



Governing Academic Civic Engagement: Lessons and Challenges from Four Engaged Campuses

Jennifer Dugan

Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement
Vol. 6, No. 3, Fall 2015

This article explores the art of governing academic civic engagement. Due to the diversity in institutional missions, locations, faculty cultures, and capacities, civic engagement projects are shaped in different ways and in accordance with context-specific possibilities. While recognizing that diversity, the article highlights central lessons in leadership and organizational design, emerging from the practices of four highly engaged campuses. It also explores the relationship between academic civic engagement, faculty workload configurations, and the criteria for faculty promotion (and, where granted, tenure). The article concludes by pointing to the leadership imperative in finding and maximizing a genuine link from the mission to academic civic engagement opportunities and the need to build boundary-spanning capacities into campus coordinating bodies. While there are clear operational elements to faculty governance, it is nonetheless an art to getting it right and being a reflective participant in the national debate on the role of academic civic engagement in 21st century higher education.

This special issue explores the integration and institutionalization of civic engagement on campuses across the country. If civic engagement is grounded in the local, by definition it will take diverse forms from one campus to the next, as projects are adapted to local landscapes and in accordance with context-specific outcomes. Civic engagement does not look the same in Baltimore as it does on Staten Island or in the Twin Cities. Nor would Goucher, Wagner, and Macalester Colleges claim they were all pursuing civic engagement for exactly the same reasons.

Yet, despite the variations, common themes emerge. It is not unusual to see civic engagement framed as a value proposition, one that encompasses diversity, intercultural competence, and global citizenship. It is also possible to discuss “civically-engaged campuses” and use roughly the same phrases to describe a shared vision. These include the promotion of social justice and change, ethical and democratic citizenship, and service to community. Finally, organizational affiliations, such as Project Pericles, and civically-minded funding foundations, including Teagle and Mellon, play an important role in promoting a civic engagement agenda. These building blocks – a common language, institutional solidarity, and funding support – help form a cohesive network for diverse civic engagement projects that are described in this special issue.

What may be less visible is how institutions govern civic engagement, especially within the curriculum. How are institutional missions interpreted in ways that support *academic* civic engagement? Who does what within the faculty governance structure to sustain civic engagement as an academic priority? How is civic engagement calculated into the faculty workload and reward system? How are outcomes determined, and who decides when they have been met? Take any single civically-engaged institution, and you have a study in faculty process and politics.

This article explores the formal governance of academic civic engagement: in promotion guidelines, workload policies, committee assignments, and course designs. It also examines how civic engagement is sustained through intentional process, including faculty development, program assessment, and reliable funding. While the primary focus of the article is on formal policies and processes, it is indisputable that decisions about what language to use in faculty handbooks, what rules to make about workload, and even what to call “engagement” are all influenced by the values and norms of faculty governance. On the campuses included in this article, there is an organic interplay between formal and informal governance. For our purposes, “govern” and “governance” are used to describe this interplay.

This article draws on the experiences of four highly engaged, private liberal arts colleges: Macalester, Goucher, Wagner, and Hampshire. These four colleges most certainly differ in their histories and missions. For example, Macalester’s traditional, discipline-based, department-centered curriculum stands in great contrast to Hampshire’s non-traditional, decentered curriculum. Clearly, these are differences that shape the distinct contours and governance of their engagement projects. This article takes those differences as a given. Our comparison is on how each campus “finds meaning” in its particular mission to shape the formal and informal synergies and relationships needed to make academic civic engagement successful. Ultimately, there are common elements that emerge across the four campuses that may be valuable for institutional – and especially faculty – leaders who seek to pursue authentic, mission-driven engagement agendas.

Mission-Driven Difference

This section situates the four campuses on a rough continuum in order to demonstrate the alignment between the campus mission and the particular shape and governance of its academic civic engagement approach.



On one end of the continuum is a traditional liberal arts mission that gives customary respect to a discipline-based curriculum; on the other is a mission that seeks, essentially, to disrupt tradition. The more traditional missions offer civic engagement as an option for students; the less traditional make it a requirement. This is a pivotal point for governance, as we will see below. Civic engagement as a requirement will involve more robust governance features as compared to campuses that retain it as optional.

Academic civic engagement at Macalester College takes the shape of *community-based research* (CBR). Macalester’s strategic commitment to CBR is an optional endeavor for both faculty and students. Interested faculty members are encouraged to integrate civic engagement into their courses by altering the content in order to make the necessary room for CBR. Thus, CBR happens inside traditional academic disciplines when faculty members deem it appropriate for particular course content.

Governance of CBR at Macalester draws its strength from faculty interest and departmental support. The arrangement – of faculty autonomy and department-based judgments – both affirms the time-honored nature of the liberal arts disciplines and allows faculty the freedom within their departmental homes to pursue CBR as they see fit. CBR does not call for a faculty-wide consensus on CBR as a curriculum-wide strategy. A student’s CBR competency is evaluated by the faculty member, alongside (and perhaps in relation to) other course objectives.

Academic civic engagement at Goucher College takes the shape of *community-based learning* (CBL). Goucher does not require CBL, seeing it as a value added rather than a requirement. Like Macalester, CBL is an option, which all academic disciplines have the freedom to pursue. Goucher’s model, however, involves the addition of a fourth community-based learning credit to existing three-credit courses. The added fourth credit goes through the regular Curriculum Committee for approval, with input from CBL academic center. While still a faculty prerogative, the added fourth credit has implications for workloads and committee activity beyond the academic department level.

Goucher's curriculum-wide arrangement for civic engagement enjoys enabling policies and procedures, including common outcomes to assess the credit-bearing addition. The fourth CBL credit is configured into faculty workload, which stands at 18 credits per year. Despite its optional nature, CBL at Goucher, like Macalester, is supported with appropriate governance features that assure the general quality and consistency of academic civic engagement initiatives across disciplines.

Academic civic engagement at Wagner College takes the shape of required *learning communities* (LCs). These are embedded in the College's signature program, the Wagner Plan for the Practical Liberal Arts, and include first year, intermediate, and senior LCs, each of which has an associated faculty coordinator. In the first year program, two existing general education courses are linked to form a learning community. A third component, the reflective tutorial, is added to bridge the two discipline-based courses, incorporate 30 hours of experiential learning, and promote writing skills and other high impact practices. Most Wagner faculty teach in an LC, and faculty members in first-year learning communities serve as the students' academic advisors. Each LC is counted as two courses in the faculty workload configuration, which currently stands at a 3-3 load. This highly integrated model features a set of shared learning outcomes that LC faculty use to evaluate and strengthen the student experience in what is essentially Wagner's liberal arts core.

Faculty engagement in learning communities is an explicit and planned facet of teaching at Wagner. Governance of the LCs is firmly in the hands of the faculty who, in addition to creating their individual courses, jointly design their reflective tutorials. In addition to the standing Academic Policy Committee, there is a faculty committee for each learning community level (first year, intermediate, and senior year). Faculty at annual retreats review guidelines and outcomes, and syllabi exist to assist them in their LC roles. Faculty are encouraged to find their overlapping interests in the formation of the LCs and to approach their collaboration and pedagogy in ways that address the changing needs of both students and the community.

Civic engagement at Hampshire College takes the form of *community engagement and learning*. CEL, like the entire curriculum at Hampshire, is a matter for negotiation between the student and her faculty member. Student-designed programs of study are infused with opportunities to learn outside the classroom and directly engage community partners in that learning. CEL begins in the first year with at least 40 hours of a campus-engaged learning activity and continues into subsequent years (or divisions, to use Hampshire's terminology), as students draw together their courses with required community work and independent study.

At Hampshire, the negotiated curriculum between student and faculty shapes the way civic engagement is governed. Promoting its unique curricular paradigm, Hampshire sees students as "the architects and builders of their own academic programs." The model requires much from faculty in intensive and progressive advising. Working closely with their professors, students select (or design) their CEL projects, a process that involves multiple entities: a faculty committee, a campus or community partner, a project supervisor, and the academic (or

tutorial) adviser. Students' required reflection pieces are read and evaluated by the faculty committee and constitute the assessment measure of student success. Logically, faculty governance of CEL is loosely configured in order to enable self-directed work and study; too many layers of authority would detract from student and advisor autonomy.

Spectrum of CE Features	Shape of Curricular CE	CE a Requirement?	Part of Workload Policy?	Separate Assessment of CE Outcomes?
Macalester	Community-based research	No	No	Yes
Goucher	Community-based learning	No	Yes	Yes
Wagner	Learning communities	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hampshire	Community engagement and learning	Yes	Yes	Yes

Lessons Learned

These four campuses differ significantly in how they shape and (therefore) govern civic engagement. Macalester's model is a rich tapestry of optional offerings and, like Goucher, offers engagement as a way for interested students to connect their academic work with applied experience. Even for campuses such as Wagner and Hampshire that require engagement, the nature and extent of student work in the community vary in accordance with institutional values and vision. Yet, along the spectrum of traditional to less traditional, the colleges have something in common: they are part of a national network of campuses that share a core belief in the power of civic engagement – for students, communities, and democracy itself. Two of the four campuses, Macalester and Wagner, are Carnegie Classified Community Engagement Institutions; all four are members of both Project Pericles and Campus Compact; and all are recipients of external grant funding to promote and integrate engaged educational experiences. Recognizing these common features, the sections below explore the lessons of and challenges presented by the four campus engagement models.

Lesson: Make the Most of the Mission

It takes leadership, vision, and support to find present-day value in historic missions. Institutional missions do not tell campuses what to do; leaders interpret missions to suit the

times, thus remaining true to history while finding contemporary purpose (Dugan, 2015).¹ To this point, the word “engagement” in the campus mission statement is not a prerequisite to a civic engagement agenda. There are many ways that such an agenda can be derived from the institutional mission to support civic engagement as a strategic priority. As the Macalester provost put it, “I would not want to have to start this from scratch,” meaning that the mission is a valuable tool, or guide, for senior leadership and faculty to use when it comes to incorporating civic engagement into the academic program.

What the four institutions have in common is that they make the most of their missions in order to enable civic engagement agendas. The different forms of civic engagement are reflections of diverse institutional missions, which are shaped by the distinct history and culture of each campus. Indeed, Goucher’s provost believes the cultural norms are so strong at his institution that “civic engagement is independent of the governance structure;” that is, has a life of its own. Mission-driven interpretations can help ease the incorporation of civic engagement into the academic program – and faculty governance structures – as compared to conditions that force faculty to “start from scratch.” The combination of enabling missions and cultural norms tends to provide the rationale and framework for civic engagement to occur all along the academic-student affairs continuum. The following presents excerpts from campus missions and other defining sources, taken from institutional websites, with emphasis added for ease of comparison.

	Mission	Vision/Purpose/ Principles	Student Learning Statement	Strategic Plan
Macalester	“Macalester is committed to being a preeminent liberal arts college with an educational program known for its... <i>service to society</i> ” (Mission statement, para. 1).	“The education a student begins at Macalester provides the basis for continuous transformation through <i>learning and service.</i> ” (Statement of Purpose and Belief, para. 2).	“We expect students to pursue learning experiences that enable them to <i>use their education to actively address social issues</i> in the Twin Cities and/or other communities.” (Catalog, para. 13).	“Emphasize our urban location...by focusing on the global city as a means to explore <i>intersections among such topics as the environment... and social justice.</i> ” (Strategic plan, 2012, para. 4).
Goucher	“Goucher College is dedicated to a liberal arts education that prepares students within a broad,	“We value <i>active participation</i> in bettering the Goucher community as well as those	“Commitment to experiential learning on and off campus as well as abroad, requiring students	“Through intensified <i>community-based learning</i> efforts and involvement in local institutions, the

¹ For example, Washington and Lee University’s mission, discussed in the referenced article, seeks to “prepare graduates for responsible leadership and service to others.” The president of that campus, working with faculty, interpreted “leadership” and “service” for a 21st century context by establishing an interdisciplinary center for the study of poverty.

	<i>humane perspective...</i> " (Mission statement, para. 1).	communities beyond the college where we live, work, and serve." (Community Principles, para. 7).	to <i>apply and extend what has been learned</i> in the classroom." (Ideals, para. 4).	college will demonstrate its commitment to social justice." (Strategic plan, 2012,p. 4).
Wagner	"Wagner offers a comprehensive educational program that is anchored in the liberal arts, <i>experiential and co-curricular learning</i> , interculturalism, interdisciplinary studies, reflection, and <i>service to society...</i> "(Mission, para. 1).	"Our goal [is] to provide a transformative college experience which best prepares our students for positions of effective and <i>responsible leadership and citizenship...</i> " (Vision, para. 1).	"The Wagner Plan incorporates our longstanding commitment to the liberal arts, <i>experiential learning</i> and interdisciplinary education with our geographical location and enduring bond with New York City." (Wagner Plan, para. 1).	"[O]ur primary strategic goal for the next decade is to emerge as a national leader in higher education, cited for our innovative and dynamic curriculum, comprehensive <i>civic engagement...</i> rooted in New York City." (Into the future, 2011, para. 2).
Hampshire	"The mission of Hampshire College is to foster a lifelong passion for learning, inquiry, and <i>ethical citizenship</i> that inspires students to contribute to <i>knowledge, justice, and positive change in the world...</i> " (Mission, para. 1).	We envision Hampshire alumni continuing to <i>change lives, communities, and the world for the better.</i> " (Vision, para. 1).	"At Hampshire you'll take responsibility for your education, customize your curriculum, and move <i>beyond boundaries of disciplines and departments...</i> It puts the emphasis on learning, not on teaching" (Academic Program, para. 1)	Hampshire will offer a distinctive academic program that emboldens students and faculty to be <i>adaptive learners and innovators</i> who interrogate our world..." (Strategic Planning Priorities, 2014, para. 1).

It is interesting that not a single mission above uses the phrase "civic engagement." Rather, civic engagement derives its general authority *from* the mission. Whatever follows – what students actually experience – requires specific, sustained, and responsive programming designed to give concrete form to the meanings being derived. All the missions above suggest an outward purpose, an obligation to serve society, which opens avenues for service to, learning in, and research with the community. But this outward purpose must be translated internally into viable pathways for engaged learning. When academic civic engagement receives sustained recognition and support and is framed with mission-driven purpose, faculty

members are more likely to pursue it, care about its governance, and be confident about its endurance.

Lesson: Collaborate and Boundary-Span

Another important component of governance is a coordinating mechanism that helps to embed civic engagement in the academic programs. These need not be brick and mortar hubs concentrated in a single center, but the faculty need to know about and have ample access to their resources. Coordination is not simply about supplying faculty a fleet of vans (of which on most campuses there can never be enough in any case). It does, however, appear to be worth the investment to, as the Macalester provost put it, “take logistics out of the faculty portfolio,” frustrations over logistics being a sure discouragement to full faculty participation. Beyond providing logistical support, coordinating mechanisms at the four colleges share certain advantageous design features:

- Successful academic civic engagement programs are led, or co-led, by faculty who speak academic language, understand how to navigate the curriculum, and report to the chief academic officer.** In three of the four colleges, faculty directors span the curricular↔co-curricular dimensions of civic engagement and thereby ease the linkages that faculty must make between their courses and the community. It is an arrangement designed not only to generate faculty interest; academics looking to lead centers of civic engagement need to know their work will not be marginalized. For example, the Director of Community-Based Learning at Goucher said that she would not have accepted the position had it not been aligned with academic programming. Her provost likewise emphasized the importance of giving CBL the authority of his office and to making engagement “as seamless as possible” for faculty. The lesson from the colleges, as indicated in the box below, is that academic civic engagement can benefit from academic leadership, and recruitment efforts are best served when reporting lines lead directly to the chief academic officer.
- Successful academic civic engagement programs are well staffed and resourced.** Across the four campuses, outreach activities included hosting faculty development retreats, holding planning meetings with faculty and community partners to co-develop learning outcomes, working with faculty to better integrate civic engagement into the advising process, hosting guest speakers and sponsoring colloquia, as well as dispersing grant funding for travel, scholarship, and course development. The lesson from the four colleges is that academic civic engagement gains serious footing when faculty members have a go-to hub capable of addressing a range of needs.

	Coordinating Mechanism	Lead Academic’s Title	Lead Staff Title
Macalester	Civic Engagement Center	Project Pericles co-Director	Director, Civic Engagement Center and Project Pericles co-

			Director
Goucher	Community-Based Learning Program	Director of Community-Based Learning	Associate Director, Community-Based Learning
Wagner	Center for Leadership and Civic Engagement	Professor, Civic Engagement and Leadership	Director, Center for Leadership and Community Engagement
Hampshire	Decentralized	Academic Director, Community Engagement and Collaborative Learning Network	Director, Community Partners for Social Change

- Successful Academic Civic Engagement Programs have boundary-spanning capacities.** If civic engagement is an institution-wide feature, then it requires mechanisms for institutional collaboration. Without such mechanisms, the danger is that civic engagement will be confined to certain areas of campus or gain only weak traction in the academic program. Membership in national organizations, such as Project Pericles, promotes collaboration at all levels, including a role for the board of trustees. Civic engagement centers can maintain that deep collaboration when they are designed with boundary-spanning capacities in mind.

Other key people might operate out of civic engagement centers, depending on the strategic intention. The Wagner Plan, for example, seeks to integrate the student experience at all levels; thus, Wagner has a Dean of Integrated Learning – a position identified in the faculty handbook. The Dean works closely with faculty on strengthening the integrated features of Wagner’s learning communities. She has the resources to incentivize faculty to generate new ideas for LC pilots projects and works to keep faculty motivated to teach in the LCs when their attention is drawn in other directions. The lesson is that boundary-spanning designs can get civic engagement “in the drinking water” and sustain it as an institution-wide feature across the student-academic affairs continuum. In the end, credit-bearing community engagement and voluntary service-learning projects reflect the same value proposition; boundary spanners can create, advocate, and evaluate benchmarks for success across the entire student experience.

The four institutions teach us that enabling interpretations of mission by campus leaders, backed up by full-capacity coordinating mechanisms, serve well the pursuit and governance of academic civic engagement. On the fundamental need for top-to-bottom institutional commitment, Wagner’s President Guarasci (2006) reflects that:

In an era of serious change marked by the absence of intellectual consensus, faculty members are apt to meet new demands with feelings of exhaustion and growing resentment, if there is not solid institutional consensus supporting the efficacy of transformation. (p. 19)

In the process, other issues emerge that influence faculty's relationship to the engagement project. We now turn to two of these: workload configurations and promotion criteria.

Challenge: Workload Questions

There are few challenges more persistent than faculty workload issues, with or without the addition of civic engagement (CE). As might be expected, the determination of how and where CE factors into faculty workloads is a project in its own right. For more traditional campuses, CE-specified courses pull on faculty time as compared to what is required in regular course design. Macalester resolves that by adhering to a three-credit norm for all courses, leaving it up to faculty to redesign their courses to include a civic engagement component. Macalester faculty who incorporate CBL need not reconfigure or count their workload any differently than those colleagues who do not; either way, they all teach three credit courses as part of the College's regular workload expectations. At Goucher, faculty can add a fourth CE credit to account for the special collaboration and advising required. Both models make CE optional, and both are buoyed by the robust coordinating mechanisms described earlier.

Nonetheless, governance challenges remain, for example, in departments that find "seat time" a more just accounting of faculty workload. At Goucher, studio and lab courses use contact hours rather than credit hours in the workload configuration of faculty in those disciplines. The discussions are ongoing to account for periodic issues, such as when faculty workload exceeds the 18-credit norm in any given semester. To reiterate the point about the centrality of mission, workload issues – while probably inevitable and not something to underestimate – can be better managed with "where there's a will, there's a way" attitude. This is a sentiment captured by Macalester's President Rosenberg (2004):

[C]ivic engagement, if it is to lie at the heart of higher education, must be embedded in the academic programs of our institutions and not relegated to the periphery – that, perhaps above all, it is the faculty who must think in a serious and sustained way about the social dimensions of the important work they do. (para. 4)

For less traditional campuses, advising, mentoring, and co-teaching generate additional measures of faculty workload and accountability. Innovation does not necessarily breed equitability in workloads, a fact which points to the importance of effective shared governance. At Wagner, faculty receive a stipend for teaching in the learning communities; those who participate in the first-year LC may also choose to go over the 3-3 load for seven semesters and take a Professional Development Semester in lieu of getting paid for the overload. One can feel the pull and tug of governance. A faculty- led task force, created to produce a cost analysis of the proposed 3-3-load policy, contributed much to its later implementation.

Hampshire eschews letter grades (in favor of written evaluations), tenure (in order to stave off entrenchment), and academic majors (in favor of individualized areas of concentration). As a result, the level of faculty-student interaction is high. The labor intensity of the model is causing Hampshire to consider alternatives – such as a cohort model – in order to bring its strategic commitments into better balance. One objective seeks to establish “new systems to rationalize and equalize the workload for all faculty, including different models for advising” (Hampshire College, 2014). Community engagement and learning – starting with 40 required hours in the first year – is a core part of Hampshire’s effort to “decenter the classroom.” Yet, even – or perhaps especially – at a school whose founding motto is “To Know is Not Enough,” workload challenges inspire discussion about how to achieve an appropriate balance between the various pulls on faculty time.

Challenge: Criteria for Promotion

Campuses also vary as to where and how civic engagement figures into faculty promotion guidelines. As one might expect, especially at more traditional institutions, there is some conceptual tension between disciplinary knowledge (and teaching) and community-based activities (and scholarship). It is not unlike questions of performance measures in interdisciplinary studies; faculty members recognize the value of working between disciplines, but criteria for evaluating interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship often lack clarity. Less traditional institutions have formalized guidelines, in accordance with the institutional paradigm and faculty governance prerogatives. Below, the criteria for promotion are presented for comparison.

	CE Included in Promotion (and Tenure ²) Criteria?	CE Explicitly Stated in Teaching Criteria?	Public Scholarship Explicitly Included in Promotion Criteria?	Other, from Faculty Handbook
Macalester	Yes	No (though the committee can review and evaluate action research and service learning projects)	No	"[F]aculty members are expected to be professionally involved in their respective disciplines in appropriate ways..." (Faculty Handbook, p. 11).
Goucher	No	No	No	-
Wagner	Yes (service to the college and service	No	No	"[Teaching] requires professional

² Again, Hampshire College does not grant tenure. To be as inclusive as possible, the term “promotion” is used here to include tenure at those institutions that grant it.

	to the community are distinct categories)			commitment, persuasiveness, and knowledge and mastery of the discipline”(Faculty Handbook, p. 56).
Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

There are several matters that require further attention. One arises when civic engagement “counts” toward promotion but is not included in the formal criteria. A related matter is the extent of the risk that pre-tenure faculty take when pursuing academic civic engagement. While it may “count,” it may also be too risky (should, for example, the pedagogy or community project fail to achieve intended outcomes). A third matter concerns the peer review of public scholarship. To that point, the work of *Imagining America* at Syracuse University is designed to “catalyze change in campus practices, structures, and policies that enables artists and scholars to thrive and contribute to community action and revitalization” (*Imagining America*, 2014). Two of the four campuses interviewed for this article are members of *Imagining America* and actively engaged in the work to establish norms for the peer review of public scholarship, among other enabling practices.

Despite the variation in workload configurations and promotion criteria, all the campuses seem to enjoy a consensus about the legitimate use of faculty time in civic engagement activities. Moreover, the president and chief academic officer – decision-makers in the promotion process – are in positions to actively promote the value of publically engaged teaching and scholarship. It does appear that campuses – perhaps especially those that retain discipline-based curricula and promotion criteria – are faced with the responsibility to set forth guidelines that are knowable and equitable, even when they are informal and culture-based.

Final Thoughts

Locations, missions, cultures, and other contextual factors influence how faculty “engage with engagement.” The governance of engagement can be as varied as the programs themselves. Faculty handbooks, committee structures, partnerships, and pedagogies will reflect conditions appropriate to that campus. The fact that student engagement, for example, is optional rather than credit bearing does not mean it is less valued or not “in the drinking water.” Rather, it means that options work better than requirements at that institution. In Macalester’s liberal arts discipline-based model, civic engagement emerges and is evaluated as a faculty-led, disciplinary prerogative. On the other end of the spectrum, Hampshire’s decentralized, interdisciplinary model naturally favors negotiated relationships between students and faculty, individualized programs, and student-led process. Yet both institutions are recognized national leaders in civic engagement, and both derive meaning from shared governance principles.

Despite these inevitable differences, this article pointed to common elements that help make academic civic engagement successful:

- **Campuses need to operationalize the mission to maximize genuine links to the principles of civic engagement.** These include social justice and change, responsible leadership and citizenship, service to society, and a Dewey-inspired commitment to “learning by doing.” Leadership at the highest levels is critical to sustained, mission-driven, and faculty-supported engagement programs.
- **Campuses that build boundary-spanning capacities will activate cross-constituency collaborations.** Faculty interest is more likely to be sustained and re-energized if logistical details are off the table, community partners and projects have been identified, and established outcomes are available to shape course design. Civic engagement centers and other coordinating mechanisms, led by a faculty member in close collaboration with her student affairs counterpart, invite integration across campus.

This article also pointed to the care being given to the status of civic engagement – in teaching, scholarship, workload configurations and promotion criteria. It may be that these are areas of most resistance to expanding definitions and disciplinary prerogatives. It is discouraging for faculty to pursue civic engagement without the assurance that their best efforts will pay off under the jurisdictions of personnel and policy committees. All four campuses examined in this article have found ways over time to work it out. As academic civic engagement programs continue to grow, it is likely that questions about workload and promotion will continue to receive needed attention. It may be that the answers, too, are context-specific. Over time, however, common principles might emerge to help guide faculty in their governance of academic civic engagement.

Acknowledgements

In addition to the reviewers and special issue editors Brandon Kliewer and Judith Ramaley, the author would like to thank the following for the sharing of their time, information, and resources: Kathleen Murray, provost (at the time of this writing, now past provost), Macalester College; Marc Roy, provost (at the time of this writing, now past provost), and Cass Freeland, Director of Community-Based Learning, Goucher College; Patricia Tooker, Dean of Integrated Learning, Wagner College; Mia Sullivan, Director of the Civil Liberties and Public Policy program, and Laura Wenk, Dean of Curriculum and Assessment, Hampshire College; Jan Liss, Executive Director, Project Pericles; and, John Saltmarsh, co-Director and Brad Arndt, Senior Program Manager and Staff Editor, the New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

References

Dugan, J. (2015). The liberal arts and organizational design: Cultivating for change. *Liberal Education*, 101(2), 60-67.

Goucher College. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.goucher.edu.

Guarasci, R. (2006). On the challenge of becoming the good college. *Liberal Education*, 92(1), 14-21.

Hampshire College. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.hampshire.edu.

Hampshire College (2014). Strategic Planning Narrative Retrieved from https://www.hampshire.edu/sites/default/files/presidentsoffice/files/Hampshire_College_Strategic_Plan_Revised_Final_Draft_Submitted_to_BOT.pdf .

Imagining America (2014, May). Imagining America: Artists and scholars in public life: Vision, mission, values, and goals statement. Retrieved from <http://imaginingamerica.org/about/our-mission/>.

Macalester College. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.macalester.edu.

Rosenberg, B. C. (2004, May). Banquet welcoming remarks at Project Pericles Conference, St. Paul, MN. Retrieved from http://www.projectpericles.org/projectpericles_1/news_events/articles__speeches/brian_c_ro_senberg_-_banquet/.

Wagner College. (n.d.). Retrieved from www.wagner.edu.