Higher Education and the Public

Deliberation as Community Engagement at Kansas State University

David E. Procter and Timothy J. Shaffer
Higher Education and the Public:  
Deliberation as Community Engagement at Kansas State University

2020 Final Report

David E. Procter, Ph.D.  
Timothy J. Shaffer, Ph.D.

Overview
As a land-grant university, Kansas State University is committed to serving the public in diverse ways. As examples, K-State has a robust Extension presence across the state. The university was recently recognized by the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) for its economic engagement and contribution to the region. Additionally, the Carnegie Foundation has named K-State a “community engaged university” for its collaborative efforts in building campus / community partnerships. These engaged practices have taken many forms, but have generally been dominated by traditional outreach and service models of knowledge transmission and transfer.

Following World War II, university research focus has primarily been on the generation of disciplinary knowledge creating the perception of faculty as “experts” whose knowledge was viewed both as having limited applicability beyond the area of their specialization and being disconnected from community context and community input. Disciplinary rather than social needs drove faculty and students into well-defined and increasingly bounded disciplinary units.

---

1 This work has been supported by a learning agreement from the Kettering Foundation.
Research universities shifted public higher education’s focus from the resolution of societal problems to achievement within academic disciplines, and societal perspectives shifted from viewing higher education as a valued public good.

Near the end of the 20th Century, there were calls for land-grants to return to their roots. The original acts of Congress creating land-grant institutions, agricultural experiment stations, and extension (Morrill in 1862, Hatch in 1887, and Smith-Lever in 1914) created a public system for connecting universities and citizens to build a stronger democratic society. As Nathan Sorber noted in his study of land-grant history, “the land-grant college could enroll the public in a democratic experiment of engaged citizenship to partner with people in schools, granges, farms, and homes to produce lasting cultural, social and material benefits for communities.” Yet, this experiment in democratic engagement was marginalized as a model for what it meant for these institutions to play a role in public life and has, only recently, been framed as a “prophetic” narrative of the institution’s impact on civic life.

Critics of the expert-centric view were encouraging universities to focus on the origins of the land-grant idea, especially in regard to addressing societal problems and the preparation of students for productive citizenship. Critics of higher education called for renewed emphasis on the quality of the student experience; a broader definition of scholarship-based teaching, research, and service; implementation of true university-community partnerships based on reciprocity and mutual benefit; and an intentional focus on the resolution of a wide range of societal problems. Undergirding this renewed approach to engagement is the understanding that not all knowledge and expertise reside in the academy, and that both expertise and great learning opportunities in teaching and scholarship also reside in non-academic settings. This broadened engagement philosophy is built on understanding that most societal issues are complex and inherently multidisciplinary.

There is evidence that Kansas State University committed to engaging with communities. All significant institutional documents – mission statement, strategic plan, principles of community –

---


support faculty and staff engaging with communities. There are significant university infrastructures built to engage with communities including K-State Research and Extension, K-State’s Global Campus, the Staley School for Leadership Studies, K-State’s Center for Engagement and Community Development, and the Ph.D. program in Leadership Communication. A 2019 application to the Carnegie Foundation for re-classification as a community-engaged university found widespread institutional support of community engagement. In this reclassification process, there was significant evidence that community engagement was in K-State’s curriculum and in its research priorities. The Carnegie application also found that over half of the academic departments at K-State recognized and rewarded community-engaged work in some fashion whether through teaching, research, or service.\(^6\) An engagement benchmarking tool revealed that hundreds of university faculty and staff are engaged in some form of community engagement whether through their teaching and/or their research. This same survey showed that nearly 10,000 students are involved in community engagement through service learning.\(^7\)

There is also evidence that K-State faculty and professional staff are committed to pairing deliberative practices with public work. The Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy has worked via non-formal education modes since 2004 to provide intellectual space for faculty, Extension professionals, and university staff interested in incorporating deliberative practices into their community-engaged work. Formal education structures also exist to support undergraduate and graduate students understand and integrate deliberation into their academic work. The department of communication studies, for example, launched a graduate certificate program in Dialogue, Deliberation, and Public Engagement several years ago that has attracted numerous students and brought university and national scholars to campus to speak about the connection of deliberative practice with community engagement. Likewise, the Ph.D. in Leadership Communication is grounded in community-engaged scholarship and incorporates the study of models of deliberation into the graduate curriculum. The breadth of this work and the attempt to scale it highlights the curricular dimension and institutional commitment to this work.\(^8\) A limitation is that the commitment is rooted in the practices of a select group of units--departments, centers, and institutes--while others do not share this approach to teaching, research, and service.

\(^6\) See [https://www.k-state.edu/ceed/Executive%20Summary.pdf](https://www.k-state.edu/ceed/Executive%20Summary.pdf).

\(^7\) To learn more about the Engagement Benchmarking Tool, see [https://www.k-state.edu/pa/ebt/](https://www.k-state.edu/pa/ebt/).

There is clearly a general institutional commitment to community-engaged practice. Within this generalized commitment, selected departments and individual faculty have demonstrated both an interest in and a passion for this mode of academic work. Additionally, there are some faculty who are familiar with and a few who have incorporated deliberative practices into their community-engaged work. But faculty knowledge and practice of deliberation is not widespread, limited to a few faculty within a few departments or to faculty who have been connected to Kansas State University's Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy.

So, we posed the following research questions:

- How might the sustained use of deliberative practices transform how faculty understand “community engagement” and their relationship to citizens?
- How might deliberative practices, sustained over time, include (and also reconceive) co-creative action, relationship-building, and public work under conditions of disagreement?
- How can deliberative practices provide communities with spaces to experience politics in a less adversarial way than “politics as usual”?

These questions have shaped our work at Kansas State and we created a project that will attend to these questions while focusing on the sustainability and institutionalization of deliberative democratic practices beyond this project. Additionally, we will explore the questions:

- What changes—both short-term and long-term—occur when faculty shifts from an expert paradigm to one that is collaborative with diverse publics through “concerns gathering” processes before beginning community engagement projects?
- What enables – and what prevents – university faculty members to approach their scholarship through a public-engagement lens as well as using a public work framework rather than only as content experts?
- Centrally, can we create, support, sustain, and develop an environment in which deliberative practices transform how Kansas State University faculty members conceptualize and approach engaged teaching and research?

A Discussion of our Experiment with the Civic Engagement Fellows
To explore the research questions listed above, Dr. Shaffer and Dr. Procter created a Kansas State University Civic Engagement Fellows program with goals to: (1) build a community of practice, (2) strengthen faculty and staffs’ understanding of and commitment to deliberation practices within community-engaged scholarship, and (3) create faculty cohorts who would address significant campus and community challenges and become campus agents of change. The Fellows program is an invited, year-long, professional development and peer-learning
community for university faculty and professional staff interested in deliberative practices and community-engaged scholarship. Fellows were intentionally drawn from a variety of disciplines and campus units where we identified interest or past history with some form of deliberative practice. Once we had identified the faculty and staff we wanted to make up our CE Fellows cohort, we passed that list on to the university Provost and he invited those individuals to join the program. The Provost invitation served to institutionalize the program and also symbolized the value of the Civic Engagement Fellows. Since the inception of the Civic Engagement Fellows program, we have found interested individuals from diverse disciplines (See Appendix A for a full list of participant cohorts and their disciplines). Certain familiar disciplines have been represented (e.g. communication and leadership studies) as well as more diverse fields such as architecture, drama therapy, biology, and family studies. Some participants have been somewhat familiar with the language of community engagement and deliberation, but others have found the intersection of alignment of these concepts new and more challenging.

Dr. Shaffer and Dr. Procter designed a four-part curriculum that explored deliberation as a central form of community engagement. The curriculum was delivered through four face-to-face meetings and a capstone experience where the CE Fellows would present a research project or a theoretical thought piece at K-State’s annual engagement symposium. For the face-to-face meetings, common readings were assigned and the meetings were characterized by reflection on the readings and group discussion highlighting individual faculty experiences and concerns. The four modules of the CE Fellows curriculum are:

1. **Academic Teaching, Research, and Outreach as Public Work.** This module includes a discussion of Kansas State University as a land-grant unit and its historical commitment to engaging the state’s residents to address significant challenges they face. The module provides an overview of university / community-engaged work and an overview of deliberation and its central connection community engagement.

2. **Dialogue and Deliberation Process Models.** The second gathering of the CE Fellows is a day-long retreat exploring and practicing different models of deliberation. During this session we brought in associates from the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy to highlight and lead practice in a variety of deliberative methods. Some of the methods we discussed were deliberative forums in the National Issues Forums Institute (NIFI) model, Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS), Appreciative Inquiry, and Nominal Group Technique. For the three cohorts, these methods have varied somewhat with core methods such as NIF deliberation as well as VTS.

3. **Connecting Deliberative Practice to Academic Disciplines Represented.** At our third CE Fellows meeting, we would search and identify (as best we could) examples of community-engaged scholarship integrating deliberative practices into the specific disciplines represented by the CE Fellows cohort. For many Fellows, this was often a time when they were introduced to deliberative work as it aligns with specific
disciplines—moving from generic discussions of deliberative practice to grounded examples relevant to a variety of academic disciplines.

4. Presentation of Teaching or Research Projects Incorporating Deliberation at Annual K-State Engagement Symposium. At our first CE Fellows yearly meeting, Dr. Shaffer and Dr. Procter would explain that some research project or thought piece was a culminating expectation for the program. The research project or thought piece would be presented at an annual K-State Engagement Symposium along with other invited and competitively selected papers. Presentations at the Engagement Symposium enabled Fellows to publicly share their work and, informally, receive feedback and guidance on their community-engaged deliberative work.

5. Integrating Community-Engaged Scholarship and Deliberative Practice into Departmental Tenure and Promotion Policy Documents and Reflections. Civic Engagement Fellows frequently mentioned that a significant barrier to integrating engagement and deliberation into their scholarly activity is that it is not recognized or rewarded. So, during the fourth and final meeting of the CE Fellows, we discussed the importance of incorporating community-engaged scholarship into university tenure and promotion policy documents. We provided exemplars of these policy documents and strategies for incorporating this language into their departmental P&T policies. Additionally, this meeting served as a time of reflection on the CE Fellows program where the Fellows talked about their learnings and how they saw their own work incorporating deliberative practices into community-engaged scholarship moving forward.

Challenges to incorporating deliberative practices into higher education work
In the three years of this experience, we found great enthusiasm for participating in the Civic Engagement Fellows program from the faculty and staff that we invited to join. Faculty who heard of the program sometimes inquired why they had not yet been invited or others told us they hoped they would soon be invited to join. In fact, over the three years of the program, only one faculty member declined our invitation and later in the year this same faculty told us that he regretted that decision and hoped he would receive another invitation (which he did and accepted). Still, as we met with our Civic Engagement Fellows and encouraged them to consider incorporating deliberation into their community-engaged scholarship, we heard a number of concerns and challenges to integrating deliberative practice into their teaching, research, and / or outreach. While these challenges, at times, overlap, they include:

Disciplinary resistance. Faculty have spent years in graduate school and then working in academic departments where there is "the right way" to teach and to conduct research. Often these disciplinary epistemologies and methodologies are not receptive to community engagement and deliberate practice. As a CE Fellow from political science stated:
“I direct a program here in public administration and there has been a wealth of information that’s been written about the importance of engaging people. I mean we’re teaching practitioners about things like how to go out and manage a crisis. But here are people (in the department) who have built an impressive career in peer-reviewed research, they don’t really know how to think about engaged research and how it can contribute to the literature, our base of knowledge. It’s (engaged research) is something different than what is in that research category. That’s the pushback I’ve seen.”

This Civic Engagement Fellow saw value in deliberation as part of scholarly work, indeed saw it as fundamental to the knowledge she needed to teach her students. However, her challenge was that her program is located within a broader discipline - political science - where the history and the culture is very much focused on conducting experimental design research and producing books and juried, peer-reviewed essays.

Inertia and Fear. As faculty spend years in graduate school and in the academy learning teaching pedagogies and research methodologies, they become “efficient” in their scholarly endeavors. Based on their academic learnings and their mentors' examples, faculty often develop a certain pedagogy and teaching routine. They grow to know the literature of their particular research area, refine and develop research questions, understand their research literature, know the number of subjects needed, and become efficient in the methods necessary to carry out their scholarly activity. According to a Civic Engagement Fellow from geography, “To a certain extent, I think inertia sets in. We’re not used to (this form of research) doing it that way and it’s hard to change.” Another Fellow from Leadership Studies said that doing community-engaged work and adding a deliberative piece to that work initially “can be a cumbersome process and it’s just an extra thing.”

Many faculty who might be interested in this form of scholarship have not had any experiences or training in community engaged methods or deliberative models. These faculty may be interested in these modes of scholarly inquiry, but are unsure and therefore a bit fearful about how to do this work.

Lack of Resources. So faculty develop pathways to conduct their work. These pathways provide recognized and comfortable heuristics for teaching and conducting research. They also provide a guide to institutional resources that assist in faculty scholarly activities. So, for example, to submit grants the university provides institutional support in writing the proposal and then additional support in managing the grant once it is awarded. The office of the Vice President for Research offers an array of support for faculty as they navigate research opportunities, protocols, and regulations. K-State’s Teaching and Learning Center offers a variety of resources in support
of the university’s teaching mission. The CE Fellows believed that that same kind of institutional support was limited regarding community-engaged scholarship generally and deliberative practices in particular. One CE Fellow specifically called out the lack of resources for community-engaged work while another spoke of lacking the language to articulate the work and the need for a community of interest that could support faculty conducting this mode of scholarship. Yet another Fellow argued that this form of research and teaching “is not heavily advertised.” So, while there are institutional structures through which community engagement and deliberation is recognized and supported (e.g., K-State Research and Extension, Global Campus, and some individual academic departments), there are not many campus-wide offices or centers focussed on community engagement or deliberation education. It is clear that there is a need for a much broader institutional effort to educate and support community-engaged scholarship and deliberative practice with that mode of academic work.

In addition to the lack of institutional educational resources, Civic Engagement Fellows lamented the lack of budgetary support for community-engaged scholarly activities and also a lack of time to conduct this form of academic work.

**Moving forward: Strategies to expand deliberative practices into academic, community-engaged work**

Because of the model of regularly engaging in group discussions around common readings and/or experiences, we found the emergence of common language among participants. While anecdotal, previous Fellows have embraced and adopted language around their community-engaged scholarship as deliberative.⁹

For example, Katie Kingery-Page is now associate dean in the College of Architecture, Planning, and Design (APDesign) at Kansas State University. She leads the office of Student Academic Services and serves APDesign as associate dean for research. As a previous member of the Civic Engagement Fellows program, Kingery-Page embraced the idea of deliberation as a form of community engagement. While trained in a field that is rooted in participatory practices, the deliberation literature and practice was unfamiliar to hear. In her current work, she was added deliberative civic engagement to her professional role within the College of APDesign and as an active member of the campus team that led to the successful reclassification as an Elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification institution.

---

⁹ For example, see Kingery-Page, K. (2019). Local Participation and Lived Experience: Dialogue and Deliberation Through Participatory Processes in Landscape Architecture. In N. V. Longo & T. J. Shaffer (Eds.), Creating Space for Democracy: A Primer on Dialogue and Deliberation in Higher Education (pp. 238-248). Sterling, VA: Stylus. Additionally, Associate Professor of Biology Michi Tobler, previous member of the Civic Engagement Fellows, has continued to broaden the Science Communication Initiative with grounding in dialogue and deliberation principles. To learn more about the Science Communication Initiative, visit [https://www.k-state.edu/scicomm/](https://www.k-state.edu/scicomm/).
Another example is Bonnie Lynn-Sherow, associate professor history and Executive Director of the Chapman Center for Rural Studies. As a Civic Engagement Fellow, Lynn-Sherow learned about the role of deliberative practices and their application in a variety of settings. She successfully integrated deliberative practice in the training of graduate research assistants working with local museums and historical societies across Kansas. The adoption of deliberation within the training of public engagement is one of the powerful examples of how deliberative civic engagement alters many practices, not simply a traditional deliberative forum.

Finally Katherine Schlageck, Associate Curator of Education of the Beach Museum of Art, has developed connections between deliberation and the use of public engagement in the arts, particularly Visual Thinking Strategies. Being a Civic Engagement Fellows has strengthened her commitment to the integration of deliberative practices into the public education work she does through the Beach Museum.

These are just a few of the examples from Civic Engagement Fellows, but they highlight some of the distinct approaches individuals have taken to using deliberation in their public engagement, teaching, and research. Some suggestions and recommendations for advancing deliberative civic engagement include:

- Efforts to incorporate stronger, higher-level higher education voices. More advocates from college / university leadership could help advance this work.
- Work through higher education Centers for Civic Life (K-State's ICDD; CSU's Center for Public Deliberation, etc.). Providing more resources and models at peer institutions would enable advocates at Kansas State University to advance this work.
- Continue to support deliberation communities of practice within the faculty and other academic professionals.
- Rely on faculty early adapters and community-engagement champions. With the ability to move into higher education leadership positions within the university or elsewhere.
- Provide training in community engagement and deliberative practices through graduate programs such as the Leadership Communication doctoral program as well as the Dialogue, Deliberation, and Public Engagement certificate program
- Continue to provide funding to support these efforts through stipends, small grants, etc.

Reflective Questions

In conversation with the Civic Engagement Fellows at the conclusion of the 2019-2020 academic year, Fellows were invited to reflect upon the same set of questions that had been used previously with other cohorts of Fellows. Following are excerpts from responses to the following questions:

- Kansas State University is a land-grant institution. What does that mean to you?
• When we invited you to be an Engagement Fellow and we spoke about deliberation as a way to think about engagement, what did that mean to you?
• How has this experience made you think about your work? What you thought about, maybe unexpectedly? Or been troubled by?
• How could Kansas State University more fully support engaged scholarship with a commitment to deliberative approaches and practices?
• What are the challenges to seeing a more engaged approach to Kansas State University’s mission?

Kansas State University is a land-grant institution. What does that mean to you?

“For me it means like we all have a duty, in a sense, like an obligation to do something to benefit the community. However you define that. That's, that's how I kind of look at it.”

“For me, I think it is about really serving the community to the best of our abilities through writers of different projects; they may be academic or research or in my case, designing and building. But having community as part of the equation is essential.”

“I think for me at the museum. We have that arch there and it sort of connects the campus in the community and, you know, I've been there 25 years now. And I think that that has been the goal of the museum is to really provide that connection between the academic part of the university and the community.”

“It means we serve more than just the campus community. So we serve our students and we serve each other in higher education, but we also serve people who aren't here.”

“Yeah, I don't know if any of you have seen a lot of. I mean, there's been a lot written; especially recently there was an article I believe in The Chronicle. It talks a little bit about the history of land grant institutions and how they acquired the land initially. And it really has made me think more deeply about what it means to be a land grant institution. And I think, you know, part of you know kind of what I feel as a college is to also serve underserved populations. So when we think about community, who isn't represented at the table? How can we use our resources to reach all members of the community, especially those that are in more marginalized positions?”

When we invited you to be an Engagement Fellow and we spoke about deliberation as a way to think about engagement, what did that mean to you?

---

“I mean, I've always been engaged, but I had not really thought about the deliberation part of this. And the thing that really struck me were the similarities between something that I've been using--the visual thinking strategies--and the engagement streams. And so I've become really, really interested in that. And in ways to use it and I've actually put in a proposal to to talk more about it at the International Visual Literacy Association Conference next fall because I was just really struck by how art and the visual can be used as part of this deliberative process.”

“Something that I've noticed since I've been thinking about this a lot is like I'm used to just 'go go go go' like, I guess we're kind of high achievers to be Civic Engagement Fellows. And the deliberative process, or like having some time to reflect and think and pause and then maybe react--I feel like a lot of academics react and that's how we we got into to wanting to know more about how the world works and and asking those questions is just like having reactions to what what inputs we get. But to spend more time with those inputs is something. Even, in like, I work with ICDD and have protocols for having conversations I didn't know that existed and I've seen it work. I see it, NIF, slow people down to the point of being extremely frustrated. So, having that process--slow people down so much that it feels cumbersome and then thinking about how that changes the way you think--is something that I've enjoyed about growing in this way.”

“I guess one thing I'll say is, I've just learned so much from hearing about all the work y'all are doing. I think it's very easy in the university to get siloed into your own space what your department is doing. But to learn about some of the engagement and the research that's going on and all the other departments, I have found it fascinating and it's given me ideas. So it's just been nice to work in a collaborative way and hear what others are doing”

“I guess what I'm thinking about is I think I've learned to live in the tension between the two. Deliberation takes time. It takes listening. But then engagement can be opposite and viewed as opposite as almost too direct and too forced. And so it's been intriguing to me how those two terms can be defined differently and how our behaviors are representative of how we define that. So there's some tension between the two. Or there could be the perceived tension between the two.”

“I was gonna say something that reminds me of ‘We want to solve problems. But sometimes, like that, a solution is not needed; a discussion as needed.’ Or at least getting everyone on the same page about what the problem is, or having some framework or foundation, a shared understanding of what's happening. And, importantly, that a solution might never be the need, but we immediately see something and jump to a solution without considering the community, or the situation, or the history, or the whatever you need to know to make those decisions with people.”
“I'm so glad you said that because I am worried. I'm concerned that as David steps back into a faculty role and other interests, finding the Center for Engagement [and Community Development] to be lucrative, I'm worried and concerned. I don't know if I should be, I don't know. I'm just feeling that way today but um yeah I'm kind of worried.”

How has this experience made you think about your work? What you thought about, maybe unexpectedly? Or been troubled by?

“So for me. You know, I think I first learned about this kind of work through my coworker Brandon Kleiwer who is a very active community person and does a lot of work in the community. And so, from the start, that just started off as this thing. It's this other thing that you can do. And it may or may not be valued by the Academy or by your T&P committee or whatever. So I always just thought of it. It's like, oh, it's just this extra thing. And then working with Brandon, you know, now he's a tenured professor. For a long time, and also going through this experience just really has brought home for me that this is what I should be doing. So for me, it you know that whole process is really upsetting and kind of troubling in a way. Because I was like, oh, I just need to do research on other people about other people and churn out peer reviewed journal articles and that was it. And so it was just a process of kind of upsetting. What I thought I should be doing. That's kind of where I what I've been thinking about. But it's also scary in it, in a sense, to that, you know, because deliberative dialogue can be like a cumbersome process and it can be a painful process. Like, I don't know, I just get anxiety about having like really difficult conversations, even though I do in the classroom all time.”

How could Kansas State University more fully support engaged scholarship with a commitment to deliberative approaches and practices?

“One thing occurs to me is that it's not heavily advertised that we do this and it would probably be a benefit both to the idea of engagement, but also has something to do with the recouching of the identity of Kansas State University. I mean, who knows what's what, what people are going to think about universities in the fall, or a year from now, you know, and I think it's probably incumbent on us to have a positive message that we can send out. So it's a reciprocal sort of thing. It can help the university; it can help us, too.”

What are the challenges to seeing a more engaged approach to Kansas State University’s mission?

“I think what has helped me with this process has just been exposure to the readings at all and given us and these talks have given me a lot more language to talk about what I do and a sense of fellowship and community around it, versus feeling siloed. So I can better talk about what I'm
doing with others and also feel like others are also doing this kind of work too and I'm not like some weirdo. That I'm not just off doing this work. And I didn't feel that totally, before obviously, Elaine and I and I are good friends. So she's already supported me in that sense, but the language has really been helpful. Like other ways to publish other ways, like other journals and other organizations to connect with. So I guess it was maybe more a solution that y'all have offered me to a challenge I had when I didn't have the understanding or have the language. I didn't have a community around it as much and this has helped.”

I think one challenge that many universities face, and K-State is no different, but certainly in our experiences. Anytime you're trying to promote something new or challenge the status quo or just, you know, get these projects up and running is just the resources. You know, we're all, I'm sure, many of you feel stretched thin, in many ways, not always, but at times. And so, always. It's just kind of institutional support at this time, you know, just kind of the resources necessary to do this important work.”

“To a certain extent I think just inertia is going to be one of the issues, right? Not used to doing it that way. And it's hard--to change minds, change budgetary allocations, resource times. Isn't that the big uphill battle here.”

“One thing that that I sort of see is, and part of this comes from the fact that I'm not really in what is considered an academic role at the university, even though I like I do a lot of of teaching of university students and a lot of work with faculty, is that some of the aspects or some of the places where a lot of engagement is going on with community and even students may not be within that academic and that maybe they need to be some stronger ties and and more value to to some of the areas of the university that are considered ‘support areas’ for the students. But I think it's in the support areas that a lot of engagement actually does happen.”

Reflection Takeaways and Lessons. What we learn from the Fellows’ is a sense that the use of deliberation aligns with the efforts of the land-grant mission as it engages diverse populations. One of the noted challenges, however, is the sense of tension between the use of deliberation and the “go go go” approach of engagement on the part of Fellows. The desire of engaging people and communities can, under certain circumstances, be a difficulty when it comes to the introduction to and commitment of deliberative practices.

A further challenge and takeaway of deliberation is the continued marginalization of such a practice within the academy. From the expectations of promotion and tenure as well as norms of of how higher education engages publics in ways that align with the expectations of expertise and scholarship that is public-serving but not necessarily public-engaging in its orientation and/or approach, the idea of public deliberation as a constitutive element to being an academic
professional. A way to respond to this is to promote deliberative civic engagement within departments, colleges, and the university through various means. The provision of multiple opportunities to learn about deliberation is a critical component of advancing the institution's commitment to viewing teaching, learning, and engagement through a deliberative lens.

Conclusion

At the time of this writing, the Center for Engagement and Community Development is going through the transition from its home within the Provost’s Office to one that, for a transitional period, will be housed within Kansas State Research and Extension. Dr. Procter, as director of the Center for Engagement and Community Development as well as the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy, will formally step down June 30, 2020. This has presented an opportunity to revisit Kansas State University’s commitment to civic engagement as a land-grant institution and how, institutionally, it will be situated and practiced.

Dr. Shaffer is part of a select group on campus to envision and reimage the next phase of engagement at Kansas State University. Currently, of 11 members of the university community, there are three Civic Engagement Fellows in addition to Dr. Shaffer. The co-chair of the Kansas State University Community Engagement Group, Dr. Timothy Steffensmeier, has a long history of being involved in public deliberation and has a commitment to having deliberation being part of the discussion about the future of engagement. With nearly half of the Community Engagement Group rooted in some understanding of and commitment to deliberation, there is interest in advancing this work. But as noted with the first meeting of this Group, the ability to transform an institution means that many more than the 28 faculty members and academic professionals who have completed the Civic Fellows Program need to be introduced to deliberative civic engagement and have the ability to utilize the resources necessary to embed this approach within their work--regardless of where they are within the university.

The ability to continue to introduce faculty members and academic professionals to deliberative civic engagement through the Civic Engagement Fellows programs is one important avenue to build a culture of public engagement rooted in democratic practices. The need for continued opportunities for formal, non-formal, and informal learning is an essential component of fostering deliberation within the campus community so that it can be utilized in a variety of ways through teaching, research, and engagement.
Appendix A
Disciplines Represented by Civic Engagement Fellows

Civic Engagement Fellows, 2017-2018
· Katie Kingery-Page (Landscape Architecture)
· Huston Gibson (Regional and Community Planning)
· Bruce Chladney (Wyandotte County Horticulture Extension Specialist)
· Erin Yellin (State Extension Specialist; Family Studies / Human Services)
· Brandon Irwin (Kinesiology)
· Kerri Priest (Leadership Studies)
· Spencer Wood (Sociology)
· Bonnie Lynn-Sherow (History)
· Laurie Baker (Agricultural Education and Communication)

Civic Engagement Fellows, 2018-2019
· LaBarbara Wigfall (Landscape Architecture)
· Laura Kanost (Modern Languages)
· Colene Lind (Communication Studies)
· Michael Tobler (Biology)
· Marlin Bates (Douglas County Community Development Extension Specialist)
· Julie Pentz (Dance)
· Mathila Jugulam (Agronomy)
· Linda Duke (Beach Museum of Art)
· Aliyah Mestrovich Seay (State Extension Specialist; 4-H)
· Greg Stephens (K-State Polytechnic; Integrated Studies)

Civic Engagement Fellows, 2019-2020
· Todd Gabbard (Architecture)
· Vibha Jani (Interior Architecture)
· Katherine Nelson (Geography)
· Brianne Heidbreder (Political Science)
· Amber Vennum (Family Studies and Human Services)
· Elaine Johannes (Extension Specialist, Family Studies and Human Services)
· Andy Wefald (Leadership Studies)
· Kathrine Schlageck (Beach Museum of Art)
· Carol Sevin (K-State Libraries)
Appendix B
Civic Engagement Fellows Interview Questions

1. What does it mean to be a professor/academic professional?
2. How do you define community engagement?
3. How do you define engaged scholarship?
4. Kansas State University is a land-grant institution. What does that mean to you?
5. When we invited you to be an Engagement Fellow and we spoke about deliberation as a way to think about engagement, what did that mean to you?
6. What do you feel you’ve learned this year about deliberation and engagement?
7. How has this experience made you think about your work? What you thought about, maybe unexpectedly? Or been troubled by?
8. How could Kansas State University more fully support engaged scholarship with a commitment to deliberative approaches and practices?
9. What are the challenges to seeing a more engaged approach to Kansas State University’s mission?
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