

Community Engaged Scholarship

CRITICAL JUNCTURES IN RESEARCH, PRACTICE AND POLICY

Conference Report

November 4–5, 2010

University of Guelph

Wenger L, Hawkins L, Seifer SD. (Editors). (2011). Community-Engaged Scholarship: Critical Junctures in Research, Practice and Policy: Conference Report. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health & the University of Guelph. <http://criticaljunctures.ca>

Introduction 1

Dialogue for change	2
---------------------------	---

What we heard 3

Advances in Community-Engaged Scholarship	4
The Development of Community-Engaged Scholars	4
Structures and Policies that Support Community-Engaged Scholarship	6
Strategies for Institutional Change	8

What we discussed 10

Conceptual challenges	11
What are we talking about?	11
How do we understand the participants?	11
How do we engage in this?	12
Values (and tensions)	12
Clarity around the concept and practice of CES	12
Mutually beneficial relationships	13
Democratized knowledge (and considerations of power)	14
Flexibility	14
Creative thinking/approaches	14
Opportunities for action	15
Creating a welcoming environment	15
Changing university culture	15
Evaluating and Rewarding CES	16
Supporting the work	17
Structures and Resources	17
Skill development	18
The need to learn more: Research questions	19
Examine how we can practice CES	19
Examine how we can evaluate CES	19
Examine other issues in CES	19
Document	19

Moving forward 20

Resources	20
-----------------	----

Appendix 24

Acronyms Used	24
Acknowledgements	25

Introduction

Community-engaged scholarship (CES) and community-academic partnerships are gaining momentum in higher education institutions. The Canadian tri-council funding bodies (SSHRC, NSERC and CIHR) have moved aggressively towards increasing support for community-engaged research and knowledge mobilization efforts. Yet there is a well-articulated disjuncture between calls for social relevance, knowledge translation and mobilization, community-based research, service-learning and engagement more broadly, and the resources, structures and policies in Canadian universities.

Stepping boldly into this challenging arena, **Critical Junctures in Research, Practice, and Policy** convened national and international leaders from diverse organizational and disciplinary backgrounds to consider what we know about CES in higher education and its implications for future research, practice and policy. The meeting, held November 4 and 5, 2010 in Guelph, Ontario, involved 72 participants based in academic institutions, community organizations and government agencies within Canada, the United States, and Australia. Drawing on their experiences as community-engaged scholars, scholars of community engagement, academic administrators, teachers, students, post-doctoral fellows, directors and staff of community organizations, and knowledge mobilizers, participants contributed to the group's collective learning through their involvement as presenters, moderators, and discussants.

Dialogue for change

In working to identify gaps in existing knowledge, clarify key challenges, and develop strategies to foster new multi-disciplinary networks and research partnerships, the conference was driven by **four core objectives**:

1. To **provide a forum for communicating** current research on university policies and practices around CES from national and international perspectives, specifically focusing on institutional structures and processes, faculty development programs, and faculty promotion and tenure policies
2. To **create an opportunity for discussing** the implications of this research for the design of institutional structures, faculty development programs, and faculty promotion and tenure policies in the Canadian context
3. To **foster the development of research collaborations** to further the study of CES in Canadian higher education
4. To **generate greater awareness, understanding and visibility** of community engagement challenges and strategies among key stakeholders in order to catalyze institutional change within the academy.

Building upon this foundation, conference sessions were designed to mobilize the knowledge shared to facilitate change in policy and practice within university policies and systems that are persistently identified as significant barriers to CES.

What we heard

Participants were welcomed to the conference by Kerry Daly, Dean of the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences (CSAHS) and Maureen Mancuso, Provost and Vice-President Academic, both from the University of Guelph. These speakers emphasized the need for boldness, risk, and comprehensive and systemic shifts within academic institutions to enable the practice, recognition, and reward of CES. Sarena D. Seifer, Executive Director of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), then set the stage for the two days, outlining lessons learned from CCPH's initiatives around institutional change in the U.S. and highlighting the opportunity offered at this conference to catalyze change at this critical point in the path toward transforming academic institutions in Canada.

The conference was structured around **four central themes** relevant to catalyzing institutional change:

1. Advances in Community-Engaged Scholarship
2. The Development of Community-Engaged Scholars
3. Structures and Policies that Support Community-Engaged Scholarship
4. Strategies for Institutional Change

Plenary panel presentations, described briefly below, were organized according to these themes. Poster presentations engaged participants in conversations covering a range of CES issues.¹ Abstracts and PowerPoint presentations are posted on the conference website at <http://criticaljunctures.ca>

Advances in Community-Engaged Scholarship

How is CES defined and conceptualized in different institutional, disciplinary and community contexts? What are the characteristics of quality CES? How are new funding opportunities for knowledge mobilization and transfer, research on collaborative models, changes in ethics protocols and more leading to changes in research practice and policy?

Keynote Speaker Sherril Gelmonⁱⁱ (Professor of Public Health, Chair, Division of Public Administration Mark O. Hatfield School of Government, Portland State University) offered participants a summary of over 15 years of work on CES, identified seminal reports and discussed the forms and dimensions of CES, emerging issues and promising practices. She presented a rationale for both “top down” and “bottom up” approaches to the institutional changes needed to fully support CES. She also provided a snapshot of CES underway in Canadian universities, citing specific examples of campus initiatives, partnerships, centres and task forces.

The Development of Community-Engaged Scholars

What do we know about faculty interest and motivation as engaged scholars? What are the competencies required to excel in CES? What do we know about preparing graduate students for faculty careers in CES? Where are the supports and incentives needed to develop engaged faculty? What do we know about the development of community-based scholars who serve as teachers, mentors and researchers alongside their university-based counterparts?

Discussant Lynn Blanchardⁱⁱⁱ (Co-Director, Faculty for the Engaged Campus, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and Director, Carolina Center for Public Service, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) offered the lead paper on this panel. Detailing the challenges in developing CE scholars and the opportunities offered through competency-based models of CES faculty development, Dr. Blanchard described the process and impact of a charrette that convened teams from 20 universities across the U.S. to design CES faculty development programs. As an example, she shared the curriculum and evaluation results of her campus' Faculty Engaged Scholars program.

Ann C. Macaulay and Jon Salsberg^{iv} (McGill University) followed with an overview of the process of establishing a new centre to promote participatory research and to build capacity in the faculty of medicine and allied faculties at McGill University, detailing its goals, process and impact.

Connie H. Nelson and Mirella Stroink^v (Lakehead University) described efforts to bring together academic and community resources in a focus on improving local food systems, outlining the critical principles of a Contextual Fluidity partnership model and offering a case study emphasizing the opportunity to foster faculty engagement through the integration of teaching, research, and student advising activities.

Denise Nepveux, Zack Marshall, Tess Vo, Devon Proudfoot, Stephanie Nixon, & Sarah Flicker^{vi} (Syracuse University) detailed lessons learned throughout the course of a community-university project focused on HIV prevention for youth with disabilities and offered practical recommendations based on this experience.

Structures and Policies that Support Community-Engaged Scholarship

What are current considerations in creating faculty promotion and tenure policies that support CES? What indicators of quality and impact are appropriate for CES? How can institutional structures such as community based learning centres, research or science shops, or offices of research contribute to supporting CES?

Discussant Barbara Holland^{vii} (Director of Academic Initiatives in Social Inclusion Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Registrar, University of Sydney) led this two-part panel by offering participants a set of eight assertions important to thinking about structures and policies supporting CES. As detailed, the assertions are statements derived from research and observed institutional practices, and are meant to inform and provoke discussion about future strategies for institutionalizing CES.

1. This is not the first time that common or traditional approaches to defining and rewarding scholarship have been out of alignment with faculty activities.
2. There are many different conceptions of CE and CES, and to some degree those differences are necessary and appropriate to local contexts.
3. Rewarding CE and rewarding CES requires different processes and policies. Most CES activities can be rewarded within current policies.
4. Changes in academic culture and values around CES require us to clarify the distinction between public service activities and CES. Both are legitimate academic work, but one is scholarly and one is not.
5. You don't need universal agreement to create strong institutional support and recognition for CE and CES.
6. The academic workforce is changing fast and the new entrants are supportive of CES.
7. The field needs to create exemplars that show how CES is similar to familiar forms of scholarly work.
8. Don't work on this agenda alone - collaboration across institutions can accelerate change.

Byron Sheldrick, Linda Hawkins, & Kerry Daly^{viii} (University of Guelph) acknowledged CES as a challenge to the intellectual roots of research and existing university structures as they argued for a shift in how institutions conceptualize, structure, and support research and emphasized the need to adopt a bottom up and top down approach.

Lesley Beagrie, Sue Levesque, Yvette Munro, Cheryl Prescod, Barry Rieder, Brenda Spotton Visano, & Varun Vig^{ix} (York University, TD CE Center) described opportunities to bridge the university and community divide through a dedicated CE teaching, research and resource centre, a Research and Knowledge Exchange Working Group, and an Inter-professional Education Subcommittee at York University.

Patricia M. Sobrero & Ellis Cowling^x (North Carolina State University) detailed the process of continued community engagement and reward of the scholarship of engagement at North Carolina State University. They described the campus culture and changing institutional, and departmental structure that progressively strengthens engagement across colleges and units even after being awarded the Carnegie Foundation Community-Engagement classification in 2006. Their most recent work focuses on faculty rewards for the scholarship of engagement, and provides evaluation tools and program design logic models that assist faculty in documenting outcomes and impact. They focused on the importance of faculty and institutional attitudes and values to address how faculty are rewarded for CES through the university reappointment, tenure and promotion processes.

Francisco Ibanez-Carrasco, Shauna Butterwick, Cathy Worthington, Sean Rourke, Elisabeth Marks, & Jean Bacon^{xi} (Universities Without Walls, Ontario HIV Treatment Network) highlighted an approach to developing engaged researchers outside of the University system and argued for broader thinking around success indicators as they described a program focused on developing the next generation of HIV researchers across Canada.

Paul Watson, Dee Ann Benard, Judy Ferguson, & Leslie Ayre-Jaschke^{xii} (Alberta Rural Development Network) emphasized the opportunity to facilitate collaborative research on rural development by catalyzing relationships across Universities, colleges, communities, and community-based organizations and detailed the value in using outcome mapping in evaluating program impact.

Melinda Forthofer, John Clarkson, Alyssa Mackelprang, & Bob Roscoe^{xiii} (Arnold School of Public Health, University of South Carolina) highlighted the importance of assessing the baseline needs and assets of key stakeholders in CES as they presented the findings of their campus study of the knowledge, capacity, motivations, assumptions, and expectations of faculty and community partners.

Strategies for Institutional Change

What institutional change models work in the higher education context to support CES? How do universities (or schools or departments within) strategically align mission, action and policies to strengthen engagement more broadly? How do differing contexts and practices (faculty agreements, strategic plans, funding sources, promotion and tenure) either facilitate or hinder movement towards being an “engaged campus”?

Discussant Rhonda Lenton^{xiv} (Associate Vice President Academic & Vice Provost, York University) led this panel by sharing lessons learned from the President’s task force on community engagement at York University and arguing for the importance of attending to how we prioritize community, ensuring students have a voice, considering multiple strategies for change, and framing CES in a way that lends supports to the advancement of other higher education imperatives.

Holly Stack-Cutler, Lorraine Woollard, and Sara Dorow^{xv} (University of Alberta) detailed the ‘ups and downs of a pan-University strategy’ at their institution, highlighting lessons learned, emphasizing the need to recognize the real challenges of sustaining a network for community-engaged learning and asking: “do universities have it in them?”

Alejandro Rojas, Will Valley, & Yona Sipos^{xvi} (University of British Columbia) highlighted how institutional change can begin in the class room as they described three interventions within the Faculty of Land and Food Systems at UBC that integrated CES into the curriculum.

Terry Mitchell, Jane Hennig, Maria Liegghio, & Lindsay Buckingham-Rivard^{xvii} (Wilfrid Laurier University) reflected on methodological and practical considerations in shifting academic culture and structures. They emphasized the importance of examining internal readiness for partnerships, prioritizing learning through consultation, developing social infrastructure that bridges community organizations and university, and contributes to establishing strong partnerships through open communication and commitment to relationship-building.

Thinking in metaphor...

At the end of day one, Kerry Daly invited participants to reflect on metaphors for CES process and practice. Ideas shared included: Universities without walls, getting rid of fences and building bridges, being a boundary spanner, getting out of the trenches, looking for strange attractors, looking for asylum/ refuge, porous hierarchies, moving beyond hit and run strategies, offering booster sessions (can't inoculate faculty once and for all), we're the grout between the tiles (holding pieces together), viewing partnerships as friendships (sticking together through the thick & thin), making room at the table, staying at the table, community as a Petri dish, not a petting zoo (let's experiment together), digging where the ground is soft (don't try to start the hard parts first), don't water the rocks (don't waste time on those who aren't interested), and recognizing that when digging for potatoes, it's best to dig where the potatoes are.

What we discussed

Following each of the four panels, conference participants met in small groups with discussants and presenters to reflect on the presentations individually and as a collective, to discuss what they learned, and to identify actions they believed critical to moving work forward. A team of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows¹ led by PhD student Lisa Wenger conducted a thematic analysis of the detailed notes from these table discussions and joined with Linda Hawkins, Director of the Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship at the University of Guelph to present summary feedback to participants on the morning of the second day of the conference.² This session afforded an opportunity for the conference participants to reflect further on the discussions of the previous day and advance new questions and considerations moving into the second day of the conference.

Common themes identified by conference participants were organized into four categories: conceptual challenges, values (and tensions), opportunities for action, and the need to learn more (research questions). These themes are detailed on the following pages:

-
- 1** Team members included: Patricia Altass, Anne Bergen, Jaime Lee Brown, Jacqueline DeGuzman, Sarah Pugh, Denise Nepveux, and Lisa Wenger.
 - 2** The discussion notes from the fourth panel were added in after this formal presentation and are included in the notes here resulting in a slightly different version relative to what was presented at the conference.

CONCEPTUAL CHALLENGES

What are we talking about?

- What is knowledge (broadening our conceptualization of knowledge)?
- What is the purpose of higher education?
- What is research and what are the parameters of research?
- Who does research (challenging the idea of research as an independent project)?
- Do we require new models of learning (movement away from expert, one-way, top-down process to one that is more collaborative, interactive and iterative)?
- What is CES (really)?
- What is the link between CE and CES (really)?
- What is good CES?
- What is peer review?
- Is CES too institutionalized and depoliticized?
- At what level are we working? (Practical vs. theoretical approaches)

How do we understand the participants?

- Who is community? (Geography, interests, etc.)
- What is 'authentic community' (who represents community)?
- What type of relationship qualifies as a partnership?
- Who is an expert?
- Who is a peer?
- How is the university perceived as a citizen in the community?

CONCEPTUAL CHALLENGES

How do we engage in this?

- How do we create proactive movement toward CES, not just reactive?
- How do we encourage discussion across disciplines?
- How do you choose which communities with which to engage?
- How do we engage community more fully?
- How do we enable participation by those with more limited funds to support their involvement in the collaboration?
- Do relationships have to be long-lasting to be successful?
- How do we handle relationships after the project ends, the grant falls through?
- How do we evaluate CES?
- How do we document the messiness of CES? (is CES messy?)
- How do we bridge the gap between structures and policies of T & P and what actually happens in practice?

VALUES (AND TENSIONS)

Clarity around the concept and practice of CES

- Be clear about what CES is (and isn't)
- Distinguish CES from service-learning
- Recognize CES as relevant to a variety of disciplines, interests

VALUES (AND TENSIONS)

Mutually beneficial relationships

- Consider relationships as part of a broader system
- Recognize and consider the history of community-university relationships (relationships are developed within a larger context)
- Treat the process as just as important as the product
- Establish trust, build ‘emotional banks’
- Recognize the importance of personal relationships
- Manage expectations
- Be transparent, realistic about priorities, capacities, and expectations for process
- Anticipate bumps in the road
- Use memoranda of understanding, contracts as a tools
- Be open to learning that goes both ways
- Be open to different relationship forms to best utilize the strengths of each partner
- Make space for reflection and re-evaluation (and listening!)
- Make long-term commitments
- But be open to ending the relationship— not all work well or need to be long-lasting
- Be aware of with whom you are not working
- Be aware of the heaviness of university guilt around CE
- Recognize that:
 - Relationship development isn’t always rewarded
 - Funding might not support long-term relationships
 - Sometimes we don’t have the time
 - Some funding agencies prioritize international focus (not local communities)
 - Community partners do not always have sufficient funds to collaborate

VALUES (AND TENSIONS)

Democratized knowledge (and considerations of power)

- Engage in critical self-reflection
- Consider who creates knowledge, who owns it, who funds it, who controls it, where it starts
- Address power imbalances
- Recognize the power that is held within the broader community
- Use accessible language

Flexibility

- One size doesn't fit all
- Consider context: different expectations, different structures—work the system
- Anticipate the unanticipated
- Tolerate ambiguity
- Leave space for when things don't work
- Let relationships go if they are not fitting
- Pick your battles

Creative thinking/approaches

- Consider potential for new traditions and research methods
- Consider how CE can connect areas of work (teaching, research & service)
- Consider existing structures as opportunities, not barriers
- Frame CES in language terms that administrators understand and value
- Put old ideas together in new ways, use existing tools
- Change doesn't happen from the centre, it happens from the edges
- View challenges/failures as learning
- Prepare to be surprised—CE can work in areas you wouldn't expect and be driven by a variety of perspectives (e.g. start with student learning)

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACTION

Creating a welcoming environment

I. Changing university culture

- **Plan effective change strategies**
 - Consider your university context (while also looking for external guidance)
 - Work bottom up and top down (and recognize/expect resistance)
- **Establish institutional commitment**
 - Measure what's valued, don't value what's measured
 - Embed CES in the mission, vision, strategic plan
 - Align CES with existing institutional values
 - Consider the needs and concerns of chairs, other administrators and obtain high-level support
- **Change institutional practice**
 - Encourage the inclusion of community partners on University boards
 - Encourage CES by social and natural scientists (and artists!) working locally and internationally
 - Build CES into job descriptions, recruitment practice and process
 - Bend institutional structures to enable CES education
 - Embed CES as part of curriculum and Teaching Support Services
 - Emphasize CE links between research, service, and teaching

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACTION

Creating a welcoming environment (cont.)

II. Evaluating and Rewarding CES

- Infiltrate T & P committees
- Build on what exists—don't create a separate structure
- Establish common language and definitions around CES
- Make principles transparent and accessible
- Describe and measure community partner outcomes as part of evaluation
- Train department chairs, other administrators, and T & P committee members to properly evaluate CES
- Incorporate sessional and professional appointments in CES discussions
- Include community reviewers on research ethics boards
- Develop a peer-reviewed journal focused on CES

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACTION

Supporting the work

I. Structures and Resources

o Across Canada

- Establish a consortium of CE Universities
- Establish a Carnegie-like designation of CE Universities
- Establish a hub/centre that offers
 - o A centralized clearinghouse of information on CES
 - o Coordination of CES activity across institutions
- Recognize that centralized structures will not work everywhere

o Within institutions

- Establish a campus-wide centre to develop relationships, negotiate research
 - o Consider locations off campus within the larger community, including sites that house community organizations
- Establish sufficient administrative support to develop and manage relationships, facilitate work across university and within faculties
- Devote space and create opportunities for academics & community partners to meet and get to know each other and their ways of knowing and operating
- Make resources available to community partners, academics & students to support work (databases, match makers, advocates)
- Fund relationship development—both long and short-term relationships
- Draw on departments, colleges, etc. already more tied to community
- Break down silos—identify causes/topics multiple faculties can rally around
- Develop structures to ensure that relationships survive personnel changes

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACTION

Supporting the work (cont.)

- Develop structures that hold participants accountable for the CE work
- Develop structures that support communication of existing relationships and the products of these relationships

II. Skill development

- **Building on values detailed above and supported by identified structures and resources:**
 - Provide opportunities for on-going faculty development
 - Emphasize training of graduate and undergraduate students (undergraduates may become graduates, graduates may become academics, all may become community workers)
 - Build capacity and awareness within the broader community

THE NEED TO LEARN MORE: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Examine how we can practice CES

- What are effective structures and policies?
- What are best (or better) practices for partnerships?
- How do we more fully engage students in CES and in the process of institutional change?
- How we can use social media to encourage CES?

Examine how we can evaluate CES

- What are alternatives to existing T & P models?
- What are models for peer review by community members?
- What are the long-term outcomes for students involved in this work?
- What is the impact of CES on social issues? (demonstrating its value)
- How we can measure less tangible, though equally (or more so) important outcomes of CES?

Examine other issues in CES

- What are the perspectives of community and university researchers on CES?
- What are the implications of gender in CES (e.g., why there are more women in CES)?

Document

- Successful partnerships and relationships
- Lessons learned
- The process of CES
- Resources (tools, methods, etc.)

Moving forward

The conference concluded on a note of optimism as participants verbally shared plans for following up with people they had met and acting on knowledge they had gained. These positive sentiments were underscored in the participant evaluations (N=34, 47% response rate). Nearly all (90% n=30) of the respondents agreed that the conference influenced how they think about CES and 85% (n=28) believed the conference would change how they do their job. All respondents were satisfied with the conference and felt its objectives were met. Nearly all (n=32, 97%) found the conference to be a valuable opportunity to network and the information shared to be useful (96%, n=29).

Respondents offered that they were leaving the conference with many new ideas and much on which to ruminate. There was excitement around the opportunity to connect with colleagues across the US-Canada border and appreciation of the range of participants, though some suggested a future conference with involvement of more community organizations. The small group discussions in particular were valued for the opportunity to go a bit deeper into ideas, engage in co-learning, and make connections with others around the table.

For their part, the conference organizers pledged their commitment to publishing and widely disseminating the proceedings. The conference co-sponsoring organizations—Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and the University of Guelph—reiterated their plans for continued collaboration around advancing CES in Canada.

Resources

Finally, as part of a process of continual learning through the sharing of knowledge, conference organizers tracked resources mentioned by speakers and participants. To participate in the ongoing sharing of CES resources, subscribe to CCPH's CES listserv at: <https://mailman2.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/comm-engagedscholarship>

ORGANIZATIONS & PROGRAMS

Campus Compact

<http://www.compact.org>

Canadian Alliance of Community Service Learning

<http://www.communityservicelearning.ca>

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's Community Engagement Elective Classification of Higher Educational Institutions

http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213

Community-Based Research Canada

<http://communityresearchcanada.ca>

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health

<http://www.ccp.h.info>

Faculty Engaged Scholars Program at UNC-Chapel Hill

<http://www.unc.edu/cps/faculty-engaged-scholars.php>

Imagining America

<http://www.imaginingamerica.org>

International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE)

<http://www.researchslce.org>

IARSLCE Graduate Students' Network

http://www.researchslce.org/_Files/GSN_Site/Join_GSN.asp

(New website coming soon)

Knowledge Commons

<http://knowledgecommons.ning.com>

National Outreach Scholarship Conference

<http://www.outreachscholarship.org>

Rewarding CES: Towards the Transformation of University Policies & Practices

<http://www.cescholarship.ca>

ONLINE TOOLKITS & DATABASES

Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A Guide for Neighborhood Revitalization

<http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/anchortoolkit>

Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit

<http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info>

Developing & Sustaining Community-Based Participatory Research Partnerships

<http://www.cbprcurriculum.info>

Database of Faculty Mentors & Portfolio Reviewers

<http://facultydatabase.info>

Yaffle

<http://www.yaffle.ca>

JOURNALS & OTHER PUBLICATION OUTLETS

AACU journal Peer Review

<http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/index.cfm>

CCPH Online List of Journals that Publish CES

<http://bit.ly/acQIdR>

CES4Health.info (a place to publish diverse products of CES including videos, resource guides, policy briefs, curricula, etc)

<http://www.CES4Health.info>

Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement (JHEOE)

<http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/index>

Metropolitan Universities Journal (MUJ)

<http://muj.uc.iupui.edu>

MUJ Theme Issue on Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative

http://muj.uc.iupui.edu/abstracts/v20_n2.html

Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning

<http://www.umich.edu/~mjcsl>

REPORTS

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. (2005). Linking Scholarship and Communities. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

<http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/kellogg3.html#ProjectUpdates>

Dragne, D. (2007). Background document for the University of Victoria Task Force on Civic Engagement

http://www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork/.../Background_UVic_Task_Force_CE.pdf

Locke, W. (2009). Reflecting on Regional Engagement of Higher Education Institutions: Have We Learned Anything, Memorial University

<http://www.yaffle.ca/a/viewProject/id/1125>

McLean, S. (2005). A Typology and Illustrative Model for Outreach and Engagement, University of Saskatchewan

http://www.usask.ca/ip/inst_planning/docs/OEFD_FINALAPPROVED.pdf

York University (2010) Towards an Engaged University, York U. Task Force on Community Engagement

<http://www.yorku.ca/commeng/documents/finalreport.pdf>

U.S. Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (2010).

Urban Universities: Anchors Generating Prosperity for America's Cities

http://www.usucoalition.org/downloads/.../USU_White_Paper_Report_2010.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2010).

Collaborating for Change: Partnerships to Transform Local Communities

http://www.oup.org/publications/oup_pubs.asp

APPENDIX

Acronyms Used

CCPH	Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
CE	Community engagement
CES	Community-engaged scholarship
CIHR	Canadian Institutes for Health Research
CSAHS/	College of Social and Applied Human Sciences, University of Guelph
ICES	Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship, University of Guelph
NSERC	Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada
SiG	Social Innovation Generation, University of Waterloo
SSHRC	Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
T & P	Tenure and promotion

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the co-sponsors of this conference: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences at the University of Guelph, Social Innovation Generation at the University of Waterloo, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health is a nonprofit membership organization that promotes health (broadly defined) through partnerships between communities and higher education institutions. Our growing network of over 2,000 communities and campuses are collaborating to promote health through service-learning, community-based participatory research, community-engaged scholarship, and other partnership approaches. What ties us together is our commitment to social justice and our passion for the power of partnerships to transform communities and academe. We believe that only by leveraging the knowledge, wisdom and experience in communities and in academic institutions will we solve the major health, social and economic challenges facing our society. CCPH advances our mission through knowledge mobilization, training and technical assistance, research and evaluation, policy development and advocacy, and coalition-building.



Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
Transforming Communities & Higher Education

Learn more about CCPH at
<http://www.ccpH.info>

The College of Social and Applied Human Sciences at the University of Guelph has a strong tradition of community engagement and socially responsive research. It is home to the Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship and the Research Shop (www.theresearchshop.ca). The Institute is committed to fostering open learning and research partnerships in collaborative, participatory, and mutually beneficial endeavors that engage community expertise and academic scholarship to produce knowledge and promote its application. It serves as a means by which the University builds, in tandem, its teaching and research capacity to be responsive to the challenges of a changing world, to the benefit of all Canadians. In 2009, the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences changed its tenure and promotion policy to recognize community-engaged scholarship and is committed to an ongoing process of faculty development in support of this change.



Learn more about CSAHS at U of Guelph at
<http://www.csaHS.uoguelph.ca>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At **Social Innovation Generation, University of Waterloo (SIG@Waterloo)**, our goals are to generate new knowledge about social innovations and the social innovation process in Canada. In particular, the dynamics of learning, adaptation and innovation in the arena of sustainable development and in the mental health domain (identified as one of the most pressing challenges of engaging vulnerable populations). We will seek to disseminate new knowledge through publications and learning events from graduate programs to lecture series developed inside and outside the university research community.



Learn more about SIG@Waterloo at
<http://sig.uwaterloo.ca>

The **Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC)** is the federal agency that promotes and supports university-based research and training in the humanities and social sciences. Through its programs and policies, SSHRC enables the highest levels of research excellence in Canada, and facilitates knowledge-sharing and collaboration across research disciplines, universities and all sectors of society. Created by an act of Canada's Parliament in 1977, SSHRC is governed by a council that reports to Parliament through the Minister of Industry. **We support research and talent that are central to quality of life and innovation.**



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

I POSTERS

A Rose by Any Other Name Does NOT Smell as Sweet: Moving from Community-Based Scholar to University-Based Scholar, Mavis Morton

Mavis Morton, University of Guelph

An Assessment of Service Assets and Gaps for Offenders and Victims of Interpersonal Violence in Waterloo Region, Anthony Piscitelli, Christiane Sadeler, Jessica Hutchison, Bill Wilson, and Tom Brenner

Anthony Piscitelli, Region of Waterloo - Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council

Incubating Community-Engaged Scholarship through a 'Friends Group', Barbara Harrison, Maureen Connolly, Gail Cook, Mary-Beth Raddon, and Ellen Carter

Barbara Harrison, Brock University

Faculty Survey on Community Engagement: The More I Know, The More I Want To Do, Anne Bergen, Jaime Brown, and Linda Hawkins

Anne Bergen, University of Guelph

Knowledge for the Public Good: A Holistic Model for Supporting and Advancing Community-Engaged Scholarship at the University of Vermont, Carrie Williams Howe, Jennifer J. Rousseau, and Kate Westdijk

Carrie Williams Howe, University of Vermont

Institutional Supports and Barriers to Faculty Involvement in Community Engaged Scholarship: A Preliminary Study, Karen Schwartz, Peter Andree, Isla Jordan, and Danette Nearing-Guibord

Karen Schwartz, Carleton University

KEYNOTE

- ii *Setting the Stage: The Landscape of Community Engaged-Scholarship.*
Keynote by Sherril Gelmon, Professor of Public Health, Chair, Division of Public Administration Mark O. Hatfield School of Government, Portland State University

PANEL 1: THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARS

- iii *The Development of Community Engaged Scholars.* Lead Paper & Discussant, Lynn Blanchard, Co-Director, Faculty for the Engaged Campus, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and Director, Carolina Center for Public Service, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- iv *Building Academic Capacity for CE Scholars at McGill University,*
Ann C Macaulay & Jon Salsberg, McGill University
- v *Faculty and CE Through a University Wide Food Security Partnership Model,*
Connie H. Nelson, Mirella Stroink; Lakehead University
- vi *Negotiating Agendas and Expectations in a Diverse Community-University Research Team: Learning from a Sexual Health Study with LGBTQ Youth Labeled with Intellectual Disabilities,* Denise Nepveux, Zack Marshall, Tess Vo, Devon Proudfoot, Stephanie Nixon, & Sarah Flicker; Syracuse University

PANEL 2 & 3: STRUCTURES AND POLICIES THAT SUPPORT COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

- vii *Eight Assertions*. Lead Discussant, Barbara Holland, Director of Academic Initiatives in Social Inclusion Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Registrar, University of Sydney
- viii *Reshaping University Governance to Enhance Community Engaged Scholarship*, Byron Sheldrick, Linda Hawkins, & Kerry Daly, University of Guelph
- ix *The York University – TD Community Engagement Centre: Stepping Out, Stepping Up*, Lesley Beagrie, Sue Levesque, Yvette Munro, Cheryl Prescod, Barry Rieder, Brenda Spotton Visano, & Varun Vig, York University, TD Community Engagement Center
- x *Strengthening the Scholarship of Engagement by Focusing on Faculty, Departments, and Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Decision-Making Processes*, Patricia M. Sobrero & Ellis Cowling, North Carolina State University
- xi *Universities Without Walls: Teaching and Learning With a New Generation of Canadian HIV Researchers*, Francisco Ibanez-Carrasco, Shauna Butterwick, Cathy Worthington, Sean Rourke, Elisabeth Marks, & Jean Bacon, Universities Without Walls, Ontario HIV Treatment Network
- xii *Rural Development in Alberta: A New Approach and Evaluation Method*, Paul Watson, Dee Ann Benard, Judy Ferguson, & Leslie Ayre-Jaschke, Alberta Rural Development Network
- xiii *Network and System Science Contributions to Advancing Community Engagement for Knowledge*, Melinda Forthofer, John Clarkson, Alyssa Mackelprang, & Bob Roscoe, Arnold School of Public Health, University of South Carolina

PANEL 4: STRATEGIES FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

- xiv *Strategies for Institutional Change. Lead Paper & Discussant*, Rhonda Lenton, Associate Vice President Academic & Vice Provost, York University

- xv *Striving for Institutional Change: Five Years of Learning Within the Network for Community-Engaged Learning*, Holly Stack-Cutler, Lorraine Woollard, & Sara Dorow, University of Alberta

- xvi *From Inquiry to Engagement: A Reflection on 10 Years of Community-Based Learning and Research on Food Security and Sustainability at the University of British Columbia*, Dr. Alejandro Rojas, Will Valley, & Yona Sipos, University of British Columbia

- xvii *Learning From Community: Methodological and Practical Reflections in Shifting the Academy*, Terry Mitchell, Jane Hennig, Maria Liegghio, & Lindsay Buckingham-Rivard, Wilfrid Laurier University

NOTES

NOTES



Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
Transforming Communities & Higher Education



COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & APPLIED HUMAN SCIENCES



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada