage points at which they might make change.

To make visible engaged infrastructure, I examine three challenges identified across community engagement scholarship and specifically in community writing— promotion and tenure, learning opportunities, and transdisciplinary projects—that I argue are central to fostering a community-engaged institution and supporting engaged scholars. The complexities of these issues are often elided in scholarship, doing scholars

and administrators a disservice by misrepresenting *how* to develop *what* institutional structures for engagement at a university. I delve into these three particular challenges at one institution to display the intricacies of enacting what is called for in scholarship, adding dimensions to the relatively flattened suggestions for solving the complicated problems of institutional structures for engagement. This dissertation begins the process of creating action plans for strengthening engaged infrastructure, contributing to a more robust scholarly conversation about university contexts in community engagement scholarship, which is particularly needed in rhetoric and composition.

UofL as a Telling Case

UofL is in the midst of a revived investment in and strategic planning for community engagement as it works to become “a nationally recognized metropolitan research university” (“About the University of Louisville”). Starting in the early 2000s, UofL began to reestablish its dedication to Louisville as a city, incorporating more outreach and explicitly creating community engagement projects by seeking out partnerships with organizations across the city. UofL has escalated its efforts in the past ten years—changing their Vice President of External Affairs to the Vice President of Community Engagement, creating an Office of Community Engagement and hiring a director for it, centralizing their engagement efforts, and providing more strategic support for engaged research and teaching in individual colleges across the university. These structural changes show movement toward community engagement being more strongly valued within the institution. Additionally, UofL has been awarded the Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement classification and has labeled Community

Engagement as one of its five priority areas for its “2020 Plan” to “become a preeminent metropolitan university” (“The 2020 Plan”). UofL is an institution that is trying to build structures for and promote community engagement. It’s a messy process, but administrators are dedicated to community engagement as a central pillar of the university.

Because of this renewed dedication to community engagement, UofL makes for a valuable case study for evolving structures that support engaged research. This process is still in progress, and though UofL is interested in and excited by community engagement, it does not have the centralized structures that more established engaged institutions, like Michigan State University, Portland State University, or the University of Memphis, already have to support faculty and students interested in pursuing community engagement projects. At these benchmark institutions, the process of how such intensive and expansive structures came to be is unclear, obscuring some of the complications of the structures that are important for the central challenges I describe, which makes it difficult for other universities and colleges to see where to *begin* infrastructure building for engaged scholarship. Analyzing UofL’s structures as they are in process reveals what *becoming* an engaged institution looks like, presenting a more useful analysis of how to grow the necessary structures to support community engagement.

Bruno Latour, in *Science in Action*, advocates for this type of analysis in his discussion of black boxing, where he differentiates between “science in the making” and “ready made science,” examining projects as they work toward their goals (e.g., planning for a nuclear power plant, designing a computer, “science in the making”) rather than finished products (e.g., the nuclear power plant, the computer, “ready made science”)

(Latour 2-3). When a structure is black boxed, it is seen as commonly understood and, thus, reduced only to its input and output. Thus, Latour argues that instead of “looking for social influences and biases” in finished products, it is “much simpler” to examine those projects “*before* the box closes and becomes black” (21). Studying projects in the making can reveal a stronger understanding of how those involved achieve/d their goals, including the myriad variables that influence a project before only the input and output matter. Thus, I am studying UofL’s structures for engagement now, as it is in the process of building support for engaged research, before the black box closes, detailing how they are working to achieve their goals before a set story is completed and the complicated process of becoming a benchmark engaged university is concealed.

One space at UofL where the complexities of becoming an engaged institution are particularly apparent is in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), and because of the messy context for engaged research in this academic unit (which features many disciplines that do not emphasize community-engaged research unlike Social Work or Public Health), the time constraints of this dissertation, and the fact that CAS houses my own discipline, I concentrate the majority of my study on how UofL’s aspirations and institutional structures work within this unit. CAS makes for a particularly compelling focus because although it has more community partners, 222, than any college or school besides Social Work, which has 232 (“Partnerships Snapshot 2014-15”), the unit’s engaged work is not widely lauded across the institution or particularly well supported by individual departments. Part of the reason may be that research in many of these disciplines has traditionally consisted of textual analysis completed individually, making community engagement difficult to comprehend within existing disciplinary structures.

Across interviews, administrators from the Vice President of Community Engagement's office and faculty from CAS claim that CAS is "behind" in showing how they value engaged scholarship when their faculty members pursue it. When administrators like the Vice President for Community Engagement and the Director of the Office of Community Engagement discuss UofL's successes—specific projects that show what good work the university is doing—they rarely point to CAS projects, whether in interviews for this dissertation or in the application for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Featured projects from the College of Education and Human Development, the School of Public Health and Information Sciences, and the Kent School of Social Work, are given institutional visibility because they are the ones on the minds of administrators and featured in panel discussions by the Office of Community Engagement like the 2016 Symposium on Interdisciplinary Engaged Scholarship, which included projects from Education and Public Health. Though CAS has such a high number of community partners (especially when compared to high profile programs like Education with 76 partnerships and Public Health with 48), it is still primarily seen as a place where there are few projects and no real structures to complete engaged research. There is a misalignment between the work being done and how the rest of the university understands that work, making CAS an important focus for my discussion of the complicated nature of institutional difficulties for engaged researchers. Analyzing the multilayered nature of challenges for engaged researchers within CAS provides a pointed view of institutional structures within UofL, which showcases paths for the university to move forward in its goals for community engagement and demonstrates the intricacies of

these problems, especially in academic units where engaged research might receive more pushback.

Methodology and Methods

In this project, I illuminate institutional structures for community-based research by studying how one university's current structures respond to leading concerns outlined in community engagement scholarship and how engaged scholars work within and against them to create and sustain engaged research efforts. Toward that end, I identify and examine infrastructure for engagement, providing rich analysis of what is, to many, a complicated system despite the surface-level views often presented in scholarship. This project is especially salient for scholars in rhetoric and composition at this moment because while community engagement continues to grow, many still seem uncertain of how to maneuver within their institutions to gain support for and intellectually validate their projects. This dissertation uses an array of qualitative research methods (including textual analysis, interviews, and case studies) to present a deep view of institutional structures that highlights particular systems that enable and inhibit engaged research projects, showing individual scholars how they might navigate similar systems at their own institutions and locating areas of need where stronger support structures might be developed in the future.

To uncover the details of UofL's structure, I employ institutional critique, a theoretical framework often used by scholars in our field, but which has primarily been applied to historical study of writing programs rather than to community engagement infrastructure (e.g., Fleming; Lamos, *Interests and Opportunities*; Ritter). Institutional

critique, as a methodology, examines how and where work happens within a particular institution and how people's activities are coordinated by institutional structures. James Porter, Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey T. Grabill, and Libby Miles see institutional critique as a way to influence universities through "rhetorical action" (610), aiming to "change the practices of institutional representatives and to improve the conditions of those affected by and served by institutions" (611). This methodology is well-suited for my purposes because it centers on the idea that there are default ways of working and structures within organizations that are laid out through documents, through lore, through how activity is divided up and more, offering me a lens through which to analyze the connections between UofL's aspirations and on-the-ground projects. Additionally, institutional critique maintains that studying people and how they navigate those structures is key to understanding how work happens at an institution, recommending that scholars move beyond traditional institutional texts to study such varied practices as tracing funding lines, visualizing organizational systems within a university and community, and making visible narratives of knowledge making processes in order to see how macro-structures influence the everyday work of actors within an institution. Using institutional critique, I am able to cultivate an understanding not only of UofL's systems for community engagement, but also how people are regarded in that system—learning more about the values and assumptions that make certain practices and possibilities viable or not.

This methodology allows for a way to mediate large, overarching structures (macro-level) and particular actions (micro-level) (612). For Porter et al., this mediation occurs in three ways—1) examining structures from a spatial, visual, and organizational

perspective; 2) looking “for gaps or fissures, places where resistance and change are possible;” and 3) engaging in “situated theorizing and relating that theorizing through stories of change and attempted change,” which undermines the theory/empirical research binary (630-31). Additionally, institutional critique relies not only on analysis, but also on an action plan as a way to move beyond reporting on “how evil institutions are” (613). Steve Lamos, in “Institutional Critique in Composition Studies: Methodological and Ethical Considerations for Researchers,” stresses the need for an “action plan designed to foment positive change” in order to mitigate concerns administrators might have about scholars seeking only to criticize, or spread “bad news,” about a particular university or one of its programs (165). Through the acts of mediation and proposal of an action plan, institutional critique allows a researcher to go beyond analysis to help craft institutional change.

What is missing from the *methods* described in institutional critique (the three acts of mediating described in Porter et al.) that is important to my project is a discussion of *how* to study people beyond how they are represented in texts. Though Porter et al. do focus on people’s places in institutions, their methods for mediating primarily rely on textual analysis, seen in the above-cited historical, archival institutional critique projects where scholars use textual representations of people’s actions to describe how they have been affected by larger institutional structures. To study the process of shifting structures for engagement and how they correspond with current challenges for engaged scholars, I also use qualitative people-based methods to gain the perspectives of stakeholders affected by these structures, drawing on Dorothy Smith’s work on institutional ethnography, which features more practical examples of using text- and people-based

methods to employ a methodology that examines contemporary structures and the people affected by them. Smith writes that institutional ethnography is “committed to discovering *beyond any one individual’s experience* including the researcher’s own and putting into words...what she or he discovers about how people’s activities are coordinated” (1). This methodology asks researchers to use interviews, participant observation, and texts together to discover not what an institution looks like on the surface, but how its daily machinations affect individuals and their work. Institutional ethnography begins in people’s experiences rather than in theory. Throughout her collection, *Institutional Ethnography as Practice*, Smith and her co-writers argue that “texts are integral to the coordinating and institutional appropriation of what people are doing” (6) and that it is key “to locate the institutional in the everyday of [its members’] work” (7), thereby combining both texts and individuals to form “a *schematic representation* analyzing an institutional process, showing how it operates and its institutional properties” (9). Examining how texts and people do work within an institution is important, because both shape institutional structures in different ways. At UofL, our aspirational documents shape the goals and vision of the university, outlining what it is the university *should* be. But it is people who do the everyday work of making those visions a reality *and* specific policies and guidelines that enable individuals to do so, or not. Thus, to gain a broader understanding of institutional depictions and realities of community engagement at UofL, I explore both texts and people.

To perform this analysis of UofL’s structures for engagement, I utilize a variety of qualitative research methods—examining aspirational documents and institutional policies as well as stakeholder interviews—to create an understanding of what current

structures exist and how they affect engaged scholars and projects in order to determine ways to provide more holistic support to engaged scholars. Aspirational documents, like UofL's 2020 Plan and the 2015 Application for the Carnegie Foundation's elective classification as a Community-Engaged University, showcase administrative goals for engagement at the university—how it hopes to engage the local community and what its plans are to reach those goals. Institutional policies, like promotion and tenure, provide more pragmatic views of the institution, detailing the everyday systems that frame all scholars' professional lives and work. Stakeholder interviews allow for further insight into both kinds of documents as scholars describe their understanding of UofL's aspirations and policies as well as how they affect scholars' work.

After reading through UofL's community engagement focused aspirational documents, I completed a series of interviews with administrators, faculty, and graduate students about their experiences with community engagement. In these interviews, I asked participants to share information about their experiences with community-engaged research and teaching projects, the university structures that enabled these projects, and the institutional problems they have faced in their engaged work. These interviews included administrators like Vice President of Community Engagement Daniel Hall, Director of the Office of Community Engagement Henry Cunningham, and Dean of the School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies Beth Boehm. I also interviewed faculty who engage in community-centered research and teaching: Cate Fosl, Professor of Women's and Gender Studies and Director of the Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research; Monica Wendel, Associate Dean for Public Health Practice, Associate Professor of Health Promotion and Behavioral Sciences, and Director of the

Commonwealth Institute of Kentucky; and Mary P Sheridan, Professor of English and Director of the Digital Media Academy (DMA), a community-engaged research project designed and implemented by graduate students (described further on page 22). Lastly, I interviewed graduate students and junior faculty who planned and implemented DMA during its first two summers. After transcribing these interviews, I began gathering documents that participants discussed as particularly useful or challenging in their interviews: promotion and tenure policies, the faculty Annual Work Plan, the “Imagining Engaged Scholarship” report, the DMA Final Report, and others. Together, the interview transcriptions and documents serve as the primary data for this dissertation—allowing for a detailed analysis of current structures that affect the work of engaged scholars at UofL.

Because each of my chapters is based on a commonly-cited challenge for engaged scholars, the methods I’ve described above are applied to different extents in each chapter. Rather than utilizing one or all methods for each chapter, I align the questions and concerns of the chapter with the methods that will best illuminate the complexities of that particular institutional issue. Below, I outline the methods I use in each chapter and provide background for the case studies I draw on in chapters three and four.

In chapter two, I explore the frequently-cited challenge of achieving tenure for engaged research (Ellison and Eatman; Foster; Saltmarsh et al.), primarily relying on textual analysis, drawing on rhetorical genre studies, to show how tenure policy represents only one part of a larger professionalization genre system that devalues engaged research over the course of a scholar’s career, starting as early as graduate school. I complement my close reading of several documents in this genre system with stakeholder interviews to explore the lived realities of these documents, how they

actually affect the scholars who fill them out. Looking at both current practices that respond to scholarly calls for change in tenure policy and the longer professionalization pipeline clarifies intricacies and occlusions within institutional structures of evaluation, in the hope that by doing so, more inclusive strategies can be determined for creating institutional welcoming of community-engaged work.

In chapter three, I focus on the challenge of how scholars learn to practice engaged research, identified by many engaged scholars (Day et al.; O'Meara and Jaegar; Schnitzer and Stephenson Jr.) as a particularly important concern for graduate education. Because this challenge is not policy-based, but rather concerns learning processes, I present a case study of one relevant program, UofL's Digital Media Academy (DMA), utilizing qualitative people-based methods—interviews and participant observation. Started in 2014 by Mary P Sheridan, Professor of English, DMA is a two-week digital production day camp at UofL for rising sixth-grade girls from historically low-performing schools and is designed and implemented by a team of five graduate students. The camp aims to address issues of social justice (e.g., the hyper-sexualized, consumerist images of girls perpetuated by dominant society) and economic justice (e.g., the underrepresentation of women in technology jobs, the secure jobs of the future) by teaching girls digital tools to create, rather than consume, representations (such as image manipulations and videos) that align with how they see themselves and the world around them. Toward that end, graduate students read and discuss scholarship to gain a theoretical understanding of community engagement, *and* they practice the central tenets they are learning by planning and implementing the technology, pedagogy, assessment, and logistics for the camp. Using DMA as a case study allows for a closer look at what

all is involved in learning to do engaged research, showcasing the necessity of both discussion- and practice-based learning as institutions consider how to construct and support architectures of participation for this type of practice.

In chapter four, I examine the challenge of creating transdisciplinary engaged research projects (Adjei-Nsiah et al.; Ramaley; Stokols) through a case study of a new organization at UofL—the Collaborative Consortium for Transdisciplinary Social Justice Research (the Consortium)—because it is an institutional structures devoted to addressing this issue. Founded by Cate Fosl (Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies, Director of the Ann Braden Institute) and Enid Trucios-Haynes (Professor of Law, Interim Director of UofL’s Muhammad Ali Institute for Peace and Justice) and initially funded by a three-year grant through UofL’s School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies and Office of Research and Innovation, The Consortium is an organization dedicated to coordinating and funding new transdisciplinary projects that address social justice research, creative activity, and advocacy. The newness of this structure means that I focus my textual analysis on the Consortium’s initial documents, considering how it is proleptically calling transdisciplinary engaged researchers into action. Further study of the Consortium, including interviews and analysis of the research projects that are created through the organization, will be required to ascertain the results of its goals and plans, but in this project, I examine the Consortium’s grant materials, showing how an organizational space built to foster transdisciplinary engaged projects helps cultivate a wider culture for community engagement by making engaged research more visible and legible across departments and colleges.

Including this variety of text- and people-based methods in each chapter allows for a triangulated, multidimensional analysis that features several perspectives on current institutional structures. Including multiple viewpoints is important for analyzing institutional systems because they are often created from a top-down administrative view, but affect the lives and work of many beyond that view like scholars who are participating in engaged research for the first time. For example, while UofL administrators might point out many ways that UofL is succeeding and clearly building structures that help scholars create and maintain engaged projects, graduate students are often surprised to hear that there even is an Office of Community Engagement on campus. In this project, I analyze UofL's institutional structures with an eye toward action, not only critique, as a way to think about how systems can take into account the vast complications of community engagement to better support projects across all stages of planning and implementing (Lamos, "Institutional Critique" 165). My goals here are not to play "gotcha" with UofL, pointing out places where they are failing, but to find how these structures are working for engaged scholars, attending to oft-cited institutional challenges of engaged research to see how scholars can be further supported.

Over the course of these chapters, I show how complicated it is to create structures that address such issues for engaged scholars, which is key because when policies and aspirations fail to align, it becomes much more difficult for scholars to take on the community work that universities say they want them to do. Moving beyond aspirations for community engagement and into action requires more than making surface-level changes to revise tenure policy, offering more learning opportunities, and creating a few transdisciplinary projects. Instead, institutions must understand a richer

view of the complexities of these challenges in order to create institutional structures that cultivate a widespread culture that values community engagement.

CHAPTER TWO

BUILDING TO TENURE: HOW PROFESSIONALIZATION DOCUMENTS SHAPE EMERGING COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARS' IDENTITIES

One of the most commonly cited institutional challenges for engaged scholars is how to gain tenure while taking on engaged research since it often does not fit into traditional understandings of research practices or products. Scholars focused on how best to institutionalize community engagement indicate that intense points of assessment, namely tenure and promotion,¹ are important moments for validating the professional identities of engaged scholars (Ellison and Eatman; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., Ward, and Buglione; O'Meara, "Rewarding;" Foster). Additionally, the application for the Carnegie Foundation's elective classification in Community Engagement, an influential extra-institutional structure used by many universities to assess institutional community engagement practices, features several questions about tenure policies.² These scholarly and professional documents indicate that engaged scholars are researching in different ways than their peers—through combining new methods, new units of analysis, and new research products outside of peer-reviewed articles in high-status journals or monographs (Boyer; Kasworm and Abdrahim; Liese). Engaged scholars argue that tenure policies must change to account for these different ways of making new knowledge. As Ellison

¹ Following, I will use only "tenure" or "tenure policy" to refer to policies regarding promotion in rank for faculty

² For more on how universities use the Carnegie Foundation application to assess community engagement practices, see Amy Driscoll's "The Benchmarking Potential of the New Carnegie Classification: Community Engagement."

and Eatman put it, “If we truly want to encourage the integration of teaching and action research, we must reward it at tenure time” (iii).

University of Louisville (UofL) also highlights the importance of tenure revision in conversations about community engagement. Administrators from UofL who are committed to enhancing community engagement at the university mark tenure policy as one of the most important ways that the institution can continue to build stronger structures for community engagement. Not only in scholarship, but also at this particular university, tenure policy is seen as central to structuring community engagement into a university’s value system.

While tenure is a key moment to showing that an institution values faculty work in engaging the community, the significance placed on this singular moment obscures a larger context where emerging engaged scholars learn how problematic it can be to inhabit that particular scholarly identity.³ I argue that university policies as enacted in professionalization documents, including but not limited to tenure, create a larger system that discourages emerging scholars from thinking of their broader body of engaged work as research, except when it results in traditional forms of scholarship like a publication or conference presentation. Investigating this larger context highlights several dimensions of complexity that shape how institutional policies validate (or not) engaged scholarship, including: 1) tenure policies are a part of a larger genre system where scholars are asked to document their work in particular ways that limit what a scholar can classify as

³ In this chapter, I use scholarly (or professional) identity to refer to how scholars understand their own work, especially as they navigate this self-understanding with how they are expected to document their work and how it is then evaluated by their superiors. Thus, the scholarly identity here is one that is negotiated through these various social practices. Like Dorothy Holland et al., I look to identities as “imaginings of self in worlds of action, as social products” and understand them as “lived in and through activity and so must be conceptualized as they develop in social practice” (5).

research; 2) this system exists over a longer period of time than the creation of the tenure portfolio, starting as early as graduate school; and 3) multiple people (aside from the emerging scholar) are involved in the uptake of these systems, influencing the creation and later reading of documents with their own values and experiences. Because the way institutions value engaged research does not derive solely from tenure policy, pushes for change cannot be limited to such policies either. Instead, true structural change that validates engaged research as a legitimate form of making new knowledge must include the larger system of professionalization policies. A more complicated understanding of how engaged scholarship is delegitimized over the course of an engaged scholar's career reveals pressure points to leverage for institutional change that can reach engaged scholars' larger goal of expanding conceptions of knowledge-making processes and products.

To show the myriad complex ways that policies shape and evaluate the professional identities of engaged scholars, I use this chapter as a case study to examine how this challenge at UofL plays out in both tenure policies, the central area of concern for most engaged scholars, and the longer professionalization pipeline. To do so, I analyze a series of documents and policies at UofL that create a larger system that discourages scholars from taking on the identity of engaged scholar. Complementing the document analysis, I've conducted interviews with UofL personnel—administrators, senior faculty, junior faculty, and graduate students—about their views of and experiences with institutional structures for community engagement, including the policy documents related to this challenge. Combining policy analysis with interviews allows me to explore the lived realities of these policies in people's professional lives, showing

how they shape scholars' identities. While institutional ethnography is a central methodological frame for the dissertation as a whole, I utilize concepts from rhetorical genre studies in this chapter to show how institutional structures work together to devalue engaged scholarship. Looking at both current practices that respond to recurring scholarly calls for change in tenure policy *and* the longer professionalization pipeline will illuminate complexities and occlusions within institutional structures of evaluation, in the hope that by doing so, more inclusive strategies can be determined for creating institutional valuing of community-engaged work.

Genre Systems as Coordinators of Action

In her discussion of institutional ethnography, Dorothy Smith proposes looking at texts as “coordinators of sequences of action” (66), which allows one to see ways that texts affect the actions people take within an institution. Importantly, she argues that texts should not be understood as “prescribing action, but as establishing the concepts and categories in terms of which what is done can be recognized as an instance or expression of the textually authorized procedure” (83). In Smith’s view, there is not a 1:1 ratio of texts creating specific action, but texts do shape the actions people take within an institution in that they perpetuate particular ways of being as authorized or not. In this case, multiple documents are working together to create particular understandings of scholarly identity for emerging scholars that devalue engaged scholarship, which ultimately shape the way engaged scholars understand their place within the institution and the actions they may take there.

Similar understandings of how texts create actions are purported in rhetorical genre studies, particularly by Carolyn R. Miller who argues that genres “serve as keys to understanding how to participate in the actions of a community” (165), and a genre systems approach illustrates how documents interact to create possibilities for particular identities. In this case, that involves how documents at UofL demonstrate to emerging scholars the possible identities open to them, which routinely show them the problems inherent in inhabiting the identity of engaged scholar. I rely primarily on Catherine F. Schryer and Philippa Spoel’s extension of Charles Bazerman’s depiction of genre systems as “interrelated genres that interact with each other in specific settings” (Bazerman 97) that allow for “an understanding of the genres available to us at any time we can understand the roles and relationships open to us” (Bazerman 99). Schryer and Spoel delve deeper into these ideas, understanding that “the rhetorical motives, structures, and functions of specific genres requires recognition of their interconnections with other genres” (255) as they examine how “genres...function as mediating tools in the complex processes of professional identity formation” (250). They argue,

The connection between genres and professional identity formation seems clear, especially if genres are seen to function as symbolic structures or tools. Tools, as activity theorists such as Engestroem (1999) have asserted, are shaped by their users, but users are also affected by their tools. As symbolic structures, genres bring social and textual resources shaped by past practitioners forward for current practitioners to use (Schryer and Spoel 259).

In their short discussions of two case studies of medical professionals, Schryer and Spoel look at how documents shape a social system, creating possibilities for how individual professional identities can be formed within that system.

Spoel's⁴ understanding of *regulated* and *regularized genres* creates a way to see how different genres work with and against each other in a genre system to create varied possibilities for workplace practices, which ultimately shape professional identity. Spoel interrogates the midwifery communication practice of "informed consent," which she describes as a "recurring communication practice of midwives exchanging information with clients to facilitate clients' decision making" and as essential to the professional identities of midwives (266). Spoel argues that informed choice is regulated by "the external authority of midwifery policy documents that stipulate the nature of this communication practice" (267). In Spoel's understanding, regulated genres offer specific and controlled guidelines for action, with little room for movement or alteration. But regularized genre activity allows for movement within these regulated genres; this activity involves "a more situational, tacit, and flexible approach that emerges out of a range of diverse practices" (Schryer and Spoel 267). Regularized genres and genre activity offer more space for people to bring their own experiences to bear on how they take part in professional practice. Spoel argues, "genres do not simply reproduce fixed, authoritative structures of communication and identity but rather rhetorically shape professional identity through the improvisational blending of regulated as well as regularized genre activity" (267). For example, though informed choice is regulated by several medical policy documents, midwives use regularized genre action, through their

⁴ Schryer and Spoel split their article into separately authored sections, and here, I'm relying primarily on Spoel's section of the article.

understanding of a particular client, to determine how they practice informed choice. Spoel's depiction of how midwives negotiate informed choice shows how professionals navigate genre systems through their understanding of policy documents (genres) and the complexities of putting those policies into practice (genre activity).

In the case of engaged scholars, examining how regulated professionalization documents coordinate activity together in a genre system reveals how emerging engaged scholars negotiate their scholarly identities and how others at the university recognize those identities. To understand how these regulated policies mediate identity construction, I describe how the key challenge considered by this chapter—gaining institutional validation for engaged research—exists within and beyond tenure policies. Beginning with UofL's tenure policies, I show how calls for regulated policy change, and thus institutions' responses, are necessary but insufficient to answer the larger problem of creating institutional structures that value engaged scholarship because tenure policy exists in a genre system that extends beyond the space and time of tenure review. Following that, I turn my attention to other regulated genres that document scholarly work at UofL—like the Annual Work Plan, for faculty members, and the Program Progress Assessment, for graduate students—attending primarily to how scholars believe such documents represent their work. These regulated genres work together in a system to constrict possibilities for documenting an engaged scholarly identity, forming a problematic deep vertical alignment of professionalization that devalues large portions of emerging engaged scholars' research practice. Alternatively, regularized genre activity allows engaged scholars to work against the constraints of regulated genres and might

serve as an example of how to create more options for documenting scholarly work, and thus scholarly identity.

Revising Tenure Policy

Many scholars across higher education have advocated for changing the regulations of tenure policies to better reflect engaged scholarship. O’Meara writes, citing two decades worth of research, “Junior faculty feel the [tenure] process is ambiguous and difficult to navigate in terms of standards and expectations, and that it seems to almost always emphasize research in ways disproportionate to the weight given to it in institutional rhetoric, mission statements, formal workload assignments, and even promotion and tenure guidelines” (275). In the moment when scholars are deemed either successful or not in terms of fulfilling the appropriate duties for their position (especially seen in many universities’ up or out procedures—where faculty are either promoted or given one additional academic year to find a new position), engaged scholars are at particular risk if their work does not fit into their institution’s tenure policy’s regulations for research, the most important category for tenure review.

The purpose of tenure is to “to safeguard academic freedom,” which according to the American Association of University Professors is “necessary for all who teach and conduct research in higher education” (“Tenure”). Tenure helps create a protective barrier for faculty that allows them greater freedom to research and teach without fear of retribution or control from those who disagree with them, whether corporations, religious groups, the government, or others. The Association of American Colleges and Universities argue, “Academic freedom is the bedrock foundation of rigorous scholarship

and of students' development of evidence-based reasoning, a critical goal of liberal education" ("Board of Directors Statement"). Tenure processes support academic freedom for professors, which is crucial for both student learning and the advancement of new knowledge. Tenure seems particularly important for engaged scholars who are developing research projects that directly address social inequalities and courses that challenge students' worldviews by asking them to think deeply about local issues and work directly with community organizations. In fact, the American Association of University Professors cite a project about community issues—Marc Edwards' research on the dangers of lead in the water supplies of Washington DC and Flint, Michigan and how this problem came to be—to show why tenure is a crucial practice ("Tenure"). What worries engaged scholars is that their research done in partnership with community members, which is not always seen as developing new knowledge, is frequently left out of tenure policies. O'Meara writes that her findings from an interview study of faculty across a range of universities "suggest that many faculty hold values and beliefs about [engaged] scholarship that doubt and devalue its scholarly nature, purpose, and products" ("Uncovering" 76). And Weerts and Sandmann maintain that in their study of community engagement practices at six universities, "Promotion and tenure policies were the strongest barrier to faculty engagement with the community" (91). Engaged scholars see a direct connection between tenure policies that explicitly value their work with the community as *research* and the continued growth of that type of work within a particular institution.

Engaged scholars discussing institutional structures for evaluating engaged scholarship have pointed to a myriad of ways to create systems of assessment that

explicitly value this type of work. In the widely lauded and cited 2008 *Imagining America* report “Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University,” Julie Ellison and Timothy K. Eatman argue for a “continuum of scholarship” that has “traditional engagement and scholarship” on one side and “the most civically engaged or reciprocal scholarship and engagement” on the other side, thus creating an inclusive idea of research that “resists embedded hierarchies by assigning *equal value* to inquiry of different kinds” (ix, emphasis original). By seeing research as a continuum, scholars can make choices about what type of research they want to pursue, rather than trying to make their engaged research fit into more traditional views of scholarship. One of the main takeaways from their continuum is an expansion of research *products*, which include: publications and presentations “that advance the scholarship of community engagement,” contributions to public policy, models for problem resolution, and evaluative statements from community partners (Ellison and Eatman 11). Ellison and Eatman’s list of “intellectual and creative artifacts” from community projects offers a tangible way to create tenure policy that includes engaged research (11).

Beyond research products, different research processes should also be accounted for during tenure, especially considering the length of time engaged research often takes to move from community project to an assessable intellectual product. O’Meara worries that trying to make the case for how engaged scholarship “is as good as if not superior to traditional scholarship using criteria related to rigor, peer review, and dissemination” will “in some ways [cloak] the true values and value of the work,” including “genuine collaboration” and “inviting in and facilitating partner knowledge and expertise in projects” (277), which cannot necessarily be tracked by research products. Both engaged

research processes and products often look different than what “the norms of academic culture” might refer to as “traditional scholarship” (O’Meara 277) that focuses on peer-reviewed publications, making them more difficult to assess if tenure regulations do not explicitly account for them.

Members of our field have also approached these questions within our disciplinary context. The Modern Language Association, in their 2006 “Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion,” discuss ways that English departments might make policy that acknowledges a more capacious view of scholarship, pointing specifically to “the applied work of citizenship” and how “the overlapping, ambiguous, and connected activities in various faculty work efforts and among sites,” serving as “a model for rethinking the conventional triad of faculty work” (25). This report shows how scholars across English studies have acknowledged the way that traditional ideas of scholarship should change, even if they are not specifically calling for the exact changes as the engaged scholars discussed above. Similarly, although there have been very few explicit conversations in rhetoric and composition about how community writing scholarship (the most common name for engaged research in rhetoric and composition) is evaluated for tenure,⁵ several strands of discussion in the field relate to these macro, institutional level claims about evaluating engaged scholarship, including discussions of 1) the interconnectedness of research, teaching, and service in community engagement projects, 2) how best to showcase the ways that engaged scholarship is intellectually rigorous research, and 3) ways to make visible the often invisible, but intellectual work, of rhetoric and composition. In each of these ways,

⁵ I have only been able to find one essay, the Donnelly piece discussed here, that focuses on explicit discussions of how community engagement relates to tenure processes in rhetoric and composition. Other texts include small sections on this challenge, most notably, Eli Goldblatt’s *Because We Live Here* (205-6).

rhetoric and composition scholars are speaking to similar complexities felt across conversations about engaged scholarship, even if they are not addressing the exact problem of how such scholarship is evaluated during tenure.

The interconnectedness of engaged research, teaching, and service, has long been a part of scholarly conversation in rhetoric and composition, likely because research on teaching and administration, engaged or not, is central to our field. Ellen Cushman, over a decade ago in “Sustainable Service-Learning Programs,” encourages scholars to “view the community site as a place where their research, teaching, and service contribute to a community's self-defined needs and students' learning” (40). And Eli Goldblatt writes in *Because We Live Here*, “we will have to call for a revision of the criteria for faculty productivity in the next few years” to include “a more holistic sense of a person’s intellectual and disciplinary goals” rather than evaluating faculty “in terms of the traditional triad of teaching-research-service” (206). In April 2016, NCTE published the “CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition,” replacing the “CCCC Position Statement on Faculty Work in Community-Based Settings” that was only a year and a half old. The name of the new statement indicates a need to re-articulate what “faculty work” (and the work of members of the fields who are not tenured faculty members, whether contingent faculty or graduate students) might look like in community settings. In its definition of community-engaged projects, the new statement includes “scholarly, teaching, or community-development activities” and points to numerous varied examples of projects (i.e., “teaching exchanges, community writing or tutoring arrangements, and facilitated public discussions about pressing issues of local concern”) and artifacts of engaged projects (i.e., “publications by incarcerated writers,”

“rhetorical histories” of marginalized communities, “oral histories and digital storytelling projects,” and “newspapers about issues related to homelessness written by homeless individuals”) that span traditional teaching, research, and service activity. In offering so many different examples of what intellectually rigorous community projects and products might look like, this statement broadens what engaged scholarship in the field might include.

Another important element of the recent CCCC Statement is how it demonstrates the engaged community work as intellectual activity that should be considered *research*, rather than just community service. The statement’s section on “Principles for Evaluating Quality, Rigor, and Success” begins by claiming, “‘Off-campus’ or ‘engaged’ projects are often labeled and undervalued as merely service.” After listing several ways that a variety of engaged projects might be considered “quality, rigorous, ethical, and successful,” CCCC recommends that “each higher education institution... establish criteria and processes appropriate to its culture and region for accurate, fair, and informed peer evaluation of community-based projects” before listing example criteria. The statement makes clear that the work of a community project is intellectually rigorous and often problematically relegated to service, or even rendered completely invisible in institutional documents. For example, in his essay “(j)WPA Work, Service-Learning, and the Case for Baby Steps,” Michael Donnelly discusses how his large-scale community project, a street newspaper, was almost completely ignored in his pre-tenure review even though he “viewed [it] as cutting across the four areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service, and ‘working with students’),” except that the committee “indicated it might be the basis of a scholarly article” (126). Donnelly’s project fulfills CCCC’s

examples of “making new knowledge” in community-engaged projects through “media for community organizations” (the paper itself), “new teaching curricula” (the course connected to the creation of the street paper) and “new opportunities for community-university dialogue” (through his partnership with the Homeless Coalition), but despite the ways this research and teaching project was intellectually rigorous, his work was only seen as valuable in that it “might” become a scholarly article.

Attitudes that privilege only traditional forms of research—like publications and conference presentations—have been addressed in larger disciplinary conversations about tenure, specifically about the type of intellectual work that is often made invisible during tenure processes. Michael Day, Susan H. Delagrange, Mike Palmquist, Michael A. Pemberton, and Janice R. Walker discuss the problems of the “‘one-size-fits-all’ model of the tenured professor” that “typically defines tenure and promotion requirements using numerical ranges of articles or books or qualitative criteria about ‘top-tier’ journals and academic presses” (186). In their article, they seek to make visible the intellectual rigors of many forms of disciplinary scholarship, pointing to digital and new-media scholarship, editorial and curatorial work, administration, and mentoring, as they argue for a more comprehensive view of what scholarship in the field should look like. For each of the four areas, they describe the intellectual nature of work that is often relegated to service (for editorial, administrative, and mentoring work) or a lesser form of scholarship (for digital publications). Though Day et al. are not speaking specifically about engaged research, their argument that “being a scholar, in short, means engaging in reflective, well-informed practices that help us accomplish the goals of advancing and sharing our knowledge of what it means to write and be a writer” (186) could easily encompass

community projects as well. For example, Day et al.'s argument for a "a more inclusive understanding of what forms scholarly excellence may take" is especially pertinent for engaged research projects that take extended amounts of time and might include a variety of products. (196). Engaged research projects, like the one described by Donnelly, are intellectually rigorous and grounded in theory, requiring "not simply a volunteer ethos but also considerable disciplinary expertise" along with "extensive critical and collaborative intellectual labor" ("CCCC Statement"), and like those areas described by Day et al., engaged projects are often overlooked by more traditional definitions of research oft-used in tenure regulations.

The primary goal of these conversations across higher education and in rhetoric and composition is for scholars to rethink what it means to make new knowledge in the academy and how to make visible the intellectual work of engaged research by expanding tenure regulations. However, changing policy regulations takes time, and enacting those changes takes even more time. Scholars need to extend their view beyond arguments for policy change to consider how such changes will be enacted across the university, how regulated change must be accompanied by regularized genre activity. In this analysis, I look at current tenure policy and proposed revisions at UofL for two purposes—1) to see how current policy and proposed revisions value engaged research, and 2) to show the complex nature of enacting policy revisions, which is often obscured when people focus only on changing the wording of policy. This analysis depicts how regulated genre activity via revising policy language will help engaged scholars forward their professional work during assessment and shows that because these texts coordinate people and practices within a larger genre system, regularized genre activity is necessary

to create a culture where such policy changes are then enacted. Ultimately, recognizing and valuing the different types of knowledge making in engaged scholarship must include changing both institutional policies and institutional culture.

Current Tenure Policy and Proposed Revisions at UofL

The high priority placed on revising tenure policies at UofL to better reflect community engaged faculty work is evident across institutional documents and interviews with administrators. Since the university began to refocus its goals to institutionalize community engagement in 2008, how tenure policies reflect community engagement has become a key area of concern for administrators. Of UofL's twelve academic units with personnel policies, five explicitly reward faculty for scholarly work "that uses community-engaged approaches and methods" (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 28)—the Kent School of Social Work, School of Medicine, School of Dentistry, College of Education and Human Development, and the School of Nursing. Current policy, as discussed in UofL's application for the Carnegie Foundation's elective classification in community engagement, shows that, "Although each unit considers community engagement as one of its standard criteria under the area of service, there are varying degrees of emphasis on engagement in the areas of research and teaching" (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 25). The goal of UofL administrators who are committed to community engagement is to change these regulated policies, in both overarching institutional documents and ones specific to academic units, to create a culture that more explicitly values and supports engaged

teaching and research (rather than only service), thus making engaged scholarship a possible activity recognized and rewarded within this regulated genre.

Work to change tenure policies began in 2009 when the former Provost led a strong push to incorporate explicit discussion of community engagement in the policies of the remaining seven academic units. Henry Cunningham, Director of the Office of Community Engagement, says, “We have made some progress but we have still not gotten there yet.” Ultimately, the hope is for UofL’s tenure policies across the university to incorporate the following, as outlined in the Carnegie Foundation Application:

Community engagement is being integrated into the more traditional model of faculty evaluation: (1) teaching portfolios that include community-based instruction, practice-based instruction and service learning, practice-based research efforts, outreach partnerships; (2) defining scholarship as “the creation, integration, and dissemination of knowledge that advances a field of study and influences the profession *and community* as evidenced in peer-review and acceptance.”; (3) establishing novel and sustained partnerships and interventions that impact the public health of the community; (4) establishing strong ties with the community-based health organizations at the local, state, regional and national level and with state and federal agencies; (5) demonstrated participation in extramural service initiatives including research service, community programs to educate and promote public health changes that have potential to impact community members’ health, curriculum development for community and government agencies and service related to elimination of community health disparities (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 30).

These parameters, though not all directly affect every discipline (particularly the health focus of sections 3-5), would offer a more robust set of possibilities for how engaged scholars' work might be evaluated during the tenure process. These definitions expand the regulated dimensions of what it means to make new knowledge, specifically by adding "the community" as a possible audience for scholarly work, enabling engaged scholars to argue that their research activities and products, beyond scholarly publications, should count as research in their tenure portfolios.

To begin this revision process, UofL administrators are focusing on the university's foremost governance document, *the Redbook*, to include specific wording about community engagement. As it stands now, the *Redbook* lists "teaching," "research or creative activity," and "service to the profession, the unit, the University or the community" as criteria for tenure, specifying that "the details of these criteria and of any additional criteria to be considered in making a recommendation concerning tenure shall be specified in the unit's personnel document" (*Redbook* 4.2.2).⁶ Proposed revisions to these policies would read: "The details of these criteria and of any additional criteria, including specific recognition of engaged teaching, research and service, to be considered in making a recommendation concerning tenure shall be specified in the unit's personnel document" (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 24). However, as of August 2016 (over two years after the writing of the Carnegie application), these revisions have not been finalized, and therefore no changes in the *Redbook* have been made. The proposed revisions would help legitimize the work of engaged research and engaged teaching by changing the regulations mandated for tenure in the *Redbook*, but

⁶ *Redbook* policy for promotion in rank is exactly the same, replacing only the word "tenure" with "promotion" (*Redbook* 4.2.3)

how such revisions would be carried out across the university would still be determined unit-by-unit.

Despite the institutional priority on including engaged scholarship in tenure policies across the university, current tenure policies at the highest institutional level and in just over half of the units *do not* yet contain language that explicitly values engaged research. For example, in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), engaged research is not visibly valued in current tenure policy. The word “community” is used only twice in the 13-page document—once in discussion of the context of where “Service” work might be done and once when pointing out that “to have an activity counted in an area with which it is not generally associated (for example...to have some professional involvement in the community treated as a Teaching activity) are expected to justify their requests to those reviewing their cases” (4). In neither case is community explicitly linked to research, a scholar’s primary means of attaining promotion. Work in the “community” is located squarely in service and to have it counted elsewhere, like teaching (not even bringing research into the equation), would require justification. Community work is an area generally not associated with the regulated definition of what adds “to the reservoir of knowledge in a faculty member’s field” (6). In this way, community-engaged research is not explicitly a visible part of the tenure process for CAS.

One might argue that there are ways that engaged scholarship could be valued in the current CAS tenure policy, but the lack of specifics about community context still privilege traditional research products. CAS lists the following as “examples of activities

in the realm of Research and Creative Activity” for which scholars might receive tenure consideration:

- The dissemination of new knowledge through the publication of refereed books, monographs, journal articles and proceedings.
- Productions in art, literature, or theater.
- Presentation of papers at scholarly meetings and the publication of abstracts associated with those presentations.
- Efforts at writing grant proposals and success in obtaining funding for research and other creative activities.
- Cross-disciplinary investigations, meta-analyses and literature reviews.
- Writing for non-specialists in publications such as encyclopedias and books intended for the general public.
- Consulting and the preparation of reports.
- Conducting studies or surveys for public or private organizations. (“Dean’s Guidelines” 6).

Of the listed products, publications and conference presentations could easily include discussions of engaged projects. Other listed activities like grant writing, writing for non-specialists, consulting, and conducting research for public or private organizations, though lower on the list than traditional products like books, articles, or presentations, are all activities that would likely be a part of creating an engaged project that could count toward tenure. So it is possible an engaged scholar could gain tenure with significant documentation of traditional and alternative scholarly products like grants and community reports, but the lack of specific wording regarding engaged scholarship

perpetuates a culture that devalues such work, which can cause problems when the policies are enacted in practice (Sobrero and Jayaratne, Ellison and Eatman, Saltmarsh et al., O'Meara). If engaged scholarship is not valued by a particular department or tenure committee, then the alternative products listed likely will not be valued either. For example, there are no guidelines for policy regarding number or venue of refereed publications, which are open to interpretation for each department, or how alternative products, might count compared to traditional publications and presentations. Because of this lack of specificity regarding community contexts or how products should be counted, departments whose members do not value engaged scholarship could still rely on the first three scholarly parameters listed as the primary or even only means of regulating tenure. As a graduate student, I do not know the conversations that happen in personnel committee meetings, how committee members decide what type of work is valued in what way. But the problem is, junior faculty do not know these details either, which is why it is important to have explicitly articulated policies that include engaged research as a means of making new knowledge, so that junior faculty have space to make an argument for why their engaged work should count toward tenure.

According to Dean Beth Boehm, who is currently Dean of the School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies where she is beginning a community engagement initiative for graduate students across disciplines and who is a former Director of Graduate Studies for English, there is a lack of value of engaged research in CAS that results from its nature as an applied field of scholarship. Boehm explains, "There is some resistance on the part of traditional academics to the work that is done by engaged researchers. So there are people who will say this work is not as rigorous or not

necessarily making new knowledge in the same way that other kinds of academic research does.” Though she believes that inroads have been made to countering that resistance, it has not been solved, which is partially seen in the way that CAS “has been slower to try and figure out how to include community engagement research products in their tenure and promotion reviews.” This is in contrast to units like the School of Medicine or the Kent School of Social Work, both of which are units specified by Boehm as intrinsically valuing engaged research (and applied scholarship broadly) and community connections. Both Boehm and Cate Fosl, Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies who served as Special Assistant to the Provost for Engaged Scholarship in 2014-15, make note of the many scholars, with and without experience in community-engaged scholarship, who “would not advise untenured people to do this sort of work” (Fosl). Boehm agrees: “We want to be very honest about the way the work is valued within the academy. I think it’s increasingly valued, but I think that students who really want to take it on are going to have to be their own best advocates... I think that sometimes we think of course this work is valuable, it’s helping people. That’s true on one level, but it’s not always valuable to the people who review your tenure files.” Boehm’s comments align with recent scholarship noting the particular lagging behind of humanities disciplines in explicitly valuing engaged research during tenure processes. Ellison and Eatman’s report is written for *Imagining America*, an organization that focuses on disciplines in the “Arts, Humanities, and Design.” Throughout the report, they explain how “evaluating the work of civically engaged scholars in the humanities, arts, and design is a challenge” (Ellison and Eatman viii), presenting examples of engaged projects, career narratives from engaged scholars, and recommendations to overcome this challenge. For fields that do

not see engaged research as a part of the regulated, institutional ways of making new knowledge, policy must change to explicitly show how community contexts are a part of the regulated assessment of faculty through tenure.

Currently, traditional paradigms for research are still the most obviously valued in CAS, which can present problems for emerging engaged scholars if members of the personnel committee do not understand the value of their work. While the proposed *Redbook* revisions for how the institution wants to value engaged research (as seen in the Carnegie application) are excellent and would do much to expand how institutional policy regulates new knowledge making, such revisions are not currently in place. For example, a key difference can be seen in the CAS definition of creating knowledge that adds “to the reservoir of knowledge in a faculty member’s field” (6) and the one included in the Carnegie application that calls for the creation of knowledge that “advances a field of study and influences the profession *and community* as evidenced in peer-review and acceptance” (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 30). In this more comprehensive definition, knowledge is no longer solely for a scholar’s field but also could equally influence community members outside of that academic field. However, even in this more inclusive definition, the degree to which community acceptance is important when compared to disciplinary peer-review is unclear, which leaves open the possibility for departments that see community audiences as less important to maintain traditional regulations for tenure review. Following policy change, cultural change for more traditional departments will happen slowly, and enacting new policies through regularized genre activity is central to creating that cultural change.

Enacting Policy Change through Regularized Genre Activity

In order to create a university-wide system for valuing engaged scholarship, policy change (or regulated genre activity) must interact with cultural change (or regularized genre activity) at the university, because members of the institution are the ones who put policies into action. One way this need for cultural change is evident is that the *Redbook* requires unit-by-unit tenure criteria. Beyond the five units listed earlier, some progress has been made according to the Carnegie application, especially in the School of Public Health and Information Sciences. However, in CAS, which as seen above does not explicitly value engaged research in its current policy regulations, progress is held to “conversations...regarding revision of faculty personnel policies to create better mechanisms for rewarding and promoting engaged scholarship” (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 29). When discussing the need for tenure policy revision, Vice President for Community Engagement Daniel Hall explains, “It’s a departmental by departmental discussion that needs to take place,” regarding whether or not to “modernize and update [each department’s] promotion and tenure guidelines to provide flexibility for [community-engaged faculty] to do this type of scholarship” without being penalized. Per the *Redbook*, every tenure decision “must originate in the department or division” prior to going to the Dean of that academic unit (*Redbook* 4.2.2). Rather than 12 academic units, Hall is saying that all academic departments must individually change their understanding of tenure requirements to visibly support engaged research and teaching. Based on the lack of specificity in the *Redbook* and CAS guidelines, it’s likely that other tenure policies—what counts as authorship, the number of publications and/or grants required, what is considered an

appropriate publication venue—are similarly decided department by department. These all represent regulated policies that are important for engaged scholars because collaborative publication, projects that require a great deal of work before publishing research on them, and publication in journals primarily about community engagement⁷ are all common for engaged scholars. If a department does not value any or all of those aspects of their work, this would combine with a lack of specific language about community projects as *research* to decrease the worth of the research portion of the tenure portfolio as a whole. Changing the culture of the university through regularized activity would make it more likely for regulated changes from the top of the institution to trickle down through various units and departments. As it stands now, even if the proposed changes in *The Redbook* become institutional policy, individual departments remain the primary arbiters of how tenure decisions are made. Simply changing policy wording does not automatically mean that members of an institution would enact policy the way it is intended, especially not without cultural change to go with it.

The need to change university culture is echoed in Cate Fosl's⁸ engaged scholarship report, "Imagine Engaged Scholarship at the University of Louisville: A Research Report to the Provost," where she highlights the difficulties of enacting new policy without such cultural change. Fosl claims, "revising T&P guidelines is a key step, but not a magic fix" (19), explaining that implementation of those guidelines continues even after explicit valuing of engaged scholarship is written into tenure policies. Even at universities where explicit policy language has been in place since the late 90s, there have been "continuing battles to get that language understood, implemented, and

⁷ For more on the devaluing of peer reviewed community engagement journals, see Sobrero and Jayaratne

⁸ Fosl researched and wrote this report during the 2014-15 academy year as the Special Assistant to the Provost for Engaged Scholarship, a temporary position

interpreted favorably, from the perspective of engaged scholars on the campus” (Fosl 19). These institutions show how policy change does not automatically mean a change in action. For those departments at UofL that have not yet fully embraced engaged scholarship, one must be careful not to assume that a textual change would create change in practice. Fosl writes:

Even with better language in place in personnel documents, earning tenure as an engaged scholar requires extensive documentation/explanation of scholarly products and can sometimes mean going an extra mile to produce written products that may seem an addendum to the intended outcome, or simply accepting that an experiential class will take more time than one’s work plan will ever convey (19).

Here, Fosl shows how regularized genre activity, adding documents that show and explain engaged research and teaching, can help a scholar navigate a regulated genre like the tenure portfolio. O’Meara affirms this, claiming that “making a clear case for the rigor of engaged work for peers through careful documentation *will* make a difference to both the quality of the work and to reviewers who are willing to hear the case made” (275). Additionally, tenure decisions require that the committee understand how to interpret all of this extra documentation. Fosl recommends another regularized activity to aid in this area—learning communities for emerging engaged scholars, which would include discussions of “modules on products of [engaged scholarship] and how to document them for review committees, as well as modules on reading and interpreting interdisciplinary writing for tenure review” (19). She specifically suggests that chairs should attend at least one session of this program with their untenured faculty member.

Current practice at UofL, as documented in the Carnegie application, shows that some training in evaluating engaged research for faculty members sitting on tenure review committees has already begun. Starting in 2008, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, the Vice President for Community Engagement, and staff from the Office of Community Engagement, began meeting with deans and unit personnel chairs to discuss “how current personnel documents could encompass engaged scholarship and how this scholarship can count toward promotion and tenure” (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 29). Additionally, these administrators were able to glean “what progress each unit had made in developing policies or practices for evaluating faculty scholarly work that involved community engagement” (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 29). Other professional development for faculty members included campus visits from internationally recognized experts in institutionalized community engagement: Dr. Barbara Holland and Dr. Hiram Fitzgerald. Administrators at the university realize that “deans, department chairs, and members of the faculty personnel committees” must continue to learn about “the role of engagement in the production of traditional and non-traditional scholarly products” (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 24). These attempts to “educat[e] the university community” (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 24) depict regularized genre activity for institutionalizing tenure guidelines that value community engaged work in that they attempt to change the culture in which those policies are enacted.

Fosl’s report and UofL’s push to educate the university community both show that the revision of institutional documents is not only textual (i.e., regulated); it is also a

longer, more active process that necessitates changing the culture of an institution through regularized genre activity. The uptake of revised tenure policy is almost as important as the writing of such revisions. While I would argue that the explicit policy changes in regulations are more important in that they give emerging scholars a stronger foundation on which to build their tenure case, scholars also need a personnel committee that understands the worth and intellectual rigor of engaged research. Policy revision is not the endgame for institutional change, but must be a step in the process toward creating a culture that values community engagement.

Changing minds is key for the valuing of engaged research to spread to other aspects of the larger professionalization genre system. Tenure is an intense moment of assessment where all aspects of a scholar's work need to be valued so that they are fairly evaluated, and thus scholars should be attentive to how policy change can make this process easier for emerging scholars. But tenure policy is not the only regulated professionalization genre that might be used as a lever to create a broader, institution-wide support of engaged scholarship. For an institution to create a culture that encourages this type of scholarship, engaged scholars need to be valued at many points during the professionalization pipeline, starting as early as graduate school. Tenure is a pivotal moment for engaged scholars, but policies in place for tenure are ultimately a part of a larger system featuring multiple policies that, together, devalue engaged scholarship over the course of a career—from graduate school to full professorship.

The Longer Professionalization Pipeline

Moving to regulated documents other than tenure policy, I depict the greater depth and breadth of challenges presented by the professionalization system for engaged scholars when it comes to documenting and rewarding community engaged research, showing why conversations about disrupting these processes can begin with revising tenure policies but must extend beyond that if an institution wants to create true structural change. Focusing on the moment of tenure shows the most obvious way that a professional identity of an engaged scholar may or may not be valued, but obscures 1) documents that come before the tenure portfolio, 2) how filling out these documents inscribes emerging scholars into ideologies that can erase large portions of the work they do, and 3) how reviewing these documents can give other faculty an opportunity to practice seeing and understanding engaged research as a way of making new knowledge. In this section, I use interviews to detail how emerging scholars navigate regulated genres, highlighting the complex ways that larger institutional structures recognize time and labor in such a way that devalues the work of engaged scholarship. However, the way emerging scholars are using regularized genres alongside regulated genres to document their work in ways that more closely align with their understandings of their scholarly identity demonstrates potential alternatives to creating structures that are less regulated and more inclusive of engaged scholarship.

Regulated Genres - The Annual Work Plan and Program Progress Assessment

Long before faculty members create their tenure portfolios, they have been constructing a professional identity through the regulated documents they show their

administrators. The genres' stringent parameters for classifying scholarly work in the tripartite system can have problematic effects on emerging engaged scholars as they are forming their professional identities. While the tenure portfolio is a one-time beast, documents like the Annual Work Plan (AWP) guide faculty members' scholarly lives from year to year. In the AWP, UofL faculty document their loose plans for the courses they will teach, the service they will do for the department and university, and of course, their research, allotting each category a percentage of their work based on the form's guidelines, which presents a somewhat fictional account of faculty members' time and efforts. For faculty members, like engaged scholars, whose work does not easily compartmentalize into these three areas, the AWP is not only difficult to complete but can also condition emerging scholars to see that projects integrating these three areas, or less traditional ways of making new knowledge, are not valued by the institution. This regulated document is only one example of how faculty are asked to justify their time and labor across different dimensions of their position, shaping their work to fit into the guidelines, and thus the ideologies, of the university. Genres like the AWP are particularly important to how junior faculty members learn to construct their scholarly identities during their first few years at an institution and how they understand their work to be valued by the institution.

For UofL's CAS faculty involved in engaged projects, the AWP's regulations make it difficult to document engaged scholarship. One faculty member, Sabrina, who served as the Co-Director of UofL's Digital Media Academy (DMA)⁹ in 2015 and the Director in 2016, says, "I guess I'm not sure whether to put [DMA] on teaching or service." In her AWP for the 2016-2017 school year, her work as Director of DMA is

⁹ More information about DMA can be found in chapter one (p. 23) and chapter three.

listed as such—1) two entries in research about a co-written article that the directors and graduate students for the 2015 camp are drafting and a conference presentation; 2) one course release in Fall 2016 for her work in Summer 2015; and 3) “Alternative Administrative Assignments,” where she says she is banking a course release for her summer 2016 work “running intensive summer digital media course for local signature partnership schools.” In two of these notations, the conference presentation and course release, Sabrina does not specifically list their connection to DMA. Sabrina explains that she doesn’t know where to put the bulk of the work of the camp—its planning and implementation, which consisted of over 200 hours of work¹⁰: “under research, I’ve put publication with Mary P [Sheridan] and grad students as something that I’m working on. And I have a course release, so that’s reflected in the teaching. But in terms of where it goes. There’s no percentage. I guess it’s reflected in the course release. I can’t make service 50%. Service is still 5%.” Sabrina clearly recognizes DMA as a research project in that she has gained IRB approval and created a research protocol that she then taught to graduate students working on the camp, but the institution, through the AWP, does not recognize that work as research until it exists as a particular type of product (i.e., peer-reviewed article or conference presentation) that circulates in disciplinary circles. Thus, all of her time and labor on the camp is subsumed under the brief research and course release notations and an addendum explaining that she was the Director of DMA, which is given only a bare-bones description as per the genre.

In addition to the instructions on the AWP making it unclear to Sabrina how to record DMA, the person guiding Sabrina’s navigation of the genre adheres to the idea

¹⁰ Sabrina has been tracking her hours working on the 2016 camp, and she provided this number in September 2016 as the number of hours she had spent on DMA in the calendar year.

that this document is largely fictional, which ultimately prompts her to stick to the regulations of the document. Sabrina mentions her department chair four times over the course of her four-minute answer discussing how she filled out her AWP, explaining that much of the choice of where to fill in DMA and the language chosen to write it up came from her chair. Sabrina says, “I feel like I should be putting [DMA] on my AWP. There’s a place where it should go, but...[the department chair] didn’t have me put it there.” Additionally, she specifies the “Alternative Administrative Assignments” section—“This is all [the department chair’s] language from last year—running intensive summer digital media course for local schools including one Signature Partnership school.” The department chair, in advising Sabrina to fill out her AWP to focus on the fictional accounting of work rather than the realities of where she spent her time (which makes sense with regard to avoiding bureaucratic issues), affirms the larger institutional system that expects faculty work to fit into a neat tripartite system, privileging a specific kind of knowledge-making as “research.” When an emerging scholar learns to default to the conventions of the genre rather than the lived realities of her engaged research efforts while navigating these regulated documents, there are significant consequences for that scholar’s understanding of her work.

Conversely, a more regularizing influence on Sabrina’s AWP, making her work more departmentally legible, comes from the same document completed by Mary P Sheridan, a more senior faculty member and the original director of DMA. In Mary P’s first two years as Director of DMA, she was aware that she had no place to add DMA to her AWP, but she was less concerned with it because she is already a full professor. Starting in her 2015-16 AWP, she specifically wrote up her work on DMA, telling me in

an interview—“So for the last two years, I’m writing on my AWP, I’m doing this [work on DMA]. This is currently invisible work—a junior, untenured faculty member is taking this over, it can’t be [invisible any more].” Mary P acknowledges that she is “protected because [she has] tenure,” which enables her both to take on efforts that do not count toward her workload without fear of significant professional repercussions and to advocate for more visibility for Sabrina’s work on the same project as a junior, untenured faculty member. Mary P can’t individually change the regulations of this document, but she can write hers in such a way to make known the amount and type of work DMA entails so that Sabrina can also receive credit for her time and labor on the project.

The AWP is one example, beyond tenure policy, where the university is attempting to regulate faculty work and, as such, has significant material and ideological consequences for faculty members. If Sabrina’s work is not written out and made visible in institutional documents, there is no way for administrators evaluating her work to realize how extensive it is. Materially, if the amount of work she does each year is not clearly represented, she might not receive appropriate merit pay, or she could be assigned additional duties. Ideologically, the AWP demonstrates to Sabrina that her time and labor on DMA are not valuable to the institution or legible as research. Her current problems determining how to count community-engaged work in her AWP influence how she chooses to divide her time and effort on projects in the future. After spending two years as Co-Director and Director of DMA, she has since chosen not to pursue further work on the camp or similar engaged projects in order to focus on research work that can be more clearly shown in regulated institutional genres. The AWP’s misalignment and erasure of Sabrina’s work is more than just an inconvenience of doing more than she receives credit

for; it has significant consequences. Pre-tenure, regulated professionalization processes like the AWP indicate to emerging engaged scholars that the time and effort spent on engaged research is not legible to the institution until it has resulted in traditional research products, and thus the engagement itself is not valued.

Even before the AWP, graduate students are similarly professionalized into the tripartite model, obscuring the value of engaged scholarship in their professional identities. For example, at UofL, graduate students in English are asked to complete a Program Progress Assessment (PPA) at the end of each school year to track needed logistics (what classes they've taken and taught), professional accomplishments (conference presentations, publications, etc.), and general goals for their progress in the program. Much like the AWP, students are asked to categorize their work and achievements in "Research Activities," "Teaching Activities," and "Service Activities," and the document's instructions leave no obvious place to record one's efforts on community-engaged research projects. Under research, the instructions indicate that students should record only "progress of dissertation research." Teaching activity is limited to the names of courses taught each year, and under service, the instructions say to "include any activities with the department, university and community and the academic year in which you participated" and "any committees you volunteered for, offices held, and volunteer efforts." Similar to the instructions for tenure assessment in CAS, community efforts are only specified under the service section, despite what those efforts might look like. For students who are participating in community-engaged research that does not directly connect to their dissertation, "service" is the only place to put these projects. Because research and service are defined in such specific terms on this

form, there is no room for engaged scholars to learn to hone their professional identity in this regulated document. Instead, they must attempt to translate their work to more traditional paradigms where the only research that matters is what you've published or what will directly lead to future research products, like the dissertation.

Though the PPA is a less official document with a narrow audience, limited only to the Director of Graduate Studies, than the AWP, this document still has ideological influence over graduate students, steering them toward certain types of professionalization. Graduate students fill out this document to show what they have accomplished in the year, and the form likely shapes the work they choose to do during that year. If traditional research products like the dissertation and article publications count more than long-term engaged research projects to be filed under service, then it seems likely that graduate students will often feel like they need to choose to work on the former over the latter, regardless of what they are more interested in or what might shape their scholarly inquiry in the long-run. Though this document does not plan out a year's workload like the AWP, graduate students know they have to show how they are progressing through the program at the end of each year and likely plan their time and labor based on how the department will view their progress.

In the face of a genre system that encourages traditional understandings of scholarly work, mentorship is an important regularized genre activity that can interrupt this system. When filling out documents like the PPA, it's easy for graduate students to follow instructions and implicitly come to understand their time and effort on engaged research as less valuable on these kinds of documents. Though I routinely describe DMA as a research project, about which I have written three articles and presented at several

conferences, I still followed the instructions, as I understood them, and categorized my actual efforts on the camp itself as service rather than research. Through repeated iterations of similar documents, I could easily learn that in evaluative genres like this, the time and labor on projects like DMA should be listed under *service* with only traditional research products listed under research, which Sabrina shows is a significant problem when service can only count for a small amount of a faculty member's work time. Mentorship, however, can interrupt this understanding of engaged work as service. The reason I describe DMA as research is due in large part to my mentors in community engagement, who frame these projects as research for the graduate students who participate in them, encouraging them to enter projects with research questions and plans in mind and to create scholarly products afterward. Had I not been mentored in such a way, I would likely assume from documents like the PPA that my time spent on engaged projects is service, while only my efforts to create traditional scholarly products should be considered research.

The placement of community engagement projects in assessment documents matters, even during graduate school. Graduate school is where students learn to become faculty members. They learn how to research in the field, how to teach, and, to an extent, how to interact in the larger university community. Faculty members are required to track their work through regulated documents, and the PPA teaches graduate students how they should navigate such documents in the future. Though, as Dorothy Smith argues, any one text does not create particular actions, it is still significant in that it acts as a part of a genre system that coordinates specific types of actions, showing graduate students how they should categorize their work in ways that institutions value. If emerging scholars

learn that they should count engaged research projects as service, they will face problems as faculty members where the bulk of their efforts are expected to go to teaching and research, not service. They will have to learn a new way to record their time and efforts on engaged research projects in regulated documents, or they won't receive credit for their work. Learning how to fill out documents like the PPA in graduate school is important and shapes how graduate students understand their professional identities and how they present themselves on the job market, through their CV, and in future faculty positions, through regulated documents like the AWP. Identities learned in graduate school are indoctrinated into scholars, and documents like the PPA are a part of molding those identities toward more traditional models of research, regardless if that model fits the lived realities of their work.

Regularized Genres - CVs and Professional Websites

Though the institutional professionalization genre system is primarily made up of regulated documents like tenure policy, the AWP, and the PPA, other, more regularized genres, like the CV and professional websites, are also places where emerging scholars represent their professional identities to themselves and to the discipline, often in high stakes settings. These regularized documents offer more flexibility for emerging engaged scholars to negotiate their professional identities. For example, one graduate student, Elizabeth, noted several differences in how she classified her work on DMA and other engaged research projects in regulated and regularized documents, showing how difficult and confusing it can be to parse what represents research, teaching, and service in engaged projects. Like me, Elizabeth included DMA only under service on her PPA,

because she followed the instructions that research only includes progress on her dissertation, a project not connected to her engaged research. On her CV, she has a special “research experience” category, directly below education and publications, that showcases her engaged research experiences, and she lists DMA under “teaching experience.” So across these two documents, she includes DMA only under “service” in the most regulated document, but under “research” and “teaching” on her CV, a regularized document with more flexibility. The ambiguity of how DMA should be classified reflects, in some ways, the ambiguous way Elizabeth thought of her work as she was doing it:

I think particularly, when I was working on the IRB proposals for both Art as Memory¹¹ and DMA, I was thinking of them as research projects, and then when we were writing about DMA, I was thinking of it as a research project. But I feel like when I was actually doing DMA, I wasn’t thinking of it so much as research. You know, sometimes, when we would sit down and do the blogs afterward, I would begin to shift back into researcher mode, trying to construct a metanarrative of some kind. But I felt like, you know, moment to moment in the camp, or even in planning aspects of the camp, I wasn’t generally thinking of what I was doing as research. So it is something that sort of, I felt like I moved in and out of feeling like it was sometimes service, sometimes teaching, sometimes research.

¹¹ Another engaged research project where English graduate students, led by Brenda Jo Brueggemann, partnered with the Council on Developmental Disabilities to attend, facilitate, and photograph/video record thirteen art workshops for Louisville citizens with developmental disabilities and three art shows that presented their work.

Though the process of making new knowledge through DMA involved all three categories, she is still asked to relegate it to only one category on her PPA—service. The CV, a regularized genre, offers her other ways to categorize this project that are more aligned with the way she thinks about it—as integrating research, teaching, and service.

While the CV offers more flexible options than the PPA, Elizabeth believes that it is actually her professional website where she is able to best represent her scholarly identity as she understands it. On her website, Elizabeth discusses DMA on her home page, directly following a short explanation of her dissertation project. Additionally, she features a picture from DMA as the only image of herself on the website. Elizabeth says, “I feel like the website is a more flexible self-presentation document, and I had a lot more control over where I put things and how I ordered things and constructed them. I think that aligns also with how I’m thinking of [DMA].” This alignment between self-thought and representation on documents is important for all scholars, but especially for emerging scholars trying to determine how they want to be understood as scholars in the field and at their institutions. Ultimately, her understanding of the process of classifying and representing her scholarly work is that “the less flexible documents” like the PPA “align less clearly with people’s self-presentation” of their professional identities, which was certainly true in her case.

Elizabeth is still exploring who she is as a scholar, and mentoring from engaged faculty helped her understand how engaged scholarship fits into that identity. Though her dissertation project did not involve community-engaged research, she still considers DMA to be an important part of her scholarly identity as a *researcher*, a *teacher*, and someone *servicing* the university, discipline, and community. Elizabeth has come to inhabit

this identity because of the opportunities presented to her by engaged faculty and their mentoring during these projects. These faculty members, in creating engaged opportunities for graduate students, offer alternatives for what it means to be a scholar in this discipline and show the value of community-engaged work. In this way, they are creating the sort of cultural change needed across the institution on a smaller scale. Elizabeth, even if she is not primarily an engaged scholar, values the projects she has been a part of and understands the importance of this work across disciplines as seen in how she represents them in regularized genres and how she discusses them. This is the kind of understanding and value that engaged scholars are looking for from people across institutions and disciplines, and for Elizabeth, that came from engaged research opportunities and the mentoring that came with them.

Another outcome of this small-scale cultural change is that engaged graduate students are influencing one another's regularized documents, finding ways together to reflect their scholarly identities across genres. Elizabeth chose to include a "Research Experience" section on her CV after she saw a similar section on the CV of another engaged graduate student, Rebecca, and I followed suit after seeing Elizabeth's. Elizabeth, explaining her thinking about this categorization, says, "Most CV templates don't have a research section, exactly. Like they do it in other ways. But because I hadn't published anything at the time, it made sense to include it that way. But I hadn't included it that way until I saw Rebecca including it as research." Because of the mentoring we had all received from Mary P, we certainly understood our time and work on DMA as research, and we had all been listed as co-investigators on the IRB application. For both Elizabeth and me, it took seeing someone else listing the project as research on their CV

to understand that this was a way we could represent ourselves in this document. When we saw another possibility, we realized how much more sense it made to classify this work as research, rather than as service. Discussing these professionalization genres with other graduate students led Elizabeth and me to document our work on community engagement projects in new ways, specifically labeling them as “research” projects, although we both put them under “service” in the PPA. When engaged scholars helped one another navigate this genre, they were able to find ways to balance the service-oriented classification of the regulated documentation by putting forward a research-oriented classification in the regularized documentation.

For engaged graduate students, regularized documents like the CV and professional website enable other members of the field, especially hiring committees, to see them as community-engaged researchers. Elizabeth explains that in almost all of her job interviews, she was asked about her engaged research projects: “I think the three projects that most defined me on the job market were DMA, Art as Memory, and my dissertation project.” She thinks its likely that the privileging of these projects came about because of the prominence of her engaged research project on her CV and her professional website. She explains, “It’s hard to know how much of that is my presentation of them, the fact that I did put them on the first and second page of my CV and all over the first page of my website. And how much of it is, you know, that’s the demands of the market or the jobs where I applied or someone’s personal hobbyhorse. It’s so hard to know why things happened the way they did, but it does seem likely that my putting them front and center in both places led people to ask more questions about them.” Though she can’t know for sure, it seems likely that the prominent position she

gave these engaged research projects led to more questions about them, encouraging hiring committees to see her as an engaged researcher, even though her dissertation, her main research project is not based in a community setting. The flexibility of these documents allowed her to create more dimensions to her identity as a researcher, emphasizing her engaged projects in a way she was not able to do in her highly regulated PPA. Such added dimensions changed the way members of hiring committees understood the full scope of her research.

As Elizabeth moves forward into a faculty position, perhaps her classification of community engagement work as research will allow such work taken on as a faculty member to be more easily understood as research. Because she has already 1) come to see that work as research herself, and classified it as such in her regularized documents and 2) discussed her engaged projects with the hiring committee as research projects due to their classification on her CV, perhaps she will more easily be able to classify new engaged projects as research on her regulated documents, like the AWP. It's possible, though certainly not a given, that in crafting her own scholarly identity as an engaged researcher in regularized documents where she is given more flexibility, she will then be able to maintain that identity across more regulated institutional documents like the AWP and tenure portfolio, enabling her work to be counted as research. Such a possibility is crucial for considering ways to revise the entire professionalization pipeline. If regularized documents can start a process that advocates for engaged scholars time and effort on projects to count as research before they have completed traditional products like publications and presentations, then this could be a way to begin creating change

along the entire professionalization pipeline, helping scholars shape their institutional identities across regulated and regularized documents.

Conclusion

For universities that are trying to create stronger structures to support engaged scholarship and for engaged scholars who are trying to renegotiate what it means to create new knowledge, how regulated institutional assessment documents form a deep pipeline of professionalization is key to thinking about creating institutional change. Current discussion in scholarship and at UofL focuses on changing one major aspect of that pipeline: tenure policy. Changing these policies requires not only the long process of revising language, which at UofL would mean revisions in overarching institutional policies and within academic units, but also cultural change so that new policy language is enacted across departments. The larger cultural change that will support revised tenure policy also involves revising other regulated documents in the professionalization pipeline to show the place of community engagement in institutional assessment of scholarly work. In moments of institutional assessment before tenure, regulated documents serve to inform graduate students and faculty that their time and labor put toward engaged research, and therefore their professional identities as engaged scholars, are not institutionally legible. In this way, tenure is not the only moment of assessment where engaged scholarship is devalued, and to create larger cultural change for valuing community engagement, then the pipeline of documentary legitimacy needs to change. One model for challenging institutional regulated genres is seen in graduate students' use of regularized genres to assert their view of their professional identities. Through

mentoring by engaged faculty, they see their work on community engagement projects as research. Though regulated genres like the PPA instruct them to categorize these projects as service, they assert a different scholarly identity in regularized genres like the CV and professional website, where they make use of the flexibility of these documents to showcase their engaged research. To create better structures for valuing engaged scholarship, engaged scholars need to promote both regulated and regularized change along the entire professionalization pipeline, creating stronger institution-wide policies that value community engagement and a university citizenry willing to enact them.

One way to challenge this problematic professionalization genre system is through mentorship partnerships between senior and emerging scholars that would, in part, encourage emerging engaged scholars to understand and document their work as research, making the full extent of their work more visible in their institutional professionalization documents. In the case study above, the most useful ways that emerging scholars' work was influenced seemed to be through conversation and collaboration with other scholars—whether that was Mary P's advocacy in her AWP for making Sabrina's work on DMA more institutionally visible or graduate students talking about how to document their engaged research on the CV and professional website. In both cases, emerging scholars did not take on the mantle of figuring out how to make their work count on their own; they had help. Mentoring partnerships could be useful for emerging engaged scholars, particularly if senior partners were attentive to ways that junior partners need to think about how to work within institutional structures to make their work visible in documentation like the AWP. For institutions that are trying to create stronger structures for engaged scholarship, the office of community engagement

(in whatever form it takes) could match up new faculty members interested in engaged scholarship with senior faculty from similar backgrounds, giving the new faculty member someone with whom they can discuss the particular professionalization structures at that institution and how best to navigate them. Alternatively, similar disciplinary mentoring partnerships might be set up—for example, in rhetoric and composition, through the Community Writing Conference or the Community Writing SIG at CCCC—so that emerging engaged scholars, both graduate students and junior faculty, might work with senior scholars in the field to discuss what navigating institutional structures looks like for other members of a discipline. Taking up what might seem like direct challenges to institutional systems (in directly disobeying instructions like those in the CAS tenure guidelines that only specify “community” work under service) would be easier with direct backing from senior members at an institution and in the field.

Ultimately, what this case study shows is that the challenge of gaining tenure for emerging engaged scholars is actually a much deeper and more complex issue than can be solved by simply changing tenure policy, and it’s a challenge that must be addressed for and by both emerging and senior scholars. If engaged scholars want to truly change what it means to make new knowledge at the university, then they need to acknowledge this deep vertical-alignment of professionalization that systematically devalues the work of engaged research in regulated professional documentation and create more opportunities for such new knowledge making processes to flourish. Because emerging engaged scholars from graduate school onward are instructed to erase large portions of their scholarly work in institutional documentation, the structures that support these erasures influence the way emerging engaged scholars see their own work and make it

impossible for the full extent of their work to be evaluated as making new knowledge.

This professionalization pipeline is an important area where engaged scholars can focus their efforts in order to create institutional change that values community engagement and rearticulates what it means to make new knowledge in the university.

CHAPTER THREE

CONNECTING META AND TACIT KNOWLEDGE THROUGH PRACTICE:

STRUCTURES FOR DEEP LEARNING IN ENGAGED RESEARCH

In this chapter, I continue exploring key challenges for emerging engaged scholars, this time focusing on graduate students and the complexities of learning how to create reciprocal community-engaged projects that engage emerging scholars' disciplinary research and their local communities. The details of constructing and implementing engaged projects are complicated, especially for first-timers trying to take on projects alone. In "Graduate Education and Community Engagement," KerryAnn O'Meara argues, "The lack of national attention to preparing future faculty for their roles as citizen-scholars represents a significant missed opportunity," claiming that many scholars across levels do not pursue community engagement because they never learned how to connect "the relevance of their disciplines to local schools, governments, business, and the public" (27), and graduate school is an opportune moment for exploring such connections.

In addition to pointing out a lack of focus on community-engaged research in graduate education, O'Meara and other engaged scholars provide suggestions for addressing this issue. Potential solutions include creating projects that help graduate students learn skills in 1) community-based research, 2) collaboration, and 3) mundane labor. These scholars claim that when graduate students participate in community-engaged projects, they "attain more sophisticated analytical capabilities and highly

developed empathetic imaginations” (Schnitzer and Stephenson Jr. 269); move away from the “individualistic nature of graduate education” that is “antithetical to the collaborative nature of community engagement” (O’Meara and Jaeger 13); and learn about mundane labor like “funding [community-based research] initiatives” (Case 71), “compiling data for adaptive community change” (Schnitzer and Stephenson Jr. 274), and “writing at all levels (websites, flyers, abstracts, reports, editorials, etc.)” (Day et al. 166). The “leadership, collaborative, and research competencies” (Case 69) gained through community-engaged projects are clearly important for graduate-student learning. While mundane labor is not as obviously important, it involves assumed skills that undergird higher order concerns and are frequently more complex than articulated in the sentence or two scholars use to describe them, making them another central area of learning for emerging engaged scholars. For example, the short phrase “funding [community-based research] initiatives” does not include the complex processes of finding grants, writing them, working with grants management at a university to accept the funds, or reporting progress to funders, all of which can include varying levels of difficulty and institutional maneuvering. Together, these three areas provide competencies that enable graduate students to learn about the process of constructing and implementing community-engaged research projects.

In calls for community-engaged graduate education, extensive space is not given to long-form description of *how* such training might work in practice, outside of a few recommendations and short project descriptions. If learning to do community engagement is a central challenge for emerging scholars, then scholarly discussions regarding how to structure learning opportunities are necessary to address it. The gestures

toward what graduate students might learn are excellent, but what is missing are depictions of how programs, through coursework or separate research projects, can be structured to help students gain skills in research, collaboration, and mundane labor that are necessary to address the complexities of learning to do the work of community engagement. Because there are so few specifics, other scholars cannot create similar projects for their graduate students or understand the complexities of how students engage in the deep learning of community-based research.

Rhetoric and composition scholars provide some specifics about structuring community engagement into graduate courses, which is one common way to address this challenge, but the courses described focus on theoretical awareness about community engagement. Primarily, faculty are asking students to “develop a sense of the theories, methodologies, and pedagogies already associated with community literacy initiatives in rhetoric and writing as well as a projection outward to other disciplines that might help them define their place within this area of work” (Fero et al. 83). They also often ask students to connect their readings with their volunteer experiences to, in one case, “raise students’ awareness about the intersections between the theories we read and systemic patriarchy, to encourage them to become active, ongoing participants in the organization they worked with” (Webb, Cole, and Skeen 239). Such courses can create a foundational theoretical understanding of community-engaged research practices, but Lauren Bowen notes issues with the semester-long structure of engaged courses, explaining that while her “class offered students many benefits of learning through engagement, and it supported a much-needed relationship between university and community... the class ended, and with it, students’ clearest (if imperfect) source of support for community

engagement” (Bowen et al. 33). In the courses described above, student learning is often weighted more heavily toward knowledge about community engagement, through reading and discussing scholarship, with only a short-term experiential component (if any), which, while beneficial for graduate students, does not necessarily lead to an understanding of how to construct an engaged research project, which is the primary focus of calls for community-engaged graduate education.¹²

Moving beyond short-term learning experiences focused on theoretical knowledge is key for graduate students to adequately learn how to construct and implement community-engaged research projects. Toward that end, community-engaged scholars should be focused on creating structures that enable deep learning, which combines knowledge about and practice of an idea. As James Paul Gee argues, “For efficacious learning, humans need overt information, but they have a hard time handling it. They also need immersion in actual contexts of practice, but they can find such contexts confusing without overt information and guidance” (*What Video Games* 114). Community engagement learning forums focused on meta knowledge, to use Gee’s term for when teachers “brea[k] down what is to be taught into its analytics bits and [get] learners to learn it in such a way that they can ‘talk about,’ ‘describe,’ ‘explain’ it” (*Social Linguistics* 171), are important for explaining what engaged scholarship looks like by *discussing* how research, collaboration, and mundane labor are structured into a project, and these forums should be paired with opportunities to put such knowledge into *practice* to produce the combination of overt information and immersion that Gee suggests,

¹² For more on non-classroom, graduate community-engaged projects in rhetoric and composition, see Blair et al. “Cyberfeminists at Play” and Blair, Dietel-McLaughlin, and Hurley “Looking into the Digital Mirror.” While neither focus particularly on graduate education, they discuss projects designed and implemented by graduate students.

enabling deep, tacit learning= of how to design and implement reciprocal community projects. Emerging engaged scholars need guided ways into action, because practice-based learning shows scholars how to navigate the differences between traditional and engaged scholarly practices as they move from campus to the community. Across higher education, deep learning opportunities for students that involve meta knowledge and practice are both valued and implemented. For example, internship programs are common across disciplines; lab experience is seen as essential for both undergraduate and graduate students in the sciences; and graduate assistantships prepare graduate students of all disciplines to become faculty members. Yet, similar models for graduate students interested in community engagement are not systemically implemented, but are instead offered inconsistently.

Opportunities for learning about community engagement at UofL illustrate the inconsistency of deep-learning offerings for graduate students, particularly because most of the offerings advertised by the Office of Community Engagement are focused on faculty gaining meta-knowledge about engaged research and teaching, excluding graduate students and tacit learning. Current efforts at UofL include: “(1) grants to support faculty/staff work to infuse community-based learning activities and assessment; (2) workshops on incorporating CE into courses and curricula; (3) a year-long Faculty Learning Community focused on Engaged Scholarship; and (4) inviting faculty and staff to share their work at national or regional engagement conferences and meetings” (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group 22). These meta-knowledge programs for faculty help spread awareness of and interest in engaged scholarship, creating a foundation for a culture of community engagement at the university. These

projects fulfill the Office of Community Engagement’s broad goal to “promote transformative experiences for faculty, staff, and students through engaged scholarship, outreach, and service to address community issues both locally, regionally, and internationally” (“Office of the Vice President”). However, to continue furthering that goal, such structures need to be extended to include graduate students and to incorporate deep learning, so that this meta knowledge can be tacitly understood through practice. Developing opportunities for practice-based learning of community engagement presents a series of difficulties, including: aligning schedules of already busy faculty members and administrators to focus on a long-term learning experience and finding funding both for the project and to supplement faculty involvement while they (likely) neglect other aspects of their research. These complexities would only be magnified if graduate students were added to the equation and are likely part of the reason Office of Community Engagement continues to focus on ways that the university could sponsor more meta knowledge-focused events for faculty—learning communities, lunch and learn events, and half- or full-day workshops. Current meta-focused offerings are both time- and cost-effective ways to help faculty develop projects and courses that engage many students and community partners, and they continue to do the work of building a foundation for a culture of community engagement on campus. But in order to strengthen that culture, more options that involve practice of engaged research are necessary for both faculty and graduate students.

Some university programs are attempting to provide recurring opportunities for deep learning of community engagement for graduate students, building on the foundational meta-knowledge programs for faculty described above. For example, the

School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies (SIGS) created the Community Engagement Academy (CEA) in 2016, a year-long learning community that includes workshops on various facets of community-engaged scholarship presented by faculty from across disciplines, and a chance to design projects with CEA's primary community partner, the Parklands of Floyds Fork, a donor-supported public park system in Louisville. The history department offers Public History as a major field of study for their MA students, which requires a series of courses and an internship, and similar processes can be seen in other disciplines that intrinsically value community engagement, like Social Work or Education. In the English department, a graduate course on Community Literacy (that involves a small experiential element) has been offered twice since 2013, and the UofL Digital Media Academy (DMA), started in 2014, is a program that allows graduate students to participate in designing and implementing a community engagement project over the summer. Such structured opportunities can help graduate students learn to create reciprocal community-engaged projects as they gain meta knowledge about community engagement—by reading scholarship and working in groups to develop strategies for designing projects that meet community needs—and go out to do work in the community, furthering their tacit understanding of these projects.

In this chapter, I use DMA as a case study of a promising model for structured deep learning of community engagement in order to re-dress the lack of detail concerning this challenge in current scholarship. To further describe this model, I examine how DMA is organized to develop meta knowledge of central ideas and practices for community-engaged research and to foster a deeper, tacit understanding of those tenets through the process of designing and implementing the camp. I use interviews with

former DMA teachers and their field notes (kept in a private blog) from before and during camp to show how such structures influenced graduate students' views of how they learned community engagement through practice and how what they learned has been useful following DMA. In my analysis, I show how DMA is structured to enable graduate students to gain meta knowledge about community engagement and to practice the concepts so frequently discussed in engaged scholarship—how they find ways to connect their research to community problems (Schnitzer and Stephenson Jr.; O'Meara), learn to value collaboration (O'Meara and Jaeger; O'Meara), and understand the intricacies of mundane labor (Case; Day et al.). Finally, I conclude with a discussion of the complexities of gaining the beneficial learning outcomes from DMA, which is in need of further compensation for faculty and graduate students and more sustainable funding for the camp in order for this largely successful model to become a viable institutional structure for community-engaged graduate education at UofL. This case study moves beyond claims about what graduate students learn, providing evidence that graduate students at DMA gain both tacit and meta understanding of community engagement concepts and that they continue to use such concepts in their scholarly careers. If engaged scholarship is to be valued throughout the university, then sustainable institutional structures need to be created that encourage deep learning of community engagement so that emerging scholars, especially graduate students, can gain meta and tacit understanding of how to create reciprocal community-based projects.

Structuring Deep Learning

In *Social Linguistics and Literacy*, Gee argues that to be a viable member of a professional community, one must combine acquisition and learning to understand the “ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing” of that community (3). He quotes Steven Pinker’s definitions of acquisition as “a process of acquiring something (usually, subconsciously) by exposure to models, a process of trial and error, and practice within social groups, without formal teaching” (169) and learning as “a process that involves conscious knowledge gained through teaching...or through certain life experiences that trigger conscious reflection” (170). While learning represents a more overt transmission of knowledge, acquisition suggests a more tacit understanding of a way of being.

Meta-knowledge of community engagement is important as scholars work to create projects and products, but some of the central elements of community engagement are practices like collaboration and reciprocity, which are active processes that one must acquire through practice not just through readings and discussion. A combination of learning and acquisition is key for understanding the full extent of community-engaged scholarly activity, because “too little acquisition leads you to too little mastery-in-practice; too little learning leads to too little analytic and reflective awareness and limits the capacity for certain sorts of critical reading and reflection” (Gee 171). To gain both “mastery-in-practice” and critical awareness of meta-knowledge about that practice, acquisition and learning practices must be joined together.

While I agree largely with Gee’s points, I choose not to use Pinker’s terms because it is a problematic assumption to say that “learning” only happens through direct

teaching. Other scholars discuss learning as a broader umbrella that encompasses teaching-based and acquisition-based methods (Bruner; Lave and Wenger; Prior; Wenger). Thus, in my advocacy for deep learning structures, I rely on Gee's understanding of combining acquisition and learning, but I will continue to use other terms—meta knowledge as representative of Gee's discussion of learning and tacit understanding gained through practice as representative of acquisition.

To create sites where meta knowledge about and practice of community engagement can be combined for participants to learn deeply about community engagement, scholars must find ways to create structured projects that enable tacit learning through action. The meta knowledge about community engagement is easy to structure into a classroom-like teaching space, but moving from theory to practice is difficult. I look to Henry Jenkins, who examines ways to create learning environments that specifically work toward tacit understanding through practice in *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*, where he describes ways to help students understand how to act within “participatory culture” media environments, which feature “relatively low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement, strong support for creating and sharing creations, and some type of informal mentorship whereby experienced participants pass along knowledge to novices” (xi). Jenkins specifically argues that creating deep learning environments, in this case for media literacy, cannot happen through an “add-on” approach, but must be diffused through a school's curriculum, “reshaping how we teach every existing subject” (109). In this way, Jenkins is encouraging systemic intervention, changing the learning structure to

better support new media literacies, which is also needed to support community-engaged graduate education.

Building on Jenkins' approach, Mary P. Sheridan and Jennifer Rowsell suggest designing *architectures of participation*, or environments that “encourage a variety of participation possibilities for people with diverse motives and abilities” (47). Like participatory culture, architectures of participation feature low barriers for entry, multiple ways to get involved, and strong mentorship. Sheridan and Rowsell seek to explore “what kinds of environments foster social engagements that encourage people to learn conventionalized and innovative ways to participate in and shape their surroundings” (48). Through their case studies, they show how a “continuum of participation” can offer multiple ways for people to participate in a creative space by both consuming and creating content related to a particular space (53). Architectures are systemic ways of creating participatory environments for tacit learning, which are especially useful for teaching new ways of interacting with the world.

Such architectures of participation for graduate education in community engagement will vary from discipline to discipline, depending on how a graduate program is structured and what values the discipline holds central to its study. KerryAnn O'Meara and Audrey J. Jaegar argue, “Each department and discipline must ascertain what integrating engagement into their doctoral programs should look like and find critical experiences and windows that make the most sense for the content and framework of that discipline” (5). Within rhetoric and composition, senior community writing scholars like Eli Goldblatt and Steve Parks argue for strong mentoring structures to help graduate students learn about engaged scholarship through getting involved in previously

developed projects. Goldblatt claims, “I strongly believe that those of us who are lucky enough to have tenured jobs have to devote a considerable amount of our time to help graduate students—and early on in their professional careers—do [community-engaged scholarship]” (Anthony, Kerr, and Scanlon 105). Mentoring from faculty through previously established projects is essential to help students understand how to take on such projects. Parks agrees: “It is almost always better to step into an existing project, build up a set of skills and strategies, then move onto your own work. This is the case not only [as a graduate student], but also for the community, who have to trust you can produce on the promises made even when things go wrong” (Harvey, Kirklighter, and Pauszek 14). Learning to do community-engaged scholarship works better within architectures of participation created by faculty who can guide a graduate student’s practices within the project. This does not necessarily mean that graduate students are relegated to carrying out a project designed by a faculty member, but that faculty create structures that enable graduate students to be mentored by and collaborate with the faculty to design and implement the project together, creating space for graduate student research. As Parks explains, structured projects create “a network of support to work through mistakes (which will happen) and to understand the successes (which will happen as well)” (Harvey, Kirklighter, and Pauszek 13). Within the field of rhetoric and composition, structured projects that allow for strong mentoring and collaborative project design are seen as key for graduate education in community-engaged scholarship.

DMA is a model for disciplinary community engagement that demonstrates strong mentoring and collaborative project design, showing how a university might incorporate architectures of participation for community-engaged graduate education, addressing the

central challenge of enabling scholars to adequately learn engaged research practices, while promoting the institutions' work in the local community. DMA is a two-week digital production day camp at UofL for rising sixth-grade girls from historically low-performing schools and is designed and implemented by a team of five graduate students. The camp aims to address issues of social justice (e.g., the hyper-sexualized, consumerist images of girls perpetuated by dominant society) and economic justice (e.g., the underrepresentation of women in technology jobs, the secure jobs of the future) by teaching girls digital tools to create, rather than consume, representations (such as image manipulations and videos) that align with how they see themselves and the world around them. The twenty campers spend two weeks working in a Mac lab at UofL learning digital technologies, creating multimodal representations of their lives, and working collaboratively with a group to produce a short film for a final showcase at the end of camp before heading home with a device of their own (a tablet in 2014 and iPod Touches in 2015-17). In addition to learning about technology, girls get to explore a college campus (for many, this will be the first time), learn from guest speakers like local musicians and computer scientists, and discuss digital media and current culture (the Women's World Cup was a hot topic in 2014). During these two weeks, DMA teachers hope to lay groundwork that empowers girls to think of themselves as future college students, as girls who can take on the harder technology, math, and science classes offered in middle school, and as young women whose thoughts, opinions, and designs are valued.

During and after DMA, UofL has used the camp to gain greater publicity for institutional work supporting local community efforts. Articles in *UofL News* (Hughes)

and *the Louisville Courier-Journal* (Carter) and features on the local NPR affiliate (Ryan), ABC affiliate (“UofL’s Digital Media Academy”), and the UofL podcast, *UofL Today*, (Hebert) all help showcase the good community work UofL is funding. DMA offers UofL a feel good project it can put on its website front page to show prospective students and their parents, potential donors, and alumni that the university cares about creating valuable opportunities for local students from historically underserved areas of the city. Featuring the camp in this way provides evidence that UofL is not just envisioning community engagement as a pillar of their vision statement for the future, but is also enacting it by encouraging and enabling projects like DMA.

To construct the plans that make these outcomes for students and the institution possible, Mary P develops and maintains the partnership with Jefferson County Public Schools, and five graduate students and Mary P collaboratively design the camp’s structure and curriculum. Interested English graduate students apply in December and begin working as a team in January, meeting with the group every other week for the entirety of the semester, discussing scholarship related to the camp and big picture ideas and goals. Graduate students are also expected to meet in small groups to work on specifics in four areas of planning—pedagogy, technology, logistics, and assessment. Leading up to the camp, Mary P and the graduate students participate in several planning days, referred to as “DMA Boot Camp” where everyone practices the technology they will be using, sets up the computer lab, and does last minute preparations for the girls’ arrival. After two weeks of intense days working with sixth grade girls on digital media projects, graduate students wrap up the camp by writing up final reports for funders, community partners, and the English department.

Through these processes, Mary P aims for graduate students to gain overt scholarly knowledge in community engagement, digital literacy, and digital pedagogy paired with a stronger understanding of how such knowledge comes together in the context of an actual engaged project. In the spring, DMA teachers take part in what is roughly the equivalent of a graduate seminar as they plan the camp. They meet together for a few hours every other week to discuss scholarship related to the project. Readings include texts that address community engagement (Blair et al., Flower, Fero et al.), learning theory (Gee; Sheridan and Rowsell), and digital media (Selber, Purdy), and graduate students are also encouraged to bring in readings from their areas of interest (i.e., trauma-informed pedagogy; culturally sustaining pedagogy; design theory) to share with the team. Such direct learning gives graduate students meta-knowledge about the community engagement project they are in the process of designing, and once they implement the project, they are able to tacitly understand how such theories play out in practice.

From graduate students' perspectives, DMA offers a chance to better understand the huge amount of work involved in taking on a community engagement project. In every interview with graduate students who designed and led DMA, they acknowledged the differences between how they understood community engagement in theory and in practice.

“It just takes an extreme amount of attention to a lot of different details, and a lot of different people and stakeholders that I don't know that I would have always considered had I not been involved with DMA” (Christina)

“There are so many [institutional] elements to DMA that I wasn’t thinking about before I got involved” (Sara)

“I think it showed me sort of boots on the ground how challenging these kinds of projects can be and...how much work goes into them” (Elizabeth)

“I think that community engagement work is really long and hard hours and not at all like teaching college students” (Lily)

DMA teachers are focusing on how *practice* allowed them to understand just how different this type of project is from research and teaching they have completed in the past. They knew about these differences theoretically from the scholarship they read as a group, but in interviews, they primarily focused on how the act of creating and implementing DMA is what showed them these differences and prepared them for future engaged scholarly work. DMA teachers, echoing engaged scholars, point to three practices of deep learning that are structured into DMA—research practices, collaboration, and mundane labor—as central to gaining an understanding of how community-engaged scholarship works, both tacitly through practice and overtly through scholarly meta-knowledge. Using these three areas, I explore DMA as an architecture of participation where teachers gain meta knowledge of community engagement and tacit understanding through practice as a way of showing how such deep learning is critical for training emerging scholars to create and implement community-engaged research projects.

Research Practices

DMA, in addition to its work as a community project that aims to teach girls how to analyze digital media and use digital tools to create new representations of themselves and the way they see the world, is set up as a research project where graduate students can practice finding and examining connections between their disciplinary interests and community issues, a key step in learning to construct community-engaged research practices.¹³ Engaged scholars argue that such research opportunities are important for graduate students, because “integrating community engagement into doctoral programs...offers opportunities for students to more effectively acquire research and teaching skills, to learn the knowledge of their disciplines in ways that promote deeper understanding and greater complexity, and to make connections with public agencies and groups that enrich the quality of their education” (O’Meara and Jaeger 4). Echoing O’Meara and Jaeger, Schnitzer and Stephenson, Jr. claim that community engagement encourages graduate students to go beyond “processing abstract knowledge” to “applying, shaping, and contributing to co-creation of knowledge that, at its best, has the advantage of reflecting community needs and aspirations” (280). These scholars and others (Sandmann, Saltmarsh, O’Meara; Case; Latimore, Dreelin, and Burroughs) posit community-engaged research experience as an important learning tool for graduate students to tacitly understand specific disciplinary research processes and how they can be employed in partnership with community members, but O’Meara and Jaeger point to the fact that few studies have assessed how community engagement affects the “specific skills, knowledge, and values that graduate programs are trying to develop as they train

¹³ There are many ways that DMA is a high-stakes environment because of the student population and the goals of the camp, and graduate students see the construction as a learning space for the girls as the primary goal for their planning time, making their research goals secondary to the pedagogical needs of the camp.

future scholars” (5). I offer DMA as one model for how to structure deep learning for graduate students to read about and employ community-based research practices that connect to their disciplinary interests, giving them the necessary meta knowledge and tacit understanding gained through practice to grow as engaged scholars.

DMA’s structure provides a focus on research from the first teacher meetings through and past the end of the two-week camp, guiding graduate students through the various stages of a research project. During initial teacher meetings in January, graduate students are asked to sit together in Mary P’s office, writing down possible research questions and discussing ways to gather data for their ideas that include such varied topics as digital media pedagogy, identity formation, and stylistic awareness. Following these initial meetings, graduate students continue to shape methods of inquiry for the camp—contributing to the IRB proposal, drafting interview questions and surveys, and creating an assessment plan, all of which attend to the various research questions graduate students plan to study during the camp. They implement these methods during camp by interviewing campers, recording brainstorming sessions with the girls, and taking field notes after each day of camp. Following DMA, the assessment team uses this data to complete a final report for community partners and funders, and many teachers have used parts of this data to produce traditional research products like publications and presentations. Through these processes, graduate students learn to collaboratively plan how to do qualitative, community-based research, thereby gaining a tacit understanding of how to connect disciplinary interests to community issues.

DMA is structured to encourage graduate students to put their meta disciplinary knowledge into practice. For graduate students already interested in community

engagement, like Lily and me, DMA easily aligned with our research interests, allowing us to develop new projects related to those interests. For my own work, I used my second summer at DMA as a soft start for analyzing institutional structures for community engagement, which I saw as the key goal of my dissertation at that time. I indicated in a blog post before camp that I was interested in “look[ing] at how we each take on the identity of ‘engaged scholar’ during this camp...and what it means for a group of graduate students and a junior faculty member to learn hands-on how to combine teaching, research, and community engagement.” As I collaborated with the other graduate student teachers at DMA, I paid attention to how teachers navigated the structures of camp and began to take on identities as engaged scholars. Through blog posts at the end of each camp day, I asked teachers to blog about their research interests in the camp and in community engagement more broadly. Because DMA was structured as a collaborative environment where the team met together to write field notes, discuss the day’s events, and plan for the following days of camp, I was able to work toward answering my initial research questions and explore my interests in institutional structures for community engagement prior to starting my dissertation inquiry in earnest by using DMA as a research site.

Similarly, Lily was able to directly implement her theoretical understanding of trauma-informed pedagogy at DMA, offering her a space to begin her research on the importance of “‘empowerment,’ collaboration, and trauma-informed care” in community engagement projects. Lily used her expertise in trauma studies to plan activities for the camp and even coordinated a training session to prepare teachers to look for signs of trauma during camp. Lily’s previous understanding of trauma-informed pedagogy

enabled her to foster stronger flexibility among all the teachers and work closely with students who had experienced traumatic situations, which was particularly useful when DMA students were bullied by a group of older boys in the lunchroom one day. After this event, Lily talked to many of the girls one-on-one and led a group discussion to help the girls work their feelings and talk about strategies for future incidents, which many of them will likely face in middle school. Lily later called this experience “formative,” explaining, “It was the first time I actually put that into practice and could then talk about that at conferences and say hey this isn’t just something I’m telling everybody they need to do. Here’s why it was really important in this context of this camp.” DMA gave her space to explore different ways trauma-informed pedagogy can be applicable in community engagement environments, both for teachers and students, which gave her a stronger practice-oriented foundation from which to write up traditional research products like the several conference presentations she has given on the topic.

Even for graduate students for whom the connection between current research interests and DMA is not as immediately apparent, DMA presents an opportunity to think about their research in new ways, finding connections between their research questions and issues that local community members face everyday. Elizabeth, in her dissertation, looks at online genres, specifically open-access journals, to show how scholars in rhetoric and composition might bring their research to a broader, public audience. With DMA, she was able to practice communicating core disciplinary ideas (i.e., digital composition, identity-making practices) to a group of girls from her local community. Elizabeth used her disciplinary meta knowledge to follow through on the theoretical goals of her dissertation, applying her interests in digital composition and open access to the camp by

sharing digital composing strategies and ideas with members of her community who can continue to use these practices long after DMA. She wrote about these pedagogical, research-driven experiences in her *Computers and Composition Online* article (Chamberlain, Gramer, and Hartline). Another graduate student, Christina, also studies media use, but her research questions about the connections between female identity and technology use are primarily historical in nature, focused on letter writing in the renaissance and 18th century. DMA offered Christina a chance to examine how these research questions might be applied to a new context—working with middle school girls. Through connecting her research to contemporary community issues, Christina was able to deepen her dissertation research by considering her disciplinary interests in a new context through community-based research methods, in addition to her dissertation’s archival study. At DMA, Christina examined further how women (or, in this case girls) “who are writing on the margins [are able] to construct...new identities that are meaningful to them and their readers or audiences.” In both of these cases, graduate students were given a chance to experience, not just learn about in a classroom, how their research might be situated and practiced in different contexts—learning tacitly how to create disciplinary community-engaged research projects.

Following their work on the camp, DMA teachers have used their understanding of engaged research in the creation of many traditional research products. Thus far, DMA has served as a case study for several publications—three published (Chamberlain, Gramer, and Hartline; Mathis et al; Sheridan) and four in progress—and over a dozen presentations at conferences including the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Rhetoric Society of America Conference, Thomas R. Watson

Conference on Rhetoric and Composition, and the Conference on Community Writing. In this way, DMA has directly led to the professionalization of graduate students by structuring in ways for them to plan and produce research that is understood by the field at large. Graduate students are not only encouraged to craft research questions about DMA; they take those questions and follow them up with inquiry that turns into presentations and articles.

Additionally, such research practices have been useful for graduate students who have gone on to create other community projects. DMA was an entry point for engaged research for most of the graduate student teachers, and after their experience at the camp, several have taken part in other projects. Elizabeth, Rebecca, and I were part of the Art as Memory team that partnered with the Louisville Council on Developmental Disabilities to attend, facilitate, and photograph/video record thirteen art workshops for Louisville citizens with developmental disabilities and three art shows that presented their work. The three of us utilized skills that we had already practiced at DMA, including: writing an IRB proposal, video recording and photographing projects in process, interviewing people involved in the project, and creating products for community partners, like our 20-minute documentary “Voices Together.” A new iteration of this project, called Nothing About Me Without Me, began in summer 2016, and six former DMA teachers have participated in planning and implementing several aspects of this project. Another community project led by a former DMA teacher is the School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies’ Community Engagement Academy (CEA), which was co-designed by Christina with Dean Beth Boehm, offers graduate students a chance to learn about engaged research by attending a series of workshops about this type of work and creating

a research project with a community partner. Christina, in her position as research assistant to Beth, has been a key player in developing community partnerships, like the one with the Parklands of Floyds Fork pictured here, which has allowed CEA participants to practice engaged research themselves. Christina has taken her own experiences at DMA and created further opportunities for other graduate students to gain both meta knowledge about and tacit understanding through practice in engaged research. Across the board, DMA has served as a starting point for new research trajectories. Through composing conference presentations, identifying new ways to connect research interests to local communities, and extending theoretical research into practice through the camp, graduate students at DMA have learned to reconceive and reframe their research as emerging engaged scholars.

DMA models one way to structure opportunities for graduate students to learn how to conduct qualitative, community-based research that connects their disciplinary research interests to community concerns, whether their research interests are already in community engagement or not. For the graduate students discussed above, DMA helped them move beyond theoretical meta knowledge to tacitly understanding how such knowledge might be shared with community members, and how future projects might align with community needs. DMA allows graduate students to discover how their scholarly interests connect with engaged research and cultivates the skills needed to create community engaged-research projects that address local community issues, which at most, encourages them to take on community-engaged research in the future to address local community issues and, at least, offers them an understanding of the importance and complexity of this type of scholarly work.

Collaboration

DMA is a project that is set up to be too large for any one person to take on alone. It requires multiple teachers to design and implement the camp, working *together* to create a good experience for the girls. Collaboration is structured into the camp as it is required both for planning—as we break into four teams to plan pedagogy, assessment, technology and logistics—and for teaching at DMA—providing backup for the lead teacher of any given lesson by quietly working with individual girls to solve their technology or learning problems. Thus, graduate students tacitly learn the centrality of collaboration to community engagement as they work together to plan and implement the camp (grounded in meta knowledge gained from readings about collaborative community engagement projects like Kris Blair’s Digital Mirror camp). DMA’s collaborative nature fulfills a specific goal discussed in engaged scholarship, for graduate students to develop “interpersonal skills in dialogue, teamwork and collaboration” (O’Meara 32) because “engaged work depends on trust and communication among diverse partners” (O’Meara 36). Other engaged scholars also emphasize collaboration as a key area of learning for emerging engaged scholars (Hyde and Meyer; Case; O’Meara and Jaeger; Jaeger, Sandmann, and Kim). Hyde and Meyer argue community-based research courses help graduate students understand principles like, “inclusion of and collaboration with community members, placing value in localized knowledge, and using the research process and results to inform politicized action” (74), and Case notes the variety of collaborative practices in engaged projects, including: relationship building, joint decision-making, and evaluating projects and progress (76, 78-9). Though the majority of

the collaboration with community partners is pursued by DMA directors, graduate students still gain experience in collaborative learning as they see how their ability to pool knowledge with one another (i.e., Elizabeth teaching everyone image manipulation software; Lily and Sara creating workshops on trauma-informed and culturally sustaining pedagogy, respectively; Rebecca sharing her experiences teaching in public schools) allows them to design a better camp for the girls than any one teacher would be able to create alone and encourages them to continue collaboration during camp, which prepares them for future collaborations with community partners, an essential skill for creating engaged research projects.

Because DMA is structured to encourage collaboration from early in the planning process, teachers are more prepared to rely on one another *during* camp as well, when collaboration becomes exceptionally important in the face of shared challenges. At camp, it didn't take graduate students long to realize how chaotic working with twenty middle schoolers would be or how daunting the smallest technology challenges would seem, and thus, they found out early the importance of relying on one another during difficult situations. Christina highlights this finding in a blog post near the end of camp: "We definitely had each other's backs for the entire two weeks. As I said in an earlier post, I think we learned really quickly what each other's strengths were, and we were able to use that knowledge throughout camp to solve problems and work together in the most effective ways." Through the experience of teachers having "each other's backs," driven by the collaborative structure of DMA, Christina and the other teachers were able to experience collaboration positively and see how important valuing one another's skills and resources is for community-engaged projects.

Collaborative problem solving was critical as teachers worked to resolve technology issues, of which there were many. Some of these were quick fixes, like girls forgetting to sign back into the wireless, but some required a great deal of coordination and collaboration as we worked to keep camp running smoothly. In 2015, we ran into many unexpected technological barriers on the first day of camp as we tried to help the girls set up their iPod touches, including: not being able to sign onto campus wireless to set up the devices, difficulties with permissions for sign up, and requests for credit card numbers for each device. The technology team, Christina and myself, worked together to determine quick in-camp workarounds for these problems with Christina keeping the girls attention while I worked on a device. After several hours of extra work that evening, Christina and I found a solution, and by the time the girls got to camp the next day, the devices were fully functional. But getting to that solution required the two of us to think quickly and work together to take charge of an unexpected situation. Seen in a blog post written at the end of that first day of camp, Christina shows a developing understanding of the collaboration required for engaged scholarship as she notes her appreciation of other teachers' responses to these tough moments; she writes:

Cheer for Day 1: Favorite thing today — everyone taking action and solving problems when they came up (which was often). Today showed me that I thoroughly enjoy working with this group [of teachers] and that we work together really well. We quickly recognized each other's strengths and knew when to ask someone else for assistance. I don't often get the opportunity to work with a group that does that so well. A big cheer to us for working together.

Even in a highly stressful situation of dealing with technology going wrong, Christina recognized the centrality of collaboration to this community engagement project, which she was in the process of learning through experience.

Intense collaboration on the first day, along with a realization among DMA teachers of how helpful such collaboration was, set the tone for how the group worked together throughout the camp. For example, Mary P writes in her blog post on the first day of camp, “The nice thing about working on a team with people you trust is that I have no fear of being unable to work through the Apple ID/Instagram complications. In other words, there was never a point where I was anxious about being able to solve these problems because my teammates are so smart and helpful.” Sara, in her interview, described a difference between facing technological problems when she is teaching alone and at DMA: “it was so great to be able to say—no, someone can figure this out, and help us out, and get everyone on board” rather than “lets abandon this whole idea and...just move on.” We all, on the first day and long after, saw the importance of facing challenges *together*. We continued to rely on one another throughout camp as we asked each other to look at smaller, specific challenges that we had either in designing our own group projects or answering questions the girls had. Collaboration might have begun as we planned camp together in the Spring, but it was fully realized (and thus fully learned) during the days of camp when we helped one another through problems big and small.

Additionally, teachers’ collaboration with one another helped the girls, because they also often collaborated with one another to overcome difficulties with the digital tools we were teaching. On the first day of camp, Mary P blogged: “I thought things went well today when the girls could take the lead. Some of the girls could help out other girls

in camp on the tech issues.” Similarly, Christina wrote, “I thoroughly enjoyed watching the girls help one another with different programs or issues that came up throughout the day if there was not a teacher immediately available.” These mentions of girls helping one another with technology continue over the course of all two weeks. One reason for this frequency of collaboration between campers could be the way the teachers modeled collaboration with each other. We genuinely wanted to work together to solve problems and showed the girls what working as a team could look like. Of course, there are other possibilities for girls’ collaboration, like being used to working together to solve problems because there is such a high teacher/student ratio at their schools or general friendliness, but the type of collaboration modeled by the teachers seems like an important influence on how girls collaboratively solved technological problems.

For the graduate students involved, this opportunity for collaboration has already had effects on how they pursue other work. As camp was ending, many of the teachers wrote about how happy they were with the collaborative process of creating DMA and noted their excitement to continue collaborating with this group of teachers. For example, Marie writes, “So, this is a lesson I’ve learned—how important collaboration is when doing this type of work. Not that I ever thought at any point that this is something I could do by myself, but, collaboration has been better than I might have expected (given that I like to be in control, etc., etc.), and it’s been a really great experience.” Echoing Marie’s observation, Christina writes, “I have enjoyed working with and learning from...such a great team. I’m looking forward to continuing the research aspects of the camp and continuing to learn from everyone here.” At the end of two weeks of working together every day on a tough project, graduate students teachers, many of whom had not had

many positive collaborative experiences prior to DMA, were not only grateful for the collaborative experience, but also excited to continue it in the future. DMA's collaborative structures helped create a positive environment for graduate students to work together with effects that lasted beyond the two weeks of camp.

Since concluding DMA, many of the teachers have embarked on other collaborative publications and projects. DMA has resulted in several co-authored research publications, including articles in *Computers and Composition Online* and *Community Literacy Journal*. And two pieces are still in progress, one featuring all eight directors, teachers, and assistants on the 2015 camp and another by Marie and Christina. Both of these in progress publications explicitly discuss feminist collaboration as key for community-engaged graduate education, a component they learned not only through reading scholarship but also through practice during their work on the camp. Additionally, DMA teachers have continued to pursue collaborative projects, community-engaged or otherwise. As stated previously, seven former DMA teachers have participated in engaged research projects with the Louisville Council on Developmental Disabilities. Christina created the Community Engagement Academy, which two DMA teachers have participated in, and another teacher has joined the University Writing Center's community writing partnership with Family Scholar House. In non-community engagement contexts, Rebecca and I developed a two-day workshop for new and experienced writing instructors to discuss and practice digital media, which was implemented with a team of five teachers, including Elizabeth.

All of these experiences show how DMA's collaborative structure has likely influenced the kinds of projects and publications teachers have pursued after the camp.

This is particularly important because academia and especially humanities disciplines like English often encourage solo, rather than collaborative, projects.¹⁴ For so many teachers to pursue other collaborative opportunities after DMA shows that not only did they learn collaboration through practice, but they also value it after completing the project. Because DMA offers space for deep learning by combining meta knowledge, through scholarly readings and discussions of projects like the Digital Mirror Camp or Linda Flower's Community Literacy Center, with practice of their own collaborative community engagement project, graduate students can leave with both overt knowledge and tacit understanding of *how* and *why* collaboration is valuable for their scholarly work at the camp and in future projects. They do not only understand theoretically why collaboration matters for community engagement, but they also gain practical experience with how collaboration positively shaped their efforts at camp, instilling values that they will carry into their future scholarly lives.

Mundane Labor

Another aspect of community engagement that graduate students working at DMA learn tacitly through practice is the frequent multitasking between high-order (e.g., planning pedagogical and assessment structures) and low-order (e.g., email and file management) concerns that is necessary for any project of this size. DMA requires a great deal of logistical planning, emailing back and forth, and managing files, but this type of work is not frequently described in scholarship on community writing projects. In

¹⁴ See Cavanagh, Gee, McGrath, and Nowviskie for informal (Gee, McGrath) and formal (Cavanagh, Nowviskie) discussions of how collaboration is perceived in the humanities. Collaboration is also discussed in MLA Task Force Reports as a needed addition to doctoral study (Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature) and promotion and tenure evaluation (Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion)

the CCCC Research Initiative grant application for DMA, Rachel Gramer writes, “Many of our academic practices are situated, collaborative, and fueled by mundane work (such as setting up 20 tablets or organizing an online sharing system) that makes projects function and that builds and maintains campus and community relationships.

Predominantly, the knowledge work involved in DMA requires a different kind of labor than is historically, or at least visibly, valued in the majority of published scholarship” (Sheridan, Gramer, and Hartline 4). This is not a kind of work that gives much credit to those who do it. It is work that becomes invisible when it goes well, but obvious when it goes poorly. Jeff Grabill argues, “Many methodologies for understanding rhetoric and even for guiding practice direct our gaze in ways that cause us to miss much of what I understand to be ‘rhetorical work’ and in some cases render invisible people and practices that make possible more visible rhetorical performance” (248-9). Grabill describes this “invisible knowledge work,” in his story of Elena who works for a community action group addressing local water contamination by coordinating a communication strategy for group members to create individual reports that all work toward a central goal. Creating a space for people to share resources and align their messages is not as tangible as the brochure for local residents the group originally asked her to create, but Grabill explains, “unless Elena and others can work in ways characterized by the story above—and do many, many more things besides—there are none of the rhetorical performances we typically study (the final draft; the public media; the delivered oration). There is no rhetoric” (252). The invisible background labor described in Elena’s story is, Grabill argues, “essential if we hope to make and teach methodologies for doing rhetoric in the world” (255). Similar sorts of mundane labor are

frequently elided in scholarly discussions about community engagement, relegated to only a few lines describing complex, time intensive processes, like gaining funding (Case; Goldblatt) or compiling data (Schnitzer and Stephenson Jr.).

Acknowledging and teaching mundane labor is necessary for emerging scholars learning to create and implement community-engaged projects, because these projects require scholars to understand how a complex set of big picture and small detail activities work together to create a larger project. Graduate students likely already know how to take on high-order concerns like planning a sequence of assignments or deciding what technology is best to teach to a group of students, and they likely even multitask between similar high- and low-order concerns in their teaching and how they fulfill the myriad tasks of graduate school. Yet, this labor may not be apparent in community engagement work unless you engage in it. In fact, graduate student teachers at DMA frequently pointed to ways that mundane labor at the camp surprised them and offered valuable learning experiences about community engagement.

The most obvious way that mundane labor is structured in DMA is through the one or two graduate students who handle the logistical concerns of the camp. This work includes maintaining paperwork from the girls, setting up the online sharing system through Google Drive, ordering t-shirts, communicating with the catering staff at UofL, and plenty of other seemingly miniscule responsibilities. Logistics is the catchall for the myriad small tasks that must happen to make sure the camp goes as planned, and these small tasks add up. The logistics leader maintains a thick binder of documents (i.e., insurance paperwork, emergency contacts for the campers) that are necessary should anything go wrong during camp. She also plays point person for pre-camp parent

meetings, a seemingly simple task, excluding when exceptions occur, and exceptions always occur like in May 2015 when a translator did not show up to help a parent understand all the required paperwork and a second meeting had to be scheduled with all parties present. Having logistics as a core area of work is a necessity for maintaining order before and during camp, and it signals to graduate students that this is an important and necessary type of work in the implementation of camp.

In addition to the prevalence of mundane labor on the logistics team, other graduate students pointed to ways they had to multitask between mundane labor and higher-order concerns. For example, Christina, who was in charge of the technology team, explained that she found the “behind the scenes work” she completed to fulfill her role both surprising and valuable. Christina imagined that she would spend more time researching technology to use and teaching digital tools to the rest of the teachers, but because she utilized several choices made the previous year, she spent more time on the mundane labor of finding additional sources of funding for the iPod touches we decided to purchase after facing issues with cheaper devices the year before. Christina explains:

In terms of just like the behind the scenes work that happened...it was a lot of calling different companies, asking if they would donate any sort of money or offer us any sort of discount [on the iPods] since it was for an educational project, learning about what grant opportunities were available. It's those kinds of things—all the many phone calls you make, all the digging around on the internet just to find what corporations have certain opportunities or discounts for certain types of projects. And if you fit that kind of project, what's the timeline—that were a good learning opportunity.

Christina ultimately netted DMA \$225 in grants from three Target stores, which helped us buy supplies for the camp, though for different multimodal composition than we were expecting—markers, pencils, and paper of all colors and sizes to help girls sketch out their ideas before they approached them digitally. While community engagement scholarship frequently posits the need to gain funding for projects (Doggart, Tedrowe, and Viera; Franz; Isaacs and Kolba), living the reality of finding even small sources of funding shows how this process is less of checking a task off a list and more of a difficult-to-parse, complicated undertaking.

Community engagement projects require multitasking to communicate among multiple parties, share files, and finalize a myriad of details, and DMA gave graduate students direct experience with both seeing how extensive this type of work is and *doing* it. If practice in community engagement is required to learn how to take on these projects, then practice in mundane labor seems especially important. A graduate student might, at first glance, see DMA as an opportunity to get involved with digital media, a new student population, or a social justice project. These core ideas for the camp are absolutely true, but they don't explicitly reveal the amount of mundane labor—the number of emails, searches through the Google Drive folder, phone calls, etc.—that are required in this project and many others like it. Additionally, experience with mundane labor in DMA prepares graduate students for the general bureaucracies of administrative work, which require similar processes. Though many of these teachers hold administrative positions like Assistant Director of Composition, Assistant Director of the Watson Conference, or Research Assistant, they gain additional nuance to their understanding of how administrative and academic work is accomplished because they are integrating research,

teaching, and service in one project, rather than separating out service as they could more easily do in graduate student administrative positions. At DMA they understand the complexities of merging deep thinking and analysis with mundane labor through the hours spent on tasks that don't *seem* like they should be particularly time consuming, but are. Importantly, graduate students at DMA gain meta knowledge about mundane labor in community engagement, even though it is often described in only a sentence or two in an article (e.g., we planned an event to celebrate our partnership; we organized our workshop attendees' writing; we compiled survey data). Their on-the-ground invisible knowledge work enables a tacit understanding of the importance of mundane labor in the creation and implementation of a community engagement project and how much more complex such practices are than they might originally believe.

Conclusion: Why Long-Term Structures Matter

In light of the oft-cited challenge regarding learning how to design and implement engaged research, universities committed to create stronger structures to support engaged scholarship should consider how they prepare scholars to take on community engagement projects, and engaged scholars, in their discussions of this challenge, regularly point to graduate school as an important time for learning these practices. To further their discussion, I argue that graduate student training for engaged scholarship should involve deep learning by combining opportunities for gaining meta knowledge and tacit understanding through practice of community engagement, which more effectively addresses the complexities of engaged research than learning opportunities focused only on meta-knowledge. At UofL, community engagement administrators and documents like

the Carnegie application highlight learning opportunities for faculty members that value meta knowledge and spread awareness of community engagement, which makes sense given the administrators' professional focus and the parameters of the genre. This professional development work for faculty members creates an important foundation for a culture of engaged scholarship on campus, and to build on that foundation, these opportunities should next extend to graduate students and include practice of community engagement for participants to understand the differences between traditional and engaged scholarship. DMA offers one such model for deep learning of engaged research where graduate students learn both theories of community engagement and practice them, gaining further understanding of the complicated ways that processes like research practices, collaboration, and mundane labor are integrated as they create this project. Each of these areas (identified as important by engaged scholars and graduate students) is structured into DMA so that graduate students gain understanding of the work of community-engaged scholars through reading and discussing scholarship (meta knowledge) and through designing and implementing the camp (tacit understanding). These learning experiences have been incredibly positive for graduate students, helping them better understand how to create engaged research projects and influencing their professional development as scholars beyond their involvement with DMA. Additionally, because they have learned the central tenets of engaged research theoretically and in practice, they have a stronger understanding of what reciprocal, partnership-based community engagement looks like, meaning they will likely not make some of the oft-cited mistakes (Mathieu; Stoecker and Tryon) that are harmful for community partners.

At the same time, DMA also reveals problems that arise when people try to provide deep learning structures—institutional support can lag in recognizing and compensating the large amount of time and effort for directors and teachers, which is compounded by a lack of stable funding. Because the camp is currently unsustainable in these ways, directors are left with less time for mentoring and teaching, and graduate students do not often return to teach a second iteration of the camp, cutting short the deep learning that they might achieve if they taught the camp multiple times. Time for mentorship and repeated work at DMA are not only good for graduate students; it also benefits the campers because these practices create a team of people who are prepared, whether by previous experience or strong guidance, to work with underserved populations and help them learn new ways to critique and design digital media. When community engagement is not sufficiently materially supported within an institution, long-term labor and funding issues can affect the quality and viability of engaged projects.

The primary issue for DMA is that the structured workload does not adequately match the amount of compensation received by directors and teachers. Everyone involved in DMA receives credit for teaching a 3-hour course, which is a significant investment from the English department. This investment matches the time and effort of implementing the camp, which is equivalent to teaching a 3-hour, intensive summer course because teachers work between 80-100 hours over the two weeks of camp, but the preparation time far exceeds that of even a newly developed course. As described in chapter two, Sabrina, who directed the camp in 2016, put in over 200 hours of work on DMA in that calendar year. Graduate student teachers attend group meetings every other

week to discuss relevant scholarly readings, plan big-picture elements of the camp, and report on the work of their committees (pedagogy, assessment, technology, logistics), and they meet several additional days in the summer to practice the digital tools they will teach and set up the computer lab. Overall, the preparation and implementation of DMA involves approximately as much work as taking a graduate level course *and* teaching an undergraduate course. DMA teachers instruct and lead campers in the creation of digital products equivalent to what they would assign their undergraduate students, *and* they produce a series of other products (e.g., curriculum plans, funding requests, publicity write-ups, research plans and tools, and a final report) that are similar, if not equivalent, to what they might turn in for a graduate course. Yet, they, and the faculty directors, only receive institutional credit for the first portion of that work.

Another institutional problem for DMA is a lack of stable funding for the camp, which means that the director, in addition to the work listed above, also searches for and writes grants to continue the camp. In its first three years, DMA was funded by three different organizations—UofL’s Liberal Studies program, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), and Verizon—but each year has presented a variety of problems for the director, including: forgotten conversations with investors who guaranteed funding for the campers, pulled departmental funding (after the camp secured funding elsewhere), a grant that had to be written over family vacation, and miles of institutional red tape, such as an institutional workaround for the CCCC grant to accommodate institutional requirements. Of the process, Mary P says, “It felt like I’m doing all this work to rewrit[e] this grant, and now I’m still where I was without doing it.

This year 0% of my academic load is for DMA,¹⁵ but I'm still writing grants and overseeing grants and meeting with donors. It is an awful lot of work that is not recognized institutionally." Mary P explains that while she has received "kudos" for this work, especially for receiving outside recognition through the CCCC grant, she still believes that "the demands for community engagement, the demands for being tactical, the demands for grant writing are not being rewarded institutionally." This type and level of time and labor on a project cannot be sustained when she is not receiving comparable institutional credit, no matter her personal investment. Although Mary P has secured tenure, which gives her a certain amount of freedom to pursue projects like DMA, the limited institutional credit she receives means that she is still taking on a full load of courses, service appointments, and a cadre of graduate students to mentor. With the time intensive nature of DMA and her other obligations beyond the camp, Mary P is on a path that could easily lead to her being burnt out as she overextends herself in her professional life.

These dual problems create a lack of year-to-year continuity in DMA because this workload is not sustainable for any parties involved. Few graduate students (only two of nine) have returned to teach the camp a second summer, and Sabrina has decided that she cannot continue to direct the camp until after she receives tenure, because the workload for the camp is too high when she is expected to achieve tenure standards. Even Mary P has said that she cannot continue to direct the camp if something does not change. This continual turnover of teachers and directors is important because having teachers stay on over multiple years helps create consistency in the camp, which is beneficial for the

¹⁵ Because Mary P was on sabbatical the semester this interview was conducted, Sabrina was the Director of the camp and received the only course release.

campers, and deepens the learning that graduate students gain. In my second summer, I was more calm and prepared for the long days and hard schedule, letting me take the lead in the classroom when other teachers were exhausted, and I was able to work in two different areas of planning (assessment and technology), which gave me the opportunity to round out my understanding of how the camp is planned and implemented, while also allowing me to deepen my learning of research methods (through assessment protocols), collaboration (through working with a different team and acting as a leader because of my experience), and mundane labor (through a different variation of labor needed on technology). Maintaining more teachers from year to year would improve the experience for campers because teachers would be able to use their lived knowledge from the year before to better the camp design. They would also experience the kinds of learning discussed above more deeply as they continue their practice of one engaged research project. However, the sheer amount of work required and how little it is compensated mean that the few teachers who are interested in continuing their work at DMA are able to devote a second spring and summer to the camp, because there are other aspects of their programs—coursework, exams, dissertation research and writing—that must take precedence over this project so that they can complete their degrees.

Making the structure of DMA sustainable is key to ensuring that the learning discussed above can be replicated and deepened for more graduate students. One necessity is giving more institutional credit to all teachers and directors for this work. While the summer implementation of the camp is already rewarded through a course release for all parties, finding a way to make the spring work sustainable, perhaps through an official graduate course structured like a teaching practicum or internship (an option

Mary P is working to implement now through courses in research methods and community literacy), would enable more graduate students to take part in this project and, especially, for more students to spend a second or even third summer working on the camp, even if they are unable to take the course again. Another necessity is finding ways to secure funding that will not require so much extra work within the system to actually procure the money, preferably resulting in some portion of the camp being funded through regular sources, rather than Mary P and others having to scramble for funding each year. Of course, these suggestions are much easier said than done, and gaining sustainable financial resources and institutional credit for the time and effort put into DMA are complex processes that will require further navigating of current systems, including possibilities like: partnering with the development office to find potential donors interested in the camp, finding ways to show how DMA is particularly valuable for the university and the English department, and establishing set paths for graduate students to use DMA as a central point of study for research projects in coursework, MA culminating projects, or dissertations, which is currently encouraged but has only been pursued by one student, me.

DMA's sustainability issues reveal leverage points where administrators and faculty can deepen and infuse support for community engagement within university structures. UofL's commitment to supporting engaged scholarship has created a foundation of support for this type of work that make projects like DMA easier to get started, and DMA, in its meta and tacit work training graduate students for engaged scholarship, helps create deep learning of and a stronger culture for community engagement that UofL administrators are trying to foster across the university. However,

institutional hang-ups, like those experienced by DMA, highlight how current structures for community engagement at UofL are not reaching as deeply as they could to support training in engaged scholarship. DMA is proving beneficial to graduate students as they learn deeply across the areas described in this chapter, preparing them to construct and lead their own reciprocal community-engaged projects, and thus DMA serves as a model for addressing the complexities of how emerging scholars can learn to practice engaged research, a central challenge cited by engaged scholars. Acknowledging the labor and compensatory constraints of DMA and similar projects, perhaps by looking for creative ways to construct more sustainable avenues of financial support, is an important way for UofL, and other universities committed to community engagement, to show that it values and supports such projects as it continues to develop as an engaged university.

CHAPTER FOUR
CULTIVATING INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: SPONSORSHIP STRUCTURES FOR
TRANSDISCIPLINARY ENGAGED RESEARCH

Many scholars have posited the development of transdisciplinary projects as a key challenge of engaged research (Adjei-Nsiah et al.; Ramaley; Stokols; Weerts and Sandmann) because large-scale community issues (e.g., poverty, youth violence, educational inequality) cannot be adequately addressed by only one discipline since “multiple perspectives are required to solve complex problems” (Amey, Brown, and Sandmann 19). For example, James Votruba, in his 1996 article “Strengthening the University’s Alignment with Society: Challenges and Strategies,” calls for universities “to improve their ability to engage in interdisciplinary problem-focused work,” claiming that such an orientation is necessary if they “are to forcefully engage the complex issues confronting society” (33). Votruba is suggesting that scholars from across disciplines come together to create projects that utilize multiple methodologies, epistemologies, and scholarship to work toward solving a particular problem, rather than using only one discipline’s research practices. Some might call this approach interdisciplinary, a term used frequently by institutions and scholars, referring to “coordination among researchers from various fields” on a particular research topic (Stokols 67), or “the transfer of methods from one discipline to another” (Nicolescu 43). However, this term often involves an additive model where researchers “remain anchored in their respective disciplinary models and methodologies” (Stokols 67), accumulating multiple scholars and

disciplinary methods to tackle an issue. Instead of interdisciplinary, I will use the term *transdisciplinary*, defined as “a process by which researchers work together to develop a shared conceptual framework that integrates and extends discipline-based concepts, theories, and methods to address a common research topic” (Stokols 67).

Transdisciplinary gets around the issues of additively layering research methods in interdisciplinary frames by working to fully blend multiple perspectives and including scholars from across disciplines in the project-building process, making transdisciplinary a more useful term to describe such integrated research processes that have been long-valued in relation to community-engaged research.

Unfortunately, taking such a transdisciplinary approach is “easier to talk about than to do” (Votruba 33) and difficulties arise when trying to “bridge the traditional barriers of disciplinary values, modes of inquiry, and standards of scholarly legitimacy” (Ramaley 4). Marilyn J. Amey, Dennis F. Brown, and Lorilee R. Sandmann superficially depict such issues in “A Multidisciplinary Collaborative Approach to a University-Community Partnership: Lessons Learned,” citing the need for additional time and work to create a model for a project that brings together values from all disciplines involved, connecting differing organizational structures between departments and colleges to “construct [a team’s] own norms, operating procedures, monitoring mechanisms, and so on” (23). But the broad problems they identify, including “develop[ing] a common language for their work” (21) and overcoming faculty culture based in individual achievement (23), are not discussed in detail, relying instead on vague suggestions for dealing with these problems. This makes sense since these problems will undoubtedly depend on local contexts and issues. However, when scholarship pays more attention to

the work of successful transdisciplinary community projects (Adjei-Nsiah et al.; Langone; Leung; Plakans et al.) than to the structures and preparation that enable them, it leaves the process of creating successful projects something of a mystery that seems to rely more on serendipity than preparation and institutional support. If transdisciplinary projects are the best way to address community needs, then attending to the depth and complexity of this challenge by examining the structures that enable and constrain scholars' ability to work across departments and colleges within an institution is of vital importance.

Exploring the challenge of transdisciplinary research beyond individual projects to the structures that might support them enables a multifaceted view of this issue that makes visible larger pathways for creating a deeper culture for engaged research across campus. I argue that building structures that support transdisciplinary engaged projects is an important way to demonstrate a university's values regarding community engagement because such a structure is central to integrating scholars into an ideology that values and supports engaged research, which is a vital component of building the culture for community engagement that marks an engaged university. Engaged research structures work at two levels to create cultural change—1) with specific individuals to help them develop and implement their projects and 2) across departments and colleges as the organization raises the visibility and understanding of engaged research for administrators and faculty throughout campus. These both, to different degrees, encourage institutional cultural change that reflects a stronger value and support of engaged research; yet these dimensions of such structures are infrequently discussed in scholarship on engaged research and the making of engaged institutions.

To provide greater depth and complexity to scholarly discussions of the challenge presented by transdisciplinary engaged research, I use this chapter as a case study to examine how institutional structures can be designed to support transdisciplinary community engagement project development and foster progress toward a culture that values and supports engaged research. Toward that end, I explore a new project at UofL that is indicative of its growing commitment to community engagement, the Collaborative Consortium on Transdisciplinary Social Justice Research (The Consortium), founded in January 2017, as an institutional structure that operates as a central hub for social justice researchers at the university—offering intellectual and financial support for new and existing projects—and is, in that process, tacitly contributing to multi-level institutional cultural change by sponsoring individual scholars and creating campus-wide visibility for engaged research. Because this project is beginning three months before my dissertation defense date, my primary data is the Consortium’s grant application (“The Collaborative Consortium on Transdisciplinary Social Justice Research”), from which it garnered startup funds, and because I am looking at how the Consortium’s initial goals and plans are depicted in the grant, I am studying only the first steps in the process of supporting transdisciplinary engaged research, which will require future research to analyze how these steps work in practice. In this chapter, I utilize Deborah Brandt’s understandings of sponsorship to examine how the Consortium proposes to support transdisciplinary community research through intellectual and financial dimensions, studying how this process combined with a vast network of supporters is already implicitly encouraging institutional cultural change. Through this analysis, I argue that structures like the Consortium can sponsor the

complex work of transdisciplinary community research, and through the ideological freight connected to this sponsorship, they can continue to cultivate an institutional culture that values and supports engaged research.

Sponsoring Engaged Research

In Brandt's foundational work on literacy sponsors, she defines sponsors as "any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy-and gain advantage by it in some way" (Brandt 166). The process of agents "gain[ing] advantage" through sponsorship of others might happen "by direct repayment or indirectly, by credit of association" (167). Brandt argues that in addition to providing literacy to the sponsored, sponsors also "deliver the ideological freight that must be borne for access to what they have" (168). Ideological freight represents the causes and concerns of the sponsor that are connected to the support they give, whether implicitly or explicitly. Brandt compares the process to youth baseball players wearing jerseys with local businesses' logos, giving support to a company for the opportunity to compete in their sport. Sponsorship comes with strings, which might be as obvious as embodied advertising, but is more likely to be conveyed implicitly through sharing particular ideologies and oftentimes expecting the sponsored to take up those ideologies in service to the sponsor. The sponsored receive support, but they do so "pragmatically under the banner of others' causes," helping sponsors meet their goals as well (168).

Ideological freight is particularly important when studying the Consortium, because it interpellates individual scholars into a network of people who value and

practice engaged research. Scholars receive intellectual and financial support for their individual projects, but by doing so, the sponsored are expected to then carry the “banner” of the cause of engaged research, helping to promote and sustain a culture of community engagement on campus. Thus, I foreground ideological freight as a key aspect of sponsorship that helps create “gain” for the Consortium, using the invisible entanglements that are a part of sponsorship practices to oblige individual scholars to become a part of a broader culture of community engagement on campus.

In the following analysis, I examine the affordances, both the benefits and limitations, of the Consortium’s sponsorship plans, showing how this organization is working toward institutional change by supporting individual scholars intellectually and financially and raising visibility of engaged research across an institutional network it has constructed. Studying the Consortium in the process of its becoming a sponsor and institutional change maker is important because it allows for a deeper understanding of *how* support systems for engaged research are constructed, both the aspects that enable and hinder the goals of the Consortium. Once the process is smoothed into a particular narrative, many of these aspects will be forgotten and the opportunity to see the realities of the construction process will be gone. Thus, I am analyzing the Consortium now, in the first few months of its work, focusing on how it has created a complex sponsorship structure that can help emerging and established engaged scholars forge transdisciplinary partnerships. With that goal in mind, I trace the Consortium’s initial plans for individual professional sponsorship—through 1) intellectual sponsorship: creating a non-disciplinary networking space for scholars and community partners to make transdisciplinary connections; and 2) financial sponsorship: making available several

funding opportunities for social justice projects—in order to analyze the ways that ideological freight is woven into these practices. Then, I show how the Consortium has built a network of institutional supporters that spans departments and colleges, weaving its ideology into this network to tacitly make engaged research more visible and better understood across the university. Studying the structures that support this sponsorship, especially while they are still in process, is central to gaining a dynamic view of the challenge of transdisciplinary engaged research and a deeper understanding of how the Consortium is built to create both transdisciplinary engaged projects that affect the local community and change institutional views of engaged research.

Individual Sponsorship

The Consortium is currently in a three-year pilot stage to create a space where faculty can coordinate projects that aim to address social justice research, creative activity, and advocacy. The organization was founded by Cate Fosl (Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies, Director of the Ann Braden Institute) and Enid Trucios-Haynes (Professor of Law, Interim Director of UofL’s Muhammad Ali Institute for Peace and Justice) and is funded by a three-year “Academic and Research Excellence for the 21st Century University” grant (referred to as the 21st Century University grant throughout this chapter) through UofL’s School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies (SIGS) and the Office of Research and Innovation that specifically called for new interdisciplinary research projects that propose solutions for complex social problems (“Internal RFP”). According to the grant proposal, the Consortium will “build on existing social justice research initiatives” and “create new transdisciplinary social justice

research teams, projects, creative activities, and community-engaged scholarship” (“Cooperative Consortium” 1). Using a transdisciplinary research model, members of the Consortium seek to address social justice issues in Louisville in ways that create “significant and innovative solutions” for the community, hoping to create maximum impact (2). What the Consortium has created is a large structure that will 1) bring together scholars from across disciplines to construct transdisciplinary projects that address local social justice concerns; 2) offer a visible entry point to social justice research for faculty and students; and 3) provide support for gaining internal and external funding for these projects. The Consortium provides a new institutional structure that can advocate for and enable community-engaged scholarship at UofL as they “buil[d] a coherent social justice community of students, faculty, staff, and community” that will “offer the entire University the opportunity to understand better the role of social justice research in advocacy and community education” (1-2). Uniting various efforts for social justice and engaged research at UofL under the Consortium’s structure provides a more cohesive vision for this type of work at the institution, contributing to the culture of community engagement that administrators in the Vice President of Community Engagement’s Office are building.

The primary goal for the Consortium is to sponsor new and ongoing research projects—serving as a space where faculty and students can gather resources and support, both intellectual and financial, for projects that merge disciplinary knowledge-making practices to address issues of social justice. This goal showcases not only what Consortium leaders want to accomplish but also the ideological freight that is connected to the Consortium’s support. Those who wish to work with and be sponsored by the

Consortium will have to engage with transdisciplinary, social justice, and community-engaged research frames, incorporating them into their projects. The Consortium's particular ideological perspectives are clearly stated in the grant and interlaced throughout every aspect of the organization from its composition as a space outside of a particular discipline to its guidelines for receiving financial support for projects, and because this is an organization devoted to helping scholars develop new research, those projects will likely also be inflected by this ideology. In constructing structures that sponsor new projects intellectually and financially, the Consortium has also created a system with ideological freight, which will help scholars begin, or extend, a career trajectory that includes transdisciplinary engaged research, while furthering the Consortium's goal to increase the visibility and value of this type of work across campus.

Intellectual Sponsorship

To begin intellectually sponsoring transdisciplinary engaged research, the Consortium is actively working to create a networking hub that encourages the formation of new transdisciplinary social justice research teams. A central part of this process is constructing several ways to reach interested faculty and bring them together to discuss their goals, visions, and possible projects to make connections that will lead to new projects. In the grant, the Consortium promises to provide “a more accessible entry point and resource for students, new faculty, and community partners” (2) by creating “structured opportunities for faculty to come together across disciplines, and in conjunction with community partners, on a common issue” (Appendix 8, 1). The following analysis highlights the complexities of this intellectual support by showing

how such structures are multidimensional. On one level, the Consortium is planning several strategies for networking and supporting scholars in the development of transdisciplinary partnerships and projects. Less visibly, the Consortium's ideological freight is entangled in these structures, implicitly and explicitly encouraging scholars to value the research ideologies of the organization, which is part of creating the kind of institutional culture that is more supportive of transdisciplinary engaged research.

One of the Consortium's strongest (and titular) commitments is to transdisciplinarity, which can be seen in the way it sets itself up as a centralized space without specific disciplinary ties—choosing not to be housed within an academic college or department. Community engagement scholars Amey, Brown, and Sandmann write that “intellectual and organizational neutral space is key” for transdisciplinary engaged research, offering a place where “it becomes safer to explore issues and consider the merits of alternative perspectives” (24) and that “enhances the opportunity to move toward integrative thinking and collaborative work” (25). Such integrated thinking is crucial for transdisciplinary work, and a neutral organization is more likely to enable such an approach than a particular department or college. Of course, no space is truly going to be neutral or free of disciplinary perspectives. For example, the leaders of the Consortium itself are faculty in Women's and Gender Studies and Law, and every project will have a leader or two from specific disciplines. Yet, a project sponsored by a transdisciplinary office is more likely to encourage and value methodological and epistemological blending than a project that *begins* in History, or Biology, or Secondary Education and adds in voices from other disciplines. Creating and publicizing a space focused on helping scholars form transdisciplinary research teams provides a viable, visible

alternative for scholars who might otherwise have tried to address such issues through a singular disciplinary lens or add in other faculty later for a layered, additive project that will ultimately still favor a particular discipline's form of knowledge creation. Scholars who enter the Consortium in order to receive intellectual backing for their projects are committing to the transdisciplinary ideology that the organization espouses.

To involve more faculty in the organization, the Consortium plans to host several networking activities where faculty members with similar interests can meet and try to find connections between their work that could lead to a transdisciplinary partnership. Planned networking events outlined in the grant include: "quarterly meetings/forums/gatherings for entire consortium;" "brown bag/event on one of the research projects;" and an "annual symposium" (Appendix 11, 1). These meetings are important because they show ways that the Consortium is actively seeking participation in its mission, rather than waiting for scholars to make contact with them and express interest. While they will have to wait and see who shows up to these meetings in order to get a sense of who is interested and how they can encourage involvement from scholars across campus, the Consortium's current advertising processes (for its preliminarily funding opportunities) have been far-reaching through multiple channels, including several listservs that serve the entire university, specific departments and colleges, and even more specific interest groups like the Anne Braden Institute's listserv for local social justice opportunities. Existing practice seems to indicate that they will continue to try and reach a wide range of scholars for their networking events. These events help individuals form teams and projects that are intricately tied to the Consortium's ideologies of transdisciplinarity, community engagement, and social justice, *and* if those

teams are formed successfully, the Consortium is not just helping individuals, but also promoting the spread of such work across campus, making it more common, which is an important step in making it more *valued* across campus.

Outside of these face-to-face activities, the Consortium is also seeking to encourage networking through their online presence, which will include detailed information on social justice activity and research across the university. Part of being a networking hub is creating and maintaining a central base of knowledge for relevant projects and courses at the university, making such information more visible across and beyond the institution. They have begun the process of gathering this knowledge in the grant—creating a “list of faculty organizers” and “prospective consortium partners list,” which detail faculty members from across colleges and campuses who are currently invested in or might be interested in community-based social justice research. These lists will serve as the backbone of a larger project for the Consortium: “a clearinghouse for all university-wide social justice research and creative activity, highlighting current and new projects of the Consortium and leading to an online library” (Appendix 8, 1). This library will be an important resource for emerging scholars, giving them a clear view of current community-engaged work on campus and which faculty members might be interested in partnering on new or existing projects. For faculty and students who might not initially see advertisements about physical gatherings, an accessible, easily searchable database can help them find the information they need to become a part of the Consortium’s group of scholars working on transdisciplinary social justice projects.

By organizing and making all of this information available online, the Consortium positions itself as the organization with institutional expertise in this area and offers a

virtual argument, through its repository of relevant research projects, about the centrality of engaged, social justice research on campus. This highly visible way of documenting and promoting transdisciplinary engaged research projects helps individual scholars and encourages a campus-wide culture for engagement. For individuals, it provides a resource of current projects that could be useful beyond the development of new research partnerships—in making arguments about the centrality and important of this type of work that could be useful in pursuing intra- or extra-mural funding or in explaining community-based research in less understanding departments on campus. And this resource could help spread widely an awareness of the value and significance of these kinds of projects to UofL, as an institution committed to strengthening its community ties, and to the particular disciplines it represents, which will hopefully be far-reaching.

Additionally, the Consortium will model transdisciplinary research practices by creating new teams that capitalize on current institutional research trends. To focus the Consortium's efforts, they have identified four particular strands of research they are interested in supporting: Community Justice and Environmental Justice, which both draw on existing research at UofL and show how the Consortium is relevant to current trends, and Emerging Social Justice and Social Justice in West Louisville, which are broader categories meant to encourage a wide range of projects that engage social justice in a variety of ways. While describing Community Justice, the grant writers describe recently completed projects (on topics like fair housing and restorative justice in public schools) and how new iterations of these projects will begin under the Consortium, incorporating a transdisciplinary framework. For example, the new Fair Housing Initiative, which originally ran from 2010-15, will include Fosl, who led the original project through the

Anne Braden Institute, and Lauren Heberle of the Center for Environmental Policy and Management (CEPM), and their primary goal is to create “reports/research/creative material that address the housing issues in the Louisville region” (Appendix 6, 4). The project will primarily draw on epistemologies and methodologies from history (through Fosl and the Anne Braden Institute), environmental policy (Heberle), and social justice in order to “examin[e] housing issues from a transdisciplinary, social justice perspective” (Appendix 6, 4). In addition to the current project team, consisting of Fosl, Heberle, and graduate students involved in the Braden Institute and the CEPM, Fosl and Heberle plan to find other partners to help them “expand the current range of products to include more arts and digital humanities products” (Appendix 6, 4), which will necessarily integrate even more disciplinary dimensions to the research process through the involvement of scholars in disciplines like art, theatre, or graphic design as well as the digital humanities, which could draw on scholars from several other disciplines depending on their scholarly interests. If the goals expand beyond reports about fair housing, the project will need new scholars to complete such products, bringing in their own research methods and processes that are necessary to create the desired products. While the grant only gives a brief sketch of what the fair housing project will look like, it does begin the process of modeling the kinds of scholarship the Consortium is interested in sponsoring, depicting what transdisciplinary, community-engaged social justice research projects look like. Sponsored projects might not have to match the exact methods or frames of the fair housing project, but it provides a model for the ideological underpinnings that will be expected in Consortium-supported projects and how to incorporate them. More importantly than the write up of this project (along with other example projects) in the grant will be its

execution, hopefully *showing* not only interested faculty, but also faculty and administrators across the university, the kind of robust, rigorous scholarly inquiry that is possible while also doing good work that addresses local social problems. These models will be crucial for raising awareness and helping people see the value of this type of research, which helps cultivate a culture of engagement on campus.

Through these three types of intellectual sponsorship—networking activities, online resources, and model projects—the Consortium is enabling individual scholars to gather the resources they need to design and implement their own projects, and tied to these resources are the Consortium’s ideologies, encouraging scholars toward particular paths of research. Through these types of sponsorship, the Consortium will encourage interest in transdisciplinary research among a wide group of scholars—those interested in collaborations across disciplines, in community engagement, in social justice, and even in the particular projects modeled by the Consortium. While some scholars might cross all of these groups, many might only be from one. The Consortium’s intellectual sponsorship is calling scholars from across groups into action as transdisciplinary engaged researchers, setting them on a path to align their scholarship with the Consortium’s ideologies.

One central question for the Consortium as it moves forward is how it will move beyond supporting the creation of teams to helping team members generate and implement a transdisciplinary, community-engaged framework for their research projects, which is key for helping individuals and is a more targeted way to incorporate the ideological freight of sponsorship. As written in the grant, two characteristics of transdisciplinary research are “transcending and integrating disciplinary paradigms” and

“doing participatory research” (Appendix 1, 1). How scholars will learn such practices is much less discussed than the Consortium’s strategies for networking scholars, implying that people need help finding research partners but already know how to plan and implement projects that integrate disciplinary frames for participatory research. Because this is only the seed grant, this assumption might work for preliminary projects the Consortium supports (like the Fair Housing Initiative), but addressing the intellectual concerns that such complex projects will face necessitates looking at the full research process, from team formation to the creation of scholarly and community products, in order to sponsor these projects from start to finish. Considering the layered, multifaceted nature of the Consortium’s structure for one element of intellectual sponsorship (networking) illuminates how complex creating further structures to support the long-term intellectual needs of sponsored projects will be. Covering the entire spectrum of intellectual needs will require further events, training, discussion, and mentoring to help teams succeed, and as seen in chapter three, teaching teams how to *do* engaged research is quite an intricate process. Of course, the Consortium will also gain from the efforts it puts toward building future structures. As the Consortium extends its structures for intellectually sponsoring new research projects, it also continues to integrate scholars into the ideological freight of the Consortium’s goals and plans. Teaching new scholars how to *do* particular types of research rather than focusing on forming teams of researchers gives the Consortium more opportunities to encourage scholarly alignment with the organization’s ideologies. Providing structured research support would only add to the already multifaceted intellectual sponsorship offered by the Consortium, providing further help for individual scholars and projects, which creates a larger mass of

transdisciplinary engaged scholars who can help grow awareness and comprehension of the value of this type of scholarly inquiry across campus.

Financial Sponsorship

In addition to its intellectual sponsorship, the Consortium also provides financial sponsorship for projects through grants and research fellowships. The financial support that the Consortium offers directly relates to Brandt's ideas of sponsorship, which she frequently describes through economic terms, comparing sponsorship practices to European patronage systems and "*compradrazgo* in the Americas" where "loaning land, money, protection, and other favors allowed the politically powerful to extend their influence" (168). Although the Consortium's financial sponsorship of research projects exists, like Brandt's literacy sponsors, in very different "economic, policy, and educational systems" than *compraadrazgo*, the process of offering financial support still exists within "larger political and economic arenas" (169). The financial sponsorship offered through the Consortium provides scholars with the monetary resources they need to complete their projects. Most obviously, scholars can use these funds to buy material goods they need for their work, which their departments are unlikely or unable to provide. But another important consideration for these projects is the time needed to complete them. If people do not give their time and energy to planning and implementing these projects, then the material goods are never needed. Financial support that gives scholars additional time for their research projects is another aspect of the Consortium's sponsorship. This financial support for material goods and time is tied to the ideological freight of the Consortium's broader goals for wider visibility of and support for

transdisciplinary engaged research. The Consortium's financial resources are not without strings, and as they provide support for scholars, they are able to reach their goals as well—creating a wider understanding of the importance of engaged social justice research across campus.

As written in the grant, the Consortium's primary means of financial sponsorship is through what they are calling "Research Fellowship Support" that will financially sponsor social justice scholars in a variety of ways. These financial opportunities include: 1) small (\$2,500) and large (\$7,500) grant fellowships, 2) one course buy-outs (12-13 available annually to junior or senior faculty), and 3) support for projects from graduate and undergraduate research fellows (who are funded through the Consortium). These different options for financial support help with varying needs of projects related to both material goods and time.

As scholars leave the university to do research with community organizations, they often need to bring resources with them for their project, and the grants available through the Consortium can help researchers make these purchases. The materials necessary for a project might be paper, paints, and paintbrushes for a children's art event, iPod touches for a digital production camp, stipends for community members who participate in an interview study, and many other things. Community engagement projects almost always require materials beyond what is available in a scholar's personal research space, no matter their discipline, and finding funding for these materials is often a major concern for the scholars involved (a need described more fully in the mundane labor section of chapter three). The small grants available through the Consortium are not going to fund exceptionally large projects, but they could help scholars provide travel to

and from a community site for students, dinner for project stakeholders who come to a meeting, or any of the other material goods necessary to complete their work. The Consortium's ability to fund such projects, even minimally, is an important way for Consortium leaders to show that they understand central concerns for engaged research and support the projects they are helping scholars create through their networking events.

Additionally, the time consuming nature of putting together and implementing a transdisciplinary research project is a significant hurdle, and the second and third options for research fellows relate to this challenge. Course buy-outs give faculty members additional time away from their teaching load in order to do the laborious work of project development and implementation, which is especially necessary for projects where faculty from across campus are coming together to integrate disciplinary ways of knowledge creation in order to create a project that addresses a large-scale community concern. Building a blended epistemology and methodology for a project is a long process, requiring scholars from across disciplines to find common ground and learn from one another through readings and discussions to figure out how they will merge their research approaches to make new knowledge in one context. Once they determine a way to move forward, implementing those methods will be difficult as well. Community-engaged research rarely works at a steady pace, instead rotating between times of intense busy-ness and relative calm. Course releases can help scholars with the pressures of dealing with the time consuming nature of planning and implementing projects. Also, access to graduate and undergraduate research fellows can help take away some of the burden of time from faculty. Because the Consortium is paying these students for their research time, project leaders can utilize them to help with aspects of their projects that

would be incredibly inefficient on their own, which also helps further the Consortium's goal of training a new generation of engaged scholars by giving them an opportunity to gain tacit understanding of engaged research processes (as I call for in chapter three). Financial support aimed to help scholars alleviate some of the time of engaged research work is an important part of sponsoring this work because it shows that the Consortium recognizes that the constraints of engaged research are not only based on materials goods but also available time.

These research fellowships are accompanied by several guidelines for how the Consortium wants fellows to spend their time and money, asking scholars to shape their projects in particular ways and participate in other Consortium activities like research talks and networking events. These stipulations carry the ideological freight attached to the Consortium's financial sponsorship, helping the Consortium reach its goals while providing financial resources to research teams. Applicants are expected to be faculty members involved in "social justice transdisciplinary research projects" that "include opportunities for both graduate and undergraduate student research" (Appendix 9, 1), which automatically creates parameters for the types of projects chosen to receive financial support: projects that include multiple scholars integrating disciplinary frames to address an issue of social inequality alongside a community partner and that include space for graduate and undergraduate research. The requirement for graduate and undergraduate researchers is an important part of the Consortium's ideology (that is not as obvious in their intellectual sponsorship structures) because having students involved in these projects helps nurture an interest in transdisciplinary engaged research for emerging scholars while further implicating established scholars into engaged work as

they mentor and teach their students about these practices. Other expectations for Research Fellows include working as “lead manager” of their proposed transdisciplinary research project; publishing or presenting on their work in national venues; and writing semi-annual reports that detail progress of their projects and scholarly products, use of their financial support, and possible external funding opportunities (Appendix 9, 2-3). This set of guidelines requires Research Fellows to make progress on their projects’ goals as dictated by the Consortium, specifically progress toward traditional scholarly products and outside funding. These outcomes are particularly useful for the Consortium as they are institutionally legible as “successful” research projects, giving the Consortium some measure of validity as a research sponsor. Additionally, by stipulating that research fellows must publish and present on their work as well as seek continued funding, the Consortium fosters trajectories of engaged scholarship, asking scholars to continue their projects beyond the initial time frame of the Consortium’s support. Prolonging their engaged research means more time working within the Consortium’s ideologies and learning to value and support this type of research, whether they initially wanted to continue such a research path after their sponsored project or not.

Research Fellows are also asked to “participate in a network of scholar-activists dedicated to identifying new solutions to intransigent problems of social inequality” (2). Participation in that network will include such activities as: working on an annual symposium for the Consortium, presenting their research locally to other members of the network, and mentoring “faculty, students, and community partners engaged in social justice research and community engagement experiences” (3). These aspects of Research Fellow expectations are geared more toward outreach and increasing visibility of the

Consortium to bring in more scholars, strengthening the organization through numbers. Increasing awareness of the Consortium is important for accomplishing their goals for individual scholars, to help them develop and sustain new projects, and for the organization as a whole, to increase support for transdisciplinary engaged research across campus. Through these various guidelines for Research Fellows, the Consortium has incorporated ideological freight into its financial sponsorship structure by including dimensions that will increase its own sustainability. The Consortium is doing more than just giving money to people to do projects that align with their interests; its leaders are designing structures for people and projects to continue building and strengthening the organization itself.

Because the Consortium is a work in progress, there are some potential misalignments between its stated goals and how financial sponsorship is currently structured, which highlight the fraught nature of creating structures that incentivize transdisciplinary engaged research. One concern is the focus on individual faculty members to receive the designation as “Research Fellow,” especially in the understanding developed in the grant that the fellow is the “leader” of the project (Appendix 9, 2). It is unclear from the grant materials how many “Research Fellows” can be chosen from a particular project. If these projects are transdisciplinary, then multiple scholars from across departments will be involved in the work of creating this project, and privileging only one scholar from each project for this kind of financial support could have problematic effects on the transdisciplinary nature of a project. To ensure transdisciplinarity, multiple faculty members from that project should be able to apply for a course release or a mini-grant. Toward that end, the “Call for Proposals” for these

research fellowships came out in January 2017 and they do contain a brief notation (buried in the middle of the second page) that “proposals from teams may request more than one kind of grant” (2). Yet, this note is still unclear. Can multiple faculty members from one project receive course releases? Or can one project apply for a mini-grant and a course release? Even if this is clarified, the Consortium will then run the risk of possibly giving too much to one project, leaving other faculty out and diminishing the number of projects they support and thus the growing strength of the organization itself. So, there is a tension between the Consortium’s multiple goals and how they can financially support projects, creating additional complexities for their sponsorship structures. In the future, Consortium leaders will likely have to revisit these concerns many times to determine how they want to use their limited financial resources to meet *all* of their goals.

By providing financial backing to transdisciplinary research projects, the Consortium is able to reach its own goals by giving faculty the opportunity to create projects that address community issues, and through the intellectual freight tied to these resources, the Consortium ties scholars to its research ideologies. Delivering financial support is as important as intellectual sponsorship, because the needs of these projects extend beyond finding research partners and developing ideas. Scholars often do research because they are passionate about it, but without sufficient financial support, passion projects die out, as discussed in the conclusion of chapter three. While the Consortium is not providing a great deal of funding for these projects, offering financial assistance shows that the organization’s leaders are serious about sponsoring transdisciplinary social justice research. Additionally, ideological freight is easily tied to financial resources. While intellectual sponsorship involves the Consortium helping shape the ideas in a

project, financial sponsorship *requires* scholars to adhere to the Consortium's ideological views about transdisciplinarity, community engagement, and undergraduate and graduate research. Financial sponsorship includes more visible and specific strings that help the Consortium meet their goals for creating campus-wide understanding and valuing of transdisciplinary engaged research by encouraging more scholars to begin and continue community-centered work and by increasing awareness of these projects and research practices. Requiring scholars to integrate the Consortium's research ideologies into new projects affects that individual project *and* spreads the organization's ideology across campus as sponsored scholars bring their work back to their individual departments and colleges, discussing their current work with colleagues and students.

Leveraging Individual Sponsorship for Cultural Change

The Consortium's individual sponsorship through intellectual and financial support is an important way the organization is already working to change the institutional culture of UofL, particularly by helping individuals make their work more institutionally legible. Aspects of the intellectual sponsorship, like the Consortium's planned research talks, offer spaces for scholars to share their research on campus, spreading awareness of current projects across the university. And the way financial sponsorship is structured in the Consortium aligns with accepted documentation of research in genres like the AWP and tenure guidelines, making it easier for sponsored scholars to make note of their time and labor in these documents to receive institutional credit for that work. Grants are obviously seen as a central element of research and are expected to be written up as such on these documents. Consortium grants and progress on

new, extramural grants, which is required of all Consortium grant-recipients, can be included on the AWP to show work on a research project before more standard products like conference presentations or publications are possible. Additionally, the title of Research Fellow offers a credible research designation to engaged projects long before they result in traditional research products. Listing a Research Fellowship from the Consortium on a scholar's AWP as the reason for a course release shows an explicit connection to their research, which they may not yet be comfortable putting in the Research section because they are not working on specific products. Lastly, graduate students who receive assistantships through the Consortium will receive professionalization opportunities in engaged research *and* be able to include it on documents like the program progress assessment, incentivizing community engagement and helping emerging scholars see the value in this type of work. Offering ways for scholars to work within these professionalization documents is an important step for creating change in the professionalization system¹⁶ to accommodate engaged research, modifying institutional understanding of what kind of work can be written into such documents without making overt, complex changes to the system. To complement these documentary possibilities, the Consortium could add conversations and workshops that would specifically help individuals navigate these processes and learn to showcase their research projects within and beyond institutional documents for their professional and scholarly development. Helping scholars learn to advocate for themselves in these documents will help grow understanding of engaged research in individual departments

¹⁶ I use the term professionalization system to refer to both the genre system I discuss in chapter one, which often devalues the work of engaged research, and how the documents in that genre system affect professional identity formation throughout a scholar's' career.

across the university, contributing to cultural change across campus toward better comprehension and valuing of engaged research.

Institutional Network of Support

In addition to creating intellectual and financial sponsorship structures for individual scholars, the Consortium has also constructed a network of institutional departments and organizations through which it can foster institution-wide support for engaged research. In “Teaching/Learning Action Research Requires Fundamental Reforms in Public Higher Education,” Davydd J. Greenwood argues that institutional change requires “strong local bases built around well-trained people and collaborators who have learned to value [action research] processes” (250). Greenwood writes that for action research, which is itself transdisciplinary research done in full partnership with community members, to become a sustainable practice within institutions, scholars must develop “innovative ways of organizing, legitimating, and growing flexible coalitions” (“Doing and Learning” 124) to support their work. The Consortium’s network of supporters could be one way to grow a coalition of people who are deeply invested in transdisciplinary engaged research.

The process of making available intellectual and financial sponsorship has been complex, and the Consortium has received support from many institutional organizations to back its mission. The primary co-sponsors of this organization are SIGS and the Office of Research and Innovation, which chose this project to receive the 21st Century University grant. These organizations have both intellectually and financially sponsored the Consortium, shaping it with *their* ideologies through requiring elements like

undergraduate and graduate student research opportunities, interdisciplinarity (the term they use) of projects, and matching funds from multiple departments (“Internal RFP”). As seen previously, transdisciplinarity is central to the Consortium’s goals, and they have made undergraduate and graduate research a part of their requirements for Research Fellows. The way the Consortium has achieved its matching funds has allowed for it to do more than gain additional financial resources; its variety of matching departments and programs across UofL and the Louisville community give the organization wide access across campus to increase awareness and understanding of community-engaged research. This network of departmental and organizational supporters is financially contributing to the idea that transdisciplinary community engagement is a viable way of making new knowledge. Through their support, the Consortium both offers individual sponsorship *and* raises the visibility of engaged research among administrators and faculty across colleges and campuses, establishing multiple points through which the Consortium can make engaged research better understood across campus. In this way, the Consortium has the potential to, as Brandt writes, appropriate this support “to divert sponsors’ resources toward ulterior projects,” namely making engaged research more visible across campus (Brandt 179). Brandt is discussing ways that her study participants used literacy practices outside of the contexts in which they were learned, often for “projects of self-interest or self-development” (179), but I use it here to think about how the Consortium uses the matching funds for its own “ulterior” motives to continue developing a culture for engagement across campus. In the analysis that follows, I trace how Consortium leaders have constructed and plan to sustain a network comprised of departments and organizations across colleges and campuses, in order to examine how the Consortium’s

ideologies are built into this network, continuing the cultivation of an institutional culture that values engaged research.

Creating the Network

By using the 21st Century University grant's requirement for matching funds to partner with and gain support from a variety of campus and community groups, the Consortium is creating campus-wide investment in their organization and, ultimately, in transdisciplinary engaged research. Fosl explains that "coming out of the Humanities...raising a quarter of a million dollars is really ambitious," which led them to a cooperative funding model. The Consortium garnered 32 letters of support from departments, offices, and programs across UofL's campuses (30) and from community organizations (2). According to the grant, the Consortium has "adopted a cooperative funding model to maximize the impact of this support and limited budgets. These matching funds derive from small donations, and the aim is to distribute these resources back to research teams to advance the University's social justice research" (2). The cooperative funding model encourages departments to place financial stakes in the project, and having numerous organizations involved financially raises the profile of the Consortium across UofL's campuses and encourages members of those organizations to get involved in the Consortium's research through applying for financial support or joining projects. Though the primary reasoning for the collaborative funding model is to distribute costs across departments, this model also works to create a network of people who are literally buying into the Consortium *and* its ideologies, allowing the organization to pursue primary (sponsoring individual research projects) and secondary (cultivating a

culture for engagement) goals. This secondary goal is particularly important because building such wide investment in the Consortium furthers the specific projects and practices it sponsors by increasing understanding of engaged research across campus, creating a professional environment that is more receptive to that kind of work.

Additionally, this model of cooperative funding is important for faculty members and administrators at and beyond UofL who might be interested in large-scale projects and grants like the one the Consortium was awarded but come from departments, particularly in the arts and humanities, that do not have the financial means to offer matching funds. Unlike the Consortium, another project that received the 21st Century University grant, which aims to use big data to develop new ways to diagnose and treat diseases and disorders, has only three letters, which all come from departments and organizations in the Speed School of Engineering and the School of Medicine. Departments in UofL's College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) simply do not have the same kind of discretionary funds that can be used to match a grant's requirement, at least in part because few scholars in these disciplines are acculturated to the kind of grant-seeking that is common and necessary for scholars in Medicine or Engineering. In fact, a digital humanities faculty group interested in the grant chose not to apply because they could not see a way to garner the matching funds from their departments. Per the grant's guidelines, "matches could include the commitment of **new** faculty lines or graduate assistants, as well as other funding" ("Internal RFP"), in the hopes that departments would hire new scholars with expertise in the grant area. Thus, units could not use the time and salary of *existing* faculty to match the funds, which made this type of match trickier because of its limited scope. From CAS, only one faculty line (10% of a new line

in Anthropology) and one graduate student line (from the Dean’s office) were committed to the funds for the Consortium. Other CAS departments could have decided to use an open line for this grant, but many searches were already underway by the time proposals were due (in January 2016)—meaning the timeline did not quite match up to advertise for a position that would be involved with the Consortium. Fosl explains that many “chairs didn’t feel that they could commit someone’s time that wasn’t even here yet,” perhaps because of the “more individualistic ethos in arts and sciences.” These departments also do not likely have the funding in place to create new lines for graduate students or postdoctoral researchers, which is the main way that matching funds in the big data project are being committed.

The necessity of such a collaborative effort for CAS departments is made even clearer when looking at the overview of funding for the Consortium. In Table 1, one can see how CAS has far and away the most units contributing, but because its contributions are mostly limited to \$500 or \$1000 increments, it still is not the college or school contributing the most money.

Table 1 – Matching Funds for the Consortium

Academic School or College	Departments and Programs Contributing	Total Amount
College of Education and Human Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of Education and Human Development • Department of Middle and Secondary Education • Early Childhood Research Center 	\$63,068 per year
College of Arts and Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of Arts and Sciences • Department of Anthropology • Department of Communication • Department of Criminal Justice • Department of English • Department of History 	\$52,550 per year

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Philosophy • Department of Political Science • Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences • Department of Sociology • Department of Theater Arts • Department of Women's and Gender Studies • Center for Mental Health Disparities • Hite Art Institute • Institute for Intercultural Communication • Peace, Justice, and Conflict Studies Program • Social Change Minor • University Honors Program 	
School of Public Health and Information Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Public Health Practice 	\$45,000 per year (approx.)
School of Social Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School of Social Work 	\$45,000 per year (approx.)
Health Sciences Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School of Medicine • School of Nursing • Health Sciences Center Office of Diversity and Inclusion 	\$37,500 per year
Other Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brandeis School of Law • UofL Muhammad Ali Institute for Peace and Justice • Office of Community Engagement • University Libraries • Jefferson County Public Schools • Metropolitan Housing Commission 	\$14,000 per year

Put even more starkly, in CAS, each unit (15) contributed, on average, \$1,821.¹⁷ In the College of Education and Human Development, each unit (2) contributed, on average, \$8,950¹⁸, and the large contributions from the School of Social Work and the School of

¹⁷ This number subtracts the amount given by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, \$27,000 per year, and does not count units that wrote non-monetary letters of support.

¹⁸ This number subtracts the amount given by the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, \$45,168.

Public Health and Information Science come from one source. The largest contribution from a unit within CAS was approximately \$8,000 from the Department of Criminal Justice. Based on these numbers, it seems that units in CAS are either unable or unwilling to contribute large amounts of funding to projects like this, but through the Consortium's cooperative funding model, many scholars in CAS are able to involve and commit their academic units to this project. These widespread commitments across the institution, and specifically in CAS, allow for a stronger awareness of the Consortium and the ideologies it promotes, helping spread interest in and understanding of engaged research across campus.

Sustaining the Network

Beyond gathering financial support from units across campus, the Consortium is also asking staff and faculty from those units to be a part of a series of advisory councils and working groups to make decisions and steer the organization. These groups take the initial investment in the Consortium created by financial contributions and sustain it over time by incorporating advisors from across campus into their decision-making structure. The primary groups in this support structure are the Lead Partner Working Group (LPWG) and the Faculty Council. The LPWG, made up of academic groups that already exist and have staff (UofL's Muhammad Ali Institute, the Anne Braden Institute, the Brandeis Laboratory for Democracy and Citizenship, the Office of Public Health Practice, and the Health Science Center Office of Health Affairs, Diversity, and Inclusion), and the Faculty Council, comprised of faculty from departments and programs that have contributed funds, are the primary decisions makers for the Consortium,

working collaboratively to “disseminate all the fellowships and consider the opportunities available to the Consortium” (Appendix 8, 1). Other committees that will be a part of these discussions include a Community Advisory Council, a University Advisory Council, and an Affiliated Faculty Group (for faculty members whose departments/units did not contribute funds). The different groups of people involved in decision-making mean several important voices are represented for making decisions within the Consortium: the faculty leading research teams, the faculty and staff carrying out day-to-day work, community partners who are essential to creating reciprocal projects that address social justice in Louisville, and university advisers who understand institutional systems and can vouch for the Consortium in the future. The Community Advisory Council is important to continue investment in the organization from outside the university, maintaining the Consortium’s relationship with community organizations. Without their support and guidance, the Consortium will be unable to develop research projects that address local issues. Within the university, each of the academic groups incorporates people from across colleges, asking faculty and administrators not only to nominally and financially contribute to the Consortium, but also to be a part of its regular work, advising Consortium leaders on which projects to support and how to work in the interest of the university and the community.

Asking financial contributors to be a part of the advisory structure is an important way to sustain investment in the Consortium. Involving community members, faculty, and administrators (who may or may not be personally involved in transdisciplinary engaged research projects) in decision-making groups means that they will continue to consider the work of the Consortium and how it fits into the university beyond the letters

of support they wrote. If the Consortium does want to appropriate their broad base of financial support to spread visibility and increase the value of transdisciplinary engaged research across campus, finding ways to sustain and build these initial investments will be necessary. This is particularly pertinent for CAS units because very few of them included stipulations to their contributions as other departments did (e.g., to be used for a particular faculty line or disciplinary graduate fellowship), meaning that they have no structural investment beyond their financial contribution. Deepening departmental commitments through having a faculty member advising the organization is an important way to strengthen this network of support. This prolongs the process of exposing faculty from different areas of campus to the research ideologies promoted by the Consortium, which is important for increasing understanding and support for engaged research across departments and colleges.

Leveraging the Network for Cultural Change

The Consortium is already creating implicit cultural change across campus as they are encouraging an increased awareness of engaged research not only among individual scholars but also across their widespread network of supporters, but what they will have to consider next is how to move from making engaged research *visible* across campus to making it explicitly *valued*. In “Doing and Learning Action Research in the Neo-Liberal World of Contemporary Higher Education,” Greenwood, in his portraits of action research centers, which like the Consortium support transdisciplinary engaged research teams, and action research degree programs, argues that “the survival” of such thinly-staffed and supported programs “depends on constant energy from a few faculty and

student leaders, and on skill in persuading administrators that the work being done actually gains public support for their institutions rather than subtracting resources” (122). The Consortium will not be immune to such challenges just because it has a larger set of funds and faculty supporters than the organizations Greenwood describes; it will similarly have to prove its worth to the university. One important step in that process will be to find ways to show the network of supporters they have built that engaged research is *valuable* to their departments—possibly through the acclaim and sustainability that comes from successful grant writing and through making targeted changes to the professionalization system.

One element of the Consortium’s plans that could help in this process is its current sustainability plan, which focuses on obtaining significant grants that would showcase how valuable engaged research is to organizations devoted to higher education and/or the public good. As required by the 21st Century University grant, the Consortium has already begun to plan how it can grow beyond the initial three-year investment by SIGS, the Office of Research and Innovation, and its network of funders. In the grant, Consortium leaders write that “community-engaged and transdisciplinary research are increasingly axes of major support by foundations and philanthropists,” citing recent five- and seven-figure gifts to the Anne Braden Institute and the Office of Public Health Practice for social justice related projects (5). They list 21 possible sources of funding for the Consortium, ranging from local foundations with smaller award amounts to organizations like the National Institutes of Health and the Center for Disease Control that fund much larger projects (Appendix 12). By the end of the three-year pilot, the Consortium plans to have “demonstrated its greater coordinating and output potential in

support of our metropolitan research mission and...improved Louisville Metro metrics in terms of violence, fair housing, restorative practices, and environmental health,” which “will better equip UofL for external funding for inter- and transdisciplinary research moving forward toward social justice ends” (5). Additionally, the Consortium, as noted previously, has built in requirements for its Research Fellows to apply for extramural funds to continue the projects that the Consortium supports. Bringing money into the university through both of these means—for the Consortium and for individual transdisciplinary projects—signals the value of this type of research, showcasing that organizations connected to higher education see this as important knowledge-making work. During this process, the Consortium acts as something of an umbrella organization that better showcases outside valuing of transdisciplinary engaged research than individual project grants might obtain because there is a critical mass of funding for both the organization itself and projects it has supported. As administrators and faculty see the financial value of transdisciplinary engaged research, the intellectual value of community-based knowledge making should become clear as well.

Another way that the Consortium can help work toward a culture that explicitly values transdisciplinary engaged research is by working within and against the professionalization system, which devalues the work of engaged research across the university and over the course of a scholar’s career. If engaged research is to be valued at UofL, it has to be seen and understood as an important form of making new knowledge, and altering aspects of this system would create structural change that makes engaged research better understood, valued, and supported for scholars at all levels across departments and colleges. There are a number of ways the Consortium can work to

transform the system: taking the lead on conversations with administrators and workshops for tenure committees about how to evaluate engaged research for promotion and tenure; partnering with SIGS to help offer graduate-student coursework and long-term projects that educate a new generation of scholars about engaged research; creating mentoring structures for emerging scholars (both junior faculty and graduate students) who want to learn more about constructing their own engaged research projects. Of course, all of these targeted changes to the system require additional planning and resources. The Consortium is already implementing a large-scale structure for individualized support, and it will take more dedicated time by leaders to gather the finances, develop programs, and prepare adequately for future work that can make such targeted interventions in the professionalization system. Altering the professionalization system so that it better accounts for the time and labor that go into engaged research align with the Consortium's ideologies and, along with garnering extramural grants to sustain the organization, provide ways of helping the organization move beyond making transdisciplinary engaged research *visible* so that it is also *valued* across campus, leading to an institutional culture that understands and supports this type of work.

Conclusion

For universities trying to cultivate a culture of community engagement on campus and for scholars invested in engaged work, structures like the Consortium are vital both for developing projects that address community issues and for advocating for professional structures that encourage and allow for such work, and here, I offer a more complex view of this challenge, providing greater detail of *how* transdisciplinary engaged

research can be supported. The intellectual and financial sponsorship the Consortium plans is an important starting point for creating projects that transcend disciplinary boundaries to change large-scale local issues like fair housing or restorative justice in public schools, and such sponsorship plans also carry ideological freight that helps the Consortium meet its own goals of continuing to grow a culture for community engagement on campus. Through the Consortium's sponsorship, scholars are encouraged to shape a scholarly profile that incorporates and values engaged research, and through the organization's structures, scholars are able to advocate for themselves professionally to make their engaged research institutionally legible in professional documents like the AWP and tenure portfolio. These practices build a mass of scholars at UofL who are invested in engaged research *and* makes their work visible to administrators through their professional documents, which helps to spread awareness and understanding of engaged research across campus. Another layer of complexity of the process of constructing these structures for individual sponsorship can be seen by looking at how the Consortium itself is sponsored—through an institution-wide network of supporters constructed for the 21st Century University grant's requirement to match funds. The Consortium has intertwined its ideologies throughout this network of support, providing greater visibility for transdisciplinary engaged research across campus. After all, by helping fund the Consortium, these departments and organizations from across UofL and Louisville are acknowledging engaged research as a legitimate type of knowledge creation. Moving beyond making this type of work visible to help people understand its value is a key next step to provide an institutional culture that makes it easier for scholars to take on these kinds of projects. Through these depictions of sponsorship structures, I detail some of the

complications of providing support for transdisciplinary engaged research; this support requires not only intellectual and financial sponsorship for individual projects, but also the development of a professional climate that values such work, which the ideological freight of these structures helps to promote by cultivating a campus culture for engagement.

This process of illuminating the Consortium's sponsorship structure is critical for understanding how incremental cultural change can be made within an institution. Eli Goldblatt and David Jolliffe in "The Unintended Consequences of Sponsorship" discuss this type of institutional change as an expected outcome of sponsoring engaged research. They argue that institutional consequences of sponsoring community research often include "transformations [institutions] neither expect nor welcome in the process of engaging groups not originally included in their mission" (128). For example, people begin to confront "attitudes toward what constitutes knowledge or what might be a suitable subject for study in a research university" (135). In Goldblatt and Jolliffe's view, when an institution sets up the structures to advocate for community-engaged research, these types of questions and changes are inevitable. They stop short of explaining the steps that make such a consequence possible, but explicit practices, though they will likely vary based on specific institutional contexts and factors, are necessary for such changes to occur and need to be explored to show *how* sponsorship practices can lead to institutional change. In this chapter, I have begun the process of uncovering such sponsorship practices, though I recognize that a richer view of these structures that incorporates actual projects and their outcomes is necessary to complete the process.

What is revealed here is that the Consortium is not only set up to help people create better engaged research projects; the organization will also gain advantage from the sponsored, enabling the growth of a deeper culture of community engagement. The ideological freight connected to the Consortium's sponsorship is another way of supporting engaged researchers, though less directly. By shifting the culture on campus, the Consortium is making such projects easier to pursue and more valued. This process of creating structures that support engaged research and an engaged campus culture have not often been documented in scholarship, obscuring the process of what it looks like for an institution to create support structures for engaged research. Examining the Consortium as an organization in the making depicts an organization taking its first steps to determine *how* they might fulfill their goals to support engaged research on campus—how they are creating an explicit support structure that will feed back into the process of shifting larger systems toward the goal of creating a culture of community engagement on campus.

Big, overarching, visionary goals are exciting to propose, but determining the structure of how to support them is far more complicated and requires logistical thinking regarding how an organization will create opportunities in service of its larger goals, structure decision making, and even gain and spend money. The Consortium can act as a model for other institutions hoping to create similar centers for transdisciplinary, social justice, and/or community-engaged research, because through this analysis, others can see how the Consortium *began* its planning, and then make their own plans. They can see the explicit intellectual and financial sponsorship for specific projects, and how the ideological freight of this sponsorship helps the Consortium work toward its larger goals of institution-wide valuing of engaged research. As the Consortium begins and especially

if it extends beyond the three-year pilot, some of these planned structures for sponsorship will change, and the project will evolve, becoming more complex and difficult to parse or replicate. These preliminary plans show a starting point for one institution's structures for transdisciplinary community research, providing background for everything that the project might come to accomplish as it along with other people and organizations at UofL work to strengthen the university's commitment to community engagement.

CHAPTER FIVE
TOWARD MAKING STRUCTURES FOR ENGAGED RESEARCH
VISIBLE AND NAVIGABLE

What I have shown throughout this dissertation is that the process of supporting community engagement at an institutional level is much more complicated and messy than making it an element of a strategic plan or including it in a vision statement. These are important factors that showcase an institution's aspirational goals for engagement, but helping scholars create and sustain reciprocal community partnerships requires more complex systems of support. As community engagement grows within higher education institutions (as it currently is, evidenced by the increasing number of schools applying for the Carnegie classification ["Carnegie Community Engagement Classification"], recent white papers [Orr, Wittman and Crews], and scholarship [Holland et al., Gilvin et al, Jaeger et al.]), attention to institutional structures that support engaged scholars is important for institutions that are already dedicated to the idea that community engagement is valuable and are committed to establishing themselves as engaged universities.

Engaged scholars and administrators have attended to big-picture issues that need to be addressed, like the need for tenure policy revision or more transdisciplinary projects. For example, there is a wealth of scholarship about the need to revise tenure policy (Foster; O'Meara, "Rewarding;" Saltmarsh et al.), including a long, deeply researched report from *Imagining America*, a professional organization for community-

engaged scholars in the arts and humanities, that has been widely lauded and cited since its publication (Ellison and Eatman). These scholars argue and offer evidence for the importance of revising tenure policies to explicitly include engaged research, providing some methods for starting the process. However, these conversations, and others focused on different challenges, frequently elide the larger complexities of the institutional systems they are describing. Within the scholarly focus on revising tenure policies, there is little attention to how this issue is situated within particular institutional contexts, obscuring the difficulties of enacting such policy changes, particularly when a long-term professionalization system is in place that devalues engaged research long before and after a faculty member applies for tenure (as I describe in chapter two).

In rhetoric and composition, community writing scholars have traditionally been less attentive to institutional concerns, only recently developing a scholarly focus on these challenges. Previously, such concerns often remained ancillary to scholars' primary arguments, seen in Mathieu's brief discussion of the problems of semester-long projects in *Tactics of Hope* (109) and Goldblatt's gesture to the need for tenure policy revisions in *Because We Live Here* (205-06). Recent collections like Restaino and Cella's *Unsustainable* and House, Myers, and Carters' special issue of *Community Literacy Journal*, "Building Engaged Infrastructure," have made these concerns more prevalent in the field, featuring articles devoted to particular institutional issues like tenure policy (Donnelly) or graduate education (Mathis et al.). Because this area of inquiry is so new for community-engaged rhetoric and composition scholars, much of the scholarly conversation is still limited, concentrating on individual experiences or programs, and this literature needs to be deepened so that the growing number of community writing

scholars might better understand how to identify and navigate the complex institutional challenges they will face in their work.

To address the limitations of previous studies, I have analyzed current structures for engagement at UofL through institutional critique, presenting a detailed discussion of how such structures enable and constrain engaged research. Focusing on three challenges that are noted by community engagement scholars across fields—revising tenure policy, learning to practice engaged research, and designing transdisciplinary projects—I argue that the complexities of each of these challenges are often obfuscated in scholarship and provide a richer study of the intricate complications of these three issues.

UofL makes for a robust case study because it is currently in the process of addressing such issues by developing new structures for engagement. UofL is genuinely interested in figuring out how to create systems that help members of the institution put university goals for community engagement into practice, and analyzing the process of building such structures is uniquely valuable because it shows what it is like for one institution to attend to challenges of community engagement. At more established engaged institutions, the various pathways toward crafting current structures are obscured because a finished narrative of how they came to be is already in place. As Latour would say, the structures have been black boxed and are thus difficult to examine for “social influences and biases” (21). Institutions even earlier in the process, with less of a commitment to community engagement, would also not be useful. Examining UofL as an engaged university in progress showcases how trenchant and complex these challenges and structures really are, because it demonstrates the complexities of moving beyond

broad, surface-level and targeted, individual attempts to make change in order to create a deeply-embedded institutional structure that values community-engaged research.

To extend scholarly and administrative views on institutional engaged infrastructure, I provide a more comprehensive understanding of how structures shape engaged research and researchers, making visible the systems that scholars need to navigate to garner support for their projects and mapping new locations where institutional change should be made. Jeff Grabill argues for this type of increased understanding, claiming in his study of engaged writing programs that “infrastructure is often invisible,” which also “makes the writing program itself invisible” (20). To understand the engaged work people are doing, Grabill argues that “we must render visible the infrastructure that remains (or wants to remain) invisible and that supports, locates—participates in—that rhetorical work” (24). This dissertation has made discernible some complexities of challenges faced by engaged programs and researchers, clarifying them for the institution at large, so that attention to these issues will not remain surface-level, inadequately responding to complicated problems. To conclude this project, I show how this study has mapped some of the tangled difficulties of current structures for engaged researchers, focusing on how administrators and scholars can come together to make their work, and especially their institutional challenges, more visible to one another. I follow this by discussing implications of this study via strategies for operationalizing institutional change, limitations of this project, and how further research might provide greater insight into how institutional structures affect engaged researchers *and* their community partners.

Increasing Visibility

In this study, I take three oft-cited concerns for engaged scholars—tenure policy, learning opportunities, and transdisciplinary projects—and use a range of qualitative research methods (policy analysis, stakeholder interviews, participant observation, case studies) to explore the intricacies of these issues as a way of deepening current research on engaged infrastructure and identifying locations for further development of support systems for engaged researchers. Each chapter delves into the realities of one of these issues at UofL—teasing out how it is currently supported and further issues that require attention.

In chapter two, I depict a deeply ingrained professionalization system that devalues engaged research across the institution, starting in graduate school. Within this system, engaged scholars find it difficult to make their community-based work legible as research, which they need to do in order to continue pursuing such projects. Using Schryer and Spoel's idea of regulated and regularized genres, I showcase how some genres (like tenure guidelines or the Annual Work Plan) regulate scholarly production, and how change to the system will require working within these genres to make engaged research better understood. I argue that promotion and tenure policy cannot be considered on its own, as has often been the case in scholarship (Ellison and Eatman; Kasworm and Abdrahim; Saltmarsh et al.); instead, the professionalization system must be challenged at multiple points in order to create an institution-wide culture for community engagement. Such a culture would provide a more supportive professional environment for community-based work, giving it credence as research and making it easier to pursue such projects.

In chapter three, I detail the myriad types of practice-based learning that graduate students do during one engaged research project. Because students are participating in a project that fosters meta-knowledge about community engagement as well as tacit knowledge gained through practice, they have a deeper understanding of the various complexities of enacting engaged research. Scholarship often focuses on the potential student *outcomes* of graduate involvement in community engagement (Case; Day et al.; Fero et al; Schnitzer and Stephenson Jr.) without explaining how to structure these outcomes into projects. In my case study of DMA, I show how graduate student learning in three significant areas—research practices, collaboration, and mundane labor—is systematically incorporated into the project, attending to what graduate students say they have learned through this experience and how it is has influenced their work following the camp. The graduate students often focus on *practice*, detailing how their work at the camp extended their theoretical knowledge of community engagement, which demonstrates the complex ways that meta- and tacit-knowledge intertwine to enable a thorough understanding of community-based research.

In chapter four, I outline potential outcomes of an organization built to encourage and support transdisciplinary engaged research projects. Though many engaged scholars have argued that there is a need for more transdisciplinary engaged research projects (Adjei-Nsiah et al.; Ramaley; Stokols; Weerts and Sandmann), few scholars describe the structural support needed to create this work beyond superficial acknowledgement that that it is a difficult process (Vortruba; Amey, Brown, and Sandmann). In my analysis of the Consortium's grant, I showcase the complex ways that this new organization is planning to structure support for transdisciplinary projects, describing preliminary

attempts at working through the difficult processes noted but not investigated thoroughly by other scholars. As a sponsor of transdisciplinary engaged research, the Consortium will not only support individual scholars and their research, but also, through the ideological freight accompanying that support, build the profile of engaged research across departments and colleges, continuing to cultivate a culture of engagement on campus.

Altogether, this study enhances understanding of the complexities of how institutional structures affect engaged researchers, both enabling and deterring them from pursuing community engagement. One key complication I have uncovered is that these multilayered structures are often differently visible and invisible to participants across the institutional spectrum. Administrators are aware of different layers and systems than faculty and graduate students, and vice versa. This creates an uneven view of the system for all participants, making it difficult for any groups to affect change that resonates across layers. Administrators understand that revising tenure policy is an important step to take to further support engaged research, but they don't necessarily comprehend the extent to which this affects project development long before tenure because they are not in the same place as a pre-tenure faculty member making the decision to forego a community partnership in order to pursue research that is better understood by members of their department. And graduate students might complain that they do not have time or finances to pursue stronger relationships with community partners, but they likely do not understand the complex funding structures of the university that dictate their teaching load and compensation. At all levels, participants understand the aspects of the system that dictate their work, while other parts of the system remain less clear.

Operationalizing Change

While making the complexities of the institutional challenges visible is one type of “action plan designed to foment positive change” (Lamos 165), as necessitated by Porter et al.’s modeling of institutional critique, I also depict two ways to operationalize change in institutional structures: 1) specific projects that acculturate scholars into community-engaged research and 2) wider organizational efforts that create umbrellas of support for specific engaged research projects. These two paths of operationalization provide additional components to the action plan for *how* institutions trying to create stronger engaged infrastructure might deepen their structures to offer more support to engaged scholars.

Creating structures that guide individual scholars through the work of learning to do community engagement is an important way to construct change by providing targeted support to engaged researchers, helping them reach their goals. As O’Meara argues, scholars often need assistance to understand “the relevance of their disciplines to local schools, governments, business, and the public” (27), and Steve Parks claims that best practices involve learning how to develop community-based projects in “an existing project” where scholars can “build up a set of skills and strategies, then move onto [their] own work” (Harvey, Kirklighter, and Pauszek 14). My analysis of DMA in chapter 3 shows one way to encourage graduate students to learn about and practice engaged research, helping them understand the complexities of this type of work, why it matters, and how they might relate their research interests to community concerns. Such learning opportunities teach a new generation of scholars about the theories, ethics, and actions of

engaged research, which is central for increasing community-engaged research on a particular campus and in the field at large. Additionally, if scholars can navigate institutional systems so that their work is legible across the university, then their department chairs, deans, and other administrators continue learning about community-centered research even if they are not pursuing this type of work themselves. DMA models a structure for providing guided ways into engaged research that can help individual scholars learn *why* their scholarly inquiry matters in community contexts and *how* to pursue projects on their own, which also builds a larger mass of scholars interested and invested in engaged research, cultivating the campus culture for engagement.

The second way to create institutional change is setting up an organization to sponsor specific engaged research activities through intellectual and financial means, while also encouraging a broader culture for community engagement by partnering with departments and colleges across campus. As I describe in chapter four, organizations that support engaged research, like the Consortium, can offer support to individual scholars and generate a large group of scholars who are invested in and practicing engaged research at a larger scale than individual projects like DMA. Instead of guiding scholars new to engagement through the process of creating a project (like you might find at DMA), the Consortium provides them with the intellectual and financial resources needed to design and implement these projects, which are crucial needs noted across scholarship (Doggart, Tedrowe, and Viera; Franz; Isaacs and Kolba; Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O'Meara). The organization also fosters institutional change by coordinating events that promote engaged research (like seminars or research talks),

advocating for new policies, and making visible the work of community engagement across campus, just as Grabill notes that programs and organizations must do (20). The Consortium demonstrates how an organization can intellectually and financially support engaged scholars and projects *and* cultivate an institutional culture for engagement, which are important steps for operationalizing change in institutions that wish to support engaged research.

The two-pronged action plan proposed in this dissertation, consisting of a multilayered view of structures and ways to operationalize change, is useful for scholars at UofL, in community engagement, and in rhetoric and composition broadly, offering them a preliminary map of *where* and *how* to build stronger support at institutions and continue scholarly conversation. At UofL, the specific, contextual understanding of this university's structures that I provide will help engaged scholars better comprehend and navigate the systems in which they are working and will allow administrators a more detailed view of where and how they might continue evolving current structures to support engaged scholars. Early feedback on this project from administrators in the Office of Community Engagement and the Consortium attest to its usefulness for these two particular organizations that are working to build stronger engaged infrastructure on campus. Outside of UofL, this study presents community engagement scholars with a deep analysis of challenges they face, depicting more complex ways to think about how tenure policies, learning opportunities, and transdisciplinary projects are situated within specific institutions. This analysis could help engaged scholars and administrators see occlusions within their own institutional structures and ways to offer further support for engaged researchers on their campus. Additionally, this project opens up a deeper well of

conversation for engaged scholars to discuss the complexities of such structures. This is particularly pertinent for community writing scholars, because detailed analysis of how institutional contexts affect engaged research has been limited thus far (as described above). Lastly, scholars across rhetoric and composition might find this study to be particularly useful as they think about their place within their institution. Because members of our field are often also in administrative positions, directing writing programs and writing centers, this study might help them reconceive of how their work fits within institutional structures—What aspects of WPA work might need to be reimagined using this type of multifaceted view? How does a Writing Program become a Writing Department and make the argument for this transition? My detailed analysis of the complex challenges of navigating institutional structures might be useful for future scholarship or practical day-to-day work of members of the field who are not necessarily invested in engaged research. For researchers and administrators across contexts, this project provides a rich analysis that develops current understandings of challenges for engaged researchers and of institutional structures themselves.

Limitations of the Study and Future Research

As this project wraps up, I find that there are still several strands of connected research left unanswered because this is a short-term dissertation project that offers only a partial view of institutional structures at UofL. Moving forward, continued research in two areas of inquiry would provide deeper understandings of institutional structures and how they influence engaged scholars' work: 1) further tracing of interview participants,

institutional structures, and university goals, and 2) the inclusion of the perspectives of community partners on these structures.

Because UofL is an engaged university in the making, it seems prudent to continue studying the structures and aspirations I've detailed in this project. This seems particularly important because of my own situated understanding of such structures. My position as a graduate student was, at times, a challenge during this project. There are many aspects of institutions I just do not know yet. Sometimes my outlook was useful, like when I learned more about the Annual Work Plan through conversations with engaged faculty members and began to put the pieces of the professionalization system together. Because I was not already integrated into a system where the AWP was the norm, my view offered a different understanding of how this and several other professionalization documents worked together in a genre system. More often, my position as a graduate student served to obfuscate my understanding of how things work at the institution. I maintain that my perspective, as someone at the bottom and/or starting point of this professionalization structure, makes for an important contribution on the subject because it reveals what understandings of structures are occluded for emerging scholars that might seem obvious to people higher in the system. In fact, Dorothy Smith writes, "A standpoint in people's everyday lives is integral to" institutional ethnography as it "works from the social in people's experience to discover its presence and organization in their lives and to explicate or map that organization beyond the local of the everyday" (11-2). Such a viewpoint makes visible the lived realities of these structures for the people who are trying to enact a university's broader aspirations for community engagement.

Additionally, I focused my study tightly, doing a deep dive on a narrow case study, which had benefits and limitations. My interviews were both pointed for my analytical goals and convenient to my own position as a graduate student in the humanities, comprising graduate students from one project—the Digital Media Academy—and a few administrators and faculty interested in engaged research. This reflects a very specific understanding of UofL’s structures told through only a few people who are almost all from the humanities (with the exception of the Vice President for Community Engagement and the Director of the Office of Community Engagement). While I think the focus on the humanities is an important one, as many of these disciplines do not *already* engage with the community through their specific disciplinary practices (like scholars in social work, education, or nursing already do), it does present only part of the institutional system for engagement. Broader study across departments and colleges would give a better institutional view of what is and is not working within the system, which currently I can explicate from the this study but cannot offer specifics for across campus.

Another step to reveal more about what an institution looks like *in the process* of building support for community engagement is to make this study longitudinal, discovering how these structures shift and change over time. I’ve noted that incremental cultural change is necessary to support community engagement, and further study of the institution could support this. Specifically, I believe tracing changes in institutional documents and programs could be a useful way of mapping progress toward goals related to community engagement. One of the key documents in this project was the 2015 application for the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification in Community

Engagement. UofL will have to re-apply for this designation in 2020, and studying the new application will reveal macro-level views of how the institution has shifted over the previous five years. Studying this document will continue the overarching, broad study of institutional structures by revealing what changes *administrators* feel are most important to note in the application.

Pairing this type of study with inquiry into the specific programs I describe—DMA and the Consortium—would help showcase how engaged research continues to be effective on the ground in actual projects. How do programs shift and change over time? Are they sustainable in the current institutional context? How have they adapted to current institutional demands and professional needs of their leaders? What projects has the Consortium supported? What have DMA alumni gone on to accomplish? These last two questions posit a different take on the two structures, but they are important to consider in the evolution of engaged research at UofL. Studying the Consortium's grant shows how the project is starting out and preliminary goals and plans, but to analyze how the Consortium works in practice, I'll have to study actual projects that the Consortium has supported—detailing how their sponsorship has played out. For DMA, I've already detailed what and how graduate students learn to do engaged research in this context, but the remaining question is to what extent do these students take this work forward with them? I've traced ways that DMA teachers have utilized their work within their graduate studies—giving presentations at conferences, writing scholarly articles, and designing other engaged research projects. But analyzing how this project has influenced their scholarly identities beyond graduate school is important as well. If the goal of projects like DMA is to encourage a new generation of engaged scholars, then further study must

be done to see how they have continued utilizing community engagement concepts in their work or, at least, contributing to a culture for community engagement at their next institution.

Beyond UofL's campuses, the next step, which I see as vitally important to the continued study of institutional structures, is to make such studies inclusive of community voices. This dissertation does not feature any community perspectives on these systems, which is rather incongruous to the study of community engagement itself. The ultimate goal of engaged research is not only to bolster the university, but also to reciprocally work with community partners to address local issues. Addressing how institutional structures affect community partners should be a vital element of continued research. Focusing on institutional actors and structures was the right choice for the limited time frame of this dissertation, but future work *must* include community perspectives.

Studying how institutional structures for engagement affect community partners and our projects adds another additional layer to the complexity of such systems that needs to be considered. When projects are not adequately supported, they are not sustainable, which can negatively affect community partners who have come to rely on university resources. Community partners may not be concerned about the specifics of a tenure case, but their work is influenced when their university partner has to suddenly drop from a project because that faculty member has to devote more time to projects their department understands as research, rather than doing the work of their engaged partnership. The hidden outcomes for a lack of support for community engagement can be problematic for local organizations when scholars make promises they ultimately

cannot keep because of their university standing. Some research on this subject has been conducted. In *Tactics of Hope*, Paula Mathieu discusses community partners who had student workers never show up, faculty fail to provide finished products, and other horror stories, and in *The Unheard Voices: Community Organizations and Service Learning*, Randy Stoecker and Elizabeth A. Tryon provide a deep analysis of the frequently negative university partnership experiences of many community organizations in Wisconsin. Tracing how the structures I describe and analyze in this dissertation affect the work of community partners and how they value the institution based on their experiences could add an important dimension to the growing area of research depicting the truths of reciprocal community partnerships. And connecting my findings in this dissertation with outcomes for community partners participating in engaged projects will make this study more compelling and useful for engaged researchers and administrators building their own engaged infrastructures, because it helps them see the further implications of current structures.

Lastly, my chosen methodology, institutional critique, is useful for gaining a broad overview of the systems in place that support (or devalue) engaged research, but it does not allow for a deep dive into the specifics of certain aspects of that system or how it affects individual projects and people enmeshed into it. While we can take away a general view of the messy complexities of institutional structures at large, institutional critique is less suitable for detailing the issues that cause problems for individuals. For example, I discuss the Program Progress Assessment as a document that broadly discourages graduate students from pursuing engaged research, but I depict it as a part of a larger system at the institution. Through a different methodology (and different project,

really), I might have discussed a litany of specific factors that contribute to the challenges of pursuing engaged research as a graduate student, which make it difficult to encourage a new generation of such scholars despite widespread interest in social justice concerns and this type of scholarship.

The goal of this dissertation was, in many ways, to reveal the deeper complexities of current institutional policies and structures for engagement—uncovering the professionalization system rather than focusing only on promotion and tenure, analyzing the tacit learning graduate students do in addition to meta, highlighting the way sponsorship structures build a culture for engagement while providing support for individual projects. These goals have been met through this preliminary mapping of three of the complicated challenges of engaged research, but this work is far from finished. Extending this research to include community partner voices; longitudinal studies of interview participants, institutional structures, and university goals; and a variety of research methodologies and methods will only serve to expand scholarly understandings of engaged infrastructure, which is useful for individuals navigating these structures and for institutions trying to better support engaged research and researchers.

Conclusion

This project has been illuminating for me, furthering my understanding of the broader structures that shape the way we all do research in the academy, especially engaged research. I, like the other graduate students I describe in chapter three, learned about the specific difficulties and intricacies of engaged projects during my time at DMA, but this study has added to that understanding by allowing me to see how scholars

navigate the complex structures that shape the way they do their work. This view of UofL's structures will benefit me as I move forward into a full-time community engagement position at Trinity College, where I will inevitably broaden my understanding of institutional structures as I become entangled in the bureaucracies and systems for work at my new institution. By illuminating the complexities of how institutions work, I, and other emerging engaged scholars like me, can further comprehend how structures shape individual projects and scholars' trajectories, and we can make use of that knowledge while forming community partnerships and engaged research projects in our local contexts. Beyond the individual, this deeper understanding of the complexities that challenge engaged researchers can help administrators craft structures that offer more comprehensive support. Overall, my aim is that through the increased visibility of structures and models for operationalization change I depict, interested scholars and universities will be better able to see multiple perspectives and layers of institutional challenges to engaged research and construct pathways that enable individual scholars to design projects that put into action the aspirations of universities, of individual scholars, and of community organizations for university-community engagement.

REFERENCES

- “The 2020 Plan.” Office of the President. *University of Louisville*, n.d. Web. 10 April 2015.
- “About the University of Louisville.” About UofL. *University of Louisville*, n.d. Web. 10 April 2016.
- Adjei-Hisah, S., C. Leeuwis, K.E. Giller, O. Sakyi-Dawson, J. Cobbina, T.W. Kuyper, M. Abekoe, and W. Van Der Werf. “Land Tenure and Differential Soil Fertility Management Practices among Native and Migrant Farmers in Wenchi, Ghana: Implications for Interdisciplinary Action Research.” *NJAS – Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences* 52.3-4 (2004): 331-48.
- Amey, Marilyn J, Dennis F. Brown, and Lorilee R. Sandmann. “A Multidisciplinary Collaborative Approach to a University-Community Partnership: Lessons Learned.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 7.3 (2002): 19-26.
- Anthony, Libby, Kathy Kerr, and Molly Scanlon. “A Hitchhiker’s Guide to Community: An Interview with Eli Goldblatt.” *Reflections* 11.2 (2012): 91-112. Print.
- Barnett, Marina, Paula T. Silver, and Trindy S. Grundy. “Implementing Service-Learning Pedagogy: A Case Example.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 13.4 (2009): 117-34. Web. 19 March 2017.

- Bazerman, Charles. "Systems of Genre and the Enactment of Social Intentions." *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. Eds. Aviva Friedman and Peter Medway. London: Taylor & Francis, 1994. 79-101. Print.
- Blair, Kristine, Katherine Fredlund, Kerri Hauman, Em Hurford, Stacy Kastner, and Allison Witte. "Cyberfeminists at Play: Lessons on Literacy and Activism from a Girls' Computer Camp." *Feminist Teacher* 22.2 (2011): 43-59. Web. 20 Jan. 2014.
- Blair, Kritine, Erin Dietel-McLaughlin, and Meredith Graupner Hurley. "Looking into the Digital Mirror: Reflections on a Computer Camp for Girls by Girls." *Girls Wide Web 2.0: Revisiting Girls, the Internet, and the Negotiation of Identity*. Ed. Sharon R. Mazzarella, Bern: Peter Lang, 2010. 139-60. Print.
- "Board of Directors Statement of Support for Joint Statement by Scholarship Association on Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure." *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, 22 June 2015. Web. 2 April 2017.
- Bowen, Lauren Marshall, Kirsti Arko, Joel Beatty, Cindy Delaney, Isidore Dorpenyo, Laura Moeller, Elsa Roberts, and John Velat. "Community Engagement in a Graduate-Level Community Literacy Course." *Community Literacy Journal* 9.1 (2014): 18-38. Web. 9 Nov. 2015.
- Boyer, Ernest. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 49.7 (1996): 18-33. Web. 12 July 2015.
- Brandt, Deborah. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 49.2 (1998): 165-85.

- Bringle, Robert G., Richard Games, and Edward A. Malloy. *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1999. Print.
- Bruner, Jerome. *Acts of Meaning: Four Lectures on Mind and Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1990. Print.
- Campus Compact. *Creating a Culture of Assessment: 2012 Campus Compact Annual Member Survey*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact, 2013. Web. 25 July 2015.
- “Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.” *New England Resource Center for Higher Education*. University of Massachusetts Boston, n.d. Web. 25 April 2015.
- Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Work Group. “2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Application.” Office of Community Engagement. *University of Louisville*, 4 April 2014. Web. 1 April 2016.
- Carpenter, Stacey L. “Undergraduates’ Perceived Gains and Ideas about Teaching and Learning Science From Participating in Science Education Outreach Programs.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 19.3 (2015): 113-46. Web. 19 March 2017.
- Carter, Darla. “U of L Academy Teaches Girls to Make Eye-Opening Videos.” *Louisville Courier-Journal*, 23 June 2014. Web. 5 April 2017.
- Case, Karen I. “Community-Based Research in Graduate Education: Implementing Program Decisions Across the Disciplines.” *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education* 4 (2014): 69-92. Web. 21 Sept. 2016.
- Cavanagh, Sheila. “Living in a Digital World: Rethinking Peer Review, Collaboration, and Open Access.” *Journal of Digital Humanities* 1.4 (2012). Web. 13 Oct. 2016.

- “CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition.”
Conference on College Composition and Communication, April 2016. Web. 15
 May 2016.
- Chamberlain, Elizabeth, Rachel Gramer, and Megan Faver Hartline. "Mess Not Mastery:
 Encouraging Digital Design Dispositions in Girls." *Computers and Composition
 Online* (Fall 2015). Web.
- “Community Engagement Award Criteria.” Office of the Vice President for Community
 Engagement. *University of Louisville*, 2 July 2015. Web. 10 April 2016.
- “Cooperative Consortium for Transdisciplinary Social Justice Research.” School of
 Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies. *University of Louisville*, n.d., Web. 13
 Dec. 2016.
- Cushman, Ellen. “Sustainable Service Learning Programs” *College Composition and
 Communication* 54.1 (2002): 40-65. Web. 15 Aug. 2015.
- . “The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change.” *College Composition and
 Communication* 47.1 (1996): 7-28. Web. *JSTOR*. 14 Jan. 2015.
- Day, Kristen, Victor Becerra, Vicki L. Ruiz, and Michael Powe. “New Ways of Learning,
 Knowing, and Working: Diversifying Graduate Student Career Options through
 Community Engagement.” *Collaborative Futures: Critical Reflections on
 Publicly Active Graduate Education*. Eds. Gilvin, Amanda, Georgia M. Roberts,
 and Craig Martin. Syracuse: The Graduate School P of Syracuse U, 2012. 163-82.
 Print.
- Day, Michael, Susan H. Delagrange, Mike Palmquist, Michael A. Pemberton, and Janice
 R. Walker. “What We Really Value: Redefining Scholarly Engagement in tenure

- and Promotion Protocols.” *College Composition and Communication* 65.1 (2013): 185-208. Print.
- “Dean’s Guidelines: Pretenure, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews.” UofL College of Arts and Sciences. *University of Louisville*, Spring 2008. Web. 10 April 2016.
- Deans, Thomas, “English Studies and Public Service.” *Writing and Community Engagement: A Critical Sourcebook*. Thomas Deans, Barbara Roswell, and Adrian J. Wurr, eds Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2010. 97-116. Print.
- . “Sustainability Deferred: The Conflicting Logics of Career Advancement and Community Engagement.” Restaino and Cella 101-12.
- Doberneck, Diane M., Chris R. Glass, and John H. Schweitzer. “Beyond Activity, Place, and Partner: How Publicly Engaged Scholarship Varies by Intensity of Activity and Degree of Engagement.” *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship* 4.2 (2012): 18-28. Web. 19 March 2017.
- Doggart, Julia, Melissa Tedrowe, and Kate Viera. “Minding the Gap: Realizing our Ideal Community Writing Center.” *Community Literacy Journal* 1.2 (2007): 71-80. Web. 13 Oct. 2016.
- Donnelly, Michael. “(j)WPA Work, Service-Learning, and the Case for Baby Steps.” *Unsustainable: Re-imagining Community Literacy, Public Writing, Service-Learning and the University*. Eds. Jessica Restaino and Laurie JC Cella. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2013. 113-34. Print.
- Driscoll, Amy. “The Benchmarking Potential of the New Carnegie Classification: Community Engagement.” Campus Compact.

- Duchelle, Amy E., Kelly Biedenweg, Christine Lucas, Arika Virapongse, Jeremy Radachowsky, and Debora J. Wojcik. "Graduate Students and Knowledge Exchange with Local Stakeholders: Possibilities and Preparation." *Biotropica* 41.5 (2009): 578-85. Web. 15 July 2015.
- Ellison, Julie, and Timothy K. Eatman. "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University." *Imagining America*, 2008. Web. 20 Aug. 2015.
- Feigenbaum, Paul, Sharayna Douglas, and Maria Lovett. "Tales from the Crawl Space: Asserting Youth Agency." *Restaino and Cella* 33-54.
- Feigenbaum, Paul. "Cultivating the Flow of Community Literacy." *House, Myers, and Carter* 33-40.
- Fero, Michele, Jim Ridolfo, Jill McKay Chrobak, Deborah Vriend Van Duinen, Jason Wirtz, Ellen Cushman, and Jeffrey T. Grabill. "A Reflection on Teaching and Learning in a Community Literacies Graduate Course." *Community Literacy Journal* 1.2 (2007): 81-93. Web. 9 Nov. 2015.
- Fitzgerald, Hiram. Karen Bruns, Steven T. Sonka, Andrew Furco, and Louis Swanson. "The Centrality of Engagement in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 16.3 (2012): 7-27.
- Fleming, David. *From Form to Meaning: Freshman Composition and the Long Sixties, 1957-1964*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2011. Print.
- "Florida Board of Governors Approves New Strategic Plan through 2025." *State University System of Florida Board of Governors*, 15 Nov. 2011. Web. 5 March 2017.

- Fosl, Cate. "Imagining Engaged Scholarship at the University of Louisville: A Research Report to the Provost." Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research. *University of Louisville*, August 2014. Web. 15 June 2015
- Foster, Kevin Michael. "Taking a Stand: Community-Engaged Scholarship on the Tenure Track." *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship* 3.2 (2010): 20-30. Web. 25 May 2016.
- Franz, Nancy. "Measuring and Articulating the Value of Community Engagement: Lessons Learned from 100 Years of Cooperative Extension Work." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 18.2 (2014): 5-15. Web. 13 Oct. 2016.
- Gee, James Paul. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse*. 3rd edition. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- . *What Video Games Have to Teach Us about Learning and Literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.
- Gee, Rob. "Collaboration, Experimentation, and Solving the World's Problems." *Grad Hacker*. Inside Higher Ed. 1 Nov. 2012. Web. 13 Oct. 2016.
- Gilvin, Amanda, Georgia M. Roberts, and Craig Martin, Eds. *Collaborative Futures: Critical Reflections on Publicly Active Graduate Education*. Syracuse: The Graduate School P of Syracuse U, 2012. Print.
- Goldblatt, Eli. *Because We Live Here*. New York: Hampton P, 2007. Print.
- Goldblatt, Eli and David Jolliffe. "The Unintended Consequences of Sponsorship." *Literacy, Economy, and Power: Writing Research Ten Years after Literacy in*

- American Lives*. Eds. John Duffy, Julie Christoph, et al. Carbondale IL: S. Illinois UP, 2013. 127-135. Print.
- Grabill, Jeffrey T. *Writing Community Change: Designing Technologies for Citizen Action*. New York: Hampton P, 2007. Print.
- Green, Ann. "Difficult Stories: Service Learning, Race, Class, and Whiteness." *College Composition and Communication* 55.2 (2003): 276-301.
- Greenwood, Davyyd J. "Doing and Learning Action Research in the Neo-Liberal World of Contemporary Higher Education." *Action Research* 10.2 (2012): 115-32.
- . "Teaching/Learning Action Research Requires Fundamental Reforms in Public Higher Education." *Action Research* 5.3 (2007): 249-64.
- Harvey, Willma, Christina Kirklighter, and Jessica Pauszek. "Interview with Steve Parks." *Reflections* 14.2 (2015): 7-21. Print.
- Hebert, Mark. "Sept. 1, 2015 UofL Today-Dietzler Bhatnagar Sheridan." *UofL Today*. *UofL College of Arts and Sciences*, 1 Sept. 2015. Web. 3 April 2017.
- Himley, Margaret. "Facing (Up To) 'The Stranger' in Community Service Learning." *College Composition and Communication* 55.3 (2004): 416-38. Web. 20 March 2017.
- Holland, Dorothy, William Lachicotte, Jr., Debra Skinner, and Carole Cain. *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1998. Print.
- Holland, Dorothy, Dana E. Powell, Eugenia Eng, and Georgina Drew. "Models of Engaged Scholarship: An Interdisciplinary Discussion." *Collaborative Anthropologies* 3 (2010): 1-36. Web. 10 July 2015.

- House, Veronica, Seth Myers, and Shannon Carter, eds. *Building Engaged Infrastructure*, special issue of *Community Literacy Journal* 11.1 (2016). Print.
- House, Veronica, Seth Myers, and Shannon Carter. "Introduction: Envisioning Engaged Infrastructures for Community Writing." House, Myers, and Carter 1-9.
- Hughes, Judy. "Digital Media Academy Empowers Girls to 'Design Their Future.'" *UofL News*, 9 June 2014. Web. 5 April 2017.
- . "Digital Media Academy Empowers Girls to 'Design Your Community.'" *UofL News*, 8 June 2015. Web. 5 April 2017.
- Hyde, Cheryl A., and Megan Meyer. "A Collaborative Approach to Service-Learning, and Scholarship: A Community-Based Research Course." *Journal of Community Practice* 12.1/2 (2004): 71–89.
- "Internal RFP from the School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies and the Office of Research and Innovation: Academic and Research Excellence for the 21st Century University." School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies. *University of Louisville*, n.d. Web. 13 Dec. 2016.
- Isaacs, Emily and Ellen Kolba. "Everyone Loved It and Still It Closed: When a Writing Program Isn't a Core Mandate." Restaino and Cella 79-98.
- Jaeger, Audrey J, Lorilee R. Sandmann, and Jihyun Kim. "Advising Graduate Students Doing Community-Engaged Dissertation Research: The Advisor-Advisee Relationship." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 15.34 (2011): 5-26. Web. 9 Aug. 2016.

- Jaeger, Audrey J., Jeremy B. Tuchmayer, and Shauna M. Morin. "The Engaged Dissertation: Exploring Trends in Doctoral Student Research." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 18.4 (2014). 71-96. Web. 10 July 2015.
- Jacobi, Tobi. "Against Infrastructure: Curating Community Literacy in a Jail Writing Program." House, Myers, and Carter 64-75.
- Jenkins, Henry. *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*. Cambridge: MIT P, 2009. Print.
- Kannan, Vani, Ben Kuebrich, and Yanira Rodríguez. "Unmasking Corporate-Military Infrastructure: Four Theses." House, Myers, and Carter 76-93.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1999.
- LaFrance, Michelle and Melissa Nicolas. "Institutional Ethnography as Materialist Framework for Writing Program Research and the Faculty-Staff Work Standpoints Project." *College Composition and Communication* 64.1 (2012): 130-150.
- Lamos, Steve. *Interests and Opportunities: Race, Racism, and University Writing Instruction in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2011. Print.
- . "Institutional Critique in Composition Studies: Methodological and Ethical Considerations for Researchers." *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies*. Lee Nickoson and Mary P Sheridan, eds. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012. 158-70. Print.

- Langone, Christine A. "Promoting Student Engagement through an Academic Leadership Certificate Program." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 11.1 (2007): 105-17. Web. 5 April 2017.
- Latour, Bruno. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988. Print.
- Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Language: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. Print.
- Leachman, Michael and Chris Mai. "Most States Still Funding Schools Less Than Before the Recession." Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. 16 October 2014. Web. 1 Nov. 2015.
- Leung, Barbara Y.P. "Service-Learning in Building Engineering by Use of Interdisciplinary Field Education." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 20.4 (2016): 7-24. Web. 5 April 2017.
- Mathieu, Paula. *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2005. Print.
- Mathis, Keri E., Megan Faver Hartline, Beth A. Boehm, and Mary P. Sheridan. "Building Infrastructures for Community Engagement at the University of Louisville: Graduate Models for Cultivating Stewardship." House, Myers, and Carter 146-56.
- Matthews, Paul H., Anna C. Karls, Diane M. Doberneck, and Nicole C. Springer. "Portfolio and Certification Programs in Community Engagement as Professional Development for Graduate Students: Lessons Learned From Two Land-Grant Universities." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 19.1 (2015): 157-84. Web. 19 March 2017.

- McGrath, Laura B. "Collaboration in the Humanities." *Grad Hacker*. Inside Higher Ed. 3 Sept. 2013. Web. 13 Oct. 2016.
- McNall, Miles A., Jessica V. Barnes-Najor, Robert E. Brown, Diane M. Doberneck, Hiram E. Fitzgerald. "Systemic Engagement: Universities as Partners in Systemic Approaches to Community Change." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 19.1 (2015): 7-32. Web. 19 March 2017.
- Miller, Benjamin. "Mapping the Methods of Composition/Rhetoric Dissertations: a 'Landscape Plotted and Pieced.'" *College Composition and Communication* 66.1 (2014): 145-76. Web. 20 March 2017.
- McCarthy, Seán. "Designing an Engaged Swarm: Toward a *Techne* for Multi-Class, Interdisciplinary Collaborations with Nonprofit Partners." House, Myers, and Carter 106-117.
- MLA Task Force. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature*. Modern Language Association, 2014. Web. 29 July 2015.
- . *Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion*. Modern Language Association, 2006. Web. 13 Oct. 2016.
- Nowviskie, Bethany. "Evaluating Collaborative Digital Scholarship (or, Where Credit is Due)." *Journal of Digital Humanities* 1.4 (2012). Web. 13 Oct. 2016.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. "Graduate Education and Community Engagement." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 113 (2008): 27-42. Web.
- . "Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship: Promotion and Tenure." *Handbook of Engaged Scholarship, Vol. 1*. Ed. Hiram Fitzgerald. Lansing: Michigan State UP, 2010. 271-93. Print

- . "Uncovering the Values in Faculty Evaluation of Service as Scholarship." *Review of Higher Education* 26.1 (2002): 57-80. Web. 2 April 2017.
- "Office of the Vice President." Office of The Vice President for Community Engagement. *University of Louisville*, n.d. Web. 3 April 2017.
- Orr, Catherine. "Women's Studies as Civic Engagement: Research and Recommendations." The Teagle Work Group on Women's Studies and Civic Engagement and the National Women's Studies Association. 2011. Web. 5 April 2015.
- Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education. *Scholarship for Society*. Council of Graduate Schools and Educational Testing Service, 1973. Print.
- Park, Peter, Mary Brydon-Miller, Budd Hall, and Ted Jackson, eds. *Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 1993. Print.
- Parks, Steve. "Strategic Speculations on the Question of Value: The Role of Community Publishing in English Studies." Restaino and Cella 55-78.
- "Partnerships Snapshot 2014-15." Office of the Vice President for Community Engagement. *University of Louisville*, 2 July 2015. Web. 10 April 2016.
- Plakans, Lia. Rebecca Alper, Carolyn Colvin, Mary Aquilino, Linda J. Louko, Patricia Zebrowski, and Saba Rasheed. Ali. "Socialization in the Institution: A Working Group's Journey to Bring Public Engagement into Focus on Campus." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 20.3 (2016): 122-39. Web. 5 April 2017.

Porter, James E., Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey T. Grabill, and Libby Miles.

“Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change.” *College*

Composition and Communication 51.4 (2000): 610-42. Web. 20 Mar 2015.

Prior, Paul. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the*

Academy. New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Ramaley, Judith. “Embracing Civic Responsibility.” *AAHE Bulletin* (2000): 1-4.

The Redbook. Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost. *University of Louisville*, n.d. Web. 4 June 2016.

Restaino, Jessica and Laurie JC Cella, ed. *Unsustainable: Re-imagining Community*

Literacy, Public Writing, Service-Learning and the University. Lanham:

Lexington Books, 2013. Print.

Restaino, Jessica. “Conclusion: Rejecting Binaries and Rethinking Relationships.”

Restaino and Cella 253-62.

Rider, Phyllis Mentzell. “From Reciprocity to Interdependence: Mass Incarceration and

Service-Learning.” House, Myers, and Carter 94-105.

Ritter, Kelly. *Before Shaughnessy: Basic Writing at Yale and Harvard, 1920-1960*.

Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2009. Print.

---. *To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman’s College, 1943-1963*. Pittsburgh:

U of Pittsburgh P, 2012. Print.

Ryan, Jacob. “Louisville Ranks 4th among Peer Cities for Women in Science,

Engineering, Tech and Math Jobs.” *WFPL*, 20 June 2014. Web. 5 April 2017.

- Saltmarsh, John, Dwight E. Giles Jr., Elaine Ward, and Suzanne M. Buglione.
“Rewarding Community-Engaged Scholarship.” *New Directions for Higher Education* 147 (2009): 25-36. Web. 25 May 2016.
- Savini, Catherine. “A Writing Retreat at the Intersection of WAC and Civic Engagement.” House, Myers, and Carter 157-63.
- Schnitzer, Marcy and Max Stephenson, Jr. “Reimagining the Links between Graduate Education and Community Engagement.” *Collaborative Futures: Critical Reflections on Publicly Active Graduate Education*. Eds. Gilvin, Amanda, Georgia M. Roberts, and Craig Martin. Syracuse: The Graduate School P of Syracuse U, 2012. 269-84. Print.
- Schryer, Catherine F. and Philippa Spoel. “Genre Theory, Health-Care Discourse, and Professional Identity Formation.” *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 19.3 (2005): 249-78. Web. 20 June 2016.
- Sheridan-Rabideau, Mary P. *Girls, Feminism, and Grassroots Literacies: Activism in the GirlZone*. Albany: SUNY UP, 2008. Print.
- Sheridan, Mary P. "Extending the Responsive Reach of 'Scholarship in Composition.'" *College Composition and Communication* 66.4 (2015). 689-693. Print
- Sheridan, Mary P and Jennifer Rowsell. *Design Literacies: Learning and Innovation in the Digital Age*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- Sobrero, Patricia and K.S.U. Jayatrane. “Scholarship Perceptions of Academic Department Heads: Implications for Promoting Faculty Community Engagement

- Scholarship.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 18.1 (2014): 123-51. Web. 9 Aug. 2016.
- Smith, Dorothy. *Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People*. Lanham: AltaMira P, 2005. Print.
- , Ed. *Institutional Ethnography as Practice*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield P, 2006. Print.
- Stenberg, Shari J., and Darby Arant Whealy. “Chaos Is the Poetry: From Outcomes to Inquiry in Service-Learning Pedagogy.” *College Composition and Communication* 60.4 (2009): 683-706. Web. 20 March 2017.
- Stokols, Daniel. “Toward a Science of Transdisciplinary Action Research.” *American Journal of Community Psychology* 38 (2006): 63-77.
- “Tenure.” *American Association of University Professors*, n.d. Web. 2 April 2017.
- “UofL’s Digital Media Academy Works to Keep 6th-grade Girls Interested in Math and Science.” *WHAS*, 11 Jul. 2016. Web. 3 April 2017.
- University Outreach and Engagement. *Michigan State University*, n.d. Web. 19 March 2017.
- Vortuba, James C. “Strengthening the University’s Alignment with Society: Challenges and Strategies.” *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*. 1.1 (1996): 29-36.
- Webb, Patricia, Kirsti Cole, and Thomas Skeen. “Feminist Social Projects: Building Bridges between Communities and Universities.” *College English* 69.3 (2007): 238-59. Web. 9 Nov. 2015.

- Weerts, David J. and Lorilee R. Sandmann. "Building a Two-Way Street: Challenges and Opportunities for Community Engagement at Research Universities." *The Review of Higher Education* 32.1 (2008): 73-106.
- . "Community Engagement and Boundary-Spanning Roles at Research Universities." *The Journal of Higher Education* 81.6 (2010): 632-57. Web. 18 April 2016.
- Wenger, Etienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.
- Wittman, Amanda and Terah Crews. "Engaged Learning Economies: Aligning Civic Engagement and Economic Development in Community-Campus Partnerships." *Campus Compact*. 2012. Web. 1 Feb. 2015.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Megan Faver Hartline
2402 Proctor Court, Louisville, KY 40218
936.414.1501
megan.hartline@louisville.edu

EDUCATION

- Ph.D. English Rhetoric and Composition May 2017
University of Louisville, Louisville, KY
Dissertation: *Aspirations into Action: Navigating Structures for
Community Engagement at the University of Louisville*
Committee: Mary P Sheridan (chair), Bronwyn Williams, Karen Kopelson,
Beth A. Boehm, Steve Lamos
- M.A. English May 2013
St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, NY
Thesis: *Assimilation and Context: Theories of Academic Literacy in the
United States and the United Kingdom*
Committee: Daniel Ellis (chair), Matt R. King, Lauren Matz
- B.A. English, *summa cum laude* May 2010
Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX
Honors Thesis: *I am Girl, Hear me Squeak: Finding Female Identity in the
Mixed Messages of Children's Literature*
Committee: Bill Carroll (chair), Shelly Sanders, Jennifer Shewmaker

PUBLICATIONS

**“Building Infrastructures for Community Engagement at the University of
Louisville: Graduate Models for Cultivating Scholarly Identities.”** with Keri E.
Mathis, Beth A. Boehm, and Mary P. Sheridan. *Community Literacy Journal* 11.1 (2016):
146-56. Print.

“Mess, Not Mastery: Encouraging Digital Design Dispositions in Girls.” with Elizabeth Chamberlain and Rachel Gramer. *Computers & Composition Online* (Fall 2015). Web.

“Clarissa Blogs.” with Debra Journet, Stephen Cohen, Rachel Gramer, Keri Mathis, Anthony O’Keefe, Kendra Sheehan, and Jessica Winck. *Kairos* 19.2 (2015). Web.

“The Practice of Citizenship.” (Response) *JAC* 34.1-2 (2014): 97-103. Print.

“Mobilizing Connections Across Disciplinary Frames.” (Response) *Working Paper Series on Mobility Work in Composition: Translation, Migration, Transformation*. Louisville: Thomas R. Watson Conference on Rhetoric and Composition, October 2016. Web.

Under Review

Writing for Engagement: Responsive Practice for Social Action. Edited with Mary P. Sheridan, Megan J. Bardolph, and Drew Holladay. (under advanced contract with Lexington Press)

“Service-Learning Off the Tenure-Track: Identifying Pedagogical Resources and Support for Non-Tenure Track Instructors.” with Megen Farrow Boyett and Michelle L. Day. (proposal accepted for *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, special section on “Service-Learning and Social Entrepreneurship”)

In Progress

Mobility Work in Composition. Edited with Bruce Horner, Ashanka Kumari, and Laura Sceniak Matravers. (for submission to Southern Illinois University Press)

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Co-Principal Investigator, Art as Memory 2014-16

Collaboration with the Louisville Council on Developmental Disabilities

- Attended, facilitated, and photographed/videotaped 13 art workshops for Louisville citizens with developmental disabilities and three art shows that presented their work, on a team of six graduate students led by Brenda J. Brueggemann
- Produced a 20-minute documentary film for the Council, screened on University of Louisville’s campus and soon to be featured on their website.

Developer and Teacher, Digital Media Academy 2014 & 15

- Designed and facilitated, on a team of five graduate students led by Mary P. Sheridan (2014 & 15) and Andrea Olinger (2015), a two-week digital media summer camp for 20 rising sixth-grade girls from historically low-performing schools.
- Led instruction for digital projects like photo editing, video editing, and creation of audio essays.
- Over the course of both years of camp, worked on all four collaborative “teams” to plan the camp—assessment, logistics, pedagogy, technology

Research Assistant to Laurie Branch, CEO of the Iroquois Group 2012-14

- Collected and organized contact information to survey Business faculty members for research projects designed to analyze Business curriculum and degree programs at the university level

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

“Cultivating Architectures of Participation for Community Writing.” Conference on College Composition and Communication	March 2017 Portland, OR
“Fostering Collaborative Dispositions: Community Engagement in Graduate Education” Thomas R. Watson Conference.	Oct. 2016 Louisville, KY
“Creating Sustainable Structures for Training Emerging Engaged Scholars” Engagement Scholarship Consortium Conference.	Oct. 2016 Omaha, NE
“Imagining and Enacting Possible Futures: Graduate Students as Engaged Scholars.” Rhetoric Society of America Conference.	May 2016 Atlanta, GA
“Engaged Scholars in the Making: Designing, Teaching, and Researching the Digital Media Academy.” Conference on Community Writing.	Oct. 2015 Boulder, CO
“University-Community Disability Collaborations: Establishing and Cultivating Partnerships.” Society for Disability Studies Conference.	June 2015 Atlanta, GA
“What Counts as Success?: Examining the Digital Literacy Practices of Middle School Girls.” Conference on College Composition and Communication.	March 2015 Tampa, FL

<p>“Writing Across the Pond: Exploring Transnational Composition Research as Responsibility.” Thomas R. Watson Conference.</p>	<p>Oct. 2014 Louisville, KY</p>
<p>“All I Hear is People Caring Loudly At Me: Examining the Ethos and Uptake of Leslie Knope.” Christian Scholars Conference.</p>	<p>June 2014 Nashville, TN</p>
<p>“The Affordances of the Blog in Navigating Personal Identity and Building Community: Examining ‘Rachel Held Evans.’” Popular Culture Association Conference.</p>	<p>April 2014 Chicago, IL</p>
<p>“Comparing American and British Composition Theories: A Study of the Royal Literary Fund’s 2006 Report, <i>Writing Matters</i>.” College English Association.</p>	<p>April 2013 Savannah, GA</p>
<p>“Negative Capability in <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>: Austen, Keats, and Mr. Darcy.” New York College English Association</p>	<p>Oct. 2012 Buffalo, NY</p>
<p>“Eavan Boland and the Domestic: Restructuring Postcolonial Identity.” Christian Scholars Conference.</p>	<p>June 2012 Nashville, TN</p>
<p>“Understanding the Correlation of Language and Identity Amongst Latino Americans and Northern Irish.” College English Association.</p>	<p>March 2012 Richmond, VA</p>
<p>“The Most Important, and now commercialized, Day of Your Life.” Great Plains Honor Council Conference.</p>	<p>March 2010 Tulsa, OK</p>

GRANTS

<p>“Squaring Composition at the University of Louisville” with Brenda Brueggemann, Elizabeth Chamberlain, and Rachel Gramer Ideas to Action, Supporting Undergraduate Innovation Grant (\$3800) University of Louisville</p>	<p>2015</p>
<p>“Community Engagement at CCCC 2015” Pearson Emerging Scholars Travel and Research Grant (\$750)</p>	<p>2015</p>

“Digital Media Academy: Designing Responsive Structures of Graduate Student Professionalization” 2014-15

with Rachel Gramer and Mary P. Sheridan
CCCC Research Initiative Grant (\$8,325)

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS

Chairs’ Memorial Scholarship (\$750)	2017
Conference on College Composition and Communication	
Dr. M. Celeste Nichols Professional Development Award (\$250)	2016
Women’s Center, University of Louisville	
Barbara Plattus Award for Excellence in Graduate Teaching (\$500)	2016
English Department, University of Louisville	
Faculty Favorite Nominee	2016
Delphi Center for Teaching and Learning, University of Louisville	
Carolyn Krause Maddox Prize in Women’s & Gender Studies (\$300)	2015
“Mess Not Mastery: Encouraging Digital Design Dispositions in Girls” with Elizabeth Chamberlain and Rachel Gramer University of Louisville	
Gesa E. Kirsch Award (\$270)	2015
University of Louisville	
Robert Lee Johnson Memorial Scholarship (\$500)	2014
Christian Scholars Conference	
Presidential Fellowship (Two-year course release)	2013-14; 2016-17
University of Louisville	
Graduate Teaching Assistantship	2014-16
University of Louisville	
Honorable Mention, Excellence in English Graduate Work	2013
St. Bonaventure University	
Teaching/Learning Fellowship	2011-13
St. Bonaventure University	
Summa Cum Laude Graduate	2010
Abilene Christian University	
University Honors	2010
Abilene Christian University	
University Scholar	2010
Abilene Christian University	

UNIVERSITY TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Graduate Teaching Assistant

University of Louisville 2013-Present

English 101: Introduction to College Writing

English 102: Intermediate College Writing

English 303: Scientific and Technical Writing

English 309: Inquiries in Writing

Digital Media Academy

St. Bonaventure University, 2011-13

Clare 110: Composition and Critical Thinking I

Other Teaching and Tutoring Experience

Writing Tutor, Plassmann Writing Center 2011-12

St. Bonaventure University

Writing Tutor, Higher Education Opportunity Program 2012

St. Bonaventure University

Undergraduate Teaching Assistant, Core 110: Honors Cornerstone 2009

Abilene Christian University

Math and Science Tutor, Alpha Scholars 2007-08

Abilene Christian University

ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDITING EXPERIENCE

Assistant Director, Thomas R. Watson Conference 2014-16

- Organized, planned, and presented two three-day academic conferences (2014 & 2016) including: organizing participant data, scheduling panels, and planning the conference program. Each conference featured 8 keynote speakers, 12-14 featured speakers, and 300+ presenters
- Wrote and managed Watson Conference social media outlets.
- Provided technological assistance both before and during the conference
- Led coordination of logistical aspects of conference, including graduate student volunteers, book vendors, all conference meals, and reception.
- Invited to continue on as special assistant and consultant for the 2016 conference after completing official duties in July 2016.

Developer and Teacher, Digital Composition Colloquium 2015

- Co-designed a two-day workshop on incorporating digital media into the composition classroom for 35 new and experienced composition instructors at the University of Louisville. Instructors designed 1-minute “Concept in 60” videos

and discussed how to incorporate, assign, and assess digital media projects in the composition classroom.

- Led video editing workshop and discussion on “Why Multimodality Matters?”
- Conducted assessment of student “Concept in 60” videos in May 2016.

Program Assistant, Society for Disability Studies Conference 2014 & 15

- Organized participant data; scheduled panels, and created and edited conference program for approximately 450 participants.
- Provided technological assistance for all participants prior to the conference.

Student Assistant Editor, ACU Creative Services 2008-10

- Wrote, edited, and proofread documents for Abilene Christian University including announcements and articles for the alumni magazine, *ACU Today*, departmental brochures, and on-campus signage and literature.
- Assisted with production of promotional videos for ACU by acting as a general assistant during filming and transcribing all footage

WORKSHOPS LED

“Graduate Student Research Methods Panel” Presenter, English 620, University of Louisville	Feb. 2017
“Concept in 60 + Digital Composition” Co-Leader, Composition Program, University of Louisville	Aug. 2016
“Teaching and Practicing Image Manipulation for the Digital Media Academy” Leader, Digital Media Academy teachers, University of Louisville	April 2016
“Connecting Composition Students with Communities” Presenter, Composition Program, University of Louisville	Oct. 2015
“Be Searchable: Online Portfolios for the Job Search” Co-Leader, School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies, University of Louisville	June 2015
“Networking at Conferences” Co-Leader, English Graduate Organization, University of Louisville	March 2015
“Let’s Get Creative: Video Editing for Professional Purposes” Co-Leader, School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies, University of Louisville	Feb. 2015
“Applying for PhD Programs” Co-Leader, English Graduate Organization, University of Louisville	Oct. 2015
“Women in Digital Spaces” Co-Leader of Roundtable Discussion, CFSHRC Meeting at CCCC	March 2014

“Networking at Conferences” March 2014
Co-Leader, English Graduate Organization, University of Louisville

SERVICE

Survey Project Co-Leader The Parklands of Floyds Fork	2016-17
Community Engagement Academy Alumni Mentor School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies	2016-17
Nothing About Me With Me Focus Group and Planning Team Louisville Council on Developmental Disabilities	2016
Concept in 60 Assessment Team Composition Program	May 2016
Reviewer 826DC 5 Year Anniversary Compendium	May 2016
Consultant University of Louisville Digital Media Academy	2016
Peer Mentor Coordinator English Graduate Program	2015 & 16
President Rhetoric Society of America – Student Chapter at U of Louisville	2015-16
Accountant English Graduate Organization	2014-16
Community Engagement Academy Focus Group School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies	2015
Symposium on Student Writing Volunteer Composition Program	March 2015
Graduate Student Ambassador School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies	2015-16
New PhD Student Peer Mentor English Graduate Program	2014
Symposium on Student Writing Judge Composition Program	March 2015
“This I Believe” Videographer Atkinson Elementary/U of Louisville Digital Writing Partnership	2013

INSTITUTES AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop Engagement Scholarship Consortium Conference	Oct. 2016
---	-----------

Research Network Forum Rhetoric Society of America Conference	May 2016
Certificate of Professional Development School of Interdisciplinary & Graduate Studies, University of Louisville	2014-16
Community Engagement Academy University of Louisville	Spring 2016
Watson Symposium on “Mobility Work in Composition” University of Louisville	March 2016
Digital Media and Composition Institute The Ohio State University	May 2015
Qualitative Research Network Conference on College Composition and Communication	March 2015
Research Network Forum Rhetoric Society of America Conference	May 2014
Research Network Forum Conference on College Composition and Communication	March 2014
Watson Symposium on “Responsivity” University of Louisville	Oct. 2013

AFFILIATIONS/MEMBERSHIPS

Conference on College Composition and Communication
Coalition of Feminist Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition
National Council for Teachers of English
Rhetoric Society of America
Rhetoric Society of America – University of Louisville Student Chapter

GRADUATE COURSEWORK

University of Louisville

Rhetoric and Composition

Community Literacy; Mary P. Sheridan
Composing Identities: Exploring Literacy, Culture, and Agency; Bronwyn T. Williams
Composition Theory and Practice; Karen Kopelson
Emerging Genres; Carolyn R. Miller
Research in Composition; Mary P. Sheridan
Rhetorical Textual Analysis: Clarissa and Blogs; Debra Journet
Teaching Practicum; Brenda J. Brueggemann
Writing, Language, Cognition, and Culture in Curriculum Design: Histories, Theories,
Practice; Bruce Horner

Literature and Theory

Counter Modernities and the Postcolonial Novel; Beth Willey
The Cultural History of American Authorship; Susan Ryan
Queer Theory; Karen Kopelson

St. Bonaventure University

Rhetoric and Composition

How a Field Works: Questions and Methods in Composition; Daniel Ellis

Composition Theory; Matt R. King

Teaching Practicum; Daniel Ellis and Matt R. King

Literature and Theory

Bibliography and Methods of Research; Lauren Matz

Early American Literature; Megan Walsh

Editing Modernism; Kaplan Harris

Eighteenth-Century British Literature; Molly Hardy

Literary Criticism; Kaplan Harris

Middle English Literature; Patrick Panzarella

The Romantic Period; Richard Simpson

Transnational Poetics; Kaplan Harris