



IJRSLCE

International Journal
of Research on
Service-Learning &
Community Engagement

Volume 11 | Issue 1

Article 5

Exploring Faculty Satisfaction Derived From Community-Engaged Teaching in the COVID-19 Era

Tara Carr-Lemke
Princeton University

Recommended Citation

Carr-Lemke, T. (2023). Exploring faculty satisfaction derived from community-engaged teaching in the COVID-19 era. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 11(1). Article 5.
<https://doi.org/10.37333/001c.91723>

Exploring Faculty Satisfaction Derived From Community-Engaged Teaching in the COVID-19 Era

Tara Carr-Lemke

Abstract

This exploratory, phenomenological study explores the impacts of community-engaged teaching on faculty satisfaction. It finds that community-engaged teaching contributes to a sense of satisfaction across five distinct modes—pedagogical, professional, emotional, intellectual, and relational—both pre- and post-COVID-19. Interviews suggest that the satisfactions derived from community-engaged teaching speak to faculty desire to achieve coherence across multiple identities of instructor, researcher, colleague, and human. Given the ongoing conversation around job satisfaction post-COVID-19, the research generates timely findings with implications for faculty and campus community engagement professional staff.

Keywords: *community-engaged pedagogy, COVID-19-era teaching, faculty satisfaction*

Explorando la satisfacción de la facultad como resultado de la enseñanza involucrada en la comunidad en la era de COVID

Tara Carr-Lemke

Resumen

Este estudio exploratorio y fenomenológico explora los impactos que tiene la enseñanza involucrada en la comunidad en la satisfacción de la facultad. Resulta que la enseñanza involucrada en la comunidad contribuye a un sentido de satisfacción a través de cinco distintos modos antes de y después de COVID: pedagógico, profesional, emocional, intelectual, y relacional. Las entrevistas sugieren que las satisfacciones derivadas de la enseñanza involucrada en la comunidad conectan con el deseo de la facultad de lograr coherencia a través de las múltiples identidades de instructor, investigador, colega, y humano. Dada a la conversación recurrente alrededor de la satisfacción en el trabajo después de COVID, el estudio da a conclusiones oportunas para la facultad y los empleados profesionales de la involucración comunitaria del campus.

Palabras claves: *la pedagogía involucrada en la comunidad, la enseñanza de la era COVID, la satisfacción de la facultad*

Editors' Note: Translation provided by
Megan Jeanette Myers
Department of World Languages and Cultures, Iowa State University

The literature on faculty experiences of teaching community-engaged courses largely focuses on motivations for and outcomes of adoption, execution and evaluation, and facilitating factors such as institutional reward systems (Celio et al., 2011; Darby & Newman, 2014; Hou & Wilder, 2015; Moore & Ward, 2010; Stoecker & Tyron, 2009). Relatively little research has been dedicated to the experiences of satisfaction and personal/professional integration of faculty teaching with community-engaged methods. Yet awareness of faculty experiences is a critical element in the creation of sustainable and effective community engagement commitments on university campuses. An understanding of faculty experiences should inform programming designed to advance university/community partnerships, including that developed by centers for community-engaged scholarship. As satisfaction across professions is under examination in the context of COVID-19, and as a new generation of scholars with community engagement aspirations enter the academy, an exploration of faculty experiences is timely (Calice et al., 2022; Lewing & York, 2017; Post et al., 2017; Sell, 2023; Zahneis, 2022).

This exploratory, phenomenological study seeks insight into ways community-engaged teaching shapes a sense of satisfaction among faculty. It examines 11 semi-structured interviews conducted with instructors across ranks and departments at a research 1 university as campuses settled into post-COVID-19 normalcy in spring 2023. It finds that community-engaged teaching offers a sense of satisfaction across five types: intellectual, pedagogical, emotional, relational, and professional. Participants reveal the ways these satisfactions build coherence across multiple identities of instructor, researcher, colleague, and human. Implications for campus programming design in collaboration with community engagement professionals (CEPs) and future directions for the research are identified.

Motivation for the Research

Exploring Faculty Satisfaction

A variety of studies examine the constituent components of faculty satisfaction. Building upon previous research, Rosser (2005) identifies four dimensions: course load and advising, job security and benefits, student quality, and a general sense of employment satisfaction. The quality of faculty's work life, understood as consisting of professional development, administrative support, and technological support, impacts general satisfaction levels. In this conceptualization, both the intrinsic motivations of the individual and the behaviors of the institution shape satisfaction. Extrinsic rewards like salary and recognition matter relatively less to faculty than do elements like variety, flexibility, and responsibility (Chen, 2023; Houston et al., 2006). This finding supports research that teaching self-efficacy serves as a primary predictor of satisfaction (Ismayilova & Klassen, 2019). Moreover, greater faculty choice to determine academic priorities and attend to inherent motivations can empower and fulfill faculty by reestablishing the balance they seek between university mandates and academic freedom (Kenny, 2018). Although many institutions have looked to national data to understand faculty satisfaction, Ambrose and colleagues (2005) underscore the importance of institution-specific data collection that is qualitative in nature, arguing that general survey research is unable to reliably predict all outcomes. This paper primarily understands faculty satisfaction to refer to the fulfillment of intrinsic professional motivations experienced through community-engaged teaching.

COVID-19 prompted a reevaluation of professional satisfaction in academia, as it did across sectors (Smith, 2022; Zahneis, 2022). Significant numbers of faculty have struggled with heavier workloads and fewer resources, leading to burnout, weakened physical and mental health, and even the decision to leave their position or exit higher education altogether (Tugend, 2020; Winfield & Paris, 2022). This crisis offers an opportunity to reevaluate the higher education landscape and its extrinsic rewards, whereas acknowledging the gratifications linked to intrinsic motivations to assess its conditions for faculty members.

Faculty Satisfaction via the Integration of Identities: Community-Engaged Teaching as a Tool

Faculty in the early 21st century confront a diversity of pressures, among them the demands of a research agenda that is responsive to contemporary public concerns amid calls for greater academic specialization and production. In the process of goal and vision setting, faculty contend with multifaceted questions of professional and personal identity, as they manage extrinsic and intrinsic expectations. Faculty may experience higher degrees of satisfaction when they can develop coherence across the identities of instructor, researcher, colleague, and human (Bartel & Castillo, 2021). Community-engaged teaching is one tool for developing identity alignment borne from intrinsic motivations.

Existing research on community-engaged teaching—defined here as including a civically engaged and oriented purpose; an intentional process that centers critical civic learning and community expertise; and the development of reciprocal, authentic, and sustained community relationships—frequently explores the pedagogical motivations of faculty for adopting the approach (Welch & Plaxton-Moore, 2019). It has also traced the ways characteristics of faculty such as demographics, religious belief systems, and personal commitments coupled with contextual factors, like academic discipline, inform motivations (Lewing & York, 2017; O’Meara, 2008, 2013; O’Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Less attention has been paid to the satisfactions gained as faculty integrate potentially overlapping professional and personal commitments into their teaching. Yet initial research suggests that community engagement provides faculty pathways to align scholarly, professional, and personal aspects of themselves with their work (Ahern-Dodson et al., 2023; Holland, 2019; Peterson et al., 2016; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). A growing area of research explores the impacts of community-engaged pedagogy on faculty satisfaction as instructors, researchers, colleagues, and whole persons (Matthews & Wilder, 2018; Sylvan & Becker, 2022). Community-engaged teaching may offer a method for building coherence across roles required of faculty—the traditional responsibilities of instructor, researcher, and departmental and disciplinary colleague—and that which they experience in their multiple identities and experiences as a human, thereby contributing to overall satisfaction.

A deeper exploration of the impacts of community-engaged teaching on satisfaction may be particularly relevant as some faculty have persevered or even redoubled efforts as the pandemic underscored their appreciation for the approach. Emerging research highlights the ways the pandemic has shaped faculty pedagogical motivations to use a community-based teaching framework (Garvin et al., 2022). It suggests that community-engaged teaching supports faculty value systems, increasingly of importance to the new generation of scholars (Garvin et al., 2022). Yet little work explores the ways community-engaged teaching augments faculty experiences of satisfaction. This study seeks to deepen understanding of relationships between community-engaged pedagogy and faculty satisfaction in the immediate aftermath of COVID-19 by asking a subset of faculty: How is community-engaged teaching satisfying to you?

Methods

Using semi-structured interviewing methods as a tool, the research adopts a phenomenological approach to the question of satisfaction. Phenomenology explores human experiences of phenomena to gain insight into the ways people make meaning of their lives. Given the focus on faculty satisfaction as community-engaged pedagogues, phenomenology provides a responsive framework for analysis. The analysis includes an initial reading of the interviews, the development of preliminary themes, a comprehensive and close rereading of the interviews, the development of subthemes and outliers, the synthesis of a coherent interpretation of the data, and ongoing critical reflection on the interviews in light of existing literature in the field and potential implications of the data.

Site of Study and Sample

The university in which the study was conducted is a private, liberal arts, research 1 institution with commitments to extensive scholarly research and excellent undergraduate education. It seeks to make its scholars accessible to students via courses and independent research. The university emphasizes a commitment to preparing students for life-long service and leadership in the public square. Pledging a

commitment to first generation and students from underrepresented communities, it offers financial support and targeted programming to expand access to educational opportunities. It acknowledges that the goal of the institution to produce and disseminate knowledge is served by incorporating these diverse groups of students into its community.

A convenience sample of participants was drawn from the subset of faculty currently teaching undergraduates using community-engaged pedagogical methods. All participants have taught courses tagged by the university's office for academic community engagement as community engaged over the previous academic year and were listed on the community-engaged learning course offerings website of the Office of the Registrar. Approximately half of faculty within this subset of instructors were invited to participate in an interview based on the following criteria: the researcher's professional rapport with the faculty; the faculty's requirement of community-engaged learning for all students enrolled in the course (not only the students who opt into community engagement); and faculty availability during the study period. The researcher also sought to interview a mix of faculty representing the following profiles: tenure and nontenure status to capture a range of faculty responsibilities; length of time teaching (including as a graduate student) to avoid picking up on themes exclusively related to classroom experience; and disciplinary training and home department to surface themes that transcend academic distinctions. (Access to community-engaged teaching faculty in the natural sciences and engineering disciplines was limited; therefore, these individuals are not incorporated.)

See Table 1 for participant profiles and types of community engagement techniques utilized. Note that all faculty incorporate activities that reflect upon the experiential learning opportunity in light of a critical engagement with course texts. Some include the use of discipline-specific methods like participant observation, mapping, interviews, discourse analysis, coding, and statistical analysis, among others. The types listed here are not an exhaustive inventory of engagement used by the participant, but instead a sample of most recent or frequently employed. Participant names and academic departments are masked in order to protect anonymity.

Table 1.

Participant Demographics and Community-Engaged Teaching Methods.

Participant	University academic division	Academic training	Total years teaching	Position type	Community-engaged teaching type
Participant 1	Humanities	Linguistics	23	Nontenure	Direct service
Participant 2	Social Sciences and Humanities	Literature	20	Nontenure	Guest speakers; site visits; site-specific work hours/labor
Participant 3	Social Sciences	Anthropology	14	Pre-tenure	Direct service; ethnographic methods
Participant 4	Social Sciences	History	30	Tenure	Guest speakers; site visits/walking tours
Participant 5	Social Sciences	Anthropology	7	Nontenure	Guest speakers; site visits/walking tours
Participant 6	Social Sciences	Anthropology	10	Pre-tenure	Ethnographic methods; mapping
Participant 7	Humanities	Philology	28	Nontenure	Guest speakers; site visits; direct service
Participant 8	Humanities	Literature	~20	Nontenure	Guest speakers
Participant 9	Social Sciences	History	15	Nontenure	Data analysis and visualization; guest speakers; site visits/walking tours;

Participant 10	Humanities	Literature	32	Tenure	arts and design creation Guest speakers; site visits/walking tours; ethnographic methods
Participant 11	Social Sciences	Anthropology	5	Nontenure	Guest speakers; site visits; literature review/research

Interviews

In-person semi-structured interviews with 11 university instructors sought to explore the impacts of a community-engaged pedagogical approach on participants' satisfaction. Foundational research on effective methods for assessing satisfaction encourages the use of interviews instead of predefined surveys (Ambrose et al., 2005). Interviews are a commonly accepted method in research to build theory around community-engaged teaching faculty experiences (Calice et al., 2022).

The researcher conducted interviews lasting between 30 and 120 minutes during spring and summer 2023. Interviews took place in one of three locations: the faculty participant's offices; the researcher's office's conference room; or, in two cases, a local restaurant convenient for the participants. The researcher audio recorded the interviews, which were then professionally transcribed. During the interview, the researcher took notes to record follow-up questions prompted by the participant's commentary and not already part of the interview protocol. Interviews centered on participants' satisfaction from teaching courses that integrate community partnerships, perspectives, or projects, with attention to the potential impacts of COVID-19. Refer to the interview protocol in the appendix.

Coding

The research process followed the approach of Saldaña (2013), with the researcher coding interviews in a multistep inductive process. The interview transcripts were first read to scan for emergent themes. Five primary areas emerged under the category of satisfaction: intellectual, emotional, relational, professional, and social change. The researcher sorted participant reflections on COVID-19 into a separate category.

After the initial categories were created, the researcher loaded and reviewed transcripts using NVivo, this time sorting commentary under established themes. Two subcategories were added to satisfaction due to the specificity and volume of relevant responses: pedagogy and ethics. Some text was grouped under multiple categories due to nuances or implications. All but one of the anticipated thematic categories—social change—was populated with substantial interview content.

Positionality Statement

The researcher serves as a staff member within the office for academic community engagement at the site of study. The role facilitates relationship development with faculty because it supports instructors integrating community partnership and community-based expertise into coursework through introductions to community-based initiatives and actors, development of research and project collaborations, consultations around community-based pedagogy, and funding for honoraria, transportation, and supplies. It is likely that the researcher's role within the institution and the positive professional relationships between participants and researcher shaped the ability of participants to open up personally relatively quickly during the interviews; furthermore, because the researcher was familiar with the courses taught by participants, she required less time establishing an understanding of the course activities and could grasp aims quickly. Simultaneously, however, because the researcher had previous relationships with the participants and knowledge of their courses, pure objectivity was impossible. The researcher attempted to hold assumptions about individual faculty at bay by using the same protocol across interviews and coding via NVivo wherein individual comments became grouped under common themes.

Limitations

One limitation is that of sample size: The small sample may constrain the level of saturation achieved in interviews and certainly does not create statistically generalizable results. A second is that of sample composition: The focus on one campus limits generalizability across institution; moreover, the inclusion of humanities and social sciences instructors alone may fail to capture important observations from other disciplines. A third is the lack of multiple coders or a system for member checking to enhance reliability. A fourth is that there is no standard measurement of satisfaction utilized that can provide a method for comparisons between faculty.

A fifth concern is that of slippage between categories. Admittedly, the categories sometimes share a degree of overlap. Pedagogical and intellectual satisfactions are two apt examples in which satisfactions may cross categories. In this case, the distinction was drawn by classifying pedagogical satisfaction as one that the participant specifically drew from the practice of teaching. The professional category provides another example: Categorizing comments under the professional classification required participant observations that allude to concerns or practices beyond that of research or teaching alone.

Although the methods do not create statistically generalizable results or comparisons that illuminate key variables, they are effective at surfacing rich information about faculty experiences and illuminating areas for future research.

Findings

Participants reflected upon the range of ways community-engaged teaching provides them with a sense of satisfaction in five distinct modes: pedagogical, professional, emotional, intellectual, and relational. These satisfactions are linked to intrinsic motivations the faculty member brings to the work. Commentaries linked to the particular influences of COVID-19 on satisfaction are reflected where they surfaced.

Pedagogical

All participants expressed satisfaction with the ability of community engagement to advance their student learning goals and shape their teaching practice. COVID-19 impacted the tools available and techniques employed but did not transform the satisfaction drawn from community-engaged teaching. Faculty reported that community-engaged teaching had introduced them to pedagogical practices designed to link theory to application pre-pandemic, which they have maintained.

Advancing Student Learning. Faculty who discussed pedagogy noted the satisfaction they derive from observation of student learning, particularly when applied toward community concerns. A comment from a nontenure track instructor in the humanities is illustrative:

There was a moment when I was teaching in [name of previous university]. It was the end of my time. I was a postdoc and it was the end of the semester. And one of my students said, “What responsibility do we have as residents of an urban neighborhood to understand the history of that neighborhood?” I was like, okay, mic drop. Cool, that’s it. I’ve achieved my goals.

A tenured social sciences faculty identified the opportunities for student life skills development through community engagement. She highlighted the benefits of her teaching when taking her students on a walking tour of a neighborhood:

A student who’s very young and very inexperienced in cities and definitely not a city like [city name], pulled me aside and he’s like, “Professor, we’re walking by everybody’s porches and stuff. Should I say, ‘hi,’ to people?” And I realized what an important learning opportunity.

Citing the importance of continued community-engaged teaching even in the face of obstacles on campus, a tenured faculty member in the social sciences noted:

The thing that is so obvious to me, to these students, to these faculty, to the staff, to the hundred people we've interviewed for our project ... it's what we are here for. Why else does a university exist? What else is this knowledge that we're creating for? It is for the students to see how meaningful it is to learn from this ... when we debriefed the next week, it was a very meaningful moment for me where one of the students said that it was so interesting to be there and to observe what was happening.

An important undercurrent is ethics. A tenured humanities faculty stressed the ways community partnership surfaces ethical issues that are central to his goals as teacher and person, noting:

The students are very good at talking about urban studies, talking about development theory, critiques of neoliberalism. They do that fine, but that's just intellectual knowledge. I'm trying to get at some kind of embodied knowledge, some kind of core that they can hold onto so that they can tell almost intuitively when something is right or wrong.

When asked to deepen the explanation, the faculty member shared the story of an in-class guest speaker who described a project in which community partners were tokenized:

So that became a kind of touchstone in the class that students came back to, because they could see palpably what gets left out. And the very genesis and the whole core of this arts project [which developed] was that.

As mirrored in the literature, the comments underscore the rewarding ways community engagement reinforces course learning goals and enlivens learning (Lewing & York, 2017). Community engagement offers opportunities to advance learning aims other than those tied exclusively to theoretical knowledge (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006).

Expanding Learning Beyond Academic Critique. Community engagement may provide a counterweight to normative practice of academic critique. Although a pre-tenure social science faculty member is comfortable with the norm in her research, she noted her discomfort in the classroom:

With students, it's really fragile and fraught. You see how it's fraught. You're just like, I've showed you that the world is a horrible place and that everyone that tries to solve the problems is terrible at it. So you've got these 18 to 21-year-olds looking at you, and you can't just leave them hanging there. You've got to be like, okay, let's give you some kind of hope or something positive. But at the same time, you don't want to actually tell them you're going to make the world a better place, because it's a difficult balance ... I feel better offering some possibility of hope, some entry into which they can see how the methods that we use, our approach to understanding the world, can offer positive possibilities.

Community partnership offers a practical means to link students to empowered engagement with the discipline and with contemporary problems, leading the faculty member to feel reassured that her course offers proactive strategies. These comments reflect faculty learning goals beyond the strict confines of the academic discipline (O'Meara, 2008).

Faculty participants did not indicate changed levels of pedagogical satisfaction teaching community-engaged courses pre- and post-COVID-19. Many, of course, had to pause community engagement activities during the pandemic due to limitations on in-person interaction among students, faculty, and partners. Any dips in faculty satisfaction with teaching methods arose from the perceived substandard nature of virtual community engagement or the need to postpone collaborations. As one nontenure track faculty member teaching in the humanities noted, "The face-to-face interaction, it made all the difference. Really, community engagement should be more about that." Satisfactions with teaching using a community-engaged framework were regained once public health restrictions were lifted and in-person teaching and collaborations resumed. Although COVID-19 forced a pause in engagement, faculty appetite for collaboration returned to pre-pandemic norms when conditions were deemed safe.

One notable outlying comment from a nontenure track humanities faculty was that additional course reading material began to replace the community-based work when engagement became impossible. This phenomenon proved challenging for the faculty who deemed the material stimulating and relevant, creating ambivalence for the faculty torn between competing activities once community work could be renewed. Although the faculty ultimately decided to resume in-person community work due to student enthusiasm and therefore shelve some readings, the choices the scenario created represent challenging pedagogical decisions for faculty caught within the space limitations of a semester.

Professional

Each of the participants raised issues of satisfaction linked to their professional lives. Comments revealed attention to long-term student learning, opportunities for professional development, and integration across careers, relatively unmarked by COVID-19.

Long-Term Student Learning

A number of participants expressed satisfaction that knowledge built in their courses would be used by students in the future. A nontenure track instructor in the humanities shared a representative response:

I'm so excited that my students are using Spanish to do something. That's one of my goals in life, is that they do something with the language. ... So the professional, it's very satisfying. It's very positive. When students tell me years after they took my class, "Oh, what I learned with you was really useful." That makes sense to my life, to my profession.

Participants realize that students might not recognize the value of course-based learning until a future moment. They understand that students will apply current learning to future experiences and contexts.

Opportunities for Professional Development

Teaching community-engaged courses, while typically more work for faculty due to logistics and relationship development, offer satisfying professional development opportunities. A nontenure track faculty in the social sciences remarked upon the participation of students in her community-engaged course:

Oh my God, it's amazing. I mean, I didn't know if I liked teaching or if I was a good teacher before I came here. I only taught as a TA [teaching assistant] when I was a graduate student. ... And so I came here being kind of indifferent to teaching. And I love it now. I feel very excited about it and really want to do more of it and get better at it because the students were so encouraging and so grateful.

Nontenure track instructors do not typically have the range of privileges afforded to tenure track faculty. Designing and teaching community-engaged courses, however, can offer a space for creativity. A nontenure track lecturer in the humanities whose initial community-engaged course ran in spring 2020, the same semester that COVID-19 shut down in-person learning, offered:

[Community engagement] has given me these open spaces where I can create, where I can do new things, where I'm not as confined by what I can do within my department. ... [It feels] empowering. I feel like I have more agency, that I'm more in control of where my professional life, my career is going.

The faculty member did not experience the impacts of COVID-19 on her course other than as obstacles to her projections for in-person engagement; a more significant takeaway was that community-engaged teaching offered her avenues for professional innovation and empowerment.

Alignment Across Careers

Finding coherence as a person and professional as well as alignment among one's interests is a critical element of faculty satisfaction. A nontenure track instructor in the humanities commented:

I've been a language teacher for many years, but that is very limiting to what I've been studying, what I'm interested about, what I've been writing about, and what I've been preparing myself to do. So, sometimes I felt, periods in my time, in my life that I don't necessarily feel that congruence. But lately, more and more I've been finding ways to bridge these two parts of my professional life, with teaching freshman seminars, creating new courses [both of which include community engagement]. ... And those are the moments when I feel like my work and who I am really come together.

Participants acknowledge that the effort to align professional aims with community-based commitments may require the span of a career. Each articulated the satisfaction experienced when components of their identity and values met via community-engaged practice.

According to these interviews, COVID-19 has not prompted a change in professional directions as linked to community-engaged faculty work.

Emotional

Faculty expressed a range of emotional responses from which they derive satisfactions or dissatisfactions. Nine of the 11 participants described their emotional responses to community engagement but did not find that COVID-19 played a particularly transformative role. Emotions triggered both positive sensations, such as satisfaction or contentment, and also sentiments that provoke disappointment or frustration. Although uncomfortable, these latter set of emotions could ultimately generate positive outcomes. Although fewer participants spoke specifically to emotional satisfactions than to intellectual and pedagogical gratifications, those who did expressed strong and unqualified emotions.

A tenured faculty from the humanities reflected upon a moment in class in which students observed a community partner learn that a local committee had been used by a community-based organization to forward the organization's goals without consultation. The participant noted:

I was moved. I'm trying to remember the emotions. Yeah, I found it very emotional. I may have teared up a little bit. I got a sense of outrage again, even though I was fairly sure that [the community-based organization] hadn't included the local committee. ... So that sort of gave me a sense of vindication that I felt like, "I'm right about this. This is something that I can stake my beliefs on." ... And I can respond on an emotional level and then I can go back and check, "Is this right? How do I act on this? So I guess the point is I learn a lot by folding in community engaged interactions in my class, too."

Although initially upsetting, the emotional response described unlocks ethical and intellectual gratifications: The participant's sense that he could trust his gut and his brain and find coherence in his practice.

Not every emotional response to community-engaged teaching manifested as a satisfaction. A tenured participant from the social sciences reflects upon the frustration, she experienced when a campus unit decided against collaborating with her on a community-based project with implications for teaching and research:

I guess I'm just going to say they didn't even explain. They just said, "I'm sorry, we're not interested." ... So you can maybe see that I verge between loving what I do, and I [then] feel like, can you see the chip on my shoulder? ... I have a chip that's so big.

Participant responses highlighted the reality that faculty emotions shape experiences and contributions to campus. Intrinsic motivations to adopt community-engaged pedagogy may link to convictions tightly connected to a sense of self and identity (Calice et al., 2022; Lewing & York, 2017). Research on the multiple emotions of students during epistemic activities offers insights that might be applied to the

faculty learning process (Pekrun et al., 2017). The role of disquieting emotional responses in faculty evolution of and satisfaction with community engagement invites further inquiry beyond the COVID-19 moment.

Intellectual

Eight of the 11 participants specifically referenced the satisfaction they derive from the intellectual experience of engaging students in community-based and -informed concerns. They underscored the edification of developing new modes of thinking and learning; absorbing new knowledge prompted by evolving social realities; connecting theory to lived experience, cocreating knowledge; and learning alongside others, whether those others be students, fellow university instructors, or community members. For some, COVID-19 has partially reshaped the context for community engagement, allowing for opportunities to imagine other possibilities, although a variety of social concerns simultaneously create the landscape.

The comments of a tenured faculty member in the humanities are illustrative. Speaking to the process of uncovering new information, coproducing knowledge, and engaging in research afforded by community-engaged work, she posited:

I think that the biggest draw [to community-engaged teaching and learning] is research ... if you're working with [local nonprofits], then this is original work that is going to go right back to the audiences that you've engaged with, and they are ready to read, they want to know. ... So it's really fantastic.

Community-engaged teaching and research dovetails in opportunities to contribute to knowledge production and connections between the abstract and the applied. It connects the scholar's work as instructor to that of researcher. The work is intrinsically gratifying because it has immediate audiences given its contemporary relevance.

A lecturer in humanities described the way the rhetoric and policy of the Trump Administration around immigration caused him to engage in a new intellectual journey as he rethought his community-engaged course materials and partnerships:

Little by little I found things that I was not reading when I was a graduate student or even my first professional year as a linguist. But now I was finding new things that speak about language but connect it to history, to politics. And that has become part of the class ... the synchrony in the class is really amazing and it works really amazingly well.

The faculty member finds intellectual engagement and satisfaction in the new direction the course has taken due to the demands of the contemporary sociopolitical moment and the connections with the community members and organizations linked to the course.

In spite of the difficulties of COVID-19, participants expressed appreciation for the chance to rethink tools for their community-engaged teaching practice. A tenured faculty member in the humanities noted, "I felt like I learned the role that Zoom interviews have. Wouldn't have thought, but we did some really incredible ones during the pandemic and so that was good. That was really good. A real positive."

A pre-tenure faculty in the social sciences likewise reflected upon the reconsiderations prompted by COVID-19:

Face-to-face interaction is important, but at the same time, I think the COVID situation offered possibilities for different definition of communities. ... The possibility of the remote type of engagement might open up a door for identifying the type of communities that have fallen outside of our imagination in the past.

The faculty goes on to note the opportunities faculty and students had to rethink community engagement provoked by COVID-19:

As far as I'm concerned, creativity comes from that kind of constraint. It's something that students can learn from that as opposed to just have an unlimited amount [of resources] on which they can put a band aid, so to speak.

Evolving modes of thinking about community engagement occasioned by COVID-19 is a generative exercise for faculty and students that may lead to novel approaches and frameworks along with some unanticipated positive results.

Participant reflections on the intellectual satisfactions of community-engaged teaching echoed previous research that some faculty perceive public engagement as core to the process of intellectual exploration and discovery (Boyte, 2004). O'Meara (2013) further substantiated this finding by sampling a diverse and broad group of faculty. Remote and hybrid community/university collaborations triggered by COVID-19 have created opportunities for faculty intellectual exploration, as they reconsider or reimagine modes of engagement.

Relational

Seven of the 11 participants described the gratification of developing relationships with students during community-engaged teaching, both before and after the pandemic. Some noted the interplay between building relationships with community partners and with students. Although this category links to pedagogical, emotional, and professional satisfactions, it is discussed separately because of the frequency of its mention and distinct characteristics.

Most participants shared their delight in building relationships with students in nontraditional ways via community-engaged teaching. Their courses offer opportunities for informal conversation during off-site experiences and insights into students as whole persons through reflective assignments and classroom discussions. A nontenure track instructor in the social sciences reflected upon the process of accompanying students, as they learned about the impacts of historical and global forces:

It's rewarding, personally, to see that process unfold right before your eyes. I think of it as a ... I don't know, it's weird. I just almost said a blessing ... It's not totally articulated in my brain, but I feel like there are very few things that seem so spiritual, interpersonal, and really connect me to other people, like my students, and then to some of the issues that I'm also experiencing and learning about. So I like building that relationship and community around learning about the world that we inhabit and how to change it.

The participant surprised himself as he described the integrative and interpersonal experience of working with students in community-engaged classes, particularly as students grapple with important contemporary social issues.

A lecturer trained in the humanities shared the centrality of student relationship development with faculty and with community partners to pedagogical practice:

I want students to develop a good moral education, and I want to be a part of facilitating that. And so those things come together for me in ways that I think my community-engaged partners are just as much collaborators with me as my colleagues on campus. ... When I paired those relationships with this move for moral education, that's where students get so excited to work on problems that matter outside the bounds of the university.

The participant later linked the relationships built with students and community partners through shared travel, meals hosted at her home, and off-campus work days as contributing to satisfaction, noting gratitude for the personal/professional "cohesion" experienced when research and teaching aims align with a personal value system. Relationship development features as a key component of the faculty's teaching strategy to enhance holistic student learning.

Multiple participants expressed appreciation for opportunities to share spaces on and off campus post-COVID-19 to build interpersonal connections. As a tenured faculty member in the social sciences

remarked, “I feel like [for] the course, there was a real buoy in the courses that first semester back. We were just all so grateful to be there. A lot of goodwill from the students and appreciation of that effort.”

Yet it is notable that the faculty alluded to the temporary effect of COVID-19 on students’ appreciation for in-person interaction, suggesting the fleeting nature of the impact as normalcy returned. Overall, faculty did not report a significant shift or reevaluation of relationships forged via community-engaged courses in the wake of the pandemic. Most did note the delight and gratitude they experienced when able to return to in-person engagement with students and partners for relational and practical pedagogical purposes but did not articulate newfound commitment to the approach resulting from the pandemic.

Outliers to the sense of a generalized return to normalcy reflected on the power of community partner relationships and their effect on students and on teaching practice. One remarked upon evaluations received at the end of the spring 2020 semester in which students emphasized the power of an in-person historical walking tour concentrated on racialized and gendered practices of oppression conducted pre-shutdown. This instructor referenced the ways he still attempts to hold onto the spirit of those evaluations, remarking that “it [COVID-19] solidified, I think, my commitments to really trying to create a dynamic where we’re not just staying in the bubble of higher ed[ucation], but trying to build relationships and do other kinds of work.”

The instructor expressed awareness of the power of relational learning the pandemic crystalized for the students, which has reinforced his commitments to this mode of teaching.

A resonant comment was made by an instructor trained in the humanities:

COVID made many of these relationships possible ... they came together through Zoom, and we started meeting and we met regularly. Our calendars were clearer than other times. So we were meeting really regularly and we started to form relationships, and then we started to meet each other in-person. And then we started to go on these trips because now we’re from all these different places. ... When we are travelling together, we’re kind of a motley crew that would’ve never known each other if it weren’t for COVID, and we would’ve never had the time to get to know each other if it weren’t for COVID. So yes, it [COVID-19] did drastically change [my community partnerships]. It made possible connections across geographical space that we would not have ever even conceptualized as needing each other.

The faculty member acknowledged the ways the pandemic altered interactions with and openness to community partners, recognizing the profound ways COVID-19 shifted capacity to engage with kindred thought partners across usual divisions of place and time. These shifts have altered the opportunities for students enrolled in the faculty’s courses, creating space for exchange and encounter previously unimagined.

Discussion

Participants experienced diverse types of satisfactions from the practice of community-engaged teaching. They did not articulate that COVID-19 significantly altered the gratification they experienced from it nor did they express newfound commitment to its use. The lack of face-to-face community engagement during the pandemic prompted faculty to reflect upon the value of community work but did not generate a reprioritization of community-engaged teaching. COVID-19 caused some faculty to deepen pedagogical modifications they were already exploring pre-pandemic, such as less reliance on lectures and traditional exams or essays and more emphasis on experiential learning paired with assignments with real-world applications. These modifications were described by participants as facilitating factors for productive and satisfying teaching.

Given the existing research on the dispositions of faculty required for effective community-engaged teaching, perhaps it is not surprising that participants did not articulate modified commitments to community engagement: The literature demonstrates that a best practice in the field is faculty flexibility and resilience in the face of changing realities for community partners. Effective community-engaged

pedagogy requires faculty to accommodate the dynamic conditions partners face and make the necessary course corrections throughout the semester to sustain collaboration (Felten & Clayton, 2011). This practice intensified during the pandemic, as community partners and institutions of higher education alike were forced to modify collaborations and assignments, while maintaining the integrity of course learning goals and commitments (Mejia, 2021; Reif-Stice & Smith-Friggerio, 2021). Might the skills faculty develop via community engagement have translated to the demands for flexibility and perpetual pivoting during COVID-19-era teaching? Faculty committed and accustomed to community engagement may be less agitated by changes in external conditions than those working within the confines of a classroom. These questions reach beyond the contours of this study but could feed a future generative line of inquiry. They also suggest that faculty who paused their partnerships during the pandemic might have unique insights about the impact of COVID-19 and different levels of satisfaction with community-engaged teaching. Furthermore, it is important to note the timing of this study, in spring 2023 once the University was “back to normal” post-COVID-19; perhaps if faculty had been interviewed in the midst of the pandemic, more pointed comments regarding desire and appreciation for the satisfactions of community partnerships would have surfaced.

Notably faculty participants in this study spoke least frequently about community-oriented gratifications and most frequently about pedagogical and professional satisfactions. When social change goals were identified, they figured as a corollary to student learning and intellectual inquiry, functions faculty may perceive as more aligned with the core mission of the university. This observation highlights the importance of CEP attention to community partner priorities if campus programs are to uphold the community-engaged learning principle of mutual benefit (Dostilio et al., 2012).

Although the interview questions were designed to elicit commentary on satisfaction, conversations often shifted away from a focus on discrete types of satisfaction toward the gratification of attaining coherence across one’s identities through community-engaged teaching. The integration of the personal with the professional is an overarching aim that afforded participants the opportunity to experience alignment between oneself as faculty scholar (instructor, researcher, and colleague) and human. The types of satisfaction may build toward a sense of congruence for faculty; some interviewed for this study experienced two or three distinct types, whereas others resonated with all five modes delineated.

Implications for Campuses

Universities possess levers to improve opportunities for community-engaged teaching by enhancing relevant professional development opportunities, administrative support, and technological support, thereby bolstering the possibility for extrinsic satisfactions (Rosser, 2005). Higher education administration could also maintain commitments to the academic freedom of faculty to choose community-engaged teaching in recognition of intrinsically motivated faculty satisfactions. Universities could improve the rewards and incentives for faculty community-engaged teaching and develop structures that support faculty learning about community-engaged teaching (Furco, 2016; Furco & Moely, 2012; O’Meara, 2003). Institutional coherence and consistency between a rhetorical commitment to community engagement and the policies and practices that affect faculty are also key (Holland, 2019). Although COVID-19 did not appear to significantly change faculty appreciation for or use of community-engaged teaching, it has drawn attention to the diminished morale and satisfaction levels of faculty across the higher education landscape and prompted conversation around remedies.

Although the research may inform the work of university administrators and department chairs interested in retention and morale, as well as community-engaged faculty crafting teaching statements or dossiers for promotion, it has a distinct resonance for campus CEPs. Faculty satisfaction and willingness to engage with community-engaged teaching shape campus efforts to sustain academic collaborations between universities and community partners: Without faculty participation, robust partnerships are impossible. If CEPs understand faculty motivations as fostered by a drive to experience satisfaction through coherence of identities, then they can more effectively craft suitable programming. Programming may include activities that prompt faculty to articulate a professional identity as community-engaged

scholar that integrates the professional with the personal and speaks to the varied rewards. These efforts may be particularly valuable when academic departments do not address faculty interests in community-oriented work due to competing priorities or constraints. Just as best practices in service- and community-engaged learning include reflection exercises to foster learning for students, capacity-building for faculty should also include reflection facilitated by CEPs (Ash & Clayton, 2009). CEPs, in concert with or independent of faculty, can play a role in discussing and disseminating lessons and developing theoretical frames in peer-reviewed work that discuss programming.

The responses of nontenure track instructors in this study underscore the opportunities community engagement offers for professional/personal congruence. CEPs can offer focused opportunities to develop pedagogical practices and explore innovation nontenure track faculty may not have access to within their academic departments or the larger university. Recent scholarship suggests that nontenure track faculty who report feelings of isolation also see value in community-based-learning office programming if it feeds intrinsic motivations (Matthews & Wilder, 2018).

It may be valuable for these offices to deepen supports that not only provide training on pedagogy and research but also consider ways to lift up the community-engaged expertise that these faculty have for the benefit of both tenure and nontenure track peers; furthermore, the offices can develop programming that allows nontenure community-engaged faculty to explore the personal and professional alignment they experience or are developing, particularly as they are ineligible for the range of opportunities designed for ladder faculty.

Although not explored in this study, another key population group is that of graduate students. As examined in recent literature, today's graduate student population is demographically more diverse, more attuned to their identities, and more eager to construct approaches to community engagement that reflect their personal and professional commitments than previous generations (Borkoski & Prosser, 2021; Doberneck et al., 2017; Post et al., 2016). This reality offers CEPs on-ramps to partnerships with academic departments willing to collaborate around capacity-building around community-engaged frameworks, pedagogy, and reflection.

Future research may explore several directions. It could expand the sample to broaden and increase faculty types and disciplines—and include graduate students—via surveys, interviews, or focus groups, thereby strengthening the generalizability of findings. CEPs could extend the interviews to investigate sentiments at a broader set of higher education institutions; they could also be incorporated into the process to share and evaluate existing programming models for pertinent faculty development.

Conclusion

As higher education adapts to new demands, it would benefit from understanding experiences that create faculty satisfaction in the workplace. Although the theme of faculty satisfaction in community-engaged teaching existed pre-COVID-19, this research extends the exploration by engaging faculty following their pandemic experiences to examine any shifts. The interviews conducted for this study underscore the findings of recent literature on the impact of COVID-19 on faculty satisfaction, well-being, and morale. They encourage institutions to support faculty by developing community, expressing respect, and building relationships of trust (Kowler et al., 2023). Pedagogical, professional, emotional, intellectual, and relational satisfactions forged in community-engaged courses can serve as an opportunity to cultivate well-being and satisfaction for faculty. The research provides insights into the ways community-engaged teaching offers faculty opportunities to experience coherence across scholarly and personal identities that sustain and enliven their work.

References

- Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 5–17.
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjcs/3239521.0009.101/1>

- Abu-Alruz, J., & Khasawneh, S. (2013). Professional identity of faculty members at higher education institutions: A criterion for workplace success. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 18(4), 431–442. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13596748.2013.847235>
- Ahern-Dodson, J., Garvin, L., & Lyon, M. L. (2023). Faculty flourishing. In L. Garvin, P. H. Clayton, & K. Medlin (Eds.), *Contributions of civic and community engagement series*. North Carolina Campus Engagement. <https://nccampusengagement.org/wp-content/uploads/Faculty-Flourishing.pdf>
- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 803–830. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-6226-6>
- Anderson-Levitt, K., van Draanen, J., & Davis, H. M. (2017). Coherence, dissonance, and personal style in learning to teach. *Teaching Education*, 28(4), 377–392. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10476210.2017.1306505>
- Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). Generating, deepening, and documenting learning: The power of critical reflection in applied learning. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1), 25–48. <https://hdl.handle.net/1805/4579>
- Bartel, A. S., & Castillo, D. A. (2021). Introduction. In *The scholar as human*. Cornell University Press. <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/62207>
- Beaulieu, M., Breton, M., & Brousselle, A. (2018). Conceptualizing 20 years of engaged scholarship: A scoping review. *PLoS One*, 13(2), e0193201. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193201>
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2), 107–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001>
- Borkoski, C., & Prosser, S. K. (2021). Developing faculty identity as a community engaged scholar: An unexamined barrier to promoting the public mission. In A. Papadimitriou & M. Boboc (Eds.), *Re-envisioning higher education's public mission*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55716-4_5
- Boyte, H. C. (2004). *Going public: Academics and public life*. Kettering Foundation. <https://www.kettering.org/catalog/product/going-public-academics-and-public-life>
- Brownell, S. E., & Tanner, K. D. (2012). Barriers to faculty pedagogical change: Lack of training, time, incentives, and...tensions with professional identity? *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 11(4), 339–346. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.12-09-0163>
- Calice, M. N., Beets, B., Bao, L., Scheufele, D. A., Freiling, I., Brossard, D., Feinstein, N. W., Heisler, L., Tangen, T., & Handelsman, J. (2022). Public engagement: Faculty lived experiences and perspectives underscore barriers and a changing culture in academia. *PLoS One*, 17(6), e0269949. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269949>
- Celio, C. I., Durlak, J., & Dymnicki, A. (2011). A meta-analysis of the impact of service-learning on students. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 34(2), 164–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10538259110340>
- Chen, C. Y. (2023). Are professors satisfied with their jobs? The factors that influence professors' job satisfaction. *SAGE Open*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181515>
- Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2006(105), 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.221>

- Cooper, J. R. (2014). Ten years in the trenches: Faculty perspectives on sustaining service-learning. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 37(4), 415–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053825913513721>
- Couillou, R. J., McGee, B. L., Carr, A. S., & Lamberth, T. (2023). Pandemic partnerships: Community/university experiences with community-based learning in the COVID-19 era. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 46(3), 319–341. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10538259221145935>
- Darby, A., & Newman, G. (2014). Exploring faculty members' motivation and persistence in academic service-learning pedagogy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(2), 91–119. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1029981.pdf>
- Doberneck, D. M., Bargerstock, B. A., McNall, M., Van Egeren, L., & Zientek, R. (2017). Community engagement competencies for graduate and professional students: Michigan State University's approach to professional development. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 24(1), 122–142. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167119.pdf>
- Dostilio, L. D. (Ed.). (2017). *The community engagement professional in higher education: A competency model for an emerging field*. Campus Compact.
- Dostilio, L. D., Harrison, B., Brackmann, S. M., Kliever, B. W., Edwards, K. E., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Reciprocity: Saying what we mean and meaning what we say. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(1), 17–33. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjcs/3239521.0019.102/1>
- Enyedy, N., Goldberg, J., & Welsh, K. M. (2006). Complex dilemmas of identity and practice. *Science Education*, 90(1), 68–93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20096>
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., Stenson, C., & Gray, C. J. (2001). At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions and communities, 1993–2000: Third edition. *Higher Education*, 139. <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered/139>
- Felten, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2011). Service-learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2011(128), 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.470>
- Furco, A. (2016). Institutionalising service-learning in higher education. In *Higher education and civic engagement: International perspectives* (pp. 65–82). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315586786>
- Furco, A., & Moely, B. E. (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(1), 128–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2012.11777237>
- Garvin, M. C., & Acosta Lewis, E. (2022). Reasons faculty teach, or do not teach, service-learning courses in a pandemic: The role of faculty investment and clues for the future of service-learning. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 12, 3. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v12i0.1311>
- Holland, B. (2016). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 20(1), 63–71. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1097178.pdf>
- Hou, S. I., & Wilder, S. (2015). Changing pedagogy: Faculty adoption of service-learning: Motivations, barriers, and strategies among service-learning faculty at a public research institution. *SAGE Open*, 5(1), 2158244015572283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015572283>
- Houston, D., Meyer, L. H., & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workloads and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 28(1), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800500283734>

- Ismayilova, K., & Klassen, R. M. (2019). Research and teaching self-efficacy of university faculty: Relations with job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 98, 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.08.012>
- Kelchtermans, G. (2005). Teachers' emotions in educational reforms: Self-understanding, vulnerable commitment and micro political literacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(8), 995–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.06.009>
- Kenny, J. (2018). Re-empowering academics in a corporate culture: An exploration of workload and performativity in a university. *Higher Education*, 75, 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0143-z>
- Khiatani, P. V., She, M. H. C., Ho, O. Y. Y., & Liu, J. K. K. (2023). Service-learning under COVID-19: A scoping review of the challenges and opportunities for practicing service-learning in the 'new normal.' *International Journal of Educational Development*, 100, 102813. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102813>
- Korthagen, F. A. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(1), 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.10.002>
- Kowler, S. M., Rubin, O., & Shpergel, S. (2023). Resilience in higher education in times of crisis. *Journal of Higher Education Theory & Practice*, 23(4). <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v23i4.5900>
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices. *Peer Review*, 10(4), 30.
- Kuh, G. D., & Kinzie, J. (2018). *What really makes a 'high-impact' practice high impact*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2018/05/01/kuh-and-kinzie-respond-essay-questioning-high-impact-practices-opinion>
- Lewing, J. M., & York, P. E. (2017). Millennial generation faculty: Why they engage in service learning. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*, 9(3), 35–47. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1271566.pdf>
- Matthews, P., & Wilder, S. (2018). “Cutting edge” or “ridiculously isolated”? Charting the identities, experiences and perspectives of full-time, non-tenure track faculty engaged in service-learning. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 6(1), 1–14. <https://ijrslce.scholasticahq.com/>
- Mejia, A. P. (2021). “Plan for the worst, hope for the best, but realistically, expect a combination of both”: Lessons and best practices emerging from community-engaged teaching during a health crisis. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 25(3). <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/2556>
- Moore, T. L., & Ward, K. (2010). Institutionalizing faculty engagement through research, teaching, and service at research universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 17(1), 44–58. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ950765.pdf>
- O'Meara, K. (2003). Reframing incentives and rewards for community service-learning and academic outreach. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 8(2), 201–220. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/628>
- O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7–30. <https://ojs01.galib.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/518>

- O'Meara, K. (2013). Research on faculty motivations for service learning and community engagement. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vol. 2A, pp. 215–244). Stylus.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003446750>
- O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., Lennartz, C., & Braxton, J. (2022). Leveraging nudges to improve the academic workplace: Challenges and possibilities. In L. W. Perna (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 37, pp. 277–346). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-76660-3_9
- O'Meara, K., Eatman, T., & Petersen, S. (2015). Advancing engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure: A roadmap and call for reform. *Liberal Education*, 101(3), n3. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1095096>
- O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is...How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(1), 17–32.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ888071.pdf>
- Oppenheim-Shachar, S. (2021). Shaping a 'pedagogical voice' using feminist pedagogical principles. *Gender and Education*, 33(6), 773–789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2020.1837350>
- Pekrun, R., Vogl, E., Muis, K. R., & Sinatra, G. M. (2017). Measuring emotions during epistemic activities: The epistemically-related emotion scales. *Cognition and Emotion*, 31(6), 1268–1276.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2016.1204989>
- Peterson, D., Perry, J. A., Dostilio, L., & Zambo, D. (2016). Community-engaged faculty: A must for preparing impactful Ed. D. graduates. *Metropolitan Universities*, 27(2), 59–73.
<https://doi.org/10.18060/21127>
- Post, M. A., Ward, E., Longo, N. V., & Saltmarsh, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Publicly engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education*. Stylus.
- Reif-Stice, C., & Smith-Frigerio, S. (2021). Communication, flexibility, and resilience: Navigating the shift to virtual service-learning during COVID-19. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 76(4), 477–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769582110225>
- Rosser, V. J. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 81–107.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-6290-y>
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, & B. A. Holland (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (pp. 3–29). IAP Information Age Publishing. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2009-21256-001>
- Sell, A. J. (2023). Contextual factors associated with the morale of academic and support staff in universities. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 27, 41–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2023.2167016>
- Smith, M. (2022, January 14). Professor who predicted 'The great resignation' shares the 3 trends that will dominate work in 2022. CNBC.
<https://www.cnbc.com/2022/01/14/the-great-resignation-expert-shares-the-biggest-work-trends-of-2022.html>
- Stoecker, R., & Tryon, E. A. (Eds.). (2009). *The unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning*. Temple University Press.

- Sylvan, L., & Becker, R. (2022). Implementing service-learning projects for the first time during the pandemic: Two instructors' inspiration, motivation and goals. *Collaborations: A Journal of Community-Based Research and Practice*, 5(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.33596/coll.93>
- Tugend, A. (2020). *On the verge of burnout: COVID-19's impact on faculty wellbeing and career plans*. Fidelity Brokerage Services and The Chronicle of Higher Education. https://connect.chronicle.com/rs/931-EKA-218/images/Covid%26FacultyCareerPaths_Fidelity_ResearchBrief_v3%20%281%29.pdf
- Veyvoda, M. A., & Van Cleave, T. J. (2020). Re-imagining community-engaged learning: Service-learning in communication sciences and disorders courses during and after COVID-19. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 5(6), 1542–1551. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_PERSP-20-00146
- Weinrach, S. G., Thomas, K. R., & Chan, F. (2001). The professional identity of contributors to the journal of counseling & development: Does it matter? *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 79(2), 166–170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01956.x>
- Welch, M., & Plaxton-Moore, S. (2019). *The craft of community-engaged teaching and learning: A guide for faculty development*. Campus Compact.
- Winfield, J. D., & Paris, J. H. (2022). A mixed method analysis of burnout and turnover intentions among higher education professionals during COVID-19. *Journal of Education Human Resources*, e20210048. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jehr-2021-0048>
- Zahneis, M. (2022, December 1). A rare survey of faculty morale shows that the pandemic's effects continue to ripple. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/a-rare-survey-of-faculty-morale-shows-that-the-pandemics-effects-continue-to-ripple>

Note

The Princeton University Institutional Review Board approved the research design and instruments (#15503).

Appendix

Interview Protocol

Introduction

Through previous and ongoing research, we know quite a bit about the benefits of community-engaged teaching and learning for students. We also know something about faculty motivations for community-engaged teaching, their planning, execution, and evaluation methods, and the obstacles they confront. What we don't know much about are the personal experiences of faculty, while using community-engaged pedagogy which may contribute toward a sense of satisfaction or fulfillment. Meanwhile, we know that COVID-19 has affected everyone's teaching in some way. This study seeks to bring two streams of research together: an exploration of faculty experiences using community-engaged methods and a discussion of COVID-era considerations of personal satisfaction in the teaching profession.

I will start with some demographic questions. I will then ask about your approaches and experiences conducting community-engaged teaching. I will end with questions regarding your experiences of community-engaged teaching during and following the peak of COVID.

Questions

- Background
 - How many years have you been teaching at this university?
 - How many years have you been teaching in total?
 - What is your title and rank?
 - With which departments, programs, and centers are you affiliated?
 - If you have been affiliated with other higher education institutions, what have been your positions?
 - What is your disciplinary training?
 - What methods do you use in your research? Do you teach these methods in your courses, including community-engaged?
- Broadly speaking, what is satisfying about your work as an instructor?
 - What enhances that satisfaction?
 - What limits it?
- What are your strengths as an instructor?
- What do you struggle with or question about your teaching?
- Is there congruence between who you are as a person and who you are as a teacher? A professional?
- Are you currently teaching any community-engaged courses?
- What community-engaged courses have you taught in the past?
- Discuss the ways you integrate community engagement into your courses.
- Discuss your rationale for incorporating community engagement into your courses.
- What impact has community engagement had on students learning?
- What is the experience of integrating community engagement like for you as an instructor?
- If you use community-engaged methods in your own research, are there any aspects that impact your scholarly work?
- Has community-engaged teaching impacted your personal experience of teaching this or other courses?
- Is incorporating community engagement into your courses satisfying?
- What dispositions are required for community-engaged teaching? Why?
- Does your rank shape facilitate your ability to incorporate community engagement?
- What are the obstacles to incorporating community engagement into your courses?
- How do these obstacles influence your decisions?
- Do you have recommendations for how to facilitate community-engaged teaching on campus?
- The overall U.S. workforce is understood to be going through a reckoning as a result of COVID. Have you? If so, have there been any implications for your teaching?
- Does the experience of COVID influence your desire or ability to teach using community-engaged methods?
- Have elements of teaching a community-engaged course changed since COVID?

About the Author

Tara Carr-Lemke serves as associate director at the Program for Community-Engaged Scholarship at Princeton. Her research centers on sanctuary policy, immigrant entrepreneurship, and community-engaged teaching (email: carrlemke@princeton.edu).