



## Community-Based Learning: Pedagogies, Partnerships, & Practice *Promising Strategies for Enhancing Faculty Engagement: A Showcase*

The Bonner Foundation's Summer Leadership Institute  
Berry College • Rome, GA  
Thursday, May 29, 2014

Today, institutions of higher education are working to advance community-based learning. The language for this work still varies by campus, including terms and forms such as academic community engagement, service-learning, public scholarship, and community-based research. Yet, the challenges of successfully engaging and supporting faculty to be involved in this work are common across campuses.

These challenges are often attributed to institutional culture and policy issues, as faculty members may not be recognized or rewarded for their engagement in this work. Teaching, research, and service may not be tied to community-based learning, and faculty members' demands to earn tenure and promotion may restrict their work according to institutional and departmental practices.

Campuses today continue to position how they can coordinate and support the engagement of faculty. Centers and their staff are positioning themselves as coordinators for the expertise and best practices for community engaged learning. This session highlights a few models that have been used by campuses, with a short presentation by each. Each presenter will highlight relevant aspects of their model, aiming to capture it in a way that can be replicated by others.

The following models or strategies are highlighted today, but they are among many more that could be useful for campus, center, and faculty members work in this area:

- **Faculty Development Workshops and Partnerships with the Center for Teaching and Learning** - Ashley Cochrane, Berea College
- **Faculty Immersions into Community** - Consuelo Gutierrez-Crosby, Macalester College
- **Defining Civic Student Learning Outcomes** - Bryan Figura, University of Richmond
- **Linking with QEP/QIP Learning Outcomes and Accreditation** - Kristine Hart, Washburn University
- **Efforts to Change Tenure and Promotion and Institutional Policies** - Dave Roncolato, Allegheny College

These materials have been developed by the Bonner Foundation through conversations and research involving these programs and others. **These and others will be available on the Bonner Network Wiki.**

# A Framework and Continuum

---

Transactional ----->Transformational----->Institutional Alignment

---

**Transactional Strategies:** these are mainly strategies that may require short-term investment of staff and that can be easy to create and share with relative little staff time or support. They can be important and possibly necessary but may not lead to long-term relationships and sustained engagement.

- Community Engagement/Service-Learning Resource Library
- Handbooks and guides, such as Faculty Service-Learning Handbook
- Assistance with transporting students to service/project sites
- Financial assistance for course related expenses
- Teaching Assistants (TAs) to assist courses (but in simple placement model)
- Templates and sample surveys (such as mid-term surveys)
- Circulating lists of relevant conferences
- Sharing lists of relevant publications (where faculty might publish their work)
- Maintaining lists of courses that have a SL/CBR project
- Helping faculty members plan/do reflection strategies for course-based projects
- Faculty Recognition Strategies (events, awards, celebrations)\*
- Letters of reference and support for faculty tenure portfolios\*
- Course/Program development support grants (Mini-Grants for Service-Learning, CBR, etc.; may be better as transformational if linked with intentional training, cohort model, support, etc.)\*

**Transformational Strategies:** these strategies may be ongoing and repeated, perhaps every term and year. They generally involve more relationship building as well as program development and management.

- Faculty Trainings and Workshops (led from within or with outside presenters)
- Faculty Development Seminars\*
- Faculty Fellowships and Cohort Programs
- Student Community Engaged Learning/Service-Learning Teaching Assistant Program (train and guide students, often in a cohort, for amore serious support role)\*
- Invitations/attendance at professional conferences related to service/community engagement/service-Learning (with a team or representing the program/institution)
- Course/Program development support grants (Mini-Grants for Service-Learning, CBR, etc.)\*
- Faculty Advisory Boards\*

**Institutional Alignment Strategies:** these strategies, which generally need to involve several faculty members and senior leaders, can help foster changes to institutional awareness, policies, and culture.

- Concerted strategy to develop Student Learning Outcomes and measures associated with community engagement/community engaged learning by a Center/Institution\*
- Efforts to link community engagement with institutional accreditation review
- Course designator efforts, especially when utilized to promote quality and best practices\*
- Efforts to revise tenure and promotion standards to align with faculty engagement\*

\* NOTE: Those with the asterisk will be featured with more detailed models and best practices over Summer 2014 by the Bonner Foundation. We will share these resources on our wiki.

# Faculty Development Seminars

---

Transactional ----->Transformational----->Institutional Alignment

---

## What are Faculty Development Seminars and why are they important:

Faculty Development Seminars for community engagement or service-learning are intensive faculty development experiences, often organized and led by Center staff. Some Centers partner with other units, like a Center for Teaching and Learning.

The goals include:

- supporting faculty to deepen and apply their understanding of community-engaged teaching and scholarship
- guiding and supporting faculty as they develop a service-learning course or connection
- helping faculty develop a community of peers at the institution who are committed to community-engaged teaching and scholarship

## Who is Involved and Other Basics:

Center staff can plan and implement this model, targeting a small group of faculty. It is recommended to involve faculty with interest and energy to be engaged, but with differing levels of experience. Some intentionally involve less engaged (or more resistant) faculty alongside more enthusiastic faculty. It works well to have some diversity of participation along these lines:

- Veteran vs. new to CEL
- Variety of disciplines (comes into play in outcomes, strategies and reflection)
- Usually tenure track and adjuncts are also represented
- You may want to think about outreach to tenured and respected faculty as a way to build support

The size of such seminars are often 3 to 10; Berea College finds that 6 is a good number. The Seminars can be done during a concentrated period of time (such as one week) or spread over the course of a term or year.

## Advantages of this Strategy:

- It builds community (including with center staff and faculty) within an institution and even with partners (some involve partners)
- It fosters awareness and common language on campus
- It cultivates allies and champions (creating people willing to speak out and offer support and change institutional structures)
- Models and content are readily available; a Center can develop this capacity.
- It positions the Center as a key leader and coordinator in this work.

## Key Needs and Requirements of this Strategy:

- You must develop/use the capacity to be good trainers/facilitators with faculty
- Resources and money are often needed, and this must align with institutional culture (mini-grants or stipends); may want to make smaller scale if necessary
- Organizational skills (such as for recruiting and planning the events) need to be strong
- Staff should develop and utilize the capacity to do outreach and build relationships with faculty. This is often done one-by-one in person, by email, and by phone, over time.

# Faculty Development Seminars (continued)

---

## Cost Considerations:

- This mainly involves stipends (and Bonner Programs may be able to utilize enrichment funds for this purpose).
- For involving six faculty at Berea College, costs have been about \$6,000 plus some additional for meeting expenses like food and other resources (books). Berea provides \$500 to each faculty member for week-long participation and another \$500 when s/he implements the course. They give them a Service-Learning Course Construction Handbook (published by Campus Compact, 2004) by Chris Hefernan.
- Berea has reduced some costs (like for materials) by sharing readings via dropbox (instead of the old binder approach). They make one sample binder that participants may review and copy as they would like.

## How this Model Includes Key Elements of Effective Faculty Development:

A study by Fitzgerald (2012) suggested that effective faculty engagement programs integrate the following elements: (1) mentoring or peer networking; (2) education or training; (3) awareness raising; and (4) supportive university infrastructure. This model does so in the following ways:

- **mentoring/peer networking:** The programming often involves pairing faculty across levels of experience; tapping a faculty member to co-facilitate is a good idea; intentionally bring in faculty who have experimented with CEL or gone through seminar before
- **training/education:** Education is the thrust of this strategy. Berea College has conducted these seminars in two ways: (1) over the course of a week from 9 am to 1 pm everyday with time for reading; (2) over the course of a semester with 8-9 meetings. Each has advantages and disadvantages (time involved, etc.). Think about your culture and what fits best.
- **awareness raising:** The intentionality of the design promotes a common language and approach. Inviting administrators to come and speak about their support for CEL is important. For example, the Dean and Associate Vice President attended and presented. Community partners are also invited and present dimensions of how to build strong collaborative, sustained relationships. This raises awareness of faculty about the community context too, as well as how the relationships are managed by the center staff. They talk about diversity issues, so this is also raised as an interconnected part of the work. They integrate literature (*A Crucible Moment*) to raise awareness for the field of CE/CEL. They bring in Director of Academic Assessment and Director of Institutional Research and Assessment to assist with learning outcomes and their evaluation.
- **supportive university (and center) infrastructure:** The Seminars provide faculty with understanding of the Center and its programs. This helps faculty to work with the support of Center staff and ongoing relationships with partners. The Seminar helps them understand how they can access students. It provides continuity for relationships with partners. Centers provide logistical and operational support for design and implementation (transportation and implementation).

## Organizing Steps or Recommended Process:

Berea College has articulated a checklist of recommended questions and issues to consider. Found on the next page, these address (1) timing, (2) participant targeting/selection, (3) participant recruitment; (4) incentives and rewards; and (5) evaluation.

## Organizing Steps or Recommended Process:

---

### ➤ **Timing**

- When in the year should your seminar take place?
  - Over the course of a semester? During the summer? During short term?
- How long will the seminar last?
  - A few days? A week? A semester?
- How often will you meet? And how long will each meeting last?

### ➤ **Participants**

- Who should lead the seminar?
  - Service-learning staff? Experienced faculty members?
- Who should participate?
  - Which faculty members? Are there members of the administration or staff who should attend?
- How many people should participate?
- Are there others who should be invited to participate in portions of the seminar?
  - Should students, community partners, or other faculty be invited to participate in panels?
  - Should members of the administration be invited to participate in portions of the seminar?

### ➤ **Recruitment**

- How will participants be recruited?
- How will you advertise the seminar? What materials will you need?
- Should there be a proposal or application form? Who will select the participants?

### ➤ **Incentives**

- Should there be a stipend? If so, what is the source of funding?
- Could there be recognition from the faculty members' departments or from the administration?
- Could there be a course reduction for participation?
- Are there other incentives that you can offer? Food?

### ➤ **Evaluation**

- What materials will you use to evaluate the seminar? Where to learn more/ find more resources about Faculty Cohort Programs. Some are seminars and some are designated fellows

## Where to Learn More:

These web-links may give you other models or even examples of language that could be helpful for you as you formulate your models. These models were recently shared by the Higher Education List-serve, which is a good resource for our field.

Appalachian State	<a href="http://engagement.appstate.edu/professional-development/faculty-fellows-program">http://engagement.appstate.edu/professional-development/faculty-fellows-program</a>
Brock University (Ontario)	<a href="http://www.brocku.ca/service-learning/faculty/grant">http://www.brocku.ca/service-learning/faculty/grant</a>
East Carolina U	<a href="http://www.ecu.edu/cs-studentaffairs/volunteer/faculty-professional_development.cfm">http://www.ecu.edu/cs-studentaffairs/volunteer/faculty-professional_development.cfm</a>
Johns Hopkins	<a href="http://www.jhsph.edu/SOURCE/FFP">www.jhsph.edu/SOURCE/FFP</a>
Portland Community College	<a href="http://www.pcc.edu/resources/community-based-learning/FacultyCohort.html">http://www.pcc.edu/resources/community-based-learning/FacultyCohort.html</a>
Stonehill College	<a href="http://www.stonehill.edu/offices-services/community-based-learning/workshops/summer-institute/">http://www.stonehill.edu/offices-services/community-based-learning/workshops/summer-institute/</a>
UMASS	<a href="http://cesl.umass.edu/faculty/facultyfellowsprogram">http://cesl.umass.edu/faculty/facultyfellowsprogram</a>
Univ. Cal Berkeley	<a href="http://americancultures.berkeley.edu/aces">http://americancultures.berkeley.edu/aces</a>
Univ. Of Alabama @ Birmingham	<a href="http://www.uab.edu/servicelearning/for-faculty-and-staff">http://www.uab.edu/servicelearning/for-faculty-and-staff</a>
University of South Florida	<a href="http://www.usf.edu/engagement/resources/funding.aspx">http://www.usf.edu/engagement/resources/funding.aspx</a>
University of Wisconsin - Madison	<a href="http://morgridge.wisc.edu/faculty/index.html">http://morgridge.wisc.edu/faculty/index.html</a>
University of Utah	<a href="http://bennioncenter.org/faculty/development/fellows-affiliates.php">http://bennioncenter.org/faculty/development/fellows-affiliates.php</a>

Berea College also notes that it learned much of its Seminar model from Tulane University.

# Faculty Immersions Into Community

---

Transactional ----->Transformational----->Institutional Alignment

---

## What are Faculty Immersions Into Community and why are they important:

Faculty Immersions Into Community are an approach for faculty training and development. The experience includes a strong emphasis on immersing faculty locally, nationally, and/or internationally through place-based engagement connecting participants with other universities, non-profits, government departments, and alumni. This approach has many similar elements to Faculty Development Seminars.

The Macalester College Urban Faculty Colloquium (UFC), introduces and prepares faculty for civic engagement connecting them to their urban context as scholars, teachers, mentors, and local citizens. The Civic Engagement Center (CEC) has partnered with a different faculty to develop and lead these interdisciplinary development experiences. The colloquium model is cohort based that creates a space for shared knowledge and provides opportunities for building and developing relationships amongst faculty and staff across various disciplines and departments. It allows for deep exploration and understanding of a particular theme and/or issue within the context of place taking into account local history and culture. As a result the UFC provides faculty with the resources and curricular support to develop and enhance courses, assignments and activities related to civic engagement and community-based learning in an urban or place-based context.

Since 2005, Macalester College has supported 12 iterations of the UFC with various themes. The trainings have varied in length from three to ten days, depending on the time of year and the focus. An annual summer UFC engages new and veteran faculty in Macalester's local context of the Twin Cities. On the national level Macalester has carried out four colloquia over winter break or immediately after spring graduation building on Macalester faculty, staff, student, and institutional connections in New Orleans, Chicago, Detroit, and Seattle, with an additional planned for 2016 in the southwest. In all, over 100 Macalester faculty, staff, or partners of the college have participated in at least one local or national UFC.

## Who is Involved and Other Basics:

Center staff handles a majority of the planning and implementation of this model, often working in partnership with experienced faculty. It is beneficial to have a dedicated staff member to lead this initiative. It is advantageous to have 2 staff/faculty handling logistics and implementation when on-site when doing national and international travel. This model is focused on building a cohort, where faculty and staff travel together and engage in shared learning. This model:

- engages new faculty in developing an understanding of the local context
- introduces faculty who have not yet become engaged in community-based learning (new or veteran) with the language and basic principles
- involves a variety of disciplines
- involves faculty and staff members in leadership roles
- involves community partners in key leadership and co-educational roles

The size of such seminars has ranged from a small group of 8, in the summer UFC, to a much more diverse and wide-ranging group of 23, in a national UFC. When carrying out a national UFC it is cost-effective to have a larger group size as you can make the most out of funds used for honoraria.

## Advantages of this Strategy:

This intensive approach to faculty development:

- Creates a cohort
- Facilitates faculty reflection and identification of their own motivations and values, such as seeing themselves as “civic professionals”
- Engages faculty in peer mentoring
- Gives examples to share as they advise and support students connecting a liberal arts education and career
- Positions community partners as key bearers of knowledge and best practice
- Provides a multiple win situation for the institution in terms of faculty development, building faculty and staff connections, and connecting alumni back to the institution.

# Faculty Immersions Into Community

---

## Key Needs and Requirements of this Strategy:

- The duties of faculty and staff leaders are co-mingled so that essential tasks are shared, such as facilitating discussions, driving vans, leading neighborhood tours, or presenting to the group.
- The strategic support of higher-level administrators is highly recommended.
- Involvement of the College's Alumni Office.
- Faculty stipends and budgetary support for projects are needed.
- The model involves readings, discussions, and meetings with community organizations and alumni.

## Cost Considerations:

- For Macalester the UFC has been grant funded and is not embedded in any departmental budget.
- The range in cost for the UFC has been \$10,000 for local to \$25, 000 for national. The cost includes: air travel, ground transportation, meals, materials, and honoraria for speakers and presenters.

## How this Model Includes Key Elements of Effective Faculty Development:

A study by Fitzgerald (2012) suggested that effective faculty engagement programs integrate the following elements: (1) mentoring or peer networking; (2) education or training; (3) awareness raising; and (4) supportive university infrastructure. This model does so in the following ways:

- **mentoring/peer networking:** A core aspect of the model is to build a faculty cohort. Mentoring and peer networking, including amongst the participants and with community partners/leaders, are part of this approach. One of the benefits of going off campus is to ask faculty members to step out of their professional roles and to leave behind their disciplinary identifications and see themselves in another role as citizens. They do this by encouraging active participation rather than observation, so that theorizing the larger meaning starts from their own experience.
- **training/education:** On a level that appears mundane but was in fact, essential and profound, the observation of the physical, social, and cultural environment is a core component of the model. By heightening faculty awareness of the “placefulness” of any particular neighborhood, we accomplish the basic task of helping to fill in otherwise blank spaces on their mental maps. This helps faculty members to think about place from a variety of perspectives—including from the perspectives of students who might be entering into that space as part of their classes, from the perspective of the diverse communities who might live and work there, and from the perspective of those who might work in schools, nonprofits, or community organizations.
- **awareness raising:** This model promotes faculty members' awareness of the broader communities surrounding the institution and how they could be involved in connecting real world applications of learning with their own teaching, research, and scholarship. Faculty members spend time looking at pedagogical issues. This approach involves significant time to helping faculty members map the campus itself. This helps faculty wrestle with perceptions they may have about community-engaged learning, like that it is not rigorous. It raises their awareness of key themes, using readings and dialogue. For instance, they engage broader themes around the purposes and values of engaged education. They utilized William Cronon's “Only Connect,” a piece that invites readers to consider how a liberal arts education helps students relate to the world (Cronon, 1998). They set aside time for faculty to share specific experiences and examples of engaged work and for faculty to work on their own syllabi and to receive feedback from their colleagues.
- **supportive university (and center) infrastructure:** This model again positions the Center and key staff as experts and coordinators of effective community-engaged learning. This approach helps faculty address key barriers to creating engaged learning opportunities, including pedagogical and logistical challenges. On the logistical side, faculty members get support with issues like transportation, arranging for the payment of honoraria, or room rentals.



## Organizing Steps or Recommended Process:

---

### ➤ Timing

- When should the UFC take place?
  - For Macalester it has worked to hold the local UFC in the summer to give new faculty time to integrate their learning into activities and/or assignments into their course(s). It also gives time for staff to work with community partners and faculty in the process.
  - The national UFCs have taken place either in January or at the end of spring semester.
- Duration
  - 4-5 days has been effective for both the local and national UFCs
  - The local UFC has been at least a half-day. This has allowed for participants to engage with the material, focus and not be distracted with work, and takes into consideration travel time. Having the UFC only be part of the day gives participants a portion of the day to accomplish other not UFC related tasks.
  - A typical day for the national UFC begins around 8:30 am and concludes with dinner.

### ➤ Participation & Selection

- Who should plan and lead the seminar?
  - CEC staff? Experienced faculty members?
- Who should participate?
  - Which faculty members? Are there members of the administration or staff who should attend?
- How many people should participate?
- How will participants be recruited?
- How are participants selected?
  - Application? Proposal? Nomination? Who selects participants?
- Are there others who should be invited to participate in portions of the seminar?
  - Should students, community partners, or other faculty be invited to participate in panels?
  - Should members of the administration be invited to participate in portions of the seminar?

### ➤ Location Selection

- How do you determine where to travel?
  - Consider faculty, staff, and alumni connections
  - Consider larger conversations that are occurring on campus as a way to frame or provide a lens on which to view the experience

### ➤ Incentives

- All travel costs covered
- Building relationships across different departments and disciplines

### ➤ Evaluation

- What materials will you use to evaluate the seminar?

## Where to Learn More:

---

This model is described in narrative form in the article, “Developing Faculty for Community Engagement across the Curriculum,” by Paul Schadewald and Karin Aguilar-San Juan of Macalester College. This article is featured in *Deepening Community Engagement: Forging New Pathways*, edited by Ariane Hoy and Mathew Johnson. This book features seventeen articles that describe models and best practices relevant for advancing community engagement and community-based learning. It can be found on Amazon.

In fact, much of this handout draws on pieces of the article.

Further reading:

- Place-based literature
- Geography of place
- Local histories of the selected area you intend to travel to
- Kerryann O-meara looks at faculty culture through a sociological and anthropological lens and provides reflection on the academic profession. Her work provided insight in the structure of the UFC.

# Linking with Accreditation (Quality Improvement/Enhancement Plan)

---

Transactional ----->Transformational----->Institutional Alignment

---

## How Linking with Accreditation Review Works and Can Be Important:

As institutions of higher education participate in a reaccreditation process, generally every ten years, they are evaluated by a relevant commission, such as the Southern Accreditation Commission (SACS) or Middle States. At this time, the institution completes a self-study and plan for improvement. For instance, SACs notes: “Each institution seeking reaffirmation of Accreditation is required to develop a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Engaging the wider academic community and addressing one or more issues that contribute to institutional improvement, the plan should be focused, succinct, and limited in length. The QEP describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning.”

This strategy involves linking the institution’s broader strategic aims for community engagement and the Center’s work with accreditation efforts, through the Quality Improvement or Enhancement Plans. Doing so is a strategic way to drive greater attention, value for, and levels of engagement across the institution. These plans often link community engagement with other key institutional priorities, like high-impact practices, research, and technology. These links can also be strategies to access greater levels of support, including budgetary and by faculty across departments.

## Who is Involved and Other Basics:

Generally this strategy must involve institutional and academic leadership. Some institutions in the Bonner Network that have done this have been Carson-Newman College, Guilford College, and Washburn University. To get this link to happen, generally *Center staff and their faculty allies take initiative to participate in campus conversations and forums*, proposing community engagement (or whatever the common language is) as a topic.

Faculty leadership is critical in this work. For Washburn University, a faculty member has been designated as the director for the QIP. This person (an Anthropology faculty member) takes the work of guiding the creation of the QIP on as a significant role (3/4 time). Washburn has also engaged an Instructional Designer, with technology expertise, to help craft strategies to link community engagement with technology. This process also involves collaboration with the Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning. The CTEL Director (the faculty member) has also become a part of the Bonner High-Impact Team, hence providing a direct connection to the work of the Bonner Program and Center.

The structure for this approach varies by institution. At Washburn, it is up to the faculty director (appointed) to produce the final strategy for including others across the institution. The main thrust has been to link community engagement with institutional high-impact practices (HIPs).

While this organizing is in the early stages, if it proceeds, the QIP link could provide \$300,000 over three years towards the Center and projects that are related.

# Linking with Accreditation (Quality Improvement/Enhancement Plan)

---

## Advantages of this Strategy:

- This is a way to *learn more across the institution* about faculty and how they are integrating community engagement, as well as their perceptions. For instance, the director is initiating a survey of faculty and Student Life staff to gather their perceptions of how learning is taking place outside of classroom context.
- The strategy focuses on finding different ways to reach faculty to learn more about incorporating experiential learning and engaged pedagogies, hence it could *broaden engagement* and build other allies.
- This is also a way to heighten *attention* to the role of community partners as co-educators.
- The successful links can free up some *significant financial and institutional resources* for community engagement and engaged scholarship.
- These links also pave the way to address *institutional changes, such as tenure and promotion standards*
- This strategy provides a way to leverage the leadership of a faculty member (especially one with respect and strong relationships with faculty), which can be very productive with faculty.

## Key Needs and Requirements of this Strategy:

- This strategy requires the investment and leadership of a faculty member and academic leadership (Vice President of Academic Affairs or Provost should be on board and working for connections).
- This strategy still may not work well with traditional or resistant faculty, who still may not be persuaded to the value of CE/CEL or want to be engaged.
- This approach requires strong strategic thinking and alignment with the broader strategic plan.
- Furthermore this approach could “water down” aspects of your plans, as they are melded with other institutional priorities.

## Example:

Here is some sample language from the abstract of the QEP from Carson-Newman University (2011) that focused on Service-Learning.

### ABSTRACT

*Service-learning is an integral part of Carson-Newman academic culture. Although the College faculty have long practiced service-learning, to date there has been no evaluation of these practices, particularly in the area of student learning outcomes. Therefore, this QEP seeks to utilize faculty development and training and innovative assessment techniques to institute a core of service-learning courses utilizing reflection as a key component. A cohort of 15 Bonner Service-learning Faculty Fellows will design and implement 15 new or revised service-learning courses that are subjected to external assessment. Areas of student learning that we seek to measure and impact are Critical Thinking and Creative Problem Solving, Civic Engagement, and Openness to Diverse Perspectives. In addition campus wide service events and consultation services will be available to other faculty members to enhance and improve service-learning across all course sections.*

# Linking with Accreditation (Quality Improvement/Enhancement Plan)

---

## How this Model Includes Key Elements of Effective Faculty Development:

A study by Fitzgerald (2012) suggested that effective faculty engagement programs integrate the following elements: (1) mentoring or peer networking; (2) education or training; (3) awareness raising; and (4) supportive university infrastructure. This model does so in the following ways:

- **mentoring/peer networking:** The QIP director is incorporating a survey to gather input from faculty at large. The director is looking to set up or support mentoring relationships between faculty. This may include tagging some experienced faculty.
- **training/education:** The approach may involve a reading group as well as trainings for faculty. There is support for bringing in speakers and others for faculty development.
- **awareness raising:** The plan will necessarily involve integration with faculty governance and operations. The QIP efforts will be linked with new faculty orientation. The survey and other outreach efforts are ways to enhance awareness.
- **supportive university (and center) infrastructure:** The plan is discussing the use of technology and web-based learning and instruction. There is a budget for the work. This is also looking at potential policy changes (tenure) that could be resulting.

## Organizing Steps or Recommended Process:

This strategy is more complex and varies by institution. However, there are three key recommendations for Center staff and faculty members who want to see this happen at your institution:

- 1) **Meet with your Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost.** Recruit this person to be a part of your initiatives (like High-Impact Team, student learning outcome design, etc.). Share with this person about the impacts of your work, for student learning, career development, diversity, post-graduate success, and community impact.
- 2) **Join the strategic planning process (round tables, etc.) at your institution.** Show up at the meetings. Recruit others (students, faculty, allies) to do so. Put your themes (community engagement) on the agenda.
- 3) **Volunteer to help move these processes forward;** be on the committee(s) that help select the focus of the QIP/QEP.

## Where to Learn More:

Ariane Hoy ([ahoy@bonner.org](mailto:ahoy@bonner.org)) can share a dropbox with you of sample QEP/QIPs linked to community engagement. Some institutions that have done this include: Baldwin Wallace University, Duke University, High Point University, Louisiana State University, and Rice University. Often, examples can be found through Internet research.

# Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

---

Transactional ----->Transformational----->Institutional Alignment

---

## Why Student Learning Outcomes Are Significant:

This strategy involves formalizing a set of learning outcomes tied to the Center, Bonner Program or civic/community engagement. This is important because it:

- Demonstrates and documents the impact of community engagement on student learning
- Connects community engagement to institutional core (curriculum, values, strategic objectives) and multiple faculty/departments
- Elevates the perception and value of community engagement, community-based scholarship, co-curricular and curricular
- Enables the Center to be taken more seriously (rigor) as a professional unit that impacts learning

Below are the Student Learning Outcomes being developed by the University of Richmond for its Bonner Center for Civic Engagement. This handout is a case study for their work.

### **1. The BCCE helps students understand the ways that difference, privilege, and power work in their own lives and in our society. Through their experiences in BCCE programs students will develop:**

Their understanding of their own identities and backgrounds.

Their understandings of identities and backgrounds different from their own

Their understanding of the systemic forces that have shaped and continue to shape our different life experiences.

Attitudes of curiosity and openness about others.

Their capacity for empathy, learning to relate to and appreciate people different from themselves.

### **2. The BCCE broadens and deepens students' thinking about complex and interconnected social issues affecting our world today. Through participation in BCCE programs students will:**

Strengthen their abilities to analyze complicated social issues.

Connect and apply knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from their areas of academic study to their own civic engagement experiences.

Connect and apply knowledge from their civic engagement experiences back to their areas of study, using these experiences

to comprehend, analyze, and/or challenge theories and frameworks.

### **3. The BCCE prepares students for active citizenship. Through participation in BCCE programs, students will:**

Clarify their civic identity.

Develop and expand their understanding of and capacity for active participation in a community.

Experience the personal benefits of forming reciprocal relationships in one's community, including joy, fulfillment, and well-being.

### **4. The BCCE prepares students for lives of active learning. Through BCCE programs, students will:**

Practice self-motivated learning.

Develop and demonstrate communication skills across a variety of settings.

Practice professional skills and gain professional experiences needed to work in a variety of settings.

# Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

---

## Who is Involved and Other Basics:

The process of working on Student Learning Outcomes can benefit from the involvement of those with expertise in assessment and outcome design. Many campuses engage staff from the office of Institutional Research or faculty with relevant experience. Conduct a process that engages key stakeholders (students, faculty, partners, staff) in providing input on student learning outcomes.

Campuses have also brought in outside experts, such as those involved in efforts for Association of American Colleges and Universities, Bringing Theory to Practice, and Imagining America. The Bonner Foundation (in summer 2014) will be developing more resource material related to this process.

## Key Needs and Requirements of this Strategy:

A desire of the Center administrators to use data to make an intentional impact is a necessary condition for this work.. This work is about creating a culture of assessment so this newer discipline of civic engagement is rooted in evidence and not simply on the hunches of educators. We did not begin this work wanting to develop student learning outcomes. That goal did not become apparent until our third data lab. We began this work wanting to look at data that we collected to see what we could glean from it and to articulate what we wanted to know more about that the existing forms of data at our disposal could not yield. That first data lab spurred questions that we sought to answer through revising existing and developing new means of evaluation. That spurred more questions. Curiosity is a necessary condition for this work. Being willing to ask questions and seek answers is necessary. Using what you learn from what you ask is necessary.

## What is the basic model/structure (in your case, the outcomes and assessment plan overview)?

The sliver of the evaluation plan most relevant to BSP, however, is the Bonner Scholars longitudinal study begun this year. Because each Bonner Scholar submits six write-ups per academic year, we collect 24 write-ups from each student over the course of four years. Analyzing their write-ups enables us to track individual Bonners over time to determine if causality exists between their civic engagement and their learning. The benefit of collecting 600 write-ups per academic year (100 Bonners x 6 write-ups) is that a wealth of data about student learning can be gleaned; the challenge, however, is that we do not have the time to read, score, and analyze that many outputs. To that end, we have identified parameters to guide the Bonner Scholars longitudinal study. This year, we scored 200 write-ups; 100 were focused on student learning outcome 1 and the other 100 were focused on outcome 3. Next year, we will score 200 more write-ups; 100 focused on student learning outcome 2 and the other 100 on outcome 4. Moving forward, we will continue to alternate between the two sets of student learning outcomes each academic year. By the time our current freshmen graduate, we would have measured their progress through outcomes 1 and 3 by comparing their freshmen and junior year write-ups and their progress through outcomes 2 and 4 by comparing their sophomore and senior year write-ups.

Each of the four BSP write-up prompts correspond to a student learning outcome (see Enclosure 2: BSP Write-up Prompts). To ensure validity of data, the Intentional Impact working group revised the original prompts, created in 2012, because students were not contextualizing their insights by describing the experiences that catalyzed them to think differently. The write-up prompts change six times each academic year depending upon the learning outcome on which we want Bonners to reflect.

# Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

---

For example, below is the write-up schedule for academic year 2013-2014:

Cycle 1 (late Sep. 2013)

Write-up prompt related to student learning outcome 1

Cycle 2 (late Oct. 2013)

Write-up prompt related to student learning outcome 3

Cycle 3 (early Dec. 2013)

Free-write prompt

\*The aforementioned prompts were repeated in the same order during the Spring 2014 semester for cycles 4, 5, and 6

To ensure reliability of data, the Intentional Impact working group hosted three norming and scoring workshops for scorers. The first two hours of each workshop were focused on norming. All scorers read the same write-up, scored it using the rubric, then discussed individual scores as a group until all participants agreed upon a final score to give. This process was repeated with two other write-ups. Thereafter, each scorer was responsible for scoring his/her remaining 10 write-ups individually. The final scores for each write-up were recorded in a shared spreadsheet.

Embedding the student learning outcomes in our Center's work has been a large, intentional, long-term undertaking. It has been a positive learning experience for our team and has begun to create a culture of assessment among staff, provide data to drive evidence-based decision-making regarding programming and curriculum, and enabled us to better understand how to actually "transform student learning" as stated in the BCCE's mission.

## **How this Model Includes Key Elements of Effective Faculty Development:**

A study by Fitzgerald (2012) suggested that effective faculty engagement programs integrate the following elements: (1) mentoring or peer networking; (2) education or training; (3) awareness raising; and (4) supportive university infrastructure. This model does so in the following ways:

Our Center submitted an evaluation plan to our Office of Institutional Effectiveness much like departments are required to do. This helped us to frame our curriculum in a way that lifts student learning based on evidence and data.

Data that was instrumental to developing student outcomes were community-based learning (CBL) course evaluations because students answered the question "What did you learn?". It was another data source that lifted student learning from a faculty-lead course that we were able to consider when crafting our student learning outcomes.

We are beginning to have faculty and community partners sit down together to analyze means of evaluation submitted by students to see what the pairing come up with regarding how they frame their campus-community partnership.



# Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

---

For another institution/center that wants to do this, what are a few basic organizing steps to get started?

Identify the data you are already collecting and think about what you can learn from it. The most important question to ask is “What else do you with you knew?” because that will dictate a way forward.

Get all staff involved for this is a way to understand student learning that is engaging and innovative.

What are other “natural springs” of data that exist and that could be analyzed with little effort? How can existing means of evaluation be bent so that they give you data you seek?

## **Where can someone learn more (web-links, who to contact)?**

Contact Bryan Figura (bfigura@richmond.edu or 804.484.1631) as our work is not published. It will be in the future, however, as we are beginning to think about writing and publishing this process.

# Working to Foster Changes in Tenure and Promotion Standards

---

Transactional ----->Transformational----->Institutional Alignment

---

## Why Tenure Standards Are Significant:

Traditionally, faculty are rewarded and promoted for their teaching, research, and service, but service is generally interpreted as to the institution, not community. In research studies and dialogue across our field, tenure and promotion standards are often cited by faculty members as a prominent barrier to their engagement. Adjunct and non-tenured faculty may believe (rightly) that they should not devote time to community engagement or engaged scholarship and would be better to put that time into traditional research and publishing. Tenured faculty may still operate according to these policies or find it difficult to revise their work and teaching to incorporate engaged pedagogies and projects.

Even in cases where institutions provide support and incentives (such as through faculty development seminars, or even revised guidelines), faculty may be unaware or perceive institutional culture to be against this work. In a study at the University of Denver, Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, and Thompson (2011) identify a “conundrum of community engagement”, where implicit institutional structures and practices can work against public pronouncements and commitments (such as mini-grants) for engagement by students and faculty. Hence, faculty engagement can be limited because faculty members perceive (rightly or wrongly) that their public scholarship, community-engaged learning, and other relevant work will not be rewarded.

Yet, community engagement can be linked to teaching and research. Ernest Boyer, in his 1990 landmark report *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* issued a call to higher education to renew its public purposes and rethink teaching and learning, expanding the notion of pedagogy and faculty members’ work as well. Boyer proposed a *scholarship of engagement* and *scholarship of integration* that connect the rich resources of the university to the most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, arguing for a broader sense of purpose and mission for higher education. Many argue that the *scholarship of discovery* (in which original research advances knowledge) may also take forms of community engaged scholarship. This strategy involves making concrete policy changes to tenure standards, on an institutional or departmental level.

## Who is Involved and Other Basics:

The process of working for tenure and promotion changes is not well articulated across higher education and is a gap for our field. For instance, Provosts and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs often point to departments, rather than take the lead in promoting changes. However, their involvement to change tenure standards across the institution can be a key asset. Often, this is not the case and changes occur in departments, generally proposed by faculty there. Some examples, such as the Sociology Department at Siena College, are included in this resource.

However, the integration of a third party, such as a higher education association, can help propel changes here. For instance, Imagining America has been active on this issue especially for the Arts and Humanities. They commissioned a tenure team initiative to investigate that produced a report entitled, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design* (2008). Campus-Community Partnerships for Health (CCPH) has also produced excellent resource material in this area.

# Working to Foster Changes in Tenure and Promotion Standards

---

## Advantages of this Strategy:

- This is a way to *incentivize and reward faculty engagement across the institution*, clearly signaling its value to faculty, administrators, and partners.
- When an institution makes these kinds of changes, it *significantly reduces barriers* to faculty engagement.
- These changes also *elevate the perception and value* of community engagement and community-based learning and scholarship.
- Supportive policies also can *drive more complex partnerships and projects*, such as those that involve research and capacity-building.

## Key Needs and Requirements of this Strategy:

- Policy changes alone may not be enough. Perceptions and embedded cultural issues may still need to be addressed.
- This strategy still may not work well with traditional or resistant faculty, who still may not be persuaded to the value of CE/CEL or want to be engaged.
- To do this, you need support from senior leadership, especially academic leadership.
- Integrating a Reading or Study Group or other change oriented approaches can help.
- Engage with the scholarship (such as Boyer's work) and apply it in one's own context.
- Start with small group of committed faculty and administrators.
- Equip and expand the circle of individuals who are advocates for this work and these changes.
- Integrate with governance and committees, like the Faculty Review Committee.

## Example:

Here is some sample language from the tenure standards from Siena College's Sociology Department that may be relevant to understanding the types of revisions needed. A key piece is revising what the department recognizes as scholarship and who can be reviewers.

### *Sociology Department Standards*

*The Department recognizes three essential components to all scholarship:*

- a. Peer Review*
- b. Public Dissemination*
- c. Sociological Analysis*

*External Review: The Department recognizes that in some cases a faculty member's scholarship is more appropriately evaluated by an expert in the field who may not be a Ph.D. sociologist. In such cases the Department requires that all nominated external reviewers meet the following criterion:*

- 1. Hold a Ph.D. or other terminal degree (i.e. J.D., PsyD., EdD., D.A., MD., etc.) in a field that qualifies them to review the faculty members body of scholarship or*
- 2. Have sufficient professional experience in a field that qualifies them to review the faculty member's body of scholarship.*

# Working to Foster Changes in Tenure and Promotion Standards

## Recommendations:

CCPH researchers suggested two proposed models can help promotion and tenure committees determine whether a given faculty activity is “scholarship.”

- Glassick et al. proposed a model that evaluates faculty work as scholarship based on the degree to which a faculty member establishes clear goals, is adequately prepared, uses appropriate methods, has significant results, creates an effective presentation of the work, and reflects critical activity.
- Diamond and Adam suggest a model for scholarship that “requires a high level of discipline-related expertise, breaks new ground or is innovative, can be replicated, documented, peer-reviewed and has a significant impact.”
- Community-engaged scholarship can apply to teaching (e.g., service– learning), research (e.g., community-based participatory research), community-responsive care or services (e.g., public health practice), and service (e.g., community service, outreach, advocacy).

For more see: *Calleson, Jordan, and Seifer (2005). Community-Engaged Scholarship: Is Faculty Work in Communities a True Academic Enterprise?*

Barker (2004) presented a taxonomy of five practices of engaged scholarship that many working to revise their standards have found useful in crafting their language:

Practice	Problems Addressed	Artifacts/Methods
Public scholarship	Complex “public”, problems requiring deliberation	Face to face, open forums
Participatory research	Participatory democracy	Face to face collaboration with specific publics
Community partnership	Social change, structural transformation	Collaboration with intermediary groups
Public information networks	Problems of networking, communication	Databases of public resources
Civic literary scholarship	Enhancing public discourse	Communication with general public

These five practices reflect the core ideas that engaged scholarship must:

- a) Relate to a public problem.
- b) Be reciprocal and collaborative with the “public”.
- c) Address problems that are broadly public in nature.
- d) Extend the boundaries of discipline-specific knowledge.
- e) Require the faculty to demonstrate a leadership role.
- f) Focus in increasing public knowledge.
- g) Involve discovery, integration, and application of knowledge.

# Working to Foster Changes in Tenure and Promotion Standards

---

## Organizing Steps or Recommended Processes:

*Some colleges have conducted an internal audit or study.* Nazareth College did this and also published a case study about their work in this area. They recommended:

- Evaluate the scholarship of engagement with the same rigor, objective thought, and significance as traditional scholarship.
- Adapt the National Review Board Criteria for the assessment and evaluation of the scholarship of engagement.
- Continue to embrace Boyer's (1996) broader concept of scholarship of engagement and value efforts of faculty to contribute to the public good.
- Differentiate, service to the community, service learning, and the scholarship of engagement.
- Expand the traditional artifacts (e.g. publications in peer reviewed discipline journals) to include those associated with the advancement of public knowledge and service (e.g. public database creation, public forums). These artifacts can be directed at new knowledge with attention to current public challenges/problems/questions.
- Discuss the merits of having the Scholarship of Engagement be institutionalized practice.

For more see: *Metger, J., Szekeres, S., and Watkins, W. "The Scholarship of Engagement" (2010) as well as Eastern Region Campus Compact Case Study*

**Look at collective studies.** For instance, the Imagining America Tenure Team recommended the following:

- Define public scholarly and creative work
- Develop policy based on a continuum of scholarship
- Recognize the excellence of work that connects domains of knowledge
- Expand, document, and present what counts: use portfolios
- Expand who counts: broaden peer review
- Support publicly engaged graduate students and junior faculty
- Build in flexibility at the point of hire
- Promote public scholars to full professor
- Organize the department for policy change

See: *Ellison, J. and Eatman, T. Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design (2008)*

# Working to Foster Changes in Tenure and Promotion Standards

---

## Organizing Steps or Recommended Processes:

Examine processes that other institutions used. For instance Patricia Elliot from the University of Guelph (2013) recommends:

- Seek institutional inroads and identify champions. Engage existing groups (T&P Committee, Union Committees, Community Engagement Centers)
- Identify the best level to engage (institution-wide vs. start in one corner)
- Seek representation from community-engaged scholars/researchers, T&P committee members, faculty administrators, faculty union, community
- Build on what you have (such as campus mapping, inventories, terminology)
- Learn what others are doing
- Examine existing T&P policies
- Reach out to stakeholders
- Prepare paths for peer/community critique and review for CES
- Operationalize your plan
- Tell others (including at other institutions)

*For more information, see: Elliot, P. (2013). "Recognizing & Rewarding Community-Engaged Scholarship". Presentation at the 2013 CU Expo.*

## Where to Learn More:

Two great websites are:

- CCPH (<https://ccph.memberclicks.net>). See their Tenure Packet samples.
- Scholarship of Engagement <http://www.scholarshipofengagement.org/>

Ariane Hoy ([ahoy@bonner.org](mailto:ahoy@bonner.org)) can share a dropbox with you from the *Civic Scholars: Engaged Campuses* meeting (also the Bonner High-Impact Initiative planning retreat) held by the Bonner Foundation and Allegheny College March 21-23, 2014.