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Purpose

• This interactive presentation will provide an overview of the definition, rationale and key components of community-engaged scholarship.

• A process for developing community-engaged scholarship as an integral part to one’s academic career will be described.
Intended learning outcomes

• Define the components of community-engaged scholarship
• Distinguish between the “doing” of community engagement and the “scholarship” of community engagement
• Assess the potential for scholarship as part of one’s community engagement
Starting premises

Members of the audience…
• have a variety of experience with service learning
• acknowledge and appreciate the role of service learning
• wish to add a scholarly component to service-learning
Recap on service learning
Advantages

Faculty perspective (mm)
- Enriching the curriculum
- Embedding the “real world” in course experiences
- Enhancing student learning outcomes
- Increasing social responsibility
- Contributing to good citizenship

Student perspective (Imss)
- Viewing “book learning” in a “real world” context
- Practicing professional techniques in a “safe environment”
- Observing change in underserved populations
- Experiencing different and new population groups
- Enhancing resume with practical experience
Disadvantages

Faculty perspective (mm)
• Time consuming
• Scheduling
• Travel distance from university
• Psychic energy for sustaining effort
• Dynamics of managing community partnerships

Student perspective (lmss)
• Time consuming
• Scheduling
• Travel distance from university
• Dynamics of group interaction
• Relevance to chosen field
• Meaningfulness to service recipient
What challenges have you experienced with service learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty perspective</th>
<th>Student perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now let’s add a scholarly dimension to service learning
Why do you think it’s important to add science to service?

- Take 5 minutes to generate ideas from each vantage point
  - Self (personal ↔ professional)
  - Institution (internal ↔ external)
  - Society (micro ↔ macro)
Let’s share some ideas

- Self
- Institutional
- Society
# A few ideas from mm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Personal: Better understand phenomena, inform practice, authenticity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional: Demonstrate efficacy and effectiveness to service recipients, other professionals, third party payers, legislators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Internal: Fulfill part of its mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External: Strut its stuff, impress stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Micro: Immediate benefit to individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macro: Long-term effectiveness across many strata of society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Before adding science to service...

- Explore the evolution of knowledge and practice over time as a backdrop to embracing community-engaged scholarship as a vital part of one’s academic career
- Look at how we’ve generated science in the past
- Identify scientific twists and turns in the western world
# A hop, skip, and jump through time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Ancients</th>
<th>Originators of <strong>practical</strong> knowledge via observation, trial and error, fortuitous happenings, and a healthy respect for the supernatural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeks 600BC</td>
<td>First to consider themselves philosophers, to value general principles, and value <strong>theoretical</strong> knowledge as superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td><strong>Dichotomy</strong> of <strong>practical</strong> and <strong>theoretical</strong> knowledge prevails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Times 500 AD on</td>
<td>Much <strong>knowledge</strong> goes underground, superstition prevails monasteries burned, war galore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A hop, skip, jump through time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Renaissance 1500’s</th>
<th>Scholars call themselves natural philosophers and use more objectivity, direct observation, and verify observation via experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600’s</td>
<td>Empricism is born, science is possible, knowledge comes from human experience, ideas reflect reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700’s</td>
<td>Logical positivism, know the world as a single reality, reductionistic thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## A hop, skip, jump through time

| 1800’s          | Scientists agreed upon methods of inquiry, research designs, **principles** to explain universe, develop and test **theories**. Practitioners recognize potential of **using theoretical knowledge to solve practical problems** so more professions emerge **Social science** emerges and generated new theories and knowledge for addressing social issues in society |
## A hop, skip, jump through time

| Early 1900’s | More professions emerge (e.g. engineering, education, health professions) **applied scientists** use research approaches to solve specific, practical and social problems while **basic scientists** continue to develop theory that will predict phenomena |
How knowledge from disciplines and professions serve society

Figure 2. The development, use, and benefit derived from theoretical information: disciplines, professions, and society.

(Mosey, 1996)
### A hop, skip, jump through time

| Late 1900s | **Post positivist** thinking moves away from reductionism to more **pluralistic** and **holistic** thinking, multiple realities, natural contexts, Qualitative research approaches used for biopsychosocial research, more concern about inner, subjective experience to gain insight and understanding to |
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Where will science go next in the new millennium?

• Moving from dichotomous to more continuous and integrated approaches to science
• Develop stronger connections between theory and practice
• Embrace the complexity inherent in marrying the traditional with the contemporary
Current examples from the health professions
A scholarship of practice

“Knowing about something is not the same as knowing how to do something.”

(Kielhofner, 2004)
Engaged scholarship

- Put aside hierarchy of “theory first, then practice”
- Move towards more participatory approaches to action research
- Preserve “claims-to-knowledge”
- Embrace contemporary “proposals for action”

(Maxwell, 1992)
Knowledge creating systems

(Senge & Scharmer, 2001)
Knowledge creating systems

- Practitioners involved in creating knowledge
- Researchers involved in solving practice problems
- Clients involved in trying out solutions
Integrating theory and practice
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Adding a community dimension to theory and practice

• If what we know and do is contextually linked to who we are and who we serve, then we can come to a community context with a more integrated sense of engaging in that which is mutually beneficial.
Definition of community engagement

• Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with those communities.

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions (2004)
Definition of community-engaged scholarship

- Community-engaged scholarship that involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with community.
- Community-engaged scholarship can be transdisciplinary and often integrates some combination of multiple forms of scholarship.

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions (2004)
Key components of community-engaged scholarship

• Genuine and established relationship with a community group or organization
  – Sustained over time
  – Mutually satisfying interest
  – Support mechanisms in place
Key components of community-engaged scholarship

• Provision of service by practitioners and students is desired and valued by constituents
  – Identifying needs
  – Shaping programs to meet needs
  – Modifying service provision to better serve constituents
Key components of community-engaged scholarship

• Emergence of authentic questions that scholar and community wish to answer based on the outcomes of the services provided.
  – Efficacy and perceived value of service
  – Immediate benefits to recipients
  – Long term effectiveness of providing service
Embracing community-engaged scholarship

Theory
What to know

Preferences
for solving selected problems

Values
for personal and professional growth

Practitioner
who we are

Reciprocal reasoning

Strengths

to engage in selected milieux

Practice
what to do

Recipient
who we serve

Skills

to implement and evaluate new practices
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Look at handout
(Kielhofner, 2005 & Mitcham, 2006)
Moving from doing community engagement to community-engaged scholarship
Boyer’s (1990) definitions of scholarship

• Discovery
  – traditional research

• Integration
  – synthesizing existing work

• Teaching
  – assessing methodologies

• Application
  – Applying theory to practice
Exploring scholarship options

- Using Boyer’s model, which type of scholarship can you envision using within the context of your current community engagement?
- Take 5 minutes to discuss with a colleague.
Let’s share some ideas
An example from public health
Figure 1. Concept: Dimensions and emphases of Practice-Oriented Scholarship.

(Aday & Quill, 2000)
Table 1

Content: selected examples of practice-oriented scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core public health functions</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Research project—community needs or assets assessment</td>
<td>Review of interdisciplinary research on a public health problem</td>
<td>Course—principles and practice of public health</td>
<td>Collaborate with agencies in developing program based on needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy development</td>
<td>Policy analysis—alternative state health care reform proposals</td>
<td>Summary of policy implications of technical, scientific findings</td>
<td>Advising—legislative interns</td>
<td>Participate in statewide task force on health care reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Program evaluation—interagency consortium</td>
<td>Critique of alternative models of program design</td>
<td>Mentoring—public health leaders</td>
<td>Consult on ways to strengthen program based on primary and secondary research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Aday & Quill, 2000)
Assessing potential for scholarship as part of one’s community-engagement

- Using the worksheet, which plays off the previous slide, begin to generate ideas for some of the cells as makes most sense to your context
- Work with a partner for 5-10 minutes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues in your field</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Let’s share some more ideas
Evaluating community-engaged scholarship

• By what criteria do you wish your work to be judged?
• Who is best prepared to make such judgments?
• How will you activate the evaluation of your scholarship?
• Let’s not reinvent the wheel.
Using Glassick’s (1997) criteria for evaluating scholarship

- Clear goals
- Adequate preparation
- Appropriate methods
- Significant results
- Effective presentation
- Reflective critique
### Table 2
Criteria: standards for assessing domains of scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for assessing scholarship</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals</td>
<td>Research focus is clearly discernible</td>
<td>Framework for the integrative perspective is elaborated clearly</td>
<td>Learning objectives are delineated clearly</td>
<td>Policy or social problem being addressed is specified clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate preparation</td>
<td>Research questions are grounded in previous and new research in the area</td>
<td>Approach evidences breadth and depth in the topics being addressed</td>
<td>Teaching materials are well organized and up to date</td>
<td>Approach evidences having laid the relevant groundwork with participating entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate methods</td>
<td>Research methods are judged appropriate by scientific standards and peers</td>
<td>Author's perspectives (or biases) in the selection and synthesis of materials are articulated explicitly</td>
<td>Teaching approach matches and engages students</td>
<td>Approach balances both rigor and relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant results</td>
<td>Research findings influence or inform subsequent research</td>
<td>Results influence or inform interdisciplinary perspective</td>
<td>Teaching enhances student mastery</td>
<td>Results influence or inform program or policy design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective presentation</td>
<td>Research results are presented clearly and interpretable to scientific peers</td>
<td>Results are presented clearly and interpretable to interdisciplinary audience</td>
<td>Material is presented clearly and interpretable to student audience</td>
<td>Results are presented clearly and interpretable to interdisciplinary audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective critique</td>
<td>Limitations of one’s own and others’ research within the discipline are identified</td>
<td>Limitations of one’s own and others’ research across disciplines are identified</td>
<td>Evidence for evaluating teaching effectiveness is available</td>
<td>Evidence for evaluating policy or program impact is available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Aday & Quill, 2000)
Table 3

Documentation: evidence for assessing domains of scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation for assessing scholarship</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement of goals and accomplishments</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scholarly contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum vitae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles, peer-reviewed journals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles, professional journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports and/or agency documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training manuals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service/practice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internal evaluations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/department administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• External letters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significance and impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service to university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service to profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service to community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations/teaching</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Aday & Quill, 2000)
mm’s experience to date in community-engaged scholarship

- OT Curriculum
  - Elective course
- Service provision
  - Aging in place
  - WISH team
- Data gathering
  - Qualitative assessment
- Scholarly component
  - Qualitative interviews
- Outcomes
  - Book chapter
  - Conference presentations
- Next steps
  - Write for publication
Further questions
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