

60-Second SoTL

Episode 79 – Faculty Engagement with Work-Integrated Learning

Featured Article

Eubanks Fleming, CJ, Letitia Henville, Catherine Wilson, Kristin Geraty, and Denyse Lafrance Horning. 2026. "Faculty Willingness and Ability to Engage with Work-Integrated Learning (WIL): Piloting the Faculty Engagement Model in the WIL Sphere." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 14: 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.14.14>

Transcript

(Music)

0:10

Jessie L. Moore:

What factors inform faculty engagement in work-integrated learning activities like internships, co-ops, and field placements? That's the focus of this week's 60-second SoTL from Elon University's Center for Engaged Learning. I'm Jessie Moore.

(Music)

0:27

In "Faculty Willingness and Ability to Engage with Work-Integrated Learning (WIL): Piloting the Faculty Engagement Model in the WIL Sphere," CJ Eubanks Fleming, Letitia Henville, Catherine Wilson, Kristin Geraty, and Denyse Lafrance Horning explore how personal, professional, and institutional factors influence faculty participation in work-integrated learning—or WIL. Their article appears in a special section on work-integrated learning, published in March 2026 in *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, an open-access journal. All of the articles in the special section share research from the Center for Engaged Learning's 2022-2024 research seminar on WIL.

1:08

In this study, the researchers build on Wade and Demb's Faculty Engagement Model, which focused on one specific form of WIL—community-based research or service—and suggests that four domains affect faculty involvement with community-based programs: personal, professional, communal, and institutional. The personal domain involves identity, values, motivation, and personal beliefs and experiences. The professional domain involves faculty rank and status. The communal domain covers department, disciplinary, and professional community norms. Finally, the institutional domain relates to institution type, mission, leadership, budget, and policies.

1:48

Eubanks Fleming, Henville, Wilson, Geraty, and Lafrance Horning mirrored Wade and Demb's earlier work, but expanded the focus to a holistic understanding of work-integrated learning. They asked three research questions:

1. How do faculty participate in various WIL activities (e.g., internship, co-op, placements)?
2. How do faculty feel supported in WIL across different levels (i.e., department, discipline, professional community)?
3. Based on the Faculty Engagement Model, what factors are related to engagement (i.e., personal, professional, communal, institutional)?

2:23

The authors modified the Survey of Faculty Engagement, with Wade and Demb's permission, and 72 full-time university faculty—primarily from the United States and Canada—completed the survey.

The authors' analysis combined descriptive statistics with a logistic regression model, allowing them to examine which factors most strongly predicted whether faculty engaged in WIL.

2:44

The findings highlight both strong interest—and meaningful barriers.

First, faculty engagement in WIL among the survey participants was widespread: 76.4% reported participating, most often through mentoring internships and field experiences, especially outside the classroom. Participants also supported WIL through classroom teaching related to service learning, practicums, internships, and community and industry projects. However, relatively few faculty engaged in WIL-related research, suggesting an opportunity to expand SoTL work in this area.

Second, faculty overwhelmingly value WIL. Nearly all participants expressed either active or passive support, and many saw WIL as central to their institution's mission.

3:28

But here's the tension: Faculty perceived a gap between institutional messaging about WIL and institutional support. While WIL is often celebrated, participants reported lower confidence in funding, infrastructure, and recognition in promotion and tenure processes.

So what actually predicts whether faculty engage?

3:47

The regression analysis revealed four key factors:

- Department-level support was one of the strongest predictors—suggesting that local cultures and immediate colleagues matter more than broader disciplinary norms.

- Community interest in university partnerships also increased engagement, underscoring the relational nature of WIL.
- Prior personal experience with WIL made faculty far more likely to participate.
- And interestingly, lower perceived institutional support was associated with *higher* engagement—perhaps reflecting that those doing the work are most aware of the gaps.

4:21

Together, these findings suggest that faculty engagement in WIL is not driven by a single factor, but by a dynamic interplay across personal, communal, and institutional contexts.

For practice, this points to several strategies:

Start at the department level, where support has the greatest impact. Build communities of practice to reduce isolation. And critically, align institutional messaging with meaningful recognition, resources, and reward structures.

Ultimately, if WIL is to fulfill its promise as a high-impact practice, supporting students means also supporting the faculty who make these experiences possible.

To learn more about this study, visit our show notes for a link to the open access article.

5:03

(Music)

5:06

Jessie Moore:

Join us for our next episode of 60-second SoTL from Elon University's Center for Engaged Learning for another snapshot of recent scholarship of teaching and learning. Learn more about the Center at www.CenterForEngagedLearning.org.

(Music)