• Campus–Community Partnerships and the Scholarship of Engagement

• What is the Scholarship of Engagement?
Engaged Research and Creative Activities

- Reflects the core values and mission of the institution
- Flows from a definition of engagement that stresses mutual input and benefit
- Anchored in the 4 cornerstones of knowledge: generation, application, dissemination, and preservation
- Focuses on community defined issues and produces evidence-based outcomes
- Guided by theories or conceptual models of change
- Builds self sufficiency in community partners
- Creates products appropriate for assessing faculty performance
Committee on Institutional Cooperation
(Big Ten + Two), Committee on Engagement

Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with public and private sectors to

- enrich scholarship and creative activities;
- enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning;
- prepare educated, engaged citizens;
- strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility;
- address critical societal issues; and
- contribute to the public good.

Oct. 2004
## ENGAGEMENT IS EMBEDDED IN SCHOLARSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Traditional Academic Activity</th>
<th>Scholarly Engagement Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University faculty provide instruction to undergraduate and graduate students in campus classrooms and laboratories.</td>
<td>Engaged TEACHING occurs when…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…credit and noncredit learning opportunities are taken off campus, online, and to community-based settings to increase access; or when service-learning experiences advance students’ knowledge about social issues while contributing to the immediate goals of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University faculty members pursue research studies according to their various professions and interests, and publish results in academic books and journals.</td>
<td>Engaged RESEARCH occurs when…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…a collaborative partnership conducts an investigation for the direct benefit of external partners; outcomes of the research lead to improved, evidence-based practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University faculty and students undertake departmental or college administrative duties and serve on committees.</td>
<td>Engaged SERVICE occurs when…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…a faculty member summarizes current research literature about an issue for working professionals or community organizations, offers research-based policy recommendations to legislators at a committee hearing, or provides medical or therapeutic services to the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Spectrum of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>INITIAL OUTCOMES</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Skills, Values, Attitudes, Beliefs, Opinions, Understanding, Emotions, Self-expression, Spiritual Awareness</td>
<td>Individual practice and behavior, Spiritual practice</td>
<td>Status, Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group or Family</td>
<td>Shared Group/Family: culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views, Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>Group/Family relationships, Group/Family practices, Group/Family interaction</td>
<td>Status, Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Shared agency culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views, Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>Inter-departmental relationships, Agency management practices, Service delivery practices</td>
<td>Status, Condition, Agency structures/system and its governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery System or Neighborhood</td>
<td>Shared system culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views, Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>System member relationships, System member interaction, System practices</td>
<td>Status, Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Shared community social norms, culture, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views, Community interests, Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>Relationships among groups, neighborhoods, Civic action, Community dialogue</td>
<td>Status and condition: social, economic, environmental, Community structures/infrastructure, Community governance structure, laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Relationship between Outcomes & Impact

**Program Activities**

- **Conflict Resolution Classes/Interventions**
  - Young person learns non-violent conflict resolution techniques and strategies.
  - Young person understands the concepts of non-violent conflict resolution.
  - Young person uses non-violent conflict resolution strategies when confronted with conflict.

**Initial Outcomes**

- Young person believes that it is important to resolve conflict non-violently.

**Intermediate Outcomes**

- These are the beliefs, understandings, and skills that are needed to enact the practice.

**Long-Term Outcomes**

- These are the practices or behavior that help partners realize the building blocks.

**Impact**

- These statuses and conditions are the building blocks that partners need to achieve the desired impact. (What evidence would suggest we’ve identified appropriate building blocks?)

- The ultimate status or condition that we are seeking with our partner

- Youth who are mentally, emotionally, physically, and socially healthy.

- Search Institute 40 Developmental Assets. Young person seeks to resolve conflict non-violently.
Context for Engagement at Michigan State University

MSU Mission Statement

• strives to discover practical uses for theoretical knowledge and to speed the diffusion of information to residents of the state, the nation, and the world….

• is committed to emphasizing the applications of information; and contributing to the understanding and the solution of significant societal problems…

Fitzgerald, SHEEO, 2006
Definition: Outreach and Engagement

“… a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.”

Provost’s Committee on University Outreach
1993
Research/Discovery/Creative Works

- Applied research
- Community-based research
- Contractual research
- Demonstration projects
- Exhibitions/performances
- Needs assessments/evaluation
- Knowledge transfer and research
- Technical assistance
- Publications/presentations
Teaching and Learning

• Service-learning
• Study abroad programs
• Distance education and off-campus instruction
• Continuing education
• Contract courses or programs designed for specific audiences
• Conferences, seminars and workshops
• Educational programs for alumni
• Participatory curriculum development

Fitzgerald, SHEEO, 2006
Service/Citizenship

- Clinical services
- Consulting
- Policy analysis
- Service to community-based institutions
- Knowledge transfer and workshops
- Expert testimony
- Technical assistance
- Contributions to managed systems
- Leading professional societies and associations
- Commercialization of discoveries
- New business ventures

Fitzgerald, SHEEO, 2006
MODELS

Building Structures for Institutional Change
UOE Scholarship Based Approach to Campus-Community Partnerships
Context for this Work

National efforts

- Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) – Committee on Engagement
  www.cic.uiuc.edu/groups/CommitteeOnEngagement/index.shtml

  “Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.”

  CIC - Committee on Engagement (revised February 14, 2005)
  Defining and Benchmarking Engagement: Draft Report and Recommendations

- National Association of State Universities & Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC)
  Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service (CECEPS) – Benchmarking Taskforce
  www.nasulgc.org/councils_extension.htm
Context for this Work

National efforts (cont.)

- MSU Benchmarking Conference
  www.csue.msu.edu/conf2005

- Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification/2006
  www.carnegiefoundation.org/newsroom/press_releases/05.01.2.htm

- National Center for the Study of University Engagement (NCSUE)/2006

- Higher Education Network for Community Engagement (HENCE)/2006
  www.henceonline.org

NASULGC/USU Forum: University Leadership in Strengthening our Urban Communities/2006

- Institutional partnerships: Consideration of national data sets
Standards of Practice for Partnerships
What is Community-Based Participatory Research?
-Extent to which community is involved; they have real, meaningful roles in decisions along the research process.
-Faculty serves as facilitators to process; the community drives it. Helping build community capacity to get to that place.
-Sometimes it can work, other times, the community does not want to be involved.
-Flexible/adaptive to community needs.
-Ecological context – attending to multiplicity of influences.
-We go to community and listen.
-Build transparency of process.
-Community drives process.
-Promote dialogue among partners.
• Shared resources
• Shared goals
• Shared inquiry
  – What do we want to learn? What are we learning?
• Shared investigation/scholarship
• Shared notes/data collection
• Shared use – how do we use what we learn
• What differences have we made?
• Build trust/mutual agreement
Creating a System Compatible with CBPR

Pennie Foster-Fishman, Ph.D.
Michigan State University
May 14, 2007
Why is a Systems Perspective Needed

There is a large body of evidence that suggests that when the existing institutional climate or culture is not compatible with and encouraging of new expectations or desired behaviors, implementation failure is highly likely - even in the context of excellent training (Klein & Sorra, 1996).
Traditional Approach to Change

Foster-Fishman, 2007
When in reality...

Foster-Fishman, 2007
Creating a Supportive Institutional System May Require Systems Change

• Systems change refers to an intentional process designed to alter the status quo by shifting and realigning the form and function of a targeted system (Foster-Fishman, Nowell, & Yang, 2007).

• In most system change endeavors, the underlying structures and supporting mechanisms that operate within a system are altered, such as the policies, routines, relationships, resources, power structures, and values.
Understanding Fundamental System Parts as Potential Root Causes

We propose targeting four categories of systems parts

- **System norms** (attitudes, values, beliefs)
- **System resources** (human, social, economic, opportunities)
- **System regulations** (policies, procedures, incentives)
- **System operations** (power, decision-making)

*Foster-Fishman, 2007*
Identifying System Parts

• Assess alignment of current system with values and assumptions of targeted outcome or change
  – System coherence
• Assess degree to which current system has or is building the infrastructure in place to support goals or targeted outcome
• Use a Systems Matrix to do this analysis
### Example Systems Change Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Target</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Research and Grants Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Regulations</strong></td>
<td>CBPR is not part of merit system. NO reduction teaching load provided when faculty do CBPR</td>
<td>No annual award to best CBPR</td>
<td>Internal funds not made available to support CBPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Resources</strong></td>
<td>Undergrad teaching assignments to not consider CBPR opps</td>
<td>No Inter-disciplinary faculty learning teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Norms</strong></td>
<td>Senior faculty do not value CBPR in mentoring of junior faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No faculty who engage in CBPR serve on P&amp;T committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Assignment

For your institution, complete the systems matrix noting what changes would be necessary to support community based participatory research if CBPR would be an important component of institutional evaluation of faculty performance.
# Example Systems Change Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Target</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Research and Grants Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrate System Change Goals into Logic Models or Theories of Change

- Identify key levers for change within the system and track to see if they shift.
- Identify and track radiating impacts of these changes.
- Convene stakeholders in on-going manner to see if system is changing is desired manner and, if not, make necessary shifts in design.

Foster-Fishman, 2007
Conceptualizing the Context of Preferred Areas of Support

The Outreach Asset Impact Measurement Approach

– Three core concepts:
  • Outcomes occur within an asset context
  • Outcomes occur on five inter-related levels
  • Outcomes at multiple levels must be considered

Brown & Fitzgerald, 2005
## Networking to Coordinating to Cooperating to Collaborating Map

### From Networking to Collaboration: Stages of Working Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Cooperating</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Exchanging information for mutual benefit</td>
<td>Altering activities for mutual benefit</td>
<td>Sharing resources for mutual benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda</strong></td>
<td>Better relationships</td>
<td>Avoid duplication</td>
<td>Divide up new resources; share resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>Individual agency functioning</td>
<td>Individual provider/agency functioning</td>
<td>Cross-agency functioning, generally limited to one service population/issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>Show and tell</td>
<td>Coordinating times for home visits</td>
<td>Making van, space, staff available to another agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Informal; limited to periodic meetings</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>Whoever comes; service providers and supervisors</td>
<td>Service providers, supervisors</td>
<td>Agency directors, supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Whatever is necessary to maintain meetings</td>
<td>Facilitative</td>
<td>Autonomous, facilitative; lead agency in control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>Informal agreements</td>
<td>Formal interagency agreement on allocation of resources</td>
<td>Formal interagency agreement on allocation of resources, respective responsibilities; institutionalizing systems change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stages of Working Together (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Cooperating</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Individual (right for me)</td>
<td>Balance good for me with good for others.</td>
<td>Best for all of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of trust, management of conflict</td>
<td>Low trust/minimal conflict, protecting turf</td>
<td>Some trust/conflict; recognize we all can benefit</td>
<td>More trust; recognize and manage conflict when it arises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal commitment</td>
<td>Just have to show up</td>
<td>Work together at meetings or informally one on one</td>
<td>Work on agenda outside of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Array of strategies</td>
<td>Only our approach or our way of understanding</td>
<td>Where our approach and yours intersect</td>
<td>Multiple approaches are sought and appreciated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outreach Partnerships Check Points Training Michigan State University - 2000
Bob Brown & Celeste Sturdevant Reed
## Spectrum of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Initial Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>• Skills, values, attitudes, beliefs, opinions, understanding, emotions, self-expression, spiritual awareness</td>
<td>• Individual practice and behavior</td>
<td>• Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spiritual practice</td>
<td>• Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group or family</td>
<td>• Shared group/family: culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>• Group/family relationships</td>
<td>• Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutal understanding</td>
<td>• Group/family practices</td>
<td>• Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual agreement</td>
<td>• Group/family interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>• Shared agency culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>• Interdepartmental relationships</td>
<td>• Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual understanding</td>
<td>• Agency management practices</td>
<td>• Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual agreement</td>
<td>• Service delivery practices</td>
<td>• Agency structures/ system and its governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery system or neighborhood</td>
<td>• Shared system culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>• System member relationships</td>
<td>• Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual understanding</td>
<td>• System member interaction</td>
<td>• Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual agreement</td>
<td>• System practices</td>
<td>• Delivery system structure and its governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>• Shared community social norms, culture, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>• Relationships among groups, neighborhoods</td>
<td>• Status and condition: social, economic, environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community interests</td>
<td>• Civic action</td>
<td>• Community structures/ infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual understanding</td>
<td>• Community dialogue</td>
<td>• Community governance structure, laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outreach Partnerships **Check Points Training** Michigan State University - 2000
Bob Brown & Celeste Sturdevant Reed
Logic Modeling

Outcomes = Benefits to People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• New knowledge or understandings</th>
<th>• Initial outcomes (or intention outcomes)</th>
<th>• “What they have inside”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changed beliefs, attitudes or values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modified behavior or practice</td>
<td>• Intermediate outcomes (or behavior outcomes)</td>
<td>• “What they do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved condition</td>
<td>• Long-term outcomes (or status outcomes)</td>
<td>• “How they are”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Altered status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outreach Partnerships Check Points Training Michigan State University - 2000
Bob Brown & Celeste Sturdevant Reed
**Logic Modeling**

*Understanding the Relationship Between Outcomes and Impact*

- **Program Activities**
  - These are the interventions that we do with our consumers to get to the outcomes

- **Initial Outcomes**
  - These are the beliefs, understandings, and skills that are needed to enact the practice
  - Young person believes that it is important to resolve conflict non-violently
  - Young person understands the concepts of non-violent conflict resolution
  - Young person learns non-violent conflict resolution techniques and strategies

- **Intermediate Outcomes**
  - These are the practices or behavior that help consumers realize the building blocks
  - Young person uses non-violent conflict resolution strategies when confronted with conflict

- **Long-Term Outcomes**
  - These statuses and conditions are the building blocks that consumers need to achieve the desired impact. (What evidence would suggest we’ve identified appropriate building blocks?)
  - Search Institute 40 Developmental Assets
    - *Young person who seeks to resolve conflict non-violently*

- **Impact**
  - The ultimate status or condition that we are seeking with our consumers
  - Youth who are mentally, emotionally, physically, and socially healthy

Outreach Partnerships **Check Points Training** Michigan State University - 2000
Bob Brown & Celeste Sturdevant Reed
# Logic Modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Initial Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>- Skills, values, attitudes, beliefs, opinions, understanding, emotions, self-expression, spiritual awareness</td>
<td>- Individual practice and behavior</td>
<td>- Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Spiritual practice</td>
<td>- Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group or family</td>
<td>- Shared group/family: culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>- Group/family relationships</td>
<td>- Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual understanding</td>
<td>- Group/family practices</td>
<td>- Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual agreement</td>
<td>- Group/family interaction</td>
<td>- Agency structures/ system and its governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>- Shared agency culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>- Interdepartmental relationships</td>
<td>- Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual understanding</td>
<td>- Agency management practices</td>
<td>- Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual agreement</td>
<td>- Service delivery practices</td>
<td>- Agency structures/ system and its governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery system or neighborhood</td>
<td>- Shared system culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>- System member relationships</td>
<td>- Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual understanding</td>
<td>- System member interaction</td>
<td>- Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual agreement</td>
<td>- System practices</td>
<td>- Delivery system structure and its governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>- Shared community social norms, culture, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, worldviews</td>
<td>- Relationships among groups, neighborhoods</td>
<td>- Status and condition: social, economic, environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community interests</td>
<td>- Civic action</td>
<td>- Community structures/ infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual understanding</td>
<td>- Community dialogue</td>
<td>- Community governance structure, laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**


Outreach Partnerships **Check Points Training** Michigan State University - 2000
Bob Brown & Celeste Sturdevant Reed
Multi-Level Logic Model: Example 1

**Activities**
- PR & Outreach
- Intake & Assessment
- Case Coordination Plans mutually enacted

**Initial Outcomes**
- Individuals & families are aware of Case Coordination Agencies
- Individuals/families & staff mutually understand and agree upon case coordination plans

**Intermediate Outcomes**
- Individuals & families access Case Coordination Agencies
- Public & private providers mutually understand & agree upon:
  - Common vision, anticipated outcomes, & shared values for the service delivery system & self-sufficient clients
  - Target population size & current condition
  - Degree to which current services support achievement of desired client self-sufficiency outcomes
  - Current gaps in service
  - Degree to which current services are connected
  - Current barriers to interconnections

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- Individuals & families who are socio-economically vulnerable or in crisis
- Individuals & families who are self-sufficient

**Activities**
- System design work sessions
- System champions (leaders) recruitment & commitment efforts
- Individual organization buy-in & formal endorsement & commitment
- Memo’s of agreement

**Initial Outcomes**
- Individuals & families are aware of Case Coordination Agencies
- Individuals/families & staff mutually understand and agree upon case coordination plans

**Intermediate Outcomes**
- Individuals & families access Case Coordination Agencies
- Public & private providers mutually understand & agree upon:
  - Common vision, anticipated outcomes, & shared values for the service delivery system & self-sufficient clients
  - Target population size & current condition
  - Degree to which current services support achievement of desired client self-sufficiency outcomes
  - Current gaps in service
  - Degree to which current services are connected
  - Current barriers to interconnections

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- Individuals & families who are socio-economically vulnerable or in crisis
- Individuals & families who are self-sufficient

**Activities**
- System design work sessions
- System champions (leaders) recruitment & commitment efforts
- Individual organization buy-in & formal endorsement & commitment
- Memo’s of agreement

**Initial Outcomes**
- Individuals & families are aware of Case Coordination Agencies
- Individuals/families & staff mutually understand and agree upon case coordination plans

**Intermediate Outcomes**
- Individuals & families access Case Coordination Agencies
- Public & private providers mutually understand & agree upon:
  - Common vision, anticipated outcomes, & shared values for the service delivery system & self-sufficient clients
  - Target population size & current condition
  - Degree to which current services support achievement of desired client self-sufficiency outcomes
  - Current gaps in service
  - Degree to which current services are connected
  - Current barriers to interconnections

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- Individuals & families who are socio-economically vulnerable or in crisis
- Individuals & families who are self-sufficient

**Activities**
- System design work sessions
- System champions (leaders) recruitment & commitment efforts
- Individual organization buy-in & formal endorsement & commitment
- Memo’s of agreement

**Initial Outcomes**
- Individuals & families are aware of Case Coordination Agencies
- Individuals/families & staff mutually understand and agree upon case coordination plans

**Intermediate Outcomes**
- Individuals & families access Case Coordination Agencies
- Public & private providers mutually understand & agree upon:
  - Common vision, anticipated outcomes, & shared values for the service delivery system & self-sufficient clients
  - Target population size & current condition
  - Degree to which current services support achievement of desired client self-sufficiency outcomes
  - Current gaps in service
  - Degree to which current services are connected
  - Current barriers to interconnections

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- Individuals & families who are socio-economically vulnerable or in crisis
- Individuals & families who are self-sufficient

**Activities**
- System design work sessions
- System champions (leaders) recruitment & commitment efforts
- Individual organization buy-in & formal endorsement & commitment
- Memo’s of agreement

**Initial Outcomes**
- Individuals & families are aware of Case Coordination Agencies
- Individuals/families & staff mutually understand and agree upon case coordination plans

**Intermediate Outcomes**
- Individuals & families access Case Coordination Agencies
- Public & private providers mutually understand & agree upon:
  - Common vision, anticipated outcomes, & shared values for the service delivery system & self-sufficient clients
  - Target population size & current condition
  - Degree to which current services support achievement of desired client self-sufficiency outcomes
  - Current gaps in service
  - Degree to which current services are connected
  - Current barriers to interconnections

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- Individuals & families who are socio-economically vulnerable or in crisis
- Individuals & families who are self-sufficient

**Activities**
- System design work sessions
- System champions (leaders) recruitment & commitment efforts
- Individual organization buy-in & formal endorsement & commitment
- Memo’s of agreement
Multi-Level Logic Model: Example 2

**Level**
- Individual
- Neighborhood
- Center (Agency)
- Service Delivery System

**Activities**
- Activities that help youth feel safe.
- Activities that help neighbors believe in themselves & build assets.
- Activities that build relationships & create understanding.
- Activities that maintain the Center.
- Reporting of Outcomes.

**Initial Outcomes**
- Youth feel safe at the Center.
- Youth think that Center programming is cool & fun.
- Neighbors view the Center as part of the neighborhood & trust the staff.
- Neighbors believe they can make a difference.

**Intermediate Outcomes**
- Youth actively participates in Center programming.
- Neighbors create a caring neighborhood.
- Neighbors participate in process to identify available community resources & agree on which are needed for the neighborhood.
- Neighbors advocate to obtain community resources.
- Center understands & is able to navigate the neighborhood.
- Center understands & is able to navigate the larger community.
- Community organizations agree to provide programming at the Center.
- Community believes Center is important to maintain.
- Center maintains good relationships with neighbors.
- Center maintains good relationships with community resources.
- Center negotiates with community organizations to obtain community resources & programming.
- Community organizations deliver programming in Center (asset building programs).

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- Youth build positive developmental assets (Search Institute assets).
- Young people experience caring neighborhoods.
- Neighbors agree on sets of community resources needed in the neighborhood that help build assets in youth.
- Community provides core funding for the Center.
### Exploring Understanding to Create Logic Modeling

**Action Planning Worksheet**

What do we need to do to resolve the community issue or problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What must we individually understand to resolve the community issue or problem?</th>
<th>What must we mutually understand and agree upon to resolve the community issue or problem?</th>
<th>What must we actually do to resolve the community issue or problem?</th>
<th>Do we need to create a space or structure in which to do our actions to resolve the community issue or problem?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behaviors and practices: What we do/what is done

Articulating activities/interventions/actions that inform practice (shifting from what “they” do to what those who make “it” happen need to do) = what activities need to take place to transform our institutions:

- Assess our initial skills
- Identify exemplars
- Develop faculty capacity (training programs)
- Create support circles/learning teams/learning communities
- Show me the money! (locate resources)
- Develop a plan for implementation
  - Introduce faculty to community (make facilitated connections)
  - Develop an evaluation component of progress
- Identify problem areas
- Create incentives
- Identify gaps
- Train in community-friendly methodologies
- Get administrative buy-in (motivation)
- Listen to and be responsive to community needs
- Development of metrics to assess how we know when we are successful

Status or conditions
HOW TO GET FACULTY TO MOVE TOWARD CBPR

**ACTIONS/INITIAL OUTCOMES**

Identify faculty who:
- Understand how to translate CBPR research methodologies (make accessible to communities)
- Need to/want to make community change
- Are passionate about community change
- Have good interpersonal skills
- Are passionate about teaching and learning
- Can be an effective communicator at multiple levels
- Understand the meaning of shared power
- Are willing to learn (know they don’t know everything)
- Are comfortable with risk-taking
- Are comfortable with ambiguity
- Understand the community development process
- Value service to others

**INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES**

*Time, money, reading, writing.*

Faculty who:
- Find time and money
- Employ and have a bounded, theoretical model
- Find opportunities
- Given time and money
- Write, measure, collect data
- Create
- Embed CBPR in their teaching
- Value and partner with community

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**

Faculty who:
- Are engaged researchers
- Co-communicate their engaged research with community partners
- Are rewarded for CBPR work (may require criteria)

**IMPACT**

CBPR (ultimate outcomes)
Metrics/benchmarks of faculty who are engaged scholars, producing X number and X type of scholarly products
### BUILDING INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO CBPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>INITIAL OUTCOMES</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assess faculty performance criteria (does it include research)</td>
<td>• Community activated and enabled to voice their concerns/desire to work with the university</td>
<td>• Co-generate pathways to CBPR</td>
<td>HBCUs who are institutionally committed to CBPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess faculty interest</td>
<td>• Further faculty development across HBCUs</td>
<td>• Develop incentives to turn outreach into products</td>
<td>CBPR firmly established at HBCUs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convene stakeholders (internal/external/alums) for achieving CBPR (selling, defining, aligning)</td>
<td>• Historic CBPR work is validated (baselines established)</td>
<td>• Resources committed to this effort</td>
<td>Multi-university, multi-disciplinary research (Funded: NSF, NIH, other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess institutional resources relevant to CBPR</td>
<td>• Outreach expressed in university mission and strategic direction</td>
<td>• Faculty development is active and supports movement towards CBPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create conscious-raising materials and circulate</td>
<td>• Assess alignment between university and faculty reward system</td>
<td>• Promote the JHEOE and MJCSL: advocate with journals to be HBCU advocates (expand variety of journals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bring in speakers/workshops on CBPR</td>
<td>• Policies in place for faculty education</td>
<td>• Faculty take ownership to report back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build administrational knowledge on what it takes to do CBPR</td>
<td>• Uncover existing examples</td>
<td>• Historic CBPR work is validated (baselines established)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance institutional infrastructure for faculty capacity to generate funding</td>
<td>• All in network know of JHEOE</td>
<td>• Co-generate pathways to CBPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and develop students as future researchers</td>
<td>• Understand CBPR model</td>
<td>• Develop incentives to turn outreach into products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance faculty capacity to do CBPR</td>
<td>• (Mutual) understanding that pathways are important levers</td>
<td>• Resources committed to this effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legitimize the process with leadership and governance</td>
<td>• Mutual leadership understands what capacity-building looks like</td>
<td>• Conference/network support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uncover existing examples</td>
<td>• Leadership has mutual understanding of resources for faculty development</td>
<td>• Match $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document recommendations from HBCU partner groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty development is active and supports movement towards CBPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disseminate information (Internal process, external results)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote the JHEOE and MJCSL: advocate with journals to be HBCU advocates (expand variety of journals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HBCUs who have the capacity to enact CBPR**

- Assess faculty performance criteria (does it include research)
- Assess faculty interest
- Convene stakeholders (internal/external/alums) for achieving CBPR (selling, defining, aligning)
- Assess institutional resources relevant to CBPR
- Create conscious-raising materials and circulate
- Bring in speakers/workshops on CBPR
- Build administrational knowledge on what it takes to do CBPR
- Enhance institutional infrastructure for faculty capacity to generate funding
- Identify and develop students as future researchers
- Enhance faculty capacity to do CBPR
- Legitimize the process with leadership and governance
- Uncover existing examples
- Document recommendations from HBCU partner groups
- Disseminate information (Internal process, external results)
• NOW: Our Task
• Develop logic model for Communities
15 Minute BREAK!!!
SOME TIME TO RECHARGE
Part II

- CBPR Research Methods
- Standards of Practice for Campus-Community Partnerships
- Faculty Reward Systems
- Next Steps
Embedding Community-Based Participatory Research in Service-Learning

Laurie Van Egeren, PhD
Director, Community Evaluation and Research Center
University Outreach and Engagement

Campus to Campus Partnerships Training Week
May 15, 2007
How is CBPR different from …

“The three CBPR approaches available to academics—as initiator, consultant, and collaborator—seem unsatisfactory and fraught with tensions. The problem, however, is not with the approaches but with a conception that CBPR is a research project. It’s not. It’s a social change project of which the research is only one piece.”

Stoecker, 2003
To embed CBPR within service-learning…

• Link to academic content and standards
• Involve young people in helping to determine and meet real, defined community needs
• Is reciprocal in nature, benefiting both the community and the service providers by combining a service experience with a learning experience
• Can be used in any subject area so long as it is appropriate to the learning goal
  – National Commission on Service Learning
CBPR-based service-learning experiences need to be…

- Positive, meaningful, and real to participants
- Involve cooperative, not competitive experiences and thus promote skills associated with teamwork and community involvement and citizenship
- Offer opportunities to engage in problem-solving by requiring participants to gain knowledge of the specific context of their service-learning activity and community challenges (vs textbook-limited learning)
- Promote deeper learning because the results are immediate and uncontrived—no “right answers”
- Because of this immediacy of experience, service-learning is more likely to be personally meaningful and to generate emotional consequences, to challenge values and ideas, and hence to support social, emotional, and cognitive learning and development
Faculty researcher

- Learning
- Presentations
- Publications
- Funding
- Resources
- Methodological Capacity

Service-learning students

- Understanding
- Research experience
- Content knowledge
- Personal growth

Community

- Resources
- Power
- Knowledge
- Visibility
- Capacity
CBPR methods will need to:

- Have the potential to answer the research/community questions
- Be acceptable and engaging to the community
- Be practicable by students and/or community members
- Build the research and collaboration capacity of both community members and students
- “11 CBR projects receive innovation grants” handout
From the perspective of *productivity*, how can CBPR be embedded in HBCU faculty service-learning activities?

- An approach to answering research questions in the faculty’s area of interest
- Scholarly work on the service-learning process and outcomes
- Scholarly work on CBPR
As we move through the methods, consider…

• How can service-learning opportunities be built into the following processes?
  – Activities
  – Learning goals
  – Research products
One example

- Photovoice (Pennie)
Photovoice: A Powerful Tool for Research and Evaluation

Pennie Foster-Fishman, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
May 15, 2007
What is Photovoice

• Photovoice (Wang & Burris, 1994) is an innovative participatory research method that incorporates the process of documentary photography with the practice of empowerment education (Freire, 1970).

• Puts cameras in the hands of individuals often excluded from decision-making processes in order to capture their voices and visions about their lives, their community, and their concerns (Wang, Burris, & Xiang, 1996).
Level 1 Questions: Framing Questions

• Purpose of Photovoice is to tell stories through photos and words.
  – What should the stories focus on?
  – How do we get participants to have enough in common in their photos so we can foster generative thinking and critical reflection?

• Framing questions provide the context for the exploration
  – Should be linked to project purpose.
  – Provide participants with a lens through which to examine their lived experiences.
Framing Questions

Project 1
- Understand neighborhood conditions and the impacts they have on residents.
- Understand hopes and dreams of residents and what needs to be done to make them a reality.

Framing questions
- What is your life like?
- What is good about your life?
- What needs to change?

Project 2
- Understand the dreams of youth in Battle Creek and what needs to be done to make those dreams a reality.
- Understand how youth are engaged in their communities and what factors facilitate and impede this engagement.

Framing Questions
- What are your dreams for your future?
- What are your educational and career goals?
- How are you and your friends involved in your schools, your neighborhoods, and in Battle Creek?
Identifying the Story Tellers

• Identify who needs to be included and in what combinations

• Considerations:
  – Number of reflection groups you can support and size of each group
  – Budget to support cameras and photo development
  – Sensitivity of the area of inquiry
  – Homogeneity vs. heterogeneity
Identifying the Story Tellers

YWC! Example

- Between group diversity:
  - Neighborhoods

- Within group diversity:
  - Gender
  - Age
  - Race/ethnicity

Playing the tension between difference and similarity

“Because a lot of times you hear ‘teenagers, you know, blah!’ You know? But…they showed me a different side [of themselves]. They’re intelligent kids…”

“We got to know everybody and I know how other people’s neighborhoods and everything was. [That] was cool because they was basically going through the same thing you going through.”
Data Management

• Potential data sources for any one photo
  – Photograph
  – Written reflection
  – Transcript of personal reflections
  – Transcript of group reflection

• Developing case summaries
  – Linking photos to individual and group reflections
Data Analysis Step 2

• Thematic Content analysis within and across bins (or a selection of cases).
• Analysis guided by the primary research questions or project goals.
• In 2002 project, this included:
  – What do participants’ stories tell us about the impact of community conditions?
  – What are the operating theories of change?
• Process
  – Two raters independently coded.
  – Committee of residents verified second-order themes.
  – We analyzed only those cases that participants voted on for group discussion. (N=140)
When should I use Photovoice

- When participants are an important beneficiary of the knowledge generated
- When issues of empowerment and participatory competence are particularly important to the evaluation context
- When what you want to know requires opportunity for exploration, thought and reflection
- When dissemination of findings to a broad audience is important
- When the assumptions embedded within traditional forms of data collection are inappropriate
For the rest of the story, contact

Pennie Foster-Fishman, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI  48824
Conversations

• Interviews with formal and informal leaders and residents
• Community dialogues or guided discussions, including focus groups
Walking and Windshield Tours

- Go through community at different times (weekends, weekdays, daytime, evening)
- Resident-researcher (student) teams
- Handwritten notes or maps
- Condition/types of housing, social interactions, vacant lots, maintenance of buildings; “hot” issues detailed on community bulletin boards in community centers, libraries, churches, stores
Delphi Process

- Get opinion from large group and allow for feedback and interaction (in person or via mail/email/web)
  - Round 1:
    - Participants identify 3-5 most important issues around area of focus
    - Answers are collated, resulting in long list
  - Round 2:
    - Participants receive this list in alphabetical order
    - Rate each item of a scale of 1-10 on importance of the item as a determinant of the area of focus
    - List is compiled to generate a list ranked in order of priority
  - Round 3:
    - List is sent to participants, who can reconsider their previous scoring on the basis of the collective opinion.
Community Asset and Outcomes Identification Processes

• Community Capacity Inventory
  – Develop a written list of the skills and talents of the individual community members, associations, other resources of the neighborhood
  – Data source can come from multiple methods
  – *Building Communities from the Inside Out* (Kretzman & McKnight, 1993)

• Community Asset Maps
  – Community members lay out in visual form the physical assets of the community—library, churches, schools, parks, community centers, playgrounds
  – Push pins in a large map
  – Do residents see these things as resources?

• Develop Community Indicators (e.g., # no smoking signs)
Risk Mapping

• Focuses on shared spaces: hallways in schools, playgrounds, apartment building lobbies
• Community members who share the space are given a large piece of paper and asked to draw the floor plan of the site, including boundaries, doorways, windows…key features
• Colored markers are used to identify different types of hazards (physical, chemical, etc)
• Participants discuss the risks on their map, which they want to target, and develop plans for further study and action
Vote with Your Feet

• Have members list their priorities
• Ask people to move into groups for the priorities that have been identified
• Where people move may depend on perceptions of feasibility, group composition
Innovative Methods
Videotelling

- Like photovoice, but with video
- Particularly engaging to students in YouTube generation
- Editing, video skills
- United Nations: Youth voices contest
- In readings: *A bridge between communities: Video-making using principles of community-based participatory research* (Chavez et al., 2004)
### Observation of Neighborhood Disorder

**What is it?** Observers walk the streets and rate the signs of physical/social disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical disorder</th>
<th>Social disorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes, cigars</td>
<td>Adults loitering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage, litter</td>
<td>People drinking alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty beer bottles</td>
<td>Peer group, gang indicators present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti, graffiti painted over</td>
<td>People intoxicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned cars</td>
<td>Adults fighting, arguing in hostile way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoms on sidewalk</td>
<td>Prostitutes on street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needles and syringes</td>
<td>People selling drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation of Neighborhood Disorder

• How could it be used?
  – Community is concerned about community conditions
  – Can use existing measure or have community come up with their own indicators of poor community conditions
  – Community identifies areas of interest
  – Observe all or a sample of the blocks

• In readings: Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999).
Assessing Cultural and Linguistic Competence


- What is it?
  - Organizational self-assessment, geared toward health organizations but could also be tailored for social service organizations, etc.
  - Uses partnerships with community stakeholders to assess the degree to which the organization addresses the preferences and needs of diverse groups
Standards of Practice for University-Community Partnerships

Hiram E. Fitzgerald, PhD
Associate Provost
University Outreach and Engagement

Date   Dec. 1, 2004; revised Nov. 30, 2006
"… a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions."

*Provost’s Committee on University Outreach*

*1993*
The Engaged University

Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship and research, enhance curricular content and process, prepare citizen scholars, endorse democratic values and civic responsibility, address critical societal issues, and in general contribute to the public good.

Adapted from the CIC Committee on Engagement
A Conceptual Framework

- To facilitate and guide partnerships between the university and the community
- To address community-defined concerns
- To generate new knowledge through research, evaluation, and instructional programs
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships

• Developmental in orientation
  – Learning by doing
  – Growing with experience
  – Improving with practice

• O & E is grounded in developmental systems theory which emphasizes the interconnectedness of people and environments and their mutual interdependence.
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

• Capitalizes on the strengths of diversity

• O & E focuses on the conscious development of competencies in recognizing diversity across people, places, socioeconomic status, and settings
Fundamental to O & E is its contextual base

- Recognizing the unique contextual features of the setting as important in shaping evaluation plans and strategies, and as fundamental to applying the results for improved performance.

- Need to be in touch with the community and responsive to the changing nature of issues and responses.
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Stresses the importance of shared
• Mission statements
• Outcome-oriented work plans
• Resource development
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

*Fosters participation*

- Focuses on participation as a way to maintain open communications and responsive operations
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Knowledge-based

- Grounded in diverse research and evidence-based qualitative and quantitative methodologies
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Orientation

• Shared mission statement
  – Commitment to program development
  – Development to plan for sustainability

• Build trust
  – Candor and confidentiality
  – University: scholarship based
  – Community: needs focused

• Form the partnership team
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Team Building and Work Plan

Phase 1
Team members initiate a small, management task to learn to work together and to trust one another. Put work plan into written document.

• Focus groups
• Literature reviews
• Baseline studies
• Pilot studies
• Screening case records
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Team Building and Work Plan

Phase 2
Team members develop methodology to investigate the central issue of concern.

• Select methodology
  – Develop logic model
  – Qualitative/quantitative data
  – Longitudinal/cross sectional design

• Identify products to emerge from this process
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Team Building and Work Plan

Phase 3
Capacity building
• To develop program sustainability
• To incorporate developmental evaluation strategies

Products
• Research/evaluation reports
• Training manuals
• General audience reports
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

**Products**

- **Stakeholder needs**
  - Research applicable to community settings
  - Policies and funds focused on community needs
  - Evaluation research
- **Capacity building**
  - Teaching curricula
  - Training manuals
  - Evaluation reports
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

**Products**

- Knowledge generation
  - Literature reviews and best practices
  - Research instruments
  - Scholarly publications
- Information dissemination
  - Policy briefs and reports
  - Conference presentations
  - Publications
- Resource generation
  - Concept papers
  - Presentations to potential funders
  - Grant proposals
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Ingredients for Success

• An early success
• Reconciliation of differences in community and university cultures
• Co-creation as a foundational principle
• Reciprocal, long term commitment
• Coherent, common community-building agenda
• Candor and confidentiality
• Effective co-management and coordination
• Patient clarification and re-clarification of mutual expectations and benefits
• Creative solutions to other challenges
• Rewards, incentives, and support for both staff and faculty
• Shared responsibility for long-term funding
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

Maintaining a Partnership

- Shared program policy rounds
- Shared resource development
- Shared scholarship
- Shared commitment to cross-site linkages
- Importance of communication
- Administrative management team
Standards of Practice in University-Community Partnerships (cont.)

*Ending a Partnership*

- Ending of work plan
- Ending of “partnership”
- Knowing when to “get out”
- Knowing when to stick it out
Contact Information

University Outreach and Engagement
Michigan State University
Kellogg Center, Garden Level
East Lansing, MI 48824-1022
Phone: (517) 353-8977
Fax: (517) 432-9541
E-mail: outreach@msu.edu
Web site: outreach.msu.edu
Rewards, Promotion and Tenure

Henry J. Findlay
Professor and Director of Program Development
Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL 36088
Email: findlay@tuskegee.edu
Phone: (334) 724-4316
Rewards

1. Research awards
2. Teaching effectiveness awards
3. Service awards
4. Faculty achievement awards
Achieving Tenure and Promotion

• Based on productivity (guidelines)
• 60/40 formula
• Disposition (unwritten rules)
• Organizational politics (unwritten rules)
• Grapevine??
Committees

• Department
• College
• University-wide
  – Faculty senate sub-committee
  – Provost/president
• Research
• Teaching effectiveness
• Service
Research

- Review journal submission guidelines
- Qualitative vs. quantitative
- Peer-reviewed articles
- Paid publications
Research (cont.)

- On-line publications
- Published abstracts
- Other publications
- Books/chapters in book
Teaching Effectiveness

- Rating of 3.5 on 5.0 scale (students)
- Department’s evaluation
- Student’s productivity (theses and dissertations)
- Teaching tools (computer software)
Service to the University

- Committee assignments
- Community projects
- Grantsmanship
Service to the University (cont.)

- Local
- State
- International
  - Leadership
Implications of CBPR and HBCU Faculty Reward Systems

Gwenda Greene, Benedict College
“Campus to Campus” Training Session
Friday, May 17, 2007
Determining the Overall Evaluation of Faculty

• The Evaluator will determine the overall evaluation of the faculty member by applying the following weights to each standard, assuming the candidate meets the eligibility threshold.
## Determining the Overall Evaluation of Faculty (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Quality and Experience</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing and Instructing</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Management</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Relate to all Students</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Service</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Quality and Experience
Instructing, Advising and Counseling, and Providing Academic Service

**Criteria**

- Student evaluation of teaching and advising
- Department head and peer evaluations of teaching, advising/counseling and academic service
- Letters from former students, employers of former students, and graduate faculty of former students
- Grade distributions in courses taught
- Attendance records in courses taught
- Success at pre-registering advisees
- Teaching and advising portfolio
  - E.G., Syllabi, exams, project assignments, quizzes, student reports, new course proposals, testimonial letters, advising and counseling records, etc.
- Academic service portfolios
  - Records of committee assignments and contributions, special assignment reports, student organization or club sponsorship, etc.
Evidence of an Ability to Effectively Relate to the Entire Student Body of Benedict College

• The evaluator will assess this factor with the following evidence whenever available:
  – Testimonial letters from alumni, students, counselors, parents, and others who have direct knowledge
  – Reports from deans, chairs, and peers if fully documented
  – Evidence from existing evaluations of instruction and advising
  – Pre-registration results
  – Attendance results
  – Recommendations of candidate’s ability to relate to an African-American student body
Determining the Overall Evaluation of Faculty (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Experience of Scholarship</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Dissemination</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To government or community</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To government or community</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality and Experience of Scholarship:
Evidence of Scholarship
(Research and Professional Service)

CRITERIA

• Published papers
  – Peer-reviewed journals, non-peer reviewed publicly available publications, books (including illustrations), book chapters, monographs, book reviews

• Internally published working papers and reports

• Artistic commissions, performances and/or recitals in peer-reviewed venues or non-peer reviewed publicly available venues for faculty holding rank in the Fine Arts
  – Similar for Visual Arts

• Works in progress if of substantial merit and if available in written draft form

• Presentations at national, regional or local professional meetings (when available in written form only)

• Funded projects on which the candidate has a documented major role
Quality and Experience of Scholarship: 

Evidence of Scholarship 
(Research and Professional Service, Cont.)

**CRITERIA**

- Evidence of involvement in continuing professional development efforts to improve scholarship
- Volunteer or paid services as an expert consultant, advisor, or witness
  - Provided it is supported by documentation from the recipient of the expert services
- Service on state, regional, or national boards of professional organizations
- Writing or participating in a major way in the development of a significant proposal for funding which required the candidate’s professional expertise
- The written opinion of peers, deans, supervisors, dissertation committee members, and other professionals who had the opportunity to interact and work with the applicant
- Service as a reviewer, editor, or evaluator for journals, publishing houses, government agencies, accrediting agencies, or juror for artistic exhibitions or performances
### Determining the Overall Evaluation of Faculty (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to College’s Vision and Mission</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interaction with Supervisors and Officials</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interactions with Peers</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commitment to College’s Vision and Mission

CRITERIA

• Reports of dean, department chairs, graduate school faculty and other persons with direct knowledge
• Applicants’ personal philosophy statement
• Written recommendations from alumni, community partners, and others with direct knowledge
Collegiality

**CRITERIA**

- Supervisor, dean and peer written assessments
- Contributions to college annual and capital fund drives
- Participation at college-wide events
- Participation and contributions on college wide committees
• Revisiting institutional identity and institutional commitment from the perspective of faculty reward systems

• Dialogue
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

Next Steps:
Gwenda Greene, Benedict College
Amelia Ross-Hammond, Norfolk State University
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

HBCU’s Next Steps

• Present an executive summary of this pilot session for co-creating a potential HBCU Faculty Development Partnership that must include the following: aim/vision, working definition of CBPR, benefits, potential for resources
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

Plan of Action

• Convene meetings with university stakeholders for buy-in: President, Vice Presidents, Provosts, Deans, and/or Departmental Chairs
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

Plan of Action (Contd.)
If legitimatized,

• Develop a faculty interest survey
• Identify a pilot faculty team (up to 10)
• Build a team by identifying and convening other university stakeholders {i.e. staff, administrators, and students} and community partners
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

Plan of Action (Contd.)

• Develop plans for MSU fall 3-day visit (date, agenda, research needs)
• Determine any preliminary actions, such as proposed long-term products and the role of the graduate assistants
• Note: This should be a mutual learning experience that should also include building models from actual faculty ideas.
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

Questions/Concerns to MSU
1. What is the proposed range of time for visits?
2. What financial obligations are expected from the host institutions?
3. Will you work on a particular venue for publication (to be able to articulate – Special Edition)?
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

Questions/Concerns to MSU (Contd.)

4. Will you consider (based on need) doing an extra training session(s) with HBCU participants/teams on the following: logic modeling, CBPR, critical engagement?

5. Would like to use Pennie’s engagement model. How could this work collaboratively, who can fund the meetings, are the meetings really collaborative or is this something that can be done collaboratively during twice per year and on campuses thereafter?
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

• Next Steps
  – June 2007
    • Executive Summary, checklist of activities with a timeline
    • May dialogue information mailed/distributed (readers, etc.).
    • Mid-June: set up a conference call/teleconference schedule
    • HBCU FDN Summer Institute (June 26-29)
  – July 2007
  – August 2007
  – September 2007
  – October 2007
    • HBCU FDN Symposium (October 18 – 20)
      – Presentation of Partnership Program
  – After October 2007
Building a Campus to Campus Partnership Team

**EVALUATION**

- On a piece of paper, please reflect on the following questions:
  - What are 3 things you found most useful in the week?
  - What are 3 things you feel can be improved?
  - What was the most significant learning transformation/experience for you from this week?