Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Scaling Community-Engaged High-Impact Practices: An Organizational Framework for Business Education Transformation

Jonathan H. Westover *

Posted Date: 11 November 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

Keywords: service-learning; community engagement; institutional change; reciprocal partnerships; high-impact practices; democratic engagement; community-campus collaboration; transformative learning

Article

Scaling Community-Engaged High-Impact Practices: An Organizational Framework for Business Education Transformation

Jonathan H. Westover

Western Governors University, USA; jon.westover@gmail.com

Abstract

Business schools increasingly recognize high-impact practices (HIPs)—particularly community-engaged learning experiences—as strategic levers for institutional transformation, student success, and regional impact. Yet implementation often remains fragmented, with isolated service-learning courses failing to generate the systemic change these pedagogies promise. This framework synthesizes research on HIPs and reciprocal community engagement to examine how business schools can scale community-engaged learning as comprehensive organizational strategy rather than boutique enrichment. Drawing on student development theory, organizational change scholarship, and partnership literature, the analysis explores how systematic HIP implementation reshapes institutional cultures, resource allocations, and community relationships. The framework addresses three critical dimensions: translating pedagogical interventions into organizational capacity-building; designing partnerships that generate authentic reciprocal value; and building sustainable infrastructure supporting long-term engagement. Evidence from multi-institutional research suggests that business schools embedding community-engaged HIPs systematically—supported by cross-functional collaboration, equity-minded design, and distributed partnership governance—can simultaneously advance student learning, organizational performance, and regional innovation. However, realizing this potential requires structural commitments extending far beyond curricular additions: faculty development ecosystems, partnership coordination infrastructure, assessment systems capturing community benefit, and resource reallocation aligning budgets with engagement priorities.

Keywords: service-learning; community engagement; institutional change; reciprocal partnerships; high-impact practices; democratic engagement; community-campus collaboration; transformative learning

---

American business education operates at the convergence of multiple crises demanding integrated rather than incremental responses. Employers question graduate preparedness for collaborative stakeholder environments and complex sustainability challenges. Students expect education connecting classroom frameworks to societal problems. Communities need analytical capacity but often lack resources to access university expertise. State legislatures demand accountability for public investment while philanthropic funders reward demonstrated regional impact. These pressures arrive as completion gaps persist across race, ethnicity, and family income despite access expansion, and as public trust in higher education—and business specifically—remains fragile.

High-impact practices have emerged as evidence-based responses to these converging demands. Originally conceptualized by George Kuh and the Association of American Colleges and Universities, HIPs are structured educational experiences distinguished by common design elements: significant time investment, substantive faculty and peer interaction, frequent feedback, real-world application, structured reflection, and public demonstration of competence (Kuh, 2008). Among the ten widely recognized HIPs—first-year seminars, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, internships, and capstone projects—service-learning and community-based learning represent particularly powerful manifestations for business education, simultaneously developing applied capabilities while addressing authentic organizational needs.

Yet a decade of implementation reveals that isolated service-learning courses or one-off community consulting projects generate limited institutional impact. When 200 students across a business school of 3,000 complete community projects annually, most graduates never encounter these pedagogies. When service-learning depends on individual faculty champions, partnerships dissolve when champions leave. When community organizations describe cycles of re-explaining context to new student teams each semester, reciprocal value erodes (Sandy & Holland, 2006). The fundamental question facing business school leaders is whether they will implement community-engaged HIPs as comprehensive organizational strategies or relegate them to marginal enrichment programs serving primarily already-advantaged students.

This framework positions systematic community-engaged HIP implementation as organizational transformation strategy that reshapes institutional cultures, reallocates resources, redefines faculty roles, and reconstructs community relationships. The analysis synthesizes foundational student success research (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 2008; Tinto, 1993), organizational change scholarship (Eckel et al., 1998), and reciprocal partnership literature (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009; Sandy & Holland, 2006) to illuminate how business schools can leverage community engagement for simultaneous student learning, institutional performance, and regional impact outcomes.

The framework proceeds through five integrated sections. First, we define community-engaged HIPs within contemporary business education contexts, documenting participation patterns and equity considerations. Second, we examine organizational and individual consequences, demonstrating how these practices simultaneously advance completion goals and institutional transformation. Third, we analyze evidence-based organizational strategies for systematic implementation, illustrated with cross-industry examples. Fourth, we propose capacity-building frameworks emphasizing distributed leadership, equity-minded continuous improvement, and partnership governance. Finally, we conclude with implications for positioning business education as catalyst for equitable, place-based change in an era of declining public confidence.

The Community-Engaged HIP Landscape in Business Education

Defining Community Engagement as High-Impact Practice

Service-learning and community-based learning represent HIPs where all design elements converge with particular intensity. Students invest substantial time in sustained community partnerships—typically 20-40 hours over a semester beyond regular coursework. Faculty interaction extends beyond lectures to mentorship navigating community contexts, facilitating reflection connecting experience to business frameworks, and mediating between academic and community expectations. Peer collaboration proves essential as students work in teams addressing organizational challenges requiring coordination, conflict resolution, and collective accountability. Feedback flows from multiple sources: faculty assess analytical rigor, community partners evaluate professionalism and deliverable utility, and peers review collaboration quality. Real-world application is inherent—students address authentic organizational challenges where their analysis may influence actual decisions. Structured reflection distinguishes service-learning from mere activity, requiring systematic examination of what students observed, connections to course concepts, and implications for their evolving understanding of business's societal role. Public demonstration occurs through presentations to community partners and deliverables organizations may implement (Kuh, 2008).

Beyond these structural elements, *reciprocal* community-engaged HIPs incorporate additional principles that transform traditional service relationships. Community organizations participate as co-educators and knowledge partners rather than passive service recipients (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009). Joint problem definition ensures projects address priorities communities identify rather than

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 11 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

academic convenience. Bidirectional knowledge flow positions students and faculty as learners from community expertise while contributing analytical capabilities. Mutual benefit accountability measures success through community-identified outcomes alongside student learning gains. Sustained relationship infrastructure replaces transactional one-semester projects with ongoing partnerships evolving over years. Power-sharing governance gives community voices influence over curriculum decisions, project timelines, and partnership evaluation (Dostilio et al., 2012).

This conceptual framework has practical implications. A traditional service-learning approach might assign MBA students to develop marketing plans for nonprofits, with instructors selecting organizations and defining deliverables unilaterally. A reciprocal community-engaged HIP would involve community partners in course design from inception, allow organizations to identify their actual strategic priorities (which might differ from marketing), incorporate community perspectives in student evaluation rubrics, build mechanisms for ongoing feedback throughout the semester, and establish multi-year partnership commitments enabling relationship deepening rather than constant reestablishment (Clayton et al., 2013).

Participation Patterns and Persistent Equity Gaps

Despite growing consensus on community-engaged learning's effectiveness, participation remains uneven across student populations and institution types, revealing equity gaps that undermine transformative potential. National data suggest that substantial numbers of business students complete at least one community-engaged experience during undergraduate careers, though considerably fewer complete multiple experiences—the threshold research associates with stronger learning gains and career outcomes (Kuh, 2008).

Evidence indicates participation patterns differ systematically by student background in ways that may reproduce rather than mitigate inequality. First-generation students, students from lower-income families, and students from some underrepresented racial and ethnic groups appear to participate in certain community-engaged HIPs at lower rates than peers, even after accounting for institutional type (Kuh, 2008). These disparities likely reflect multiple mechanisms: unpaid or underpaid internships and community placements systematically exclude students who must work for wages to cover living expenses; application processes for competitive service-learning programs may advantage students from college-educated families who understand how to approach faculty and possess tacit knowledge about professional norms; implicit biases in faculty mentorship may lead to differential encouragement; departmental cultures may signal that community engagement is "for students interested in nonprofits" rather than core business competency development.

Participation also varies predictably by institution type and program level. Undergraduate business programs may embed service-learning in required courses at higher rates than graduate programs, where compressed timeframes and working professional populations create implementation challenges. Yet MBA programs increasingly recognize community-engaged learning's value for developing stakeholder management capabilities and exposing students to mission-driven career paths often invisible in traditional business curricula (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2008). Specialized programs in social entrepreneurship, nonprofit management, and sustainability embed community partnerships more systematically than general management programs, potentially creating stratification where students self-selecting into "impact" tracks gain community engagement access while mainstream students do not.

Beyond student-level participation, organizational participation patterns merit examination. Research suggests that larger, better-resourced community organizations with dedicated volunteer or partnership coordinators participate in university relationships more readily than small grassroots organizations operating with minimal staff (Sandy & Holland, 2006). This pattern risks replicating existing power dynamics where well-established nonprofits gain additional capacity while organizations serving the most marginalized communities—precisely those potentially benefiting most from university analytical support—remain excluded from partnership ecosystems.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 11 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

Organizational and Individual Consequences of Community-Engaged HIPs

Organizational Performance Impacts: Beyond Retention to Institutional Transformation

Community-engaged HIPs influence institutional metrics that matter to boards, legislators, and accreditors while simultaneously reshaping organizational cultures and structures. Multi-institutional research documents that students completing service-learning and similar community-engaged experiences demonstrate retention rates notably higher than non-participants, with effect sizes persisting even after controlling for prior achievement, demographics, and institutional selectivity (Kuh, 2008). Students engaging in multiple HIPs—such as service-learning combined with learning communities or culminating in community-based capstones—appear to complete degrees at substantially higher rates than peers with no HIP experiences.

Importantly, completion effects appear particularly pronounced for historically underserved populations. Research indicates that first-generation students who engaged in community-based learning showed completion rates approaching continuing-generation peers, potentially mitigating structural disadvantage typically associated with being first in one's family to attend college (Kuh, 2008). Similarly, students from underrepresented backgrounds participating in service-learning demonstrated completion rates more comparable to majority peers than would otherwise be expected. These equity-closing patterns suggest community-engaged HIPs may provide compensatory social and cultural capital for students whose families cannot offer professional networks, internship connections, or tacit knowledge about navigating career pathways.

Methodological caveat: These correlational findings, while consistent across studies, cannot definitively establish causation. Students who participate in community-engaged HIPs likely differ from non-participants in unobserved ways—motivation, sense of belonging, family support—that also predict completion. While researchers employ increasingly sophisticated controls, selection bias remains a threat to causal inference. The most rigorous studies suggest effects are real but potentially smaller than simple correlations indicate.

Beyond quantifiable retention and completion metrics, community-engaged HIPs reshape institutional culture and organizational priorities in ways that alter identity and resource allocation. Scaling service-learning from isolated course experiments to general education requirements necessitates creating partnership infrastructure—dedicated offices coordinating community relationships, legal frameworks governing liability and intellectual property, partnership coordinators managing ongoing communication, transportation logistics supporting student access to community sites (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009). These investments signal institutional commitment extending beyond mission statement rhetoric to budget allocation and organizational design.

For business schools specifically, systematic community engagement challenges traditional organizational structures and cultural assumptions. When substantial numbers of students engage in community-based consulting projects annually, schools must reconsider how mentorship labor is recognized within promotion criteria, potentially compensating community-engaged teaching through course load adjustments or explicitly valuing partnership development alongside traditional scholarship (Eckel et al., 1998). When community partners participate in curriculum design and student evaluation, power dynamics shift from faculty as sole authorities toward collaborative governance that can feel threatening to academic autonomy. When capstone experiences transition from individual case analyses to team-based community projects, assessment approaches must evolve to capture collaborative competencies and stakeholder communication alongside analytical rigor.

The financial sustainability case for community-engaged HIPs rests on multiple mechanisms beyond direct retention revenue. State performance funding in jurisdictions allocating appropriations based on completion metrics makes HIP-driven completion gains potentially financially valuable. Philanthropic attraction may follow demonstrated regional engagement; business schools with robust community partnership ecosystems attract mission-aligned foundation support and corporate donations from employers valuing community-engaged graduate capabilities. Employer partnerships develop around internships and consulting projects, sometimes evolving into sponsored research, gift agreements, or preferred hiring relationships yielding financial and reputational benefits (Eyler et al., 1996).

Individual Learning Outcomes: Cognitive Gains and Career Readiness

Community-engaged HIPs influence multiple dimensions of student learning with particular relevance for business education. Kilgo, Sheets, and Pascarella's (2015) longitudinal study using data from the Wabash National Study examined approximately 2,000 students across 17 diverse institutions, employing hierarchical linear modeling to control for pre-college characteristics and confounding factors. Researchers found that HIP participation during second and third years predicted significant gains in critical thinking, need for cognition (intrinsic motivation for effortful cognitive activity), and integrative learning (ability to connect ideas across domains and apply knowledge in new contexts). Effect sizes exceeded those for other educationally purposeful activities, suggesting HIPs' unique contributions.

For business students specifically, service-learning appears associated with enhanced applied skill development that simulated cases may not provide to the same degree. Working on authentic organizational challenges develops capabilities in problem diagnosis under ambiguity, stakeholder management across diverse interests, navigation of resource constraints, and communication with non-technical audiences—competencies employers consistently identify as critical yet underdeveloped in business graduates (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2008). When students develop financial models for community health centers, they confront data limitations, political sensitivities, and implementation constraints absent from textbook problems. When MBA teams consult with social enterprises, they grapple with dual missions balancing social impact and financial sustainability, developing nuanced understanding of stakeholder complexity.

Civic learning and ethical reasoning represent particularly salient outcomes in an era where business legitimacy depends increasingly on demonstrated stakeholder value creation. Exposure to community contexts and social challenges appears associated in some studies with enhanced understanding of business's societal role, recognition of structural inequality shaping market contexts, and more sophisticated ethical reasoning navigating competing stakeholder claims (Jacoby, 2015). Students may transition from narrow shareholder primacy assumptions toward stakeholder capitalism frameworks, from charity orientations (helping the less fortunate through individual volunteerism) toward justice orientations (addressing systemic inequities through structural change).

Career clarification and purpose connection represent additional outcomes with retention and satisfaction implications. Community engagement helps students discover mission-driven career paths—social entrepreneurship, impact investing, corporate sustainability, nonprofit management—that traditional business curricula rarely illuminate (Eyler et al., 1996). For students experiencing purpose crisis common in business education, connecting analytical capabilities with meaningful societal contribution may enhance motivation and wellbeing. Some longitudinal research tracking students years post-graduation suggests that service-learning participants report higher rates of community organization engagement and pro-social career choices, though selection effects complicate causal interpretation.

Community Organization and Regional Innovation Impacts

For community organizations, well-designed university partnerships can generate measurable capacity gains and strategic value, though effects vary substantially based on partnership structure and implementation quality. Organizations with limited staff or technical expertise access analytical capabilities through student collaboration. An environmental nonprofit gains market research capacity informing program expansion. A community development organization receives financial modeling supporting loan program evaluation. A social enterprise obtains consumer behavior analysis guiding product positioning (Sandy & Holland, 2006).

However, partnerships also impose real costs. Hosting student projects requires staff time for context-setting, coordination, and review—time diverted from direct service or fundraising. Projects sometimes deliver recommendations that are analytically sound but operationally infeasible given resource constraints or political realities. Organizations may experience "partnership fatigue" managing relationships with multiple universities operating on different timelines with different expectations. Research documenting community partner perspectives reveals that perceived value depends heavily on whether projects address priorities organizations actually identify versus what universities assume they need, whether deliverables arrive in actionable formats and timelines, and whether partnerships demonstrate genuine reciprocity versus extractive relationships where organizations provide learning laboratories without commensurate benefit (Sandy & Holland, 2006).

When business schools systematically align community-engaged HIPs with regional priorities, potential emerges for meaningful innovation ecosystem contributions. Capstone projects addressing local business challenges may yield innovations deployable in regional industries. Service-learning supporting neighborhood economic development organizations amplifies community capacity. Undergraduate and MBA research potentially accelerating discoveries in regional sectors—healthcare delivery, sustainable agriculture, renewable energy—may contribute to economic competitiveness. The regional impact potential intensifies when institutions intentionally coordinate HIP themes with community-identified priorities rather than individual faculty research interests alone, positioning higher education as civic anchor institutions integrating learning, discovery, and community problem-solving (Kuh, 2008).

Evidence-Based Organizational Strategies for Systematic Implementation

Curricular Embedding: From Boutique to Universal Access

Isolated HIP offerings—an elective service-learning section here, a competitive summer consulting program there—produce limited institutional impact and may perpetuate inequity by primarily serving already-confident students possessing cultural capital to seek opportunities. Systematic scaling requires curricular mapping and intentional sequencing ensuring all students encounter community-engaged experiences as degree requirements rather than optional enrichment.

Strategic curricular embedding begins with comprehensive auditing: Where do community-engaged HIPs currently exist? Which student populations access them at what rates? What gaps exist across majors, student demographics, and degree progression? Diagnostic analysis often reveals significant disparities: students in specialized social enterprise or sustainability tracks complete multiple community projects while mainstream finance and accounting majors never encounter community-engaged learning; residential students participate in service-learning learning communities while working commuters remain excluded; MBA students in competitive consulting programs dominate community partnerships while part-time evening students lack access.

Armed with diagnostic data, business schools can redesign curricula ensuring access through requirement rather than aspiration:

First-year business foundations redesign transforms introductory courses into community-engaged experiences. Rather than isolated case studies, students investigate local business challenges through community partnerships while developing core analytical frameworks. A business fundamentals course might partner with small business development centers, with student teams conducting market research for local entrepreneurs while learning competitive analysis, financial statements, and strategic planning. This integrated approach cultivates intellectual engagement and community connection from day one while building academic skills contextually.

Discipline-specific applied experiences embedded within major requirements democratize community engagement beyond elective courses. When business strategy courses require consulting projects with community organizations, all strategy students—not only those selecting service-learning electives—engage with authentic stakeholder complexity. When marketing courses partner with nonprofit communications needs, all marketing students develop campaign skills in contexts

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

where resource constraints and mission alignment introduce realistic complications textbooks cannot simulate. This curricular embedding shifts community engagement from enrichment activity to core disciplinary competency development.

Capstone community partnerships ensure students synthesize accumulated knowledge through projects addressing real organizational challenges. Rather than individual case analyses or hypothetical business plans, students work in teams with community partners—social enterprises, nonprofits, government agencies, or small businesses—conducting strategic analysis, developing implementation recommendations, and presenting findings to organizational leadership. Capstone community partnerships combine all HIP elements: sustained time investment, intensive faculty and peer collaboration, frequent feedback from multiple sources, authentic application, structured reflection connecting experience to business frameworks, and public demonstration to community audiences evaluating practical utility alongside analytical sophistication.

Georgia State University exemplifies intentional equity-focused curricular embedding at scale. Institutional leaders analyzed completion data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and income, discovering differential HIP participation patterns. Leadership launched comprehensive student success initiatives embedding HIPs more systematically throughout undergraduate education. The university restructured advising to proactively identify students ready for community-engaged learning and connect them with opportunities, substantially expanding participation. Learning community offerings expanded from optional programs to scaled implementations integrated with general education. Academic advising shifted from reactive to proactive, with analytics identifying students likely to benefit from specific interventions and advisors initiating targeted outreach. Community-engaged capstones became universal major requirements with coordinated faculty development. Over several years, Georgia State documented substantial completion rate increases while narrowing or eliminating gaps between Black and White students and between Pell Grant recipients and non-Pell students. While attributing improvements to any single intervention proves impossible in comprehensive change initiatives, institutional analysts credit coordinated HIP embedding—including community engagement—as central alongside advising reform and financial support (Kuh, 2008).

Faculty Development and Partnership Coordination Infrastructure

Community-engaged HIPs demand pedagogical competencies and partnership management skills that graduate training rarely provides: facilitation of collaborative learning, navigation of community partnership complexity, design of project-based assessment, scaffolding of structured reflection, management of intensified student interaction, and translation between academic and community organizational expectations. Without intentional professional development, HIP quality suffers—becoming what Kuh (2008) termed "high-impact in name only"—and faculty experience burnout from unsustainable workload.

Faculty learning communities model the collaborative practice HIPs promote for students. Rather than isolated individuals designing courses independently, faculty cohorts co-design community-engaged courses, observe one another's teaching, analyze student work collectively, and troubleshoot partnership challenges together. This peer learning reduces isolation, surfaces tacit pedagogical knowledge, and builds institutional capacity persisting beyond individual faculty careers (Eynon & Gambino, 2017). Research on scaling educational innovations emphasizes that sustainable change requires creating communities of practice—networks sharing concern for a domain and learning collectively—rather than relying on heroic champions whose departure often collapses initiatives (Eckel et al., 1998).

Effective faculty development addresses not only pedagogical technique but also equity considerations shaping how standard HIP implementations can reproduce inequities without critical awareness. Unpaid community placements exclude working students; competitive application processes may favor culturally privileged students; service-learning approaching communities through deficit lenses may reinforce rather than challenge problematic narratives. Faculty

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 11 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

development should directly address equity challenges, training instructors to design financially accessible experiences, proactively recruit underrepresented students, and facilitate difficult dialogues about privilege, power, and structural inequality that community engagement inevitably surfaces (Jacoby, 2015).

Elon University's Center for Engaged Learning exemplifies comprehensive faculty development infrastructure. The center coordinates ongoing professional development around service-learning partnership principles, community-based research methods, and integrative learning assessment. Annual summer institutes bring faculty cohorts together to design or redesign community-engaged courses, providing structured time, expert facilitation, and peer feedback. Participants receive stipends and mini-grants funding pilots. Critically, the center facilitates ongoing communities of practice extending beyond initial institutes—faculty teaching service-learning courses meet regularly to share syllabi, discuss partnership challenges, and analyze student reflection quality. These sustained communities normalize community-engaged pedagogies and provide emotional support for challenging innovation work (Eynon & Gambino, 2017).

Partnership coordination infrastructure proves equally essential. Reciprocal community engagement functions better when supported by dedicated staff reducing coordination costs and professionalizing relationship management. Partnership coordinators manage community relationships year-round (not just during active courses), match projects with organizational needs and course learning objectives, provide orientation for students and faculty, maintain communication across academic and fiscal year cycles, and ensure institutional memory persists when faculty or community staff transition (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009).

Portland State University's integration of community-based learning demonstrates sustained infrastructure investment. The university requires all students complete year-long senior capstones organized around community-identified themes—affordable housing, environmental sustainability, food security, educational equity. Community organizations don't simply host students; they serve as co-educators helping define project parameters, providing stakeholder access, offering feedback on student work, and receiving final deliverables useful for planning or advocacy. Partnership infrastructure includes dedicated community engagement staff brokering relationships, legal counsel developing template agreements clarifying intellectual property and liability, and transportation services providing site access. These investments signal that community partnership constitutes core institutional business rather than optional enrichment dependent on individual faculty heroics (Kuh, 2008).

Reciprocal Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Effective community-engaged practice requires systematic assessment of community benefit alongside student learning, using feedback to improve continuously. Traditional assessment focuses almost exclusively on student outcomes—learning gains, skill development, satisfaction. Yet reciprocal partnerships demand measuring whether communities actually benefited, not merely whether students learned (Gelmon et al., 2001).

Assessment approaches supporting reciprocity include:

- *Community partner voice in evaluation*: Formal mechanisms where organizations evaluate project usefulness, student professionalism, communication effectiveness, and overall partnership value. These evaluations should influence course design and potentially student grades, not serve merely as supplementary feedback (Sandy & Holland, 2006).
- *Outcome measurement beyond deliverables*: Assessment examining whether projects actually influenced organizational decisions or capabilities, not just whether deliverables were produced. Follow-up conversations several months post-project reveal implementation and impact more

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

accurately than end-of-semester evaluations when organizations haven't yet assessed practical utility.

- *Relationship quality metrics*: Measurement of trust, communication effectiveness, mutual respect, and partner satisfaction as partnership health indicators. These process dimensions may predict sustainability better than individual project metrics (Gelmon et al., 2001).
- *Balanced scorecards*: Assessment frameworks explicitly measuring reciprocal value—student learning gains, community benefit, faculty development, and institutional mission advancement. This balanced approach prevents overemphasis on easily measured student outcomes at the expense of community impact.

LaGuardia Community College pioneered ePortfolio assessment at scale, with students in service-learning and community-engaged courses maintaining portfolios throughout enrollment. Students select artifacts representing strongest work, write reflective narratives connecting experiences to goals, and receive formative feedback from faculty and peers. The college uses ePortfolios for both student development and programmatic assessment. Faculty analyze portfolios using AAC&U's Integrative Learning VALUE rubric, revealing patterns in student development across critical thinking, communication, and community engagement competencies. These findings inform curricular revision and faculty development priorities (Eynon & Gambino, 2017).

Critically, LaGuardia treats ePortfolio implementation as comprehensive organizational initiative requiring technological infrastructure, pedagogical training, and advising integration—not isolated technology adoption. This coordinated approach enables ePortfolios to function as intended rather than becoming compliance exercises.

Building Long-Term Institutional Capacity for Community-Engaged Learning

Integrated Leadership and Distributed Governance

Community-engaged HIPs inherently transcend traditional organizational boundaries. Service-learning requires academic affairs and student affairs coordination; community partnerships depend on legal counsel, transportation, and external relations; assessment involves institutional research and academic programs. When these units operate in silos—the dominant pattern—implementation becomes fragmented, inefficient, and potentially inequitable.

Cross-functional planning structures bring stakeholders together around shared goals, creating accountability transcending individual units. Effective models include executive councils co-chaired by chief academic and student affairs officers, charged with setting institution-wide participation targets, allocating resources across units, monitoring equity indicators, and troubleshooting barriers (Eckel et al., 1998). Regular review of disaggregated participation data enables proactive intervention when gaps emerge—if commuter students participate at lower rates, leadership directs resources toward accessible formats; if particular student populations are underrepresented, targeted outreach and inclusive design address barriers.

Beyond internal integration, *distributed partnership governance* gives community organizations genuine voice in institutional decisions. Partnership advisory councils comprising community representatives, faculty, administrators, and students provide input on program direction, evaluate partnership quality, and recommend improvements. These councils create formal channels for community influence over university practices (Dostilio et al., 2012).

Community-based partnership agreements formalize power-sharing, specifying decision-making authority, data ownership, publication approval processes, and conflict resolution mechanisms. These agreements prevent unilateral university decisions and acknowledge that community organizations—not universities—should determine what serves their interests.

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

Some business schools operate social impact initiatives with advisory boards including partner organization representatives who provide strategic direction and evaluate program effectiveness, giving community partners direct influence over university program development. Other institutions have developed community partnership councils comprising staff from organizations partnering regularly across the university. Councils review proposed partnerships, provide feedback on university practices, and recommend policy changes better serving community needs.

Equity-Minded Design and Continuous Improvement

Not all HIP participation yields equitable outcomes. Unpaid internships systematically exclude students needing wage employment. Competitive programs may replicate racialized and gendered hierarchies when lacking cultural responsiveness. Service-learning sending predominantly privileged students into lower-income communities risks reinforcing deficit narratives absent critical pedagogical framing (Kuh, 2008).

Equity audits systematically surface these patterns, disaggregating participation and outcome data by intersectional identities and investigating why disparities exist. Beyond describing gaps—"first-generation students participate at lower rates"—equity audits pursue explanatory questions: Do application processes advantage students with college-educated parents? Do unpaid positions exclude working students? Do implicit biases lead to differential encouragement? These investigations reveal structural barriers rather than individual student deficits, pointing toward systemic solutions.

Equity-responsive design strategies include:

- *Need-based stipends* for previously unpaid experiences. When community placements pay competitive wages, students need not choose between engagement and necessary employment. When service-learning courses provide transportation stipends, students without cars can access community sites.
- *Proactive recruitment and inclusive messaging*. Rather than posting opportunities and waiting for applicants, equity-minded programs train faculty to identify promising students in required courses and personally invite participation. Targeted outreach includes testimonials from peers with similar backgrounds who successfully navigated experiences.
- *Culturally responsive mentorship training* helps faculty recognize that students from underrepresented backgrounds may hesitate approaching authority figures due to prior negative institutional experiences; that perceived lack of professionalism may reflect different cultural norms; that students managing multiple responsibilities may need flexibility rather than being written off as uncommitted (Kuh, 2008).
- *Critical pedagogical framing* ensures service-learning challenges rather than reinforces deficit thinking. Faculty preparation includes readings on structural inequality and power dynamics. Student preparation modules explicitly address privilege and positionality. Reflection prompts push beyond feel-good narratives to grapple with uncomfortable questions about complicity, systemic injustice, and what genuine solidarity requires.

Continuous improvement cycles institutionalize equity as ongoing practice rather than one-time achievement. Annual reviews convene cross-functional teams examining latest data and asking: Which students are we still missing? What new barriers have emerged? How do students from different backgrounds experience the same HIP differently? This stance resists complacency and recognizes that equity work never concludes.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.0610.v1

Regional Innovation Ecosystems and Place-Based Commitment

Community-engaged HIPs position business schools as engines of regional vitality when systematically aligned with community and economic development priorities. Capstone projects addressing local challenges may yield innovations deployable in regional industries. Service-learning supporting neighborhood organizations amplifies community capacity. Research potentially accelerating discoveries in regional sectors contributes to economic competitiveness. When institutions intentionally align HIP themes with regional priorities, students graduate better prepared for local workforce needs while communities potentially benefit from sustained intellectual capital.

Regional partnership compacts formalize institutional obligations to dedicate portions of HIP activity toward community-identified priorities. A business school might pledge that specified percentages of capstone projects address small business development in economically distressed neighborhoods or that service-learning placements prioritize educational equity organizations. These compacts shift typical dynamics where universities define priorities and communities accommodate institutional interests; instead, community needs help shape university resource deployment.

Industry-sponsored capstones exemplify potential multi-sided value creation. Corporations fund student teams to prototype products, analyze market opportunities, or evaluate strategic options. Students gain authentic professional experience potentially leading to employment. Faculty access real-world problems enriching teaching and sometimes sparking research collaborations. Companies receive cost-effective innovation services while developing talent pipelines (Strand et al., 2003).

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis employed data-driven resource reallocation expanding community-engaged learning substantially. Institutional researchers analyzed completion rates and career outcomes by program, identifying high-demand majors with modest success metrics. Program review revealed low-enrollment courses consuming disproportionate resources. Leadership redirected faculty lines into high-demand programs with expectations that faculty design HIP-designated community-engaged courses accessible to non-majors. Savings from consolidation funded university-wide community engagement initiatives providing need-based stipends, faculty development on inclusive partnership, and centralized administrative support (Kuh, 2008).

Conclusion: Community Engagement as Comprehensive Institutional Strategy

Community-engaged high-impact practices have evolved from promising pedagogical innovations into potential comprehensive strategies for business school transformation. The evidence synthesized here is compelling: these practices appear to enhance learning across cognitive, civic, and professional development domains; potentially narrow equity gaps in retention and completion when designed with explicit attention to access barriers; strengthen student-institution bonds through meaningful faculty, peer, and community relationships; and position business education as regional innovation asset when aligned with community priorities.

Yet realizing this potential requires seeing community-engaged HIPs not merely as teaching techniques but as organizational change initiatives reshaping institutional cultures, resource allocations, faculty reward structures, and community relationships. Business schools demonstrating success with community engagement scaling share common commitments revealed through the organizational strategies examined here:

- They *embed community engagement systematically* into curricular requirements rather than offering isolated enrichment programs, using strategic curricular mapping to ensure rather than merely encourage participation.
- They *invest substantially in faculty development and partnership infrastructure*, recognizing that sustainable implementation requires collaborative communities of practice and dedicated coordination rather than heroic individual effort (Eckel et al., 1998).

- They *cultivate reciprocal community partnerships* guided by principles of mutual benefit, shared authority, and long-term commitment rather than transactional service extraction (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009; Dostilio et al., 2012).
- They *implement sophisticated assessment* generating evidence of both student learning and community benefit while supporting continuous improvement, with portfolios enabling documentation of integrative competencies transcripts cannot capture (Eynon & Gambino, 2017).
- They *reallocate resources strategically*, making difficult trade-offs to align budgets with engagement priorities even when disrupting entrenched interests.

Most fundamentally, successful institutions treat community-engaged HIP scaling as comprehensive organizational change requiring integrated leadership across traditionally siloed units, explicit attention to equity in design and implementation, and sustained effort over years rather than quick wins (Eckel et al., 1998). This organizational lens reveals that implementation challenges are not primarily pedagogical—faculty generally grasp how to design effective community projects given appropriate training and support. Rather, challenges are structural: fragmented organizational designs preventing coordination, resource allocation processes favoring incremental continuity, reward systems valuing traditional scholarship over community-engaged teaching, and cultures treating engagement as peripheral rather than central institutional commitment.

For business education navigating multiple crises—enrollment pressures, completion gaps, employability concerns, declining public trust, fiscal constraint, questions about fundamental purpose—community-engaged HIPs offer potential convergence of solutions. They address completion challenges through evidence-based pedagogies appearing to improve retention (Kuh, 2008). They potentially narrow equity gaps by providing structured access to high-quality mentorship and applied learning historically secured informally by privileged students. They enhance career readiness through authentic professional experiences and stakeholder capability development. They strengthen civic capacity by engaging students with community challenges and cultivating sophisticated understanding of business's societal role. They position institutions as regional assets contributing intellectual capital to community and economic development.

Yet community-engaged HIPs cannot resolve business education's challenges if relegated to marginal enrichment programs. The fundamental question is whether business school leaders will muster organizational will to make community-engaged learning universal rather than exceptional—a question with profound implications for mission fulfillment, equity, and institutional sustainability.

This framework suggests several priorities for leaders committed to transformation:

- Start with *equity audits* examining which students currently access community-engaged experiences at what rates and investigating structural barriers rather than individual student deficits.
- Invest in *faculty development infrastructure* creating communities of practice rather than relying on individual champions. Provide time, resources, and recognition for pedagogical innovation.
- Build *cross-functional collaboration structures* bringing academic affairs, student affairs, community partnerships, and other units together around shared goals. Align incentives and information systems.
- Design for *scale from inception* rather than allowing boutique programs to calcify around potentially inequitable access patterns. Embed community engagement into curricular requirements.

- Cultivate *community partnerships as genuine reciprocal relationships* rather than unidirectional service. Invest in partnership infrastructure, recognize community expertise, and document mutual benefits through balanced assessment (Gelmon et al., 2001; Sandy & Holland, 2006).
- Implement *assessment systems capturing integrative learning* and community benefit that transcripts miss. Use assessment data for continuous improvement rather than merely compliance.
- Reallocate *resources strategically* from lower-impact activities toward evidence-based community-engaged HIPs, using transparent data to build cases for difficult trade-offs.

For business schools embracing this challenge, community-engaged high-impact practices offer powerful frameworks for translating aspirational mission statements into tangible outcomes for students, communities, and regions—potentially positioning business education as catalyst for equitable, place-based change in an era demanding higher education demonstrate genuine public value. The organizational transformation this requires is substantial. But the evidence suggests the transformation is achievable and that potential benefits—for students, institutions, communities, and democratic society—may justify the effort and disruption involved.

References

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4), 297–308.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2009*(147), 37–46.

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vol. 2A). Stylus Publishing.

Dostilio, L. D., Brackmann, S. M., Edwards, K. E., Harrison, B., Kliewer, B. W., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Reciprocity: Saying what we mean and meaning what we say. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19*(1), 17–32.

Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). *On change: En route to transformation*. American Council on Education.

Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., & Schmiede, A. (1996). A practitioner's guide to reflection in service-learning: Student voices and reflections. Vanderbilt University.

Eynon, B., & Gambino, L. M. (2017). High-impact ePortfolio practice: A catalyst for student, faculty, and institutional learning. Stylus Publishing.

Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B. A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., & Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and techniques*. Campus Compact.

Jacoby, B. (2015). Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned. Jossey-Bass.

Kenworthy-U'Ren, A. L. (2008). A decade of service-learning: A review of the field ten years after JOBE's seminal special issue. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81*(4), 811–822.

Kilgo, C. A., Sheets, J. K. E., & Pascarella, E. T. (2015). The link between high-impact practices and student learning: Some longitudinal evidence. *Higher Education, 69*(4), 509–525.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). Jossey-Bass.

Sandy, M., & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*(1), 30–43.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. Jossey-Bass.

Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.