

**Evaluation Results**  
**Symposium on Community-Engaged Scholarship in Higher Education:**  
**Have We Reached a Tipping Point?**  
**February 21 – 22, 2007 ~Westin Embassy Row Hotel ~ Washington, DC**

Total N= 64

**1. What was your overall impression of the symposium?**

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | Sessions   |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| 0        | 0        | 5        | 29       | 24       | <p>N=58<br/> Average score: 4.33</p> <p>1= Poor<br/> 2= Fair<br/> 3=Good<br/> 4=Very Good<br/> 5=Excellent</p> |

**2. Please circle one response for each statement below:**

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |  |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| 0        | 1        | 28       | 31       | <p><b>2a. I achieved my main objective in attending the symposium.</b></p> <p>N= 61<br/> Average score: 3.49</p> <p>1= Strongly disagree<br/> 2= Disagree<br/> 3= Agree<br/> 4= Strongly agree</p> |
| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |  |
| 0        | 1        | 30       | 32       | <p><b>2b. I gained knowledge that I can apply in my work.</b></p> <p>N= 63<br/> Average score: 3.49</p> <p>1= Strongly disagree<br/> 2= Disagree<br/> 3= Agree<br/> 4= Strongly agree</p>          |

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |   |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 0        | 1        | 15       | 46       | <p><b>2c. There was adequate opportunity for questions and discussion.</b></p> <p>N= 62<br/>Average score: 3.73</p> <p>1= Strongly disagree<br/>2= Disagree<br/>3= Agree<br/>4= Strongly agree</p>          |
| 1        | 2        | 3        | 4        |   |
| 0        | 1        | 33       | 26       | <p><b>2d. I made important connections with others who share similar interests.</b></p> <p>N= 60<br/>Average score: 3.42</p> <p>1= Strongly disagree<br/>2= Disagree<br/>3= Agree<br/>4= Strongly agree</p> |

**3. To what extent did the symposium meet its stated goals? Please circle one response for each goal below:**

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |  |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| 0        | 13       | 33       | 17       | <p><b>3a. To examine trends and issues facing higher education and what future scenarios for higher education look like.</b></p> <p>N= 63<br/>Average score: 3.06</p> <p>1= Expectations not met<br/>2= Met most expectations<br/>3= Met all expectations<br/>4= Exceeded expectations</p> |

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u>         | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |   |
|----------|------------------|----------|----------|---|
| 0        | 16<br>One<br>2.5 | 33       | 14       | <p><b>3b. To examine how community engagement (CE) and community-engaged scholarship (CES) fit into these scenarios.</b></p> <p><b>N= 64</b><br/><b>Average score: 2.96</b></p> <p><b>1= Expectations not met</b><br/><b>2= Met most expectations</b><br/><b>3= Met all expectations</b><br/><b>4= Exceeded expectations</b></p>  |
| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u>         | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |   |
| 2        | 12               | 34       | 16       | <p><b>3c. To learn from the experiences of national conversations/initiatives about CE and CES that have been going on in parallel with the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative.</b></p> <p><b>N= 64</b><br/><b>Average score: 3.00</b></p> <p><b>1= Expectations not met</b><br/><b>2= Met most expectations</b><br/><b>3= Met all expectations</b><br/><b>4= Exceeded expectations</b></p> |
| 1        | 2                | 3        | 4        |   |
| 2        | 11               | 34       | 15       | <p><b>3d. To inform the national conversation about CE and CES in higher education and inspire collective action.</b></p> <p><b>N= 62</b><br/><b>Average score: 3.00</b></p> <p><b>1= Expectations not met</b><br/><b>2= Met most expectations</b><br/><b>3= Met all expectations</b><br/><b>4= Exceeded expectations</b></p>   |

**4. Please evaluate each component of the symposium. Please circle one response for each component:**

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u>  | <u>5</u>  | <b>Components</b>   |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>36</b> | <p><b>4a. A View From the Trenches: Lucille Webb and Geni Eng.</b></p> <p><b>N= 53</b><br/> <b>Average score: 4.51</b></p> <p><b>1= Poor</b><br/> <b>2= Fair</b><br/> <b>3=Good</b><br/> <b>4=Very Good</b><br/> <b>5=Excellent</b></p>                                     |
| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u>  | <u>5</u>  |   |
| <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>9</b>  | <b>53</b> | <p><b>4b. Have We Reached a Tipping Point? Judith Ramaley</b></p> <p><b>N= 64</b><br/> <b>Average score: 4.80</b></p> <p><b>1= Poor</b><br/> <b>2= Fair</b><br/> <b>3=Good</b><br/> <b>4=Very Good</b><br/> <b>5=Excellent</b></p>  |
| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u>  | <u>5</u>  |   |
| <b>0</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>27</b> | <b>26</b> | <p><b>4c. Panel on Linking Scholarship &amp; Communities: Holland, Nyden, Freeman, Ellison, Gelmon</b></p> <p><b>N= 64</b><br/> <b>Average score: 4.19</b></p> <p><b>1= Poor</b><br/> <b>2= Fair</b><br/> <b>3=Good</b><br/> <b>4=Very Good</b><br/> <b>5=Excellent</b></p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3                | 4  | 5  |  |
|---|---|------------------|----|----|--|
| 0 | 1 | 18               | 33 | 11 | <b>4d. Small Group Discussions</b><br><br><b>N= 63</b><br><b>Average score: 3.86</b><br><br><b>1= Poor</b><br><b>2= Fair</b><br><b>3=Good</b><br><b>4=Very Good</b><br><b>5=Excellent</b>                          |
| 1 | 2 | 3                | 4  | 5  |  |
| 0 | 6 | 27<br>One<br>3.5 | 25 | 4  | <b>4e. Town Hall Forum</b><br><br><b>N= 63</b><br><b>Average score: 3.44</b><br><br><b>1= Poor</b><br><b>2= Fair</b><br><b>3=Good</b><br><b>4=Very Good</b><br><b>5=Excellent</b>                                  |
| 1 | 2 | 3                | 4  | 5  |  |
| 1 | 9 | 21               | 16 | 7  | <b>4f. Call to Action: Recommendations &amp; Strategies</b><br><br><b>N= 54</b><br><b>Average score: 3.35</b><br><br><b>1= Poor</b><br><b>2= Fair</b><br><b>3=Good</b><br><b>4=Very Good</b><br><b>5=Excellent</b> |

## 5. What was the most valuable aspect of the symposium? Why?

### *Judith Ramaley's talk (18 responses)*

- Judith Ramaley—the historical overview was extremely valuable to juxtapose with other societal changes over the last 20 years or so. It helped to understand what helped to make this CES work come into being
- J. Ramaley's talk. Relevant on many fronts—really appreciated the evolutionary dimension.
- Provided inspired perspective
- Valuable, contextualized presentation.
- Great thinker.
- Meeting and hearing Judith Ramaley.
- Thoughtful and meaningful.
- Very useful and inspirational.
- Gave an excellent overview/perspective/context, very inspirational.

### *Networking and More (11 responses)*

- Networking (5 responses)
- Networking and hearing from others.
- Networking with multidisciplinary colleagues
- Networking with others doing CES
- The networking and learning some best practices.
- Networking and new ideas.
- Networking, hearing others' stories.

### *General Dialogue and Hearing from and Sharing with Others (13 responses)*

- Ability to share with others who have similar interests.
- An opportunity for a group of people doing this work to get reenergized, touch base on current trends.
- Being able to talk with fellow community-engaged researchers.
- Colleagues. Pasteur's Quadrant.
- Great dialogue re: community-engaged scholarship in higher education.
- Hearing from leaders in the field. Learning of resources.
- Informal dialogue with questions and answers
- Learning about other faculty members' struggles with implementing community engagement strategies.
- Listening to the general dialogue on CES.
- Meeting and talking with other health professions. I know and talk regularly with others in my discipline, but rarely get the opportunity to talk and find out what other health professions are doing.
- Opportunity to hear about what others are doing.
- Reconnecting with collaborative colleagues and adding new faces/components to the mix. And new and impressive voices.
- The discussions that highlighted progress and programs in existence at other institutions.

***Presentations in General (5 responses)***

- AM presentation and panel—offered real expertise.
- Plenary sessions.
- Some of the panelists who addressed CES and health professions
- The speakers were excellent—broad-thinking experts in the field, they really expanded my thinking.
- The presentations set the stage for thinking and the current status of CES. These were also though provoking and provocative and opportunities for sharing.

***Wednesday Night Partnership Panel (4 responses)***

- Hearing from the community representatives.
- Opening discussion Wednesday night.
- The discussion—expressing ideas and seeing what other colleagues are doing. I really liked Dr. Eng and Mrs. Webb—hearing about a partnership in action was great!
- The first night's program. They were excellent.

***Small Group Discussions (2 responses)***

- Small group discussions.
- Small group discussions—very robust discussion.

***Other Comments (9 responses)***

- 60's kids becoming professors/administrators?
- A broader, national view of issues related to community-based scholarship and service. Good dialog for do's and don'ts related to implementation.
- A chance to reflect on my own assumptions and experiences as I listened to others.
- Education is about the work of the collaborative. Ideas for my own institution. Discussion on tenure.
- Learning about CCPH (and much outside of this area).
- Mixture of people, places and institutions—but good try to recruit more indigenous and Chicano representation.
- Real example.
- Seeing like-minded folks in one spot. Rethinking service/research/teaching trichotomy and how to loosen it?
- The knowledge and expertise of all participants. Sarena's leadership.

**6. What was the least valuable aspect of the symposium? Please make constructive suggestions for improvement.**

***Nothing, None or N/A (9 responses)***

***Small Group Discussions (6 responses)***

- Might have had two sets of group work—one group session where people from similar institutions participated and another group session with diverse groups (institutions of different types).

- My small group was disjointed. It didn't feel like we were really dealing with what we were supposed to.
- Questions in the small group could have been more focused on strategies for enhancement, improvement, and expansion. Barriers that need to be addressed in order to expand the notion of CES across all academic institutions.
- Small group discussion needed a process for interaction versus random conversations.
- Small group discussion was poorly facilitated (my group).
- Small group.

***Town Hall Forum (6 responses)***

- 3 pm. Town Hall. Starting at 8 AM, we were all tired by 3. It could have ended with a 15-minute 3 pm wrap-up. That would have been better.
- Closing town hall meeting; low group energy
- Difference between town hall and inst. Session.
- Not sure how effective the town hall meeting was.
- The town hall/strategy—could have had more focused—adoption of an initiative.
- Town hall—needed forum.

***Panel (6 responses)***

- Barbara Holland's comments.
- Panel: would have been stronger if each speaker had been given a topic.
- Panel: for me this was too long and somewhat blah. Sorry. I felt that one of the stories were approaching a rant about past mistreatments and some moved into the politics of global warming with a typical one sided view. Not an experience-based discussion, nor related to the topic.
- Smaller panel.
- The panel was good but drifted a bit. It appeared that the structured questions assisted some folks more than others.
- The plenary was too long and could have been more engaging.

***Everything is valuable (3 responses)***

- All aspects were valuable.
- Hard to find any. Might like to hear about a completed CES project.
- I found every aspect of the symposium important and valuable. An excellent flow of information.

***Partnership Discussion (2 responses)***

- I would have liked to hear more concrete examples for how community engagement was expanded to scholarship with a focus more on the process and less on the outcomes.
- Partnership discussion Wed pm—not about scholarship! Irrelevant to topic.

***RPT (2 responses)***

- Stalling on the perpetual (but totally necessary) issues of promotion and tenure, even though I myself focus on this issue.

- We are going home to research sources for P&T etc. A handout with resources would have been helpful.

***Time (2 responses)***

- Not enough time.
- Timing—too ambitious. Facilitation—passive. No experienced CES universities here!

***Other Comments (3 responses)***

- A little less sitting in one place.
- The people I met.
- Would like to see more community partners. Good beginning.

**7. What will you do differently when you go home as a result of the symposium?**

***CES (7 responses)***

- Consider how to expand CES in physical therapy and to budge the concept of community engaged scholarship with physical therapy education.
- Continue to chip away—find the in-roads for connecting the much respected and valued community service learning outreach partnerships to the scholarship.
- Continue to promote, by example, and through institutional mechanisms a place for CES
- I have a better sense of how to talk about service vs. CES.
- Keep agitating for CES
- Talk with administration about more faculty development opportunities related to community-engaged scholarship.
- Write more about our CES work and model

***Partnerships/Community Engagement (7 responses)***

- Change name of our service learning university committee to reflect “community-engagement and community learning.”
- Continue to work effectively to achieve authentic partnerships.
- Evaluate courses in disciplines that can gravitate to interdisciplinary and inclusive of service learning.
- Follow up on contacts made. Renew my involvement and commitment to the CBOs with whom I collaborate.
- Implement a couple specific strategies to: community engagement task force that I chair. Think of documenting my individual work. Look at assessments.
- Not sure. I think the partnership I am part of is wonderful. I am to be co-author of two journal articles.
- Try to form a community-engagement interest group. Be more strategic about alliances within the university (e.g., follow the \$)

***RPT (6 responses)***

- Ask the assistant vice president for outreach to allow his assistant to serve as the P&T representative to the committee.

- Explore P&T guidelines and engagement for my school. Look at models of documentary scholarship.
- Reframe promotion and tenure strategies.
- Strategize difficulties re: RPT
- Work on my P&T documentation to include my CES pieces!
- Work within my school to integrate CES principles into P&T exemplars

***Renewed Sense of Priorities/Ideas/Energy (5 responses)***

- Impacted my focus and priorities—what I spend time on related to these issues.
- Implement a couple of new ideas and call some colleagues from other institutions to explore possible collaboration.
- Implement some new interdisciplinary strategies.
- This refreshed my thinking and will inform my research, writing and campus advocacy efforts.
- Work ever harder on this matter.

***Work with Administration/University (4 responses)***

- Make contact with vice chancellor to share info with him.
- More contact and linkages with SOPH. Promote faculty development at the unit and university level.
- Talk with administration and faculty about faculty development and networking.
- Update dean and associate deans with regard to the national debate

***CBPR (3 responses)***

- Explore more ways for encouraging faculty involvement in CBPR
- Feel more supported—more “mainstream” in our CBR projects.
- It is not necessarily a “different” activity, but I plan to take the history that Judith presented and juxtapose it along a brief overview, timeline of CBPR and my own history with this topic and share it with a faculty learning circle at Metro State.

***Team (3 responses)***

- Have the realization of fitting into a larger network of like-minded individuals.
- Hope to continue our efforts as a team.
- Pay attention to a set of institutions and learned more about and to community health centers

***Other Comments (6 responses)***

- Be more patient in expectations for change.
- Affirmed what I am already doing.
- Connect with new colleagues I met here.
- Don’t know yet.
- Start reading the books suggested by Judith Ramaley.
- Give more attention to some possible opportunities that we have been considering.

## **8. What, if anything, would you like to see as a follow-up to the symposium?**

### ***Proceedings and Action Steps (11 responses)***

- Action steps and breaking into work groups.
- An e-mail reporting findings that T&P report people are expecting to discuss on FRI available to Thursday participants.
- Disseminate.
- I see the work of the collaborative from tomorrow.
- Paper—action strategies
- Post presentations on web.
- Proceedings made available
- Published summary of recommendations. Case study monograph or exemplars.
- Summary of decisions.
- The conversations posted from Thursday through Friday.
- You have already said this would happen, but I am delighted that Judith Ramaley’s speech will be shared online.

### ***Networking/Continued Contact (6 responses)***

- Continued communication with consortium members.
- Continued contact with each other.
- Continued contact/dialogue among the participants.
- Postings on the webpage of the journals to disseminate CES work
- Some ongoing dialogue and networking
- Updating on progress by each school represented. More on networking.

### ***Reconvene/Meet (4 responses)***

- Another symposium that includes advanced CES universities.
- Other small groups such as this.
- Reconvene in a year if funding is available. Distribute the transcripts of talks (i.e., keynote)—facts from Panels.
- Something on CCPH website and another symposium like this on our campus.

### ***Resources/Information (3 responses)***

- Examples of the neat creative activity that I heard discussed.
- Get to the participants meta-analysis of the existing literature on CES—valuable for “talking with” university administration
- More information about the types of collaborative projects attendees are involved with.

### ***Funding (2 responses)***

- Get the funding agencies into the conversation.
- Involvement in advocacy, political, fundraising to provide seed money for initiatives in CES.

**Other Comments (4 responses)**

- A research consortium and project on gender, race and ethnicity and engagement. Faculty development that grounds faculty in their region and teaches them about the history of American higher education, which faculty know nothing about.
- Don't know right now!
- Leadership promotion through faculty development for individuals in administration positions—academic and community.
- More on this topic.

**9. What questions do you have that remain unanswered? (12 responses)**

- None (2 responses)
- “Rigorous” journals that are publishing CES. Peer Reviewers.
- Community feedback that influences scholarship and leads to practical action.
- Effective ways to interact with the university around policy issues.
- Finding funding sources is always a challenge.
- Have right now.
- How institutions and/or community organizations in addition to the “CES” might provide measures that support and encourage the necessary individual transformations.
- How to deal with CBR in the context of interdisciplinary divides. Focus on specific barriers and solutions—implementing P&T guidelines.
- How to include community in the beginning stages of planning.
- More on CES
- Whether this issue is the right one long-term given the changing nature of the profession.

**10. Are you a...(please check all that apply):**

**Faculty Member (38 responses)**

**Academic Administrator (24 responses)**

**Community Partner (4 responses)**

**Student (3 responses)**

**Association staff (5 responses)**

**Other (5 responses)**

**please specify:**

- Consultant (1 response)
- Staff (1 response)
- How many others are there? (1 response)
- Academic-community liaison (1 response)
- Association director (1 response)

**11. Additional comments and suggestions (13 responses).**

- 24 hours of sitting and listening is too long. Needed more interactive session.
- Absolutely valuable—new ideas, new energy (and I commend the staff for having the Symposium in a union hotel)
- Great facilitation.

- Great work—very important
- I was pleased to be invited to join our team for years 2 and 3 and I have learned a great deal in the process. (? Should be on gold sheet)
- PAGE (Public Active Graduate Education) program for CCPH—book publishing idea is a good one.
- Please don't take my negative comments in #6 as dissatisfaction with the conference. I enjoyed the conference, that piece simply didn't work for me. I would have preferred an additional small group session instead.
- Started late, ended late.
- Thank you for all the effort.
- Thank you for all the hard work and hospitality.
- Thank you!
- Timing of activities was excellent. I never felt rushed from session to session.
- We need to create other options to conventional faculty appointments and contracts.