

Recognizing & Rewarding Community-Engaged Scholarship

Partners:

Memorial University of Newfoundland, University of Alberta, University of Calgary, University of Guelph, University of Regina, University of Saskatchewan, University of Victoria, York University and Community-Campus Partnerships for Health

Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices

Patricia W. Elliott, University of Regina CU Expo June 12-16, 2013



Faculty Assessment Workgroup

- **Objective:** “Ensure that university tenure and promotion policies and practices recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship.”



Some perspectives on the issue

- **Academy:** “The obstacle to engaged-community research most frequently mentioned is the typical reward system, which puts the highest value on individual in-depth theory-based research that expands knowledge in a specific field” (Scott, 2007, p. 9).
- **Community:** “Instead of being promoted for all the hard work, planning, implementation, evaluation, and re-planning, my academic partners have been ignored, except by their community partners” (Freeman, et. al., 2009, p. 89).
- **Gender:** 90 per cent of faculty who self-identify as community-engaged scholars are women (O’Meara, 2002).



Obstacles

- Formal methods of recognition lack specific language.
- What recognition there is for community engagement falls in the service/voluntarism arena, not scholarship.
- Good language, where it exists, doesn't necessarily change established practices.

(Randall, 2010)



Our Research Project

- How is CES recognized and rewarded in written documents and policies at Canadian universities?
- What is the reality in practice?
- How can/should CES be recognized in faculty assessment policies and practices?

Document Review

- Brandon University
- Campus St. Jean
- Cape Breton University
- Concordia University
- L'institut français (U of R)
- Nipissing University
- Memorial University
- Simon Fraser University
- University of Alberta
- University of Calgary
- University of Guelph
- University of Manitoba
- Université de Moncton
- Université du Québec à Montreal
- University of Regina and affiliated colleges (Campion, Luther and First Nations University)
- University of Saskatchewan
- University of Toronto
- University of Victoria
- University of Winnipeg

*Research by Ijeoma
Madueke, 2012*



Scope

- Collective agreements
- T&P policy documents
- Vision statements
- Websites /public communications
- 15 main keywords and their variants



Key Findings

- Specific language lacking or absent
- Very little in collective agreements
- Supportive vision statements generally not matched with specific methods of recognition
- Fewer useful examples than we expected – but there were some



Qualitative Inquiry

In-depth semi-structured interviews with faculty and administrators at:

- Memorial University
- First Nations University of Canada
- Campus Saint-Jean
- University of Regina
- University of Victoria

*Research by Leonzo Barreno
and Ijeoma Madueke, 2012*



Smaller in scope, but richer context

- Sense of history – an established field, albeit not reflected in institutional policy language
- Common concepts/characteristics
- Beyond scholarship: relational, community-building, organic aspects
- Philosophical questions about the meanings and implications of recognition and reward



Challenging characteristics

- Organic development
- Lacks neat separation of self-academy-community
- Tied to concerns about privilege and power
- Transformative goals
- No singular model – diverse approaches driven by necessity and the research question
- Highly inventive, creative and fluid



Opportunities revealed

- Community understands and supports CES
- Individual faculty members have been able to gain tenure and promotions by framing and presenting their work well
- There are clear benefits for all involved – scholar, partners, university, community
- Broad acceptance growing, which should inexorably lead to specific support



Devil in the details

- Mechanisms for presenting evidence of scholarship
- Non-traditional research products
- Timelines
- Impact assessment
- Performance indicators
- Peer review
- Language



Moving Forward

- Pro-active program of change needed
- Locally-derived solutions



1. Seek institutional inroads

- Identify your champions
- Engage existing groups
 - Tenure and promotion committees
 - Union committees
 - Community engagement offices
 - Etc.



2. Identify the best level to engage

- What is the most logical institutional level to lead the change?
- This will vary from university to university.
- Institution-wide change, or start in one small corner and grow?
- Choose carefully and logically – because all else will follow from that choice.




3. Create a working group

- Seek representation from:
 - Community-engaged researchers
 - T&P committee members
 - Faculty administrators
 - The faculty union
 - The community



4. Build on what you have

- Review the inventory our Partnership created
- If you're not included, carry out your own inventory
- Where possible, work with the terminology already in place in your institution.



5. Familiarize yourself with what others are doing

Two starting points:

- Rewarding Community Engaged Scholarship www.cescholarship.ca (Canada)
- Campus Compact www.compact.org (U.S.)



6. Examine your existing T&P policy

- What can be used as is?
- What can be adapted?
- What should be added?



7. Reach out to your ‘stakeholders’

- Educate and engage your colleagues
- Workshops and presentations
- Help change the culture through knowledge



8. Prepare paths for peer/community critique and review for CES

- Be prepared with a well-planned, well-thought-out strategy for reviewing CES
- Involve the community
- Provide links to peer review resources and opportunities
 - CES4health.info - online mechanism for peer review
 - [ICES \(theresearchshop.ca\)](http://theresearchshop.ca) – ideas for dossiers



9. Operationalize your plan

- Work with T&P committee members
- Agree on definitions and major characteristics
- Agree on key performance indicators
- Set up peer review processes



10. Tell others

- Disseminate your successes and challenges to other universities.
- Share via the CES Partnership.
- We all need to learn from each other!



References

- Barreno, L., Elliott, P.W., Madueke, I.C.S., Sarny, D. (2013). Community Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices. Guelph: CES Partnership.
- Freeman, E., Gust, S. and Aloschen, D (2009). Why faculty promotion and tenure matters to community partners. *Metropolitan Universities Journal*. 20(2), 87-103.
- Randall, J. (2010) Community engagement and collective agreements: patterns at Canadian universities. In *The Community Engagement and Service Mission of Universities*, Patricia Inman and Hans G. Schuetze, eds. Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (England and Wales). 261-277.
- Scott, J. (2007). Engaging academia in community research: overcoming obstacles and providing incentives. Boca Raton, FL: Center for Urban and Environmental Solutions at Florida Atlantic University.

Thank you