



## Faculty for the Engaged Campus

*A National Initiative of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health in Partnership with the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, supported in part by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education in the U.S. Department of Education*

Synthesis and Analysis of Faculty Development Program Progress Reports  
For the January 1, 2009 – April 30, 2009 Reporting Period

Prepared by Sherril Gelmon, Evaluator, Faculty for the Engaged Campus

---

*Faculty for the Engaged Campus* aims to help institutionalize and sustain community-engaged scholarship (CES) in institutions of higher education. A major goal of the initiative is to strengthen career paths in the academy by developing innovative, campus-wide, competency-based models of faculty development. In May 2008, twenty campus teams convened for a community-engaged scholarship faculty development program design charrette and subsequently invited to apply for funding to support the design, implementation and evaluation of their faculty development program designs. Six universities were selected to receive up to \$15,000 over a 21-month period that began on January 1, 2009: North Carolina State University, Northwestern University, Ohio University, the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. The funds are used to support the design, implementation and evaluation of models of faculty development that advance community-engaged scholarship. The universities were encouraged to incorporate and build upon the faculty competencies and additional resources shared at the May 2008 Charrette.

The following summary highlights substantive examples of work the participating sites are doing as presented in their first progress reports, synthesized around the core focus areas areas for the project. To learn more about *Faculty for the Engaged Campus*, visit <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/faculty-engaged.html>.

### **Site-Specific Project Goals**

Six universities were selected to participate in this phase of the project: Each site has defined specific goals and objectives; these may be found on the *Faculty for the Engaged Campus* webpage at <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/faculty-engaged.html>.

All sites are working to develop “innovative, campus-wide, competency-based models of faculty development” as articulated in the project overview; this is being operationalized through specific goals and objectives such as:

- To build capacity for CES among faculty and their community partners;
- To strengthen the ability of faculty to design and carry out community-engaged scholarship that advances faculty scholarship and community agendas;
- To create a CES “learning community” on campus;
- To develop and document the faculty development curriculum content and lessons learned in a manual for distribution in print and online;

- To ensure that communities benefit in enduring ways from CES and research originating at the institution;
- To create an institutional plan for CES faculty development;
- To strengthen CES capacity, recognition, and investment within the institution;
- To develop increased CES understanding and support by institutional leadership; and
- To promote and tenure faculty including CES as a criteria.

Within these goals and objectives, given the emphasis on competency-based faculty development, some campuses have adopted models that emphasize different levels of competency and are seeking to establish programs that recognize the varying levels of competency which various faculty will develop – noting that different faculty will have differing strengths across a range of competencies. In some institutions the emphasis is broad across the campus; in some, the focus is a target group of “early adopter” faculty who will then become the role models to support others in developing their capacity for CES. The individual models being pursued reflect the institutional setting, prior history of CES, and resource capacity.

### **Activities Undertaken**

Sites have offered a number of activities; in general, these have been structured by providing workshops and seminars, creating networking opportunities, building clearinghouses and/or databases, establishing mechanisms to facilitate coordination across campus, offering mini-grants, and conducting surveys to establish a baseline of competencies and faculty development needs. Mentoring is being used on many of the campuses as an important strategy for helping less experienced faculty to learn from those with more experience.

Key to this work is creating some sort of vehicle on campus for shared dialogue to build knowledge and understanding of CES and how it can be integrated into teaching and research, as well as how community partners can be involved. In some cases incentives for faculty participation have been built into the faculty development program, such as mini-grants.. Modest resources may also be available to help support bringing community partners to campus to work with faculty on specific CES activities. Faculty development leaders are also recognizing opportunities to gain synergy between work on CES and related initiatives, such as the development of a campus center for community-based participatory research.

Where institutional change (such as increasing leadership support, or modifying faculty reward systems) is a project goal, faculty leaders are working to build the infrastructure for such change but recognize that it may not be feasible to see substantial results within the short time frame of this project. Some institutions are framing their faculty development initiatives to help faculty prepare their dossiers for review to showcase CES and how the resulting work is responsive to institutional guidelines for recognition and rewards.

### **Characteristics of Faculty Development Programs**

Sites were asked to articulate how their programs were innovative, campus-wide, and competency-based. Innovations included programs created using collaborative or participatory strategies involving faculty and community partners; the use of technology; the use of a developmental strategy for faculty development, recognizing faculty at different career stages or levels of expertise (as compared to one program for all); and the use of cohort-based activities. Key to “innovation” is that the strategy is innovative for that campus – it could be something that has been used elsewhere previously, but viewed as an innovation on the specific campus.

The six sites were charged to develop campus-wide programs and are pursuing a number of mechanisms for doing so. These include centrally locating the responsibility for the faculty development (i.e. in a central university office such as that of the Provost as compared to an individual college or school); recruiting across disciplines for participants; and using a broad and intentional strategy for promotion of the program and related activities and events to build campus-wide participation.

The third expected element of the programs is to be competency-based. At the May 2008 charrette, the CES competencies developed in an earlier CCPH project were presented (available at [http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf\\_files/handout-smallgroup.pdf](http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/handout-smallgroup.pdf)), and in most cases the campuses are using them to develop faculty development activities, organize curricula and learning modules, and assess the capacity of participants. Several campuses are working on developing assessment tools that will help participants to self-assess against the competencies (pre- and post- faculty development), and CCPH is working with them to create common methods that can be disseminated more broadly.

### **Accomplishments to Date**

Sites were asked to articulate their most important accomplishments to date. Campuses report that activities and programs have raised awareness, interest, and understanding among faculty and administrative leadership across the university about opportunities and issues related to CES. Most campuses report strong interest and participation from faculty and partners in activities offered. Discussions with campus leaders have also shown an increasing recognition of the need for support and coordination of efforts related to CES. Over time it is hoped that these efforts will have helped to leverage other activities and initiatives on campus regarding CES and related activities.

### **Challenges to Date**

While the sites have only been at work on their projects for a few months, some key challenges have already been identified. These relate to institutional culture and policy, competition for resources, uncertainty about future support, lack of or changes in leadership, time, the economy, resources, lack of faculty interest, scheduling, and sustaining partnerships. These are issues that one might expect to encounter and reflect the challenge of implementing an innovation that initially may not be widely understood or welcomed.

One of the specific strategies being pursued by *Faculty for the Engaged Campus* is to facilitate conversations about challenges among the six sites in order to build knowledge and develop creative solutions. Program leadership at the national level is creating opportunities to promote this sharing of “promising” practices to accelerate replication across the sites.

### **Lessons Learned to Date**

Sites identified a number of lessons learned to date. Sites are recognizing that creating CES faculty development programs, engaging allies and moving toward broader institutional change is slow work that takes time. There is a lack of a clear definition of CES on some campuses and little consensus about what relevant faculty development needs to look like. In order for this work to be successful, leaders need to be agile and adaptable, recognizing and seizing upon opportunities. There may be resistance if this work is seen as new or an add-on; thus there needs to be a clear definition of what “CES” is, why it is important and why faculty need preparation and support to succeed in doing it. Faculty think about “community-based” in a range of ways

from service and extension, to research about community, to research with community; these varying perspectives present challenges so clarity is vital.

The community voice is important in this work, and there is a need for mutually beneficial, reciprocal relationships between the university and the community. These relationships are key, they take time to develop. Finally, sites are recognizing that there may be a need for written agreements to ensure a common understanding among all involved. Such agreements may be critical if it becomes necessary to remind all parties involved of the agreed upon arrangements.

### **Changes in Institutional Culture**

Many sites said it was too early to see substantive changes in institutional culture. Nonetheless, sites are already reporting increased administrator awareness, beginning to formalize the work by giving it a name, developing supportive policies, and creating networks of like-minded individuals across campus. In some cases, the project appears perfectly timed and poised within the context of other institutional activities, with sites reporting an impact on hiring decisions and/or on work related to promotion and tenure policies (for example, through the creation of a task force to consider engaged scholarship). At one institution, leaders reported that faculty appear to have been thinking about “community-based” work but have not had a name for it; this process is providing some awareness and direction for those who are interested. In another institution, grants to support “Engaged Departments” are being offered in parallel with this project, with the aim of institutionalizing engaged scholarship within a growing number of departments and disciplines on campus.

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

Sites were asked to speak specifically to the involvement to date of administrators, faculty, community partners, and students. There is a range of involvement of administrators from keeping them informed to full participation in planning and implementing activities. Faculty are involved in a variety of roles – as advisors, decision-makers, and participants in the faculty development activities.. Community partners have also served in variety of roles – as advisors, presenters, planners, and research partners. Students may not be involved or have limited involvement but they have potential to be influential with faculty; most evident to date is the involvement of doctoral students in some programs where there is an emphasis on career development in CES and a desire to start with individuals before they become faculty.

### **Relationships and Partnerships**

The sites described relationships and partnerships they have leveraged or established, and identified other relationships they intend or need to develop. The success of faculty development is perceived as depending upon building networks within and across universities in order to share learning and build the infrastructure needed to deliver strong faculty development programs. A key opportunity on campus is connecting with other related university centers or units, as well as connecting across disciplines. Project leaders recognize the importance of being strategic about building relationships with campus entities that have power and resources, including administrators and faculty leaders. Sites are using these relationships to increase awareness about CES. Key partnerships relate to those with community members, and identifying strategies for bringing community members to campus as to share their expertise with faculty

### **Resources Leveraged**

Sites were asked to describe resources leveraged to date. In some cases, sites have leveraged grant money to obtain additional resources to further build capacity for CES faculty

development. Some see the need to garner additional funds for sustainability, while others believe their efforts can be sustained on volunteer time.

### **Evaluation Efforts to Date**

A core element of this project is capturing the lessons learned and documenting the experiences from each institution. Thus each site is expected to evaluate and report on its work and related process and outcome observations. Sites were asked to describe their evaluation efforts to date. In many cases substantive evaluative effort will take place in the coming months. To date, evaluations have focused on assessing faculty competencies, needs, satisfaction, interests, and reasons for participating or not. Events have been evaluated to gauge participant satisfaction and perceptions of the success of these activities. Some sites are tracking faculty participation and subsequent actions such as developing scholarly products. In all cases a key element is determining whether what is being offered is relevant and targeted to those participating.

One of the evaluation challenges for sites at this point is determining whose perspectives to solicit in addition to those of the faculty participants (such as institutional leadership, academic partners, community partners). Similarly, sites are determining what to evaluate: events conducted such as workshops; shared understanding of CES; use of the competencies; satisfaction with partnerships; the partnership processes; impact on course offerings; creation of new partnerships; scholarship generated; and/or mentoring relationships formed. Ideally, sites will report on all relevant learning and offer findings that reflect upon multiple perspectives.

### **Dissemination**

Most sites have done little beyond informal dissemination on their campuses, although a few identified proposals accepted for presentation and some described plans for future dissemination, such as books and journal articles. The forms of dissemination being pursued to date include announcements at relevant university and other local events/meetings, internal communications, and conference presentations. The actual content has focused on lessons learned to date; information about *Faculty for the Engaged Campus* and the specific campus project (processes and anticipated outcomes); and discussion of strategies for institutionalization.

### **Plans for Ongoing Sustainability**

Some sites can already comment on plans for sustainability. Some activities can be sustained at little or no cost (such as a learning community), but others require an investment of internal or external funds. In order to sustain work, some sites are attempting to weave grant activities into a unit's regular activities to become the norm. For example, where a faculty development office is leading this work, it may be feasible to include training expenses in future fiscal year budgets. Other sites are identifying campus-wide partnerships to cover some of the costs.

### **Program Elements for Replication**

Some sites were able at this point to identify program elements that could be replicated elsewhere. Key elements include having dedicated staff for the program; creating individualized participant action plans; leveraging the support of experienced faculty; encouraging scholarly products; disseminating the faculty development model to other faculty development activities; creating a focus on skill-building with an emphasis on institutional change; identifying and securing additional resources to support the work; and recognizing administrative champions.