Writing and Publishing Community-Engaged Scholarship: Advice for Junior Faculty on Promotion, Publishing, and Craft

John Forester[1] and Anna Sims Bartel[2]
[1]Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University
[2]David M. Einhorn Center for Community Engagement, Cornell University

ABSTRACT

This article offers research-based advice on how to write and publish community-engaged scholarship (CES), with special emphasis on success in career-building and academic publishing contexts. It further offers a snapshot of a program designed to build a faculty community of practice for advancing publication of CES. Publishing CES throws into stark relief the tensions between what's accessible and valuable to communities and what's recognizable and admirable to academics who hold power over community-engaged scholars' careers.

Keywords: publication, academic, career, advancement, tenure, writing, research, community of practice, faculty fellows program

The disconnect between the ongoing needs of communities and the career needs of scholars remains a persistent and troubling challenge of community-engaged research and scholarship. Academics who bring their research to bear on issues of public life with community partners often feel forced to choose how to focus their scholarly production: Do we contribute research publicly with how-to guides, searchable databases, accessible exhibits, even policy analyses, or do we contribute to our academic disciplines via journal articles and monographs that can ground theory, demonstrate the value of new methods, engage in critical debates in "the literature," or try to push the boundaries of our fields? Can we make our work both available to communities who can use it and compelling to those reviewing our prospects of reappointment, promotion, or tenure?

Too often, these challenges seem intractable. At times, senior scholars and review committees have seen community-engaged scholarship as less rigorous or less committed to our disciplines than conventional scholarship. Editors have allowed academic writing to become so jargon-laden that much of it is accessible only to insiders. Community concerns and academic interests seem rarely to converge. None of that bodes well for a form of rooted and accountable research that aspires to be collaborative: co-generated with and responsive to community partners, yet still contributing to boundary-pushing disciplinary knowledge (Peters et al., 2005; Peters 2003).

Nevertheless, as the "translational research" field has shown (Wethington & Dunifon, 2012), public interests in academic discovery are substantial, so the practical and institutional challenge remains: to co-produce research and scholarship that both serves public purposes and secures engaged researchers the advancement they need to enrich their disciplines and the public realm. Diane Doberneck and Christine Carmichael (2020), for example, offer a valuable formula for a both/and approach in their article "Unfurling Your Community-Engaged Work into Multiple Scholarly Products"—but in a tight time and resource economy, scholar-practitioners may need to make hard choices.

Little empirical work explores how community-engaged researchers might thread this needle. How might individual researchers productively navigate systems of academic training, institutional culture, "review, promotion, and tenure" (R/P/T) practices, scholarly publishing, and faculty mentorship to secure careers as public scholars? In this essay we present an exploratory survey and broader discussion that gathers advice and reflections from published authors and editors of engaged scholarship, and we describe one successful programmatic effort to support engaged scholars concerned with these issues. We focus upon difficulties and opportunities of writing and publishing for academic journals, not on research design.

Given that different disciplines use a range of terms, we wish to be clear that we understand the domain of community-based scholarship (CES) to include but extend beyond the often more technically delimited domain of community-based research (CER). "Community-engaged scholarship can apply to teaching (e.g., service-learning), research (e.g., community-based participatory research), community-responsive clinical and population-based care (e.g., community-oriented primary care, academic public health practice), and service (e.g., community service, outreach, advocacy)" (Calleson et al., 2005). And CES can encompass a range of forms that may or may not hew to particular quantitative academic conventions and standards, aiming as it does to meet multiple needs at once. To us, then, as to many of the journals that publish CES, publishable work might include historical assessments, ethnographic work and case studies, interpretive studies of organizational outreach efforts, even book reviews and op-eds that collaboratively bridge scholarly work and public interest. Students and faculty might work with communities to survey, compare, and draw lessons from 10 years of historic preservation efforts, for example. They might work with communities on flooding or other natural disaster response efforts to try to learn from them (Reardon et al., 2015). They might partner with local organizations to co-create plays on issues of local concern, rooted in local stories. While intellectual rigor is always vital to any CES enterprise, scholarly form can vary from intensely, quantitatively academic to less formally, community-responsive. Diverse resources from the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (https://ccphealth.org/register-2/welcome/) and the Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit (www.communityengagedscholarship.info) illustrate some powerful approaches to CES, while Imagining America, for example, offers others. Our view here is capacious and generous, recognizing that much good work insists upon competing visions of rigor, and that these tensions are what make CES so important and so challenging to publish.

This essay rests on two premises. First, we believe that both statistical and ethnographic methods may contribute to excellent scholarship. Either statistical or ethnographic methods can be careful, rigorous, and systematic in their own domains or, alternatively, careless, sloppy, and haphazard. Jordan et al. (2007, p. 7) acknowledge as much in writing in the Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion and Tenure Package: "It is important to note here that 'significant results' is intended to be broadly defined and not only 'statistically significant results."

Second, we believe that the challenges of writing, publishing, and promotion are daunting for junior faculty who are interested in either community-engaged research or scholarship (cf. Jordan, 2007; https://ccphealth.org/the-community-engaged-scholarship-review-promotion-tenure-package-2/). But we suspect that in the fields of community-engaged scholarship in particular these challenges are still more ambiguous, disciplinarily varied, and ill-defined. In fields of public health and education, conventions of systematic research and rigor might well vary less than they will in the fields of history, anthropology, journalism, and theatre arts (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). We try to address in what follows, then, issues that junior faculty are likely to face not only in the narrower

domain of disciplinary community-engaged research but in the broader and more diverse domain of community-engaged scholarship.

METHOD

Casting a Wide and Exploratory Net

So, how might junior faculty who hope to publish community-engaged scholarship actually do that without jeopardizing their prospects of reappointment and promotion? We sent simple queries to several dozen authors who had published community-engaged scholarship successfully. How did they do it? What would they recommend to junior faculty worried about their publication records and promotion prospects but wishing to partner with and learn from communities in their scholarship?

Our respondents were identified through several exploratory methods. Limiting our scope to North American institutions, we assembled pools of editors, editorial boards, and frequent contributors to journals that publish engaged scholarship. We also included faculty recognized as regional officers of Campus Compact or as leadership of university service-learning offices. We leave to future research how our practical findings have resonance outside the North American context.

Our list of journals developed primarily by using online resources available through Campus Compact, university service-learning offices, and university library research guides. Those sources identified journals addressing engaged scholarship as well as more disciplinarily focused journals frequently publishing engaged research. We decided to draw only from the former group to narrow our pool of respondents.

Our initial pool of possible respondents included almost 300 people, and we selected 60 who had published CER in the last 20 years or so. We sought to make this smaller list representative of diverse journals and universities, public and private, larger and smaller. We selected three names from each of the journals specifically addressing engaged scholarship. We received email responses from 12 authors, a modest response rate of 20%.

Throughout, our approach was exploratory—we had no well-developed theory to test. We had no well-ordered data set linking junior faculty working environments with possibilities of community-engaged research and publication possibilities including diverse requirements of journal editors. So our net had to be cast more widely than deeply. Our challenge to conventional presumptions ("I'll never get tenure here if I do engaged scholarship") roots in common sense rather than statistical rigor.

In a second-round survey, we sent similar queries to journal editors with experience as gatekeepers of community-based research publication. How could they advise younger scholars hoping both to develop strong publication records and to do CES as well? Of these 30 "editors' queries," we found ourselves fortunate to hear from eight, constituting a slightly stronger response rate of nearly 27%.

In each case, we sought a mix by both gender and institutional type (public or private). The gender mix among published authors was roughly 62% women/38% men; the public/private mix among authors was roughly 58% public/42% private. The gender mix among editors was roughly 40% women/60% men.

We present what we learned below in three parts, followed by an Afterword that presents one model of how we've addressed these issues on our campus. Part One begins with the advice of editors and authors regarding the challenges of gaining acceptance and recognition of community-engaged research as a respected basis for promotion and tenure. Part Two presents the counsel of editors and authors about publishing engaged scholarship. Part Three addresses still more practical issues of writing and composition. Finally, in the Afterword, we share our program model for Faculty Fellows in Engaged Scholarship and offer broader advice about the craft of writing community-engaged research and scholarship.

Part I: On the Challenges of Seeking Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

In what follows, we take journal editors to offer reflections not only as editors but as plausible proxies for faculty with experience on promotion and tenure committees. Editors are keenly aware that their deliberations affect career prospects, and they tend to have served on these committees as well. Further research must focus specifically on influences upon reappointment, promotion, and tenure, but here we consider editors' initial advice for early-career faculty interested in and committed to engaged research.

1. Talk to and Educate Senior Colleagues: Don't Assume "They'll Get It"

Editors and authors both urge community-engaged scholars to take seriously their own departmental and disciplinary homes, their own academic communities. Senior colleagues are not all curmudgeons, stuck in their narrow attitudes: They can come to recognize important new work and broaden their assumptions. So an editor counsels newer faculty members: "Talk to your senior colleagues, one by one, face to face, about the work and why it matters (and why it is disciplinarily important and appropriate). Start with those most amenable." But don't just talk, they suggest. Many editors observe that senior faculty can often be educated themselves, that their initial ignorance of, or resistance to, community-engaged research can shift. So one editor writes, echoing others, that junior faculty should "engage senior colleagues with examples from one's discipline about CES/ CER done well and published in top tier journals: allow them to see the merit and complexity of such work in a field-relevant way."

These comments argue that there's an "internal" educational project to be done within our own disciplines (see Afterword for one example of a program tackling this): Acknowledge precedents and build on others' contributions. Show good work, don't just argue for it, they suggest. But more than that, too, these comments suggest that there's another danger: that junior faculty can themselves engage in the self-defeating and self-fulfilling prophecies that senior colleagues, initially resistant or unknowing or hesitant, will always be that way.

2. Leverage Authority

Build coalitions, find help, get academic supporters together, and showcase their views and work. As one editor put it, "Bring excellent community-engaged scholars, particularly those that are respected, to campus as often as possible. If newer scholars cannot change their colleagues' minds, let others do that work for them."

Here we have an appeal not only to excellence but to respect, not only to a single event but to multiple occasions, not to junior colleagues shouldering the burden of arguing with their senior colleagues, but to allowing respected senior scholars and colleagues—with their own track records and results to show—to do that community-building work of legitimating and supporting the significance of community-engaged scholarship or community-engaged research (cf. O'Meara, 2005). So, show or demonstrate the good work of others who have already earned respect; then you won't have to make an abstract argument about its importance for your department or your work. Several editors of journals publishing engaged research also note that in these troubled times, even "traditionalists" can be swayed by powerful public impact, so sharing visible, effective work can contribute to stretching minds regarding the public purposes of the disciplines.

3. Tell Them What's New

Several authors urged aspiring community-engaged scholars to "Explain to your colleagues what the real contribution of your writing is: make them advocates for you, not judges. Make clear to them that you are not reinventing the wheel; that you are extending the work of others, building on the work of others, not simply repeating what others have already shown."

Here, of course, these experienced authors are urging community-based scholars

to anticipate every journal editor's question: "What's new here? Why isn't this recreating the wheel?" They suggest, if you're not just repeating what others have already done, explain why not, explain what's new: If not altogether new, then what might extend the work you respect and build upon—to raise fresh issues and explore fresh answers? Being very clear about the disciplinary contribution, not just in one article but in a line of work, seems essential. The forms of such communication can vary here, as an astute reviewer suggested, from informal chats to departmental seminars or "brown bags" to more formal venues like the research statements of fellowship or funding proposals or even a tenure and promotion dossier.

4. Collaborate with Senior Scholars in Your Own or Peer Institutions

Another editor urges that, "Junior faculty, in particular, should reach out for collaborative possibilities with established and tenured faculty. Such collaborative work [need not be] confined to the [home institution, because] scholars from all over the country (and the world) practice this type of research...[Many are] willing to be involved in collaborative projects." This becomes especially significant in the era of COVID-19, given our new awareness of a) how to collaborate across geographic lines and b) how urgently we need to collaborate on complex problems we see more clearly now. Collaboration enables additional strategies for the engaged scholar: leveraging authority of expertise and argument, legitimating the form of research and writing, and adding credibility to the significance of the topic chosen and the viability of the research approach.

Editors grant that community-engaged research and scholarship can be more valued by some departments than by others, so they advise, in effect, "Find like minds." Despite any one department's priorities, they suggest, "There are many other institutions that do value this type of research." So, one editor argues, "I believe [junior faculty] should remain optimistic and continue to pursue . . . scholarship that interests them and that can make a difference for their students and communities." Authors echoed these themes. They pointed to the importance of the (varying) fit between a faculty member's department and the focus of their work. So one even advised, "Read your job description!" Perhaps more importantly, though, others suggested, use and leverage both collaboration and networks to show, legitimate, and detail a case for careful, community-based work.

5. Defend Non-standard Methods

One editor/scholar raises a persistent challenge of studying complex phenomena: "Community-engaged work will likely have a non-standard methodology in its selection or implementation. This is probably inevitable. When choices must be made between good method [*sic*] and interesting questions, it is my view to veer to the side of interesting questions, always telling the story of the options and choices made during the process. Let future [readers] know and choose to second guess you, if they wish."

Here we find the tensions between "rigor" and "relevance" as Donald Schön (1983) had put it, also between being precise and uninteresting or intriguing but uncertain about the findings. We might consider more expansive definitions of rigor, as suggested by Imagining America's working group on Assessing the Practices of Public Scholarship: For them, rigor "references fidelity to (potentially new, potentially challenging) methods that align with the purposes of inquiry as well as with its sociocultural context (e.g., beliefs, norms, practices); it speaks to critical, iterative examination of processes and of the meanings we make of results as well as to questions of ethics and concerns about avoiding harm" (Bandy et al., 2018, p. 27). As journals vary, so will editors vary about their judgments here; in some cases, "rigor" becomes a stand-in for "convention." Notice that this advice addresses less the technical demands of a given exploratory research effort and more the intellectual health and vibrancy of the discipline at hand. As in some fields (such as mathematics)

where an interestingly formulated wrong answer to an important question can generate important future work, so too in engaged research and scholarship (Schön, 1995).

6. Diversify the Work

Many editors suggest that community-engaged research should be one style of a faculty member's research among others, one strategy of writing and publishing among others: "The junior faculty member should have a standard research agenda in addition to the community-engaged research." These editors suggest that a promotion case showing breadth and a range of research styles may appear stronger, not weaker, due to its internal diversity of mission, engagements, and contributions to the larger institution as well as to the discipline.

An author suggests that community-based scholars "balance their portfolio" with a combination of traditionally, disciplinarily focused work and community-engaged scholarship too. One writes, "Not every article you publish has to end up in a top journal." Another argues, "Showing that you can publish in one of your field's top journals will then allow you to publish broadly in allied fields, and that may be to your credit too (suggesting you might collaborate well with others on research projects, grant-writing, for example)." Furthermore, as the Afterword will discuss, scholars might produce multiple contributions, perhaps for differing audiences, from a single partnership project, thus deepening the impact of their work.

7. Consider Precedent!

Another author of community-engaged research advised that younger faculty consider what earlier research their colleagues already recognize as legitimate work. One urged scholars to consider excellent work being done in allied or complementary departments "whose engaged work," he wrote, "[c]ould be respected by your department and could be used as gold standards." Campus Compact (compact.org) and International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (https://iarslce.memberclicks.net) have also provided access to portfolio review and formal support from senior engaged scholars around the country. This might provide forms of recognition and legitimation in contexts where senior department members are unfamiliar with the engaged research of a junior colleague. Yet another author suggests that if a scholar's institution supports engaged research in principle (for example, holding the elective Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement), "tie your work directly into its strategic goals."

These recommendations point to work that provides instructive examples of engaged research; that evokes recognition, respect, and esteem for this kind of engaged and collaborative inquiry; that creates intellectual precedents that could familiarize colleagues previously less acquainted with engaged research; that expands a sense of the role of scholars and researchers in healing the world.

Part II: Dealing with Challenges of Publication

The advice of editors and authors about the obstacles to and opportunities for publishing built upon strands of their earlier suggestions regarding career advancement.

1. Be Recognizable

An editor counsels junior faculty to be "disciplinarily specific and speak to and from one's disciplinary expertise. The more [your work] looks...like the work of others in the discipline, the easier it is to have it recognized." Here the editor knows that a project's research report can be framed in many different ways. But which facet of the work does the report stress: its new substantive findings? Its use of a novel method? Its presentation of a counter-argument to a provocative article previously published by another author?

Furthermore, this editor knows that other editors will always wonder if a submitted article "fits" or "is appropriate" to their particular journal. Journals and editors are looking backwards as well as forwards: What

have we been publishing that we are known for? What do our editorial board members and our readers expect us to publish that's relevant to and in keeping with our reputation? Does this new submission "fit" or not? Does this new submission belong somewhere else, at another journal, instead?

The less an article is recognizable as appropriate to *this* journal, the more likely that editors will reject it. But several other editors take broader views of publishing opportunities, as we see below.

2. Ground the Work in the Discipline and Community

Another editor writes, "Ground the work in theory of both the discipline and also of engagement. Make it evident in the writing of the paper." This editor knows that in many first drafts, what authors think to be clear can still be hidden—and many authors need to say much more clearly why their project's results matter both in and beyond academia. Rewriting, of course, can help authors to be more explicit about their real purposes—and can help them establish the "ethos" that gives their voice authenticity and credibility in both academic and community arenas. And, if that can't be done within a single piece, consider Doberneck and Carmichael's advice of "unfurling"—creating multiple products from one project, so that the public AND academic purposes of that project can all be met with integrity.

3. Broaden the Scope of Publication

Another editor writes, "Seek publishing opportunities in and outside the discipline. There are many engagement journals that are very strong and are accepted in Reviews for Promotion and Tenure." Still others encourage mixed strategies of publishing both within and outside of an author's disciplinary home. Another colleague suggests addressing a deliberately broad range of journals: "Junior faculty should not fall victim to the mindset that only certain journals should be outlets for their work. I encourage all faculty to consider journals that are not in the traditional 'top tier' category. Additionally, faculty should con-sider journals outside of their discipline. Many such journals are highly prestigious, and they can be considered germane or related to one's discipline, and therefore count toward scholarly productivity." Obviously, the specific standards and expectations at one's home institution may have the last word on this.

Published authors of community-engaged research gave advice, too, that anticipated the ways that journal editors—with decisions to make about what to publish—will want to know clearly just how any submitted article contributes to any particular discipline. These authors were advising engaged scholars to make the case, to help these editors—especially those of established, recognized journals—embrace submitted articles. In effect, they suggest that prospective authors should remember this: Journal editors need fresh, well-written, well-documented work to distinguish their journals. So authors must help these editors with a cover letter that explains what's exciting about their project—so that the editors can, in turn, help the authors by being excited to publish what they have submitted.

4. Clarify the Fit, the Contribution, and the Conversation

Published authors recommended, not surprisingly, that earlier-career colleagues find a fit between what kind of study a journal has published and the kind of project they're writing up. Some journals will stress education in that discipline; some will focus on the use of particular methods; some will focus on a limited substantive topic area. The Journal Section Comparison Table of the National Campus Compact (https://compact.org/resource-posts/journal-section-comparison-table/) is one helpful tool for exploring types of publications embraced by each journal.

Other authors urged aspiring scholars to think carefully about the several contexts in which their work can make a difference and so be attractive to a journal editor. For example: "The journal might have published an analysis

of a project like yours a year ago, but that analysis has failed to address issues that your project-analysis highlights. Their failure becomes an opportunity for your contribution. Or, the journal has published a paper on a similar project but the authors have used a very different approach or theory than the approach or theory you wish to demonstrate. That difference becomes a potential opportunity for you. Or national legislation or public events have made the subject of your project more prominent than it would have been several years ago; these outside events can help to create a context in which your project becomes 'more timely' or more 'salient' and so more interesting to journal editor and her or his referees…In all these cases, it's important to notice, the significance of your project's analysis lies not in the data analysis or interviews alone but in the intellectual, disciplinary, or even social-political context into which you can engage."

Another suggested that prospective authors think about how their community-engaged research and scholarship has produced lessons for their discipline. Has a particular project produced a fine example or case study that the author and others might use in class? Crucially, does a particular case show something new that other cases have not already shown clearly? We can think of this, as regional economist Kieran Donaghy suggests, as contributing to the ongoing conversation in the literature and among community-engaged and other disciplinary scholars caring about the issues that you do.

5. Academia is a Contested, Evolving Community: Cultures Change Even in Academia

The idea of "culture change" arose again and again in responses to our queries. Colleagues argued that engaged research was a newly emerging style of work in academia and that many "traditional" colleagues might wonder if this work was really scholarly. One said quite candidly, "It's up to the person doing community-engaged work to explain how it is part of their overall workload. Tell the story of your work!" Others concurred and virtually all agreed: The work itself must be "grounded in the literature" (clear about its contribution to the discipline's conversation about the issues being explored), "theoretically and methodologically rigorous" (careful and explicit about methods and intellectual arguments relevant to the issues at hand).

These suggestions from editors and authors who have worked the fields of community-based research speak to legitimating it in one's department just as they anticipate dealing with obstacles to publishing successfully. Another author amplified the comment above: "As an academic, you have a responsibility to your disciplinary colleagues: Share your work, constructive criticism of prevailing interpretations, teaching insights, methodological tips, and more." We are all part of that evolution.

Whether their advice concerned promotion or publication, editors and authors alike stressed parallel strategies—legitimation, finding and building allies and precedents and respected authorities, articulating clearly the disciplinary and intellectual contributions of a project's work (cf. Franz, 2009, 2011)—to help shape a thriving culture of community-engaged research, on and off campuses. Ethical practice and meaningful commitment to public purpose are requisites of any such work.

Part III: On the Challenges of Writing and Composition

We now turn to a less well-developed topic: the craft aspects of academic writing and publication (cf. Wildavsky, 1993; Becker, 2007; Plimpton, 1988). In the last section, we draw from the comments of editors and authors of engaged research as well as from the lead author's experience giving doctoral writing and publishing workshops (Forester, 2015). Editors and authors provided advice, too, about writing up results, and here their counsel becomes more craft-focused than disciplinarily based; we accompany these findings with our own reflections from our practice and experience.

1. Try Collaborative Writing Groups and Communities of Practice

Contributors suggest experimentation with collaborative writing groups, not only to support the writing and revision and sharpening process, but to gain insights from others about the significance and richness of cases at hand. One such model, a yearlong faculty-learning cohort at Cornell University called Faculty Fellows in Engaged Scholarship, is explored in the Afterword. Community-engaged writers can also find inspiration in collaborative forms of engaged scholarship, including digital, experiential, audiovisual, and artistic. Such collaborative projects are fertile fields for communities of practice who seek to work together on core issues, or to envision new products that make more of their engaged research.

2. Recognize Cross-cutting Issues

Many community-engaged projects can lend themselves to analysis from more than one point of view. These cross-cutting issues can interest diverse readers and, perhaps more importantly, contribute in powerful new ways to addressing the wicked problems of our world (Rittel & Webber, 1973). In addition to writing up a project's research results, one might spin off work on related themes and issues, including partnership formation, conceptual issues, lessons learned, ethical dilemmas, work in progress, and community perspectives. Similarly, consider cross-cutting publication outlets, including professional or topically oriented journals that invite multiple perspectives on the same issues. Several useful, differently oriented products might be developed from the same project (Doberneck & Carmichael, 2020).

3. Use Surprise as a Resource

Authors and editors both point to the significance of surprise: the complexity and messiness of community-engaged research can be rewarding at times, especially when a well-designed and carefully executed project produces unexpected results. As Donald Schön, following John Dewey, explored so well, surprise teaches us not only about something that we did not expect, but it can lead us to examine the question, "What were we thinking?" in productive and instructive ways (Schön, 1983; Dewey, 1928; cf. Campbell et al., 2018). The scholar's experience of surprise is always two-directional: We learn both about something new that has taken place in an unforeseen way, and we learn as well about the blinders and selectivity of the "frames" of attention that we'd been assuming as adequate to the project at hand (Forester, 1999). Surprise can also lead to unexpected topics for analysis and publication, as in Scott Peters' personal narrative (shared in a Fellows session) of "the bucket of cold water"—he received some unexpected and direct news from a community colleague that fundamentally reshaped his approach to the work. And, of course, surprise makes for good reading: Emphasizing the unexpected turn of your projects' events up front can help engage readers and drive home the significance of the work.

4. Use Networks and Conferences, Trade Work in Progress

If senior colleagues can help with legitimacy, conference presentations can lead to visibility as well. Sharing one's research on panels or round tables or other conference venues can lead to constructively critical comments from colleagues, who can suggest other relevant literature to cite, acknowledge, and build upon. This "networking" at conferences can help authors not only to refine papers, of course, but to learn about potentially interested journals in which they might publish as well. Furthermore, this can help build a community of scholars with whom one does deeply satisfying writing, especially if the writing community collaborates virtually over a long period of time, like the Imagining America working group on Assessing the Practices of Public Scholarship.

5. Frame Your Community-Engaged Work as a Scholarly Enterprise

One author writes emphatically: "To colleagues who say, 'I want to respond to community issues, but I do so on the side,'

others urge, 'Get it back on the desk; make it part of your faculty workload, part of your scholarship.'" In other words, perhaps, clarify why your research matters in the world. "Consider the driving intellectual question being investigated/addressed collaboratively"; [consider] "how it can lead to knowledge discovery, integration, application, or transmission." Make clear to your readers, this author suggests, the exciting intellectual question that's at stake. This prolific author develops an essential premise, that research and scholarship involve a drama of discovery, it matters, and they offer a fundamental, "single piece of advice: Frame your community-engaged work as a scholarly enterprise" (cf. Sandmann, 2008).

This advice urges us to look for the overlap in the Venn diagram circles of "the research questions I care about" and "the community issues our engaged projects hope to address." They go on to note that if colleagues "frame the project as scholarship from the beginning," that can also include "securing IRB approval so that data collected…may be used for publication."

CONCLUSION

Frame Questions That Matter, Write Every Day, and Answer, "So What?"

Nothing here suggests that publishing community-engaged scholarship is rocket science. We can waste time thinking about it instead of writing it. We discourage ourselves and each other if we presume that others won't care about, or be open to learning about, our findings (Sandman et al., 2008). If we're rejected by one journal, we have to learn as best we can from critical reviews and go on to submit to another journal, clarifying, learning, rewriting as we go.

Leveraging others' expertise and authority, sharing our work to test ideas and gather suggestions, helping senior colleagues appreciate insights generated through community engagement—all can help generate a broader and deeper body of engaged research and scholarship. So we need to keep writing up what matters, linking research and scholarship and community well-being while generating excitement about community-engaged work. Community-based research and scholarship are too important to bury in jargon, to treat as second-class, to not share with the growing number of journals, editors, and readers committed to integrating university scholarship and insight with community sensitivity and need.

Significantly, engaged scholars do well to remember that process is also product. Developing valuable findings through the labor of your partners without acknowledging them or giving them voice is extractive behavior. The work of engaged research and scholarship is to heal our world together: to bring multiple kinds of expertise to bear on common issues, so that we can do together what we cannot do alone. And yet the reward systems of academia push us toward transactional rather than transformative relationships (Clayton et al., 2010). Our resistance and our solidarity matter profoundly in this work, not only in printed words but in everyday practice. And so our words must reflect those aspects of practice that are truly participatory, equity-oriented, redistributive of power, regenerative of hope. It matters not only that we do it, but that we tell the story of it, to legitimize and normalize the values and value of engaged scholarship and research.

AUTHORS' AFTERWORD

A Model of Institutional Support for Engaged Scholarly Production, and Further Advice on Craft Aspects of Academic Writing

At our university, the central unit responsible for supporting engaged learning and research has for many years hosted two yearlong faculty learning communities: Faculty Fellows in Engaged Learning and Faculty Fellows in Engaged Scholarship (FFES). In each, faculty of all ranks from across the university apply to the program with a project in mind: For Faculty Fellows in Engaged Learning, that's a course, typically, being designed or redesigned; for Faculty

Fellows in Engaged Scholarship, it's some product of engaged research that the Fellow wants to (co-)produce.

Faculty Fellows in Engaged Scholarship is obviously the more relevant to this article, as it invites Fellows to negotiate together articles (including a draft stage of this one) on the cultures, practices, and evaluation of engaged research while also creating space and community for them to create their actual product (see Appendix for sample "syllabus" of this learning community). While FFES has privileged development of academic publications, we also encourage colleagues to think hard about the utility of their work: Who stands to benefit from their research? The Fellow, certainly, if the product contributes to reappointment, promotion, or tenure. But in many cases, there are other (and for some Fellows, more important) considerations—like a Fellow whose groundbreaking, high-impact videography programs with schoolchildren led him to create training materials and programs for state Extension workers, thus expanding a powerful model in practice rather than seeking his own advancement in academia. Most of all, we try to emphasize the multiple stakeholders and interests involved in any community-engaged learning or research project—we offer a simple project design matrix (see Appendix) that poses questions similar to Diane Doberneck's "unfurling" approach (Doberneck & Carmichael, 2020, p. 1): What good can this project do in the world, for whom, and how can we best reach them?

One Fellow churned out several peer-reviewed journal articles as a matter of course and also recognized that her community partners offered her work new paths to greater public significance. So, at their suggestion, she also wrote a piece for a professional magazine in the partners' field. That both/and approach, while demanding, is also commonplace among committed institutions and works to legitimize both engaged research and engaged scholars. Perhaps more importantly, it enables the scholar to live their deep sense of vocation—as Frederick Buechner puts it, where "your deep gladness and the world's deep hunger meet" (Buechner, 1973, pp. 118-119). Most of our Fellows come to their work from such a sense of calling or identity, and we strive to be one of the spaces on campus that can support that level of conversation (for more, see Bartel & Castillo, 2020).

Key features of the Fellowship program that contribute to its success include this sense of open and honest community, nurtured through relational discussions and carefully selected readings that seek to align soul and role. But we also insist that Fellows create a mentoring relationship with a peer—typically a more senior member of their field, but sometimes a community partner or other colleague. Sometimes informal mentorship happens as well, as when a Fellow was told by their Dean at a third-year review that they had to stop puttering around with CES and "write their book." The Fellow brought that to our cohort and asked the senior, tenured Fellows there what to do; the resulting conversation included the advice that the Fellow should "write your book, indeed. *Your book*. And if it's not the book the Dean wants to see, then they may not give you tenure, but somebody else probably will." In short, we focus on questions that Fellows live on a daily basis: What is engaged research? What forms does it take? How does it make a difference in the world? What are the obstacles to being an engaged scholar, and how do we overcome them? What is the rhythm of your particular writing, and how can we best support it? What forms feel most natural to you, and how can you best take advantage of them? We share stories of success; start Twitter feeds; stitch together new perspectives and possibilities; solidify, often, the sense that we, as engaged scholars, are perhaps more than the academy typically encourages us to be. It's a rich and fertile field that appears to be making a difference for many of our faculty.

In both the Fellows program and this article, a whole spectrum of interests is broached, from institutional culture to career strategy to public purpose to actual craft aspects, that move us from writing down notes to writing up results for publication. Because

the editors and authors we surveyed paid attention primarily to advice regarding promotion and publication requirements, we offer here brief advice and suggestions drawn from conversations with academic writers more generally, and discussed, if not strictly tested, in doctoral and faculty workshops and learning communities we've led at universities in the United States and Europe.

1. To Take Your Audience Seriously, Read Aloud to Test Every Sentence

Too often, community-engaged scholars do not realize that they are writers and producers, not just researchers. If they embrace that identity, they will soon see that they must—and can—learn to write not only for "the community of scholars" who share their disciplines, but for a broader audience too. This has direct, practical implications. Community-engaged scholar-writers can treat writing to their readers as presenting results to a courtroom jury—to diverse readers who need to understand, follow, and embrace the argument and methods at hand (Trimble, 2011). This calls for using one's ears along with one's brain and heart: Engaged scholar-writers can write for a broad audience by following a simple exercise—read your sentences aloud as if to friends, or to smart undergraduates who don't know their disciplinary jargons. When your ears tell you to explain, to break up a sentence, to clarify, do it. Nothing else helps as much to produce readable, direct, smart prose, fresh and jargon-free.

2. Don't Just Rewrite, Cultivate the Habit of Rewriting

Since the core of writing is rewriting, habit matters more than any given conclusion, finding, or result: cultivating the habit, discipline, regime, time, and space of daily writing (cf. Plimpton, 1988). Traditional visions of this process typically exclude email and social media (though there are many examples of fine engaged scholarship taking place on social media, often for significant public impact); notes to oneself (though who among us has not had a breakthrough over breakfast and written it out on the back of a napkin?); lists and outlines and good intentions (though again, these are all positive steps in the writing process). This includes paragraphs written for articles for journal editors to publish; this includes writing and rewriting the story, purpose, methods, surprises, findings, and shortcomings of the community-engaged project at hand. Most of all, this includes rewriting yesterday's material to be more clear and compelling today and tomorrow—and with regularity, this writing will lead to additional scholarship and writing too. How much daily writing and rewriting? Think of a musician's daily practice, an athlete's daily workout, a religious devotee's daily prayers. Surely the work of engaged writing should be taken as seriously. And just as we have seen the obstacles pile up against athletes and others who nurture families, hold down multiple jobs to make rent, or face barriers due to racism, sexism, or other supremacist attitudes, so too must engaged scholars find communities of support that make it possible to keep writing and producing. This may mean a different, personalized writing process—and we recommend programs like our Fellows in Engaged Scholarship as a way of surfacing and addressing these questions of healthy process, obstacle, resistance, and development, and as a way to build vital communities of support.

Daily, regular writing and rewriting must address the questions that any journal editor and their referees will want to have addressed: What's new here? Why does this work matter in the world? Why should any reader (with or without a PhD) trust you? What methods did you use that others could replicate? What is your contribution to existing scholarly debates on your topic? What did you learn, from whom, and why does it matter? Answers to these questions are sometimes best found in dialogue, so interaction with colleagues (in community as well as academia) and friends who share your commitments and interests may be essential to your scholarly production.

3. Don't Confuse Your "Introduction" with the "Background"

Once a community-engaged scholar-writer can answer those questions, then and perhaps only then can he or she really write their article's introduction—once the rest is done!—because more importantly, only then can he or she know just what "background" is actually relevant to the story or argument they wish to publish. There is perhaps no greater potential waste of time than an author's thinking he or she's writing an "introduction" in the form of the "background" to a paper, article, or chapter when the author does not yet really know what he or she actually has to say and actually can demonstrate (Forester, 2015).

4. Make Sure Every Conclusion Answers, "So What?"

These suggestions together point toward a critical question that any excellent piece of engaged scholarship must address: "So what?" If that question can be answered clearly and directly, editors will know why they should publish the article. They will know what its scholarly contribution is (the "so what?" for the discipline) and they will also know who will care (the "so what?" for those working on the same public issue, or for a broader audience).

More generally, sharing community-engaged scholarship can have several benefits. Sharing with disciplinary scholars will contribute to intellectual debates and related lines of research and argument. Sharing, or even more powerfully, co-producing with community members can lead us to deeper impact, more clarity, and better organization in our writing, and possibly to further insights and arguments from stakeholders. From other readers we might also learn how the answers that we thought were so clear might not have been so clear after all, and it's always preferable to hear that from colleagues and partners than in rejection letters from journal editors.

REFERENCES

Bandy, J., Price, M. F., Clayton, P. H., Metzker, J., Nigro, G., Stanlick, S., Woodson, S. E., Bartel, A., & Gale, S. (2018). *Democratically engaged assessment: Reimagining the purposes and practices of assessment in community engagement.* Imagining America.

Bartel, A., & Castillo, D. (Eds.). (2020). *The scholar as human: Teaching and research for public impact.* Cornell University Press.

Becker, H. (2007). *Writing for social scientists*. University of Chicago Press.

Bolton, G., & Rowland, S. (2014). *Inspirational writing for academic publication*. Sage Publications.

Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*(1), 11–20.

Boyte, H. C., & Fretz, E. (2010). Civic professionalism. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 14*(2), 67–90.

Buechner, F. (1973). *Wishful thinking: A seeker's ABC.* Harper and Row.

Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine, 80*(4), 317–321. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200504000-00002

Campbell, H., Forester, J., Sanyal, B., Anwar, K., Brando, C., Azis, I. J., Robiglio, M., Micelli, E., Delli Santi, R., & Vanderhoven, D. (2018). Can we learn from our mistakes? *Planning Theory and Practice, 19*(3), 425–446. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2018.1486985

Campus Compact. (2017). *Journal section comparison table.* https://compact. org/resource-posts/journal-section-comparison-table/

Campus Compact. (2021). *Publishing engaged scholarship.* https://compact.org/resource-posts/publishing-engaged-scholarship/

Clayton, P., Bringle, B., Senor, B., Huq, J., & Morrison, M. (2010). Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, *16*(2), 5–21.

Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *114*, 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.45

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. https://ccphealth.org

Creighton, S. (2008). The scholarship of community partner voice. *Higher Education Exchange*, 12–22.

Dewey, J. (1928). *The quest for certainty*. Putnam.

Doberneck, D. M., & Carmichael, C. (2020). Unfurling your community-engaged work into multiple scholarly products. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*, *12*(3), 5–19.

Eatman, T. (2009). Engaged scholarship and faculty rewards: A national conversation. *Diversity and Democracy*, Association of American Colleges & Universities, 12(1), 18–19.

Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university.* Imagining America. https://iagathering.org/mainsite/wp-content/uploads/TTI_FINAL.pdf

Forester, J. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner*. MIT Press.

Forester, J. (2015). Learning the craft of academic writing. In E. Silva, P. Healey, N. Harris, & P. Van den Broeck (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of planning research methods* (pp. 82–96). Routledge.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S. T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *20*(1), 223–244.

Franz, N. (2009). A holistic model of engaged scholarship: Telling the story across higher education's missions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *13*(4), 31–50.

Gelmon S. B., Seifer S. D., Kauper-Brown, J., & Mikkelsen, M. (2005). *Building capacity for community engagement: Institutional self-assessment.* Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

Jordan, C. (Ed.). (2007). Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion and tenure package. Peer Review Workshop, Community Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. https://ccphealth.org/the-community-engaged-scholarship-review-promotion-tenure-package-2/

Kezar, A. J., Drivalas, Y., & Kitchen, J. A. (Eds.). (2018). *Envisioning public scholarship for our time: Models for higher education researchers*. Stylus.

O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty rewards systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(5), 479–510.

Peters, S. J. (2003). Reconstructing civic professionalism in academic life: A response to Mark Wood's paper, from service to solidarity. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *10*(2), 83–198.

Peters, S. J., Jordan, N. R., Adamek, M., & Alter, T. R. (2005). *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system*. Kettering Foundation Press.

Plimpton, G. (1988). *Writers at work*. Viking.

Post, M. A., Ward, E., Longo, N. V., & Saltmarsh, J. (2016). *Publicly*

engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education. Stylus.

Reardon, K., & Forester, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Rebuilding community after Katrina: Transformative education in the New Orleans planning initiative*. Temple University Press.

Rittel, H. & Webber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences, 4*(2), 155–169.

Sandmann, L. R. (2006). Building a higher education network for community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *11*(4), 41–54.

Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996-2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 91–104.

Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J. & O'Meara, K. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 47–64.

Schön, D. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change, 27*(6), 26–34.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. Basic Books.

Snyder-Hall, C. (2015). *Civic aspirations: Why some faculty are reconnecting their professional and public lives.* Kettering Foundation. https://www.kettering.org/catalog/product/civic-aspirations-why-some-higher-education-faculty-are-reconnecting-their

Trimble, J. (2011). *Writing with style* (3rd ed.). Pearson.

Wildavsky, A. (1993). *Craftways*. Routledge.

Wethington, E., & Dunifon, R. E. (Eds.). (2012). *Research for the public good: Applying the methods of translational research to improve human health and well-being.* American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13744-000

Wheatley, M., & Freize, D. (2006). *Using emergence to take social innovations to scale.* Berkana Institute. https://www.margaretwheatley.com/articles/using-emergence.pdf

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHIES

John Forester, PhD, is Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell University. His research into the micro-politics of the planning process, ethics, and political deliberation assesses the ways that planners shape participatory processes and manage public disputes in diverse settings. His most recent book is the edited volume *How Spaces Become Places: Place Makers Tell Their Stories*, New Village Press, 2021.
216 Lake Ave, Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 351-2187
jff1@cornell.edu

Anna Sims Bartel, PhD, is Associate Director for community-engaged curricula and practice in Cornell University's David M. Einhorn Center for Community Engagement. Her work centers public humanities, purpose, and practice in community-engaged scholarship; her most recent publication is the co-edited volume *The Scholar as Human: Teaching and Research for Public Impact*, Cornell University Press, 2020.
802 Mitchell Street, Ithaca, NY 14850
(207) 240-0534
annasbartel@gmail.com

AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors are grateful to Katherine Idziorek, Amanda Wittman, Richard Kiely, and Scott Peters for perceptive, constructive, and critical comments. Thanks to Sam Coons and Noah Schumer for research assistance.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anna Sims Bartel, 802 Mitchell Street, Ithaca, NY, 14850, annasbartel@gmail.com

Appendix
Sample "Syllabus" of the Faculty Fellows in Engaged Scholarship

Question	Reading
Who are we and why are we here?	Kezar, A. J., Drivalas, Y., & Kitchen, J. A. (2018). Defining the evolving concept of public scholarship. In A. J. Kezar, Y. Drivalas, & J. A. Kitchen (Eds.), *Envisioning public scholarship for our time: Models for higher education researchers* (pp.3-17). Stylus.
Community-engaged scholarship foundations	Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*(1), 11–20. Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S. T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 20*(1), 223–244. https://engagement.oregonstate.edu/sites/outreach/files/2018-12/the_centrality_of_engagement_in_higher_education.pdf Campus Compact. (2017). *Journal section comparison table*. https://compact.org/resource-posts/journal-section-comparison-table/
Living out our public purpose	Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 114,* 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.45 Snyder-Hall, C. (2015). *Civic aspirations: Why some faculty are reconnecting their professional and public lives.* Kettering Foundation. https://www.kettering.org/catalog/product/civic-aspirations-why-some-higher-education-faculty-are-reconnecting-their
Ethics in community-engaged scholarship	IRB processes; co-authoring; mutually beneficial products. Kezar, A. J., Drivalas, Y., & Kitchen, J. A. (2018). Cultivating ethical mindfulness. In A. J. Kezar, Y. Drivalas, & J. A. Kitchen (Eds.), *Envisioning public scholarship for our time: Models for higher education researchers* (pp. 38-50). Stylus. Creighton, S. (2008). The scholarship of community partner voice. *Higher Education Exchange,* 12–22. http://bonnernetwork.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/59896442/Creighton%2520Scholarship%2520of%2520Community%2520Partner%2520Voice.pdf

Where can you make the best contributions? Who needs your work or your collegiality?	Anderson-Nathe, B., Jacquez, F., Kerns-Wetherington, R., & Mitchell, T. D. (2016). Fortunate accidents and winding pathways: The personal and professional spaces of authenticity. In M. A. Post, E. Ward, N. V. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Publicly engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education* (pp.169-183). Stylus. Eatman, T. (2009). Engaged scholarship and faculty rewards: A national conversation. *Diversity and Democracy,* Association of American Colleges & Universities, 12(1), 18–19. https://cmapspublic3.ihmc.us/rid=1JMYKDDX6-3HQ80Q-MFNX/Eatman_T-2009_DiversityAndDemocracy_vol12no1.pdf
What is tripping us up and how do we fix it?	Emphases on clear writing, problem-solving; articles often provided by Fellows based on their own challenges and insights.
Where do we go from here?	Boyte, H. C., & Fretz, E. (2010). Civic professionalism. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 14*(2), 67–90. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/429/429 Wheatley, M., & Freize, D. (2006). *Using emergence to take social innovations to scale.* Berkana Institute. https://www.margaretwheatley.com/articles/using-emergence.pdf