



**Developing and Rewarding Community-Engaged Scholarship:  
Towards the Transformation of University Policies and Practices**

*A National Initiative of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and the University of Guelph*

**Answers to Questions Posed by Prospective Applicants  
May 28, 2010 Edition**

If you have questions that are not answered here, please email them to [ces@uoguelph.ca](mailto:ces@uoguelph.ca) and they will be addressed in the next edition of this document and posted on the CCPH website at [www.ccphe.info](http://www.ccphe.info) and the initiative website at <http://www.cescholarship.ca/>

(1) How is "community" in community-engaged scholarship defined for purposes of this initiative?

The "community" in community-engaged scholarship (CES) refers to non-university people and organizations as partners. The "community" in CES can be local, national or international.

What we mean by community is dynamic and inclusive; there is no one definition of community. As articulated by the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health board of directors, "Community need not be defined solely by geography. It can refer to a group that self-identifies by age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, illness or health condition. It can refer to a common interest or cause (e.g., a community of interest), a sense of identification or shared emotional connection, shared values or norms, mutual influence, common interest, or commitment to meeting a shared need. Defining community in a particular community-university partnership or community-engaged activity is more about the process of asking and answering key questions than about a strict definition of who is community or represents community: Are those most affected by the issue being addressed at the table? Are those who have a stake in the issue being addressed at the table? Are community members at the table? Do they play decision making roles? The purpose of the partnership drives the definition, therefore each effort must ask for the definition of community."

We do not proscribe a definition of "community" for this initiative. Rather, applicants are asked to respond to "the question: What do the terms 'community engagement,' 'scholarship' and 'community-engaged scholarship' mean at your university?"

(2) I think I need to know more details about how my university would find a way to enable my participation in this effort, should we be included in the universities that take part. I am strongly involved with community-oriented scholarship -- publications, teaching, community service-learning, but also recognize that universities have not commonly been amenable or open to recognizing these kinds of efforts - so I guess I want to know more about how this association intends to move into this realm of discussion – who is spear-heading this?

First, we applaud your commitment to community-engaged scholarship! Your observation about the lack of recognition and reward for CES at many universities is exactly why the University of Guelph and Community-Campus Partnerships for Health are spearheading this initiative. We are looking for universities that are committed to advancing CES and eager to collaborate with their peers to develop innovative competency-based models of faculty development, facilitate peer review and dissemination of products of CES, align faculty

review, promotion and tenure policies and practices with standards of quality CES, and support community-engaged faculty through the promotion and tenure process, are encouraged to apply. Applicants may propose to make change at the level of the university as a whole, one particular school/college or multiple schools/colleges.

We suggest that you approach key stakeholders regarding your interest in having your university participate in this initiative – for example, your dean, promotion and tenure committee members, colleagues involved in supporting CES (e.g., director of a centre for service-learning). Even if your university does not apply, you may find that the process of bringing people together to consider applying could serve as a catalyst for change.

(3) How will commitment and readiness for change be assessed in the applications submitted?

Each application will be assessed by four reviewers comprised of the initiative leadership team and advisors with expertise in CES, faculty development, institutional change and evaluation, using a standardized form that asks for a numerical score and comments on these criteria:

- Support from a university official who is able to commit the expected financial contribution
- Demonstrated alignment between the goals of the initiative and university priorities
- A compelling case for the university's readiness to participate in the initiative and achieve its goals and objectives
- A sound rationale for the composition of the proposed team
- A candid appraisal of the university's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats with respect to supporting CES
- Intention and ability to both learn from and contribute to a multi-university collaboration

(4) What funding has been secured for the initiative thus far? What external bodies have been and will be approached for funding?

The University of Guelph and Community-Campus Partnerships for Health are devoting financial and in-kind resources to support the start-up of the initiative. We have had encouraging conversations with several potential funding agencies. We will collaborate with the universities selected to participate in the initiative in submitting proposals to these funding agencies as well as others we collectively identify. The financial contribution of the participating universities will be used as matching funds for the proposals we submit together. We are taking this approach because (a) funding agencies are increasingly expecting to leverage their investments and (b) we believe that universities need to financially contribute to efforts, like this one, that are at their core about changing institutional culture and incentives.

We view this initiative as part of a long-term strategy for change and are committed to moving forward even as we seek full funding for it. Since announcing the initiative, for example, we have applied for a conference grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council to support a conference entitled "Community Engaged Scholarship: Critical Junctures in Research, Practice and Policy," that will convene national and international scholars from diverse disciplinary backgrounds to present and discuss emerging research on CES in higher education and mobilize that knowledge to facilitate changes in policies and practices at Canadian universities. If funded, the universities applying to participate in this initiative will be invited to attend.

(5) Will prospective applicants have access to the budget prior to submitting an application? This might help us to make our case to senior administrators to make the required financial investment.

We will be developing the budget in collaboration with the universities selected to participate. We will work together to leverage the cash and in-kind resources provided by the participating universities and CCPH to

leverage external sources of support. The “initiative components” section on pages 2 and 3 of the call for applications includes information about the activities and expenses that funding would support. We have tried to be clear about the direct tangible activities and services that would come from a university’s participation in the initiative.

(6) How much room is there to modify the composition of the university team to be reflective of the university culture and mandate? (e.g., are the functional categories for team participants circumscribed or can others – including community partners - be welcomed into the process)?

As indicated in the “call for university partners,” you must specify the composition of your team and explain why they are the right people/positions to participate in this initiative. Your university’s 4 person team must include at least one senior faculty member with a proven track record of CES and at least one member of a faculty promotion and tenure committee (these may be the same person). Additional team members are entirely up to you and can include administrators or staff with campus-wide faculty development, faculty advancement or community engagement responsibilities, union representatives, community partners, graduate students, faculty members and others.

(7) What are the specific objectives of this process and what time commitment is required so that we can consider the staff resources needed to support this initiative from our end?

The specific objectives for participating universities over the three year period are:

- To significantly change their tenure and promotion policies and practices to recognize and reward CES
- To establish innovative, campus-wide, competency based mechanisms for developing community-engaged faculty
- To collectively develop metrics and tools to permit a longitudinal assessment of the impact of the above changes
- To collectively establish a functioning network of universities that are supporting and advancing CES will be established

Below is a list of team expectations, with an estimated time commitment **each year** in parentheses:

- Complete a team self-assessment of university capacity for community engagement and CES (30 minutes for each team member to complete self-assessment on their own, 90 minutes to come together as a team to discuss individual responses and complete the self-assessment as a team)
- Participate in in-person working meeting (3 days, including preparation, in-person meeting and travel time)
- Participate in workgroups, formed at the initiative’s first meeting, that address cross-cutting issues identified by campus teams (monthly one-hour conference calls for workgroup members; an additional one hour per month for member preparation and follow-up; and additional one hour per month for the workgroup chair(s), supported by initiative staff who will schedule calls, take notes, prepare notes, etc.)
- Quarterly educational conference calls that address shared challenges and present innovative models (four 90 minute conference calls)
- Submit an annual progress report (6 hours to draft report)
- Participate in one site visit during the three-year period of the initiative, designed to address campus challenges and help support the change process (in the year the site visit takes place: 3 days, including preparation, actual site visit and site visit follow-up).

The specific team activities undertaken over the course of any given year will depend on the action plan developed at that year’s in-person meeting and how vigorously they are able to move forward. For example, one team’s first year might focus on activities that lead to revising faculty promotion and tenure policies, while another team might determine that the policies are actually worded fine but the focus needs to be on educating

members of promotion and tenure committees on applying the policies and coaching community-engaged faculty members to develop strong portfolios for promotion and tenure. We hope this initiative serves as a catalyst for a significant institutional investment in the team's ability to succeed.

(8) What are the costs and opportunities to broaden the circle to involve others who are interested? If we are not chosen, have you thought about mechanisms for us to “play along from the outside” and still benefit?

We are planning for at least two cohorts of universities involved over a 6 year period. We're committed to sharing materials, results, lessons learned, etc to a wide audience and will be doing so via website, listservs, conference calls, conferences, etc that will be publicly accessible. We also plan to raise funds to support our ability to make presentations and lead workshops at others' conferences and on campuses.

Those of you familiar with CCPH know that the organization is known for sharing information widely and being open with the resources that come out of the work that we do. We encourage others interested to join CCPH ([www.ccphe.info](http://www.ccphe.info)) and tap into resources it has already made available to support CES:

CES toolkit: [www.communityengagedscholarship.info](http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info)

Peer-reviewed publication of diverse products of CES: [www.CES4Health.info](http://www.CES4Health.info)

Online database of faculty mentors and portfolio reviewers: [www.facultydatabase.info](http://www.facultydatabase.info)

CES Listserv: <http://mailman2.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/comm-engagedscholarship>

Last but not least, we welcome your suggestions for keeping you engaged and maximizing your ability to benefit from this initiative.

(9) How is this significantly different from CURA projects? I've been involved with one for years and we've pulled non-profits, private businesses, and government agencies to the table. And it involves several universities, communities, and ... I think, conspicuously ... community colleges. It is the latter kind of organization that has the longest and deepest legacy of engagement with the community. Why not -- here's a radical idea -- pair a university with a college and let the latter do some of the leading?

This particular initiative is focused on the changes needed within universities to recognize, reward and support CES, including changes in policies and processes for promotion, tenure and faculty development. The purpose of the Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) program is “to support the creation of alliances between community organizations and postsecondary institutions which, through a process of ongoing collaboration and mutual learning, will foster innovative research, training and the creation of new knowledge in areas of importance for the social, cultural or economic development of Canadian communities.” (From the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council website, <http://bit.ly/c9Tq4x>). Universities that have or have had CURA funding should be well positioned to apply for this initiative.

Regarding your comment about community colleges, you might want to consider including a community college member of your team if you apply for the initiative.

(11) My feeling is that larger institutions will dominate such an organization because they have better developed infrastructures for CES and that smaller institutions will always be behind - how can we ensure that this is not the case?

The review criteria described in the answer to question 3 are not intended to privilege any particular size or type of institution. The application questions provide ample opportunity for an applicant to elaborate on its particular institutional context, strengths and opportunities. Applicants may propose to make change at the level of the university as a whole, in one particular school/college or in multiple schools/colleges.

(12) Is it possible for two different teams from the same university to apply?

Only one team may apply from a given university. However, that team could have explicit ties back to a larger group of people whose involvement is critical to the change process (e.g., administrators and faculty from multiple schools/colleges, a university-wide task force on community engagement).

(13) If the initiative depends on external funds to proceed, i.e., what happens if no external funds are secured?

Please see response to question 4. We are committed to proceeding in the absence of external funds while we continue to seek funds. Of course, this would mean proceeding on a smaller scale and scope and this would need to be determined in collaboration with the universities selected to participate.

(14) How much opportunity is there for partner institutions to influence the shape of the initiative, its goals, deliverables, etc?

After the selected universities confirm their participation, we will begin to develop collaborative proposals for funding and in that process there will ample opportunity for all involved to shape the specifics. The overall purpose of the initiative, however, will remain unchanged (to advance CES in Canadian universities by transforming university policies and practice) as will the collaborative, team-based nature of the change process undertaken and the technical support provided.

(15) Why is this a competitive process? Why not welcome every university that wants to take part?

There are several reasons we have chosen to have this be a competitive process:

- Not all universities are ready to embark on a deliberate, strategic process of change
- Not all universities are able to invest the internal resources that will be required to achieve change
- Not all universities are able to fully participate in a collaborative change process involving other universities
- We believe it is wise to begin the collaborative change process with a reasonably sized group of universities who are ready and able to participate, invest in their success over a period of time and then begin to expand the circle from there. Thus, we are planning for at least two cohorts of universities involved over a 6 year period

As mentioned in the answer to question 8, we believe it is possible to both work intensively with a selected group of universities while at the same time engaging a wider group of universities that is interested in moving in the same direction.

(16) We are considering putting forward an application with our faculty of arts in the lead because that's where our community research unit is housed. But our senior administration is interested in seeing this effort "spun out" into other key faculty that are also community-engaged, such as education, social work and engineering. How should we approach our application? Should we focus on reviewing performance reviews in our faculty only, or should we take on the whole university?

Using this initiative to demonstrate a change process in one faculty or a couple of faculties and then use the experience to support change more widely is a great strategy. You might have the faculty of arts take the lead and work to demonstrate changes in policies and practices there and have them serve as a mentor to other faculties that follow closely behind. In other words, spend the first few years or perhaps all three years of your involvement in the initiative focused on making sustainable change in the faculty of arts, and then begin to move out from there to other parts of the university. You might construct your team to have several

representatives of the faculty of arts and a representative of another faculty and/or the provost's office so that a link is made within the team to other parts of campus. You might consider establishing a larger committee or task force that has representatives of the various community-engaged faculties to help ensure that what you learn from participating in the initiative is quickly and widely spread to other faculties for their consideration.

Because we are planning to have two cohorts of institutions, there may be an opportunity to start with the faculty of arts but then come in with a second application for a different team composition and focus.

(17) Have you had success in getting the research intensive universities in Canada interested in this? How about in your American initiatives?

Representatives of research intensive universities registered for the call and most of them participate on the call. We had participation of research intensive universities in CCPH's U.S.-based initiatives as well. There is a group in the U.S. that has formed called The Research Universities Community Engagement Network that is working to advance CES in research universities. In 2008, the group released a Research Universities Engaged Scholarship Toolkit that includes many of the resources developed by CCPH. For more information, visit <http://bit.ly/aJXwHs>

(18) For universities that have unionized faculty, the union is an important player in tenure and promotion matters. If a university decided it wanted to include a member of the faculty union as a member of the team, would that be ok?

Yes, you may include union representatives on your team. Applicants are asked to explain the rationale behind the particular people and positions they are proposing to serve on their 4 person team. In considering the most effective strategies for making change at your institution, if union involvement is critical, then having a union representative on your team makes a lot of sense. Considering that faculty agreements can take years to negotiate, having them involved at the start of your involvement in this initiative – whether as a team member or in other ways – would be wise. James Randall has authored a manuscript that will be published soon that looks at collective agreements across Canada and whether their language supports or inhibits faculty community engagement. For a copy, please email [ces@uoguelph.ca](mailto:ces@uoguelph.ca)

(19) The context for higher education is quite different in Canada and in the U.S., although some of the foundational issues and challenges are quite similar. It would be interesting to do a cross-country comparison.

We would agree. The application asks for an analysis of the applying university's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats with respect to CES. Similar questions were asked of the American universities participating in CCPH's Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative. Thus it will be possible to compare the two and we would be interested in doing so.

(20) Since you are looking for universities that are prepared to make change, does that necessarily mean you are not looking for a wide range of universities from both extremes – i.e., those that have barely started the process to those that are actively engaged and already have supportive language in their collective agreements? Would a university that is embarking on change in one faculty or college be viewed as favorably as one that is ready to make change across an entire institution?

We believe there are many universities in Canada that are ready to make change in their policies and practices to support and advance CES. For some, it makes sense to begin in a given school or college, for others it makes sense to work campus-wide. This initiative has room for both. Successful applicants will make a compelling case for their readiness for change, for their commitment to change over the long haul, and for the rationale of where and how to start. Making these changes is hard, complicated work that requires lots of discussions and

there will always be pockets of resistance from faculty who raise concerns about academic freedom, the legitimacy of CES as scholarship, and other issues. It will be key for universities to be ready to tackle these challenges and issue and be in it for the long run.

(21) In our case we have faculty across numerous colleges who are community-engaged. If we aim for change across the university, we could end up with a 20 person team! What is the most efficient way to go about this?

Having an explicit link from your 4-person team to a broader group is one possibility. In other words, perhaps you invite representatives from each college to serve on a campus-wide committee that then has a 4-person team representing it on the initiative.

We should also take this opportunity to clarify that although certain components of the initiative would only be open to your 4-person team (e.g., attendance at annual initiative meetings), we would welcome participation in other components by others at your university and in your community (e.g., educational conference calls, listserv discussions, etc).

(22) We don't do anything without our community partners and we are very aware that they have been extremely generous with their time and we're always thinking through how much we ask of them. It feels counterintuitive not having a community partner on our 4-person team. For example, we have brought in alumni who are now leading community organizations so they can help advocate for change within the university so it doesn't always have to come from us as faculty and staff. What is your experience with having community partners involved in these sorts of initiatives? We're concerned that the conversations are going to be so university-centric.

This initiative, with its focus on changing university policies and practices to better support faculty to be community-engaged, will necessarily be university-centric. That being said, community partners could be strong allies and supporters in the change process. In CCPH's Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, several but not all universities had community partners on their teams. These were usually partners who had been collaborating on the ground with faculty and students over a number of years and had become involved in matters of university policy (e.g., serving on curriculum committees, writing letters of support for faculty going up for promotion, serving on university-wide task forces on community engagement, etc). One community partner team members and two other community partners who served as consultants to the CCPH Collaborative co-authored an interesting and important article: Freeman E, Gust S, Aloschen D. (2009). Why Faculty Promotion and Tenure Matters to Community Partners. *Metropolitan Universities Journal*. 20(2): 7-103. Available at <http://bit.ly/dePZbO>

If you consider community partner participation as being essential to the process of changing your university policies and practices, we would encourage you to include a community partner on your team.

We should also take this opportunity to mention that we are aware of the parallel need for rewards and supports for community partners in community-engaged teaching and research. We all have to be careful about the demands we place on our community partners and the usual imbalance of power and resources in community-university partnerships that favor universities. There's a whole process of change that needs to happen around community partner rewards and supports.

(23) One of our big barriers to community-university partnerships is the funding arrangements. For example, funding agency policies around who can submit a proposal, who serves as a peer reviewer, how funding arrangements are structured, etc can undermine equitable partnerships. Will this initiative be looking outward to change funding agency policies (e.g., getting more funding into communities, supporting community

sabbaticals, etc)? That would be more likely to engage our community partners that only looking inward to change university policies.

Our long-term goal in this initiative is to make change not only in individual institutions but in policies around them that affect their ability to support CES. This is an excellent example of the sort of cross-cutting issue that the initiative could form a work group and agenda around. In the CCPH Collaborative, for example, one of the cross-cutting work groups focused on influencing funding agency policies and practices by providing lists of potential community-based peer reviewers and draft language to include in requests for proposals.

(24) Are there any universities on the line who would be willing to muse aloud about their own institution and whether they are positively oriented to this initiative? Are there any that see some reluctance to participating?

“There is a lot of interest at the executive leadership level and a strong movement on our campus for this type of initiative.”

“We circulated the call for partners and a lot of people want to put their stamp on it. Leaders in the upper echelons are willing to “talk the talk” but we’re not sure yet about their “walking the walk.” The financial commitment is not a problem – that’s one way they can put their stamp on it. But change can be unsettling and destructive and we’re wondering whether we will meet resistance from some quarters as the change process begins.”

“Our university was born out of the community and has strong links but the other factor is that the funding reward system for universities looks at our record of getting council grants and funding for our research operations. How do we make sure that whatever we do in community-based research is included in our key performance indicators? There are quite understandable concerns about these issues. They may not be insurmountable but they need to be considered as we pursue change.”

“Our faculty of humanities at the University of Victoria has adopted tenure and promotion guidelines that embrace CES and that’s been a good start.”

(25) Sitting on a promotion and tenure committee has given me a strong sense of what is valued at my university and it’s research and teaching over service. Service is there but it will not make up for the other two. I have a self-interested concern: will participating as a team member in this initiative, which would involve a fair amount of service work, undermine my ability for advancement at my university?

There are real opportunities for scholarship to come out of this initiative. We will be generating new knowledge about what it takes to make institutional change, we will be developing new models of promotion and tenure review and of faculty development, for example. We need to collaboratively develop a scholarly agenda as a core component of this initiative. This does not come through as it should in the call for university partners. In our past collaborative initiatives, for example, individuals involved have been promoted and tenured, they have received letters of support and mentorship from their peers at other participating universities, they have authored paper and collaborated on grant proposals for “spin off” projects.

This is also a good opportunity to step back and emphasize that much of CES does not belong and should not be described in the “service” category for promotion and tenure. Community-engaged teaching and community-engaged research belongs in teaching and research. CCPH’s past initiatives make this case and provide guidance, robust standards and useful tools for doing so.

(26) Can you clarify the maximum size of the team?

A four member team must be named in the application. That team could be connected to a larger group of people at the university who are working on the initiative, but the team itself is limited to 4 people.