

Michigan State University
Graduate Certification in Community Engagement
2010-2011 GUIDEBOOK

Office of the Dean, Graduate School

110 Linton Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
Phone: (517) 353-3220
Fax: (517) 353-3355
E-mail: gradschool@grd.msu.edu
Web: grad.msu.edu/

Office of the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement

Kellogg Center, Garden Level
East Lansing, MI 48824
Phone: (517) 353-8977
Fax: (517) 432-9541
E-mail: outreach@msu.edu
Web: outreach.msu.edu

Contact:

Robert Brown, E-mail: brownr23@msu.edu
Diane Doberneck, E-mail: connordm@msu.edu

The Graduate Certification in Community Engagement is an initiative of Michigan State University's Office of University Outreach and Engagement (UOE) and The Graduate School. This handbook was compiled and written by Robert Brown and Diane Doberneck with significant input from other faculty and staff members of UOE. We would like to acknowledge the contributions of Burton Bargerstock, Jessica Barnes, Karen McKnight Casey, Patricia Farrell, Hiram Fitzgerald, Dozier Thornton, Rex LaMore, Miles McNall, John Melcher, Celeste Sturdevant-Reed, and Laurie VanEgeren.

© 2010 Michigan State University Board of Trustees. All rights reserved.

Michigan State University is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity employer.

Contents

INTRODUCTION: THE GRADUATE CERTIFICATION IN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	1
Purpose of the Program.....	1
Why MSU? – Historical Perspective	2
About this Guidebook.....	3
OVERVIEW OF THE GRADUATE CERTIFICATION IN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ..	4
General Guidelines	4
Certification Requirements	4
REQUIREMENT 1. APPLICATION AND ACCEPTANCE INTO THE PROGRAM.....	7
Who Should Apply?.....	7
Learning More About the Program.....	7
Discussing your Application with your Guidance Committee Chairperson.....	7
Making Your Application.....	8
Review Process	8
Changes to Approved Plans	8
Preparing to Complete the Certification	9
Final Review	9
REQUIREMENT 2. CORE COMPETENCIES	10
Coursework	10
Learning Objectives	10
Seminar 1. Engaged Scholarship and the Scholarship of Engagement	12
Seminar 2. Co-Building Effective Partnerships.....	16
Seminars 3 and 4. Capacity Building for Mutual Benefit.....	21
Seminars 5 & 6. Community-Based Participatory Evaluation and Research.....	29
Seminars 7 & 8. Confirming Agreement among Community and University Partners: One Useful Technique.....	36
Seminars 9 & 10. Evaluating Engaged Partnerships	40
Seminar 11. The Ethics of Engaged Scholarship.....	42
REQUIREMENT 3. MENTORED COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCE	45
Helpful Suggestions for Mentors and Mentees	49
Principles of Engagement	50
REQUIREMENT 4. REFLECTION AND ENGAGEMENT PORTFOLIO.....	54
Your Engagement Portfolio	54

Potential Supporting Materials to Include in Engagement Portfolio.....	56
APPENDIX A. RESOURCES FOR COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARS	58
MSU Campus Resources	58
National Resources	61
APPENDIX B. BIBLIOGRAPHY	66
APPENDIX C. GLOSSARY OF COMMON ENGAGEMENT TERMS	74
APPENDIX D. LIST OF JOURNALS THAT PUBLISH SCHOLARLY OUTREACH AND ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP	80
Community Engaged Scholarship and the Scholarship of Engagement.....	80
Other Journals that Publish Community Engaged Scholarship.....	81
APPENDIX E. FORMS AND CHECKLISTS	84

INTRODUCTION: THE GRADUATE CERTIFICATION IN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Who would have imagined 150 years ago...that we would become the global prototype of a genuinely American brand of higher education—one that is an engine of the economy, a force for democratization of public learning, the model for engagement with the world beyond the campus, and a catalyst for improving the quality of life in Michigan and around the world.

Lou Anna Kimsey Simon, Ph.D.
President, Michigan State University
Founders' Day Address, February 11, 2005

Purpose of the Program

Michigan State University's *Graduate Certification in Community Engagement* is an initiative of University Outreach and Engagement and The Graduate School. The Certification is designed to help graduate and professional students develop systemic, thoughtful, and scholarship approaches to community engagement. With approval from the student's Graduate Committee chairperson and University Outreach and Engagement, students tailor their program of study to strengthen their scholarly and practical skills in engaged research, engaged teaching, or engaged service.

Modeled after MSU's Certification in College Teaching, and in partnership with various University departments and colleges, the Certification assists graduate students to:

Modelled after MSU's Certification in College Teaching, this Certification is designed to help graduate and professional students:

- Reflect on community-based research and community engagement experiences
- Improve their community-based research skills, community-engaged teaching skills, and ability to participate in community engaged experiences
- Enhance their professional development and socialization within the culture of university-community partnerships
- Participate in an atmosphere that supports critical discussions about scholarly engagement at Michigan State University
- Cultivate relationships with other faculty, graduate students, outreach specialists, and community partners who share similar disciplinary and engagement interests
- Understand ethical issues related to scholarly community engagement
- Familiarize themselves with MSU's land-grant tradition of engagement and the resources that support that tradition.

- Be better prepared for a career as an engaged scholar.

For graduate and professional students, the Certification and the official notation on their academic transcript signify that:

- They have gained a definable set of scholarly and practical skills and have mastered a set of competencies related to community engagement
- They value community outreach and engagement as a scholarly activity

Why MSU? – Historical Perspective

MSU, a nationally recognized leader of engaged scholarship, defines engagement as “...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, p. 1).

The MSU model of engagement involves the co-creation and application of knowledge, advocating scholarly engagement that fosters a reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship between the University and the public. As we at the Office of University Outreach and Engagement work to diffuse this model across the university and in communities, we have become aware of the multidisciplinary skills and competencies needed for exemplary community engagement. We perceive a need to make the understanding of these skills and competencies more broadly available to the university community, including graduate students interested in community engagement.

Highlights of MSU’s National Leadership In Scholarly Engagement

- Early in this decade, MSU led the way for the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (a consortium of the Big Ten universities and the University of Chicago) to develop a definition of engagement for the CIC. The CIC’s Committee on Engagement is chaired by MSU’s Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement, Hiram E. Fitzgerald.
- In 2005, MSU was invited by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to serve on a National Advisory Taskforce of 14 institutions to develop standards for a new Carnegie classification system for engaged institutions. In 2006, MSU was one of nine very intensive research institutions to be recognized by Carnegie as a fully engaged university (both in curriculum engagement and in outreach and partnerships).
- MSU’s Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument has been adopted by the Universities of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Kansas State, with several other institutions negotiating contractual relationships for its use.
- In 2007, MSU hosted the first annual Outreach Scholarship Conference Graduate Student Training Academy, involving 23 young investigators representing nine different disciplinary fields of study.

The Graduate Certification in Community Engagement is an appropriate vehicle for such dissemination. As a national leader in engagement, MSU's Graduate Certification in Community Engagement serves as a model for how to support the development of future generations of engaged scholars across colleges and units in partnership with the preparatory work done within disciplines.

About this Guidebook

This *Guidebook* gives an overview of the program, outlines the procedures for application and acceptance, and summarizes the key requirements for certification—the core competencies the student will be expected to master, the mentored community engagement experience, and the preparation of a portfolio.

Seven chapters outline the topics, learning objectives, required and suggested readings, and other supporting materials for each seminar.

Appendix A lists MSU and national resources for community-engaged scholars; Appendix B is a bibliography; Appendix C offers a glossary of common engagement terms; and Appendix D lists journals that publish scholarly engagement work. Finally, Appendix E contains program forms and checklists.

OVERVIEW OF THE GRADUATE CERTIFICATION IN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

General Guidelines

To create an integrated, coherent, and effective professional development program for graduate and professional students across participating colleges and departments, the Certification organized to maximize flexibility in the following ways:

- The methods for fulfilling the requirements are flexible. Specific requirements and program options may vary by college or department, student, or community partner.
- Representatives from UOE are available to consult with colleges, departments, guidance committees, and graduate and professional students, as needed, in the formation of their plans to complete the Graduate Certification.
- Students considering the Graduate Certification are asked to provide documentation that they have approval from their respective Guidance Committee chairs for participation.
- Graduate students may complete the Graduate Certification in one year or over multiple years, depending on how the Certification requirements can be best coordinated with their degree program plans.
- Changes to the student's plan for earning the Graduate Certification must be documented and approved in advance by Guidance Committee chairs and University Outreach and Engagement.
- University Outreach and Engagement reviews final portfolios, listens to portfolio presentations, and determines whether all requirements have been fulfilled.

Certification Requirements

Requirements for completion of the certification include:

1. Submission of complete application and acceptance into the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement.
2. Mastery of seven (7) core competencies through seminars offered by University Outreach and Engagement, approved alternatives offered by colleges or departments, and/or a combination of these.
3. Participation in a 60-hour mentored community engagement experience organized by your Guidance Committee chairperson, department, college, or University Outreach and Engagement.
4. Completion of a reflective engagement portfolio and presentation summarizing learning experiences and perspectives on scholarly community engagement.

1. Application and Acceptance into the Program

Your first step is to discuss your interest with UOE staff and your Guidance Committee chairperson to make sure the Certification is an appropriate learning option for you given your personal and professional interests. To apply, visit the Web site for either Graduate School (grad.msu.edu) or UOE (<http://outreach.msu.edu/gradcert/>) for additional information and application materials.

Your application package consists of:

- A completed application form
- Your statement of interest
- A letter of support from your Guidance Committee chairperson
- A copy of your graduate program plan
- An up-to-date resume or curriculum vitae

2. Core Competency Areas

To earn the Certification, you need to demonstrate knowledge and competency in the following seven core areas:

- The scholarship of engagement and engaged scholarship (Seminar 1)
- Co-building effective partnerships (Seminar 2)
- Capacity building for mutual benefit (Seminars 3 and 4)
- Community-based participatory research (Seminars 5 and 6)
- Confirming agreement among community and university partners (logic models; Seminars 7 and 8)
- Evaluating engaged partnerships (Seminars 9 and 10)
- Ethics of engaged scholarship (Seminar 11)

You may achieve these competencies by attending the seminars offered by UOE, completing alternatives approved in advance, and/or any combination of these. *The Scholarship of Engagement and Engaged Scholarship* (Seminar 1) and *Ethics of Engaged Scholarship* (Seminar 11) may not be substituted. Assignments from UOE seminars (or approved alternatives) are a required part of your final reflective portfolio on scholarly community engagement.

3. Mentored Community Engagement Experience

The Mentored Community Engagement Experience is an opportunity for you to broaden and refine your practical engagement skills. This 60-hour experience should be organized by you, a faculty mentor, and a community* partner. It should include:

* Community defined (Fraser, 2005):

- A group of people living in a particular local area (geographic community).

- An agreement between you, your faculty mentor, and the community partner about expectations and outcomes associated with your experience
- Your collaborative work with your community partner
- Your reflection on your experience
- Written feedback by your faculty mentor and community partner—separately or together—about your capacity and improvement in community engagement skills
- Documentation of 60 hours of community engagement (e.g., engaged research, engaged teaching, or engaged service)

Evidence of your mentored community engagement experience is required to be part of your final reflective portfolio on scholarly community engagement.

4. Reflective Engagement Portfolio and Presentation

Your reflective engagement portfolio and presentation is your opportunity to reflect upon your community engagement experiences; synthesize your learning about engaged research, engaged teaching or engaged service; and share your perspective on scholarly community engagement.

Your final portfolio, which will be reviewed by UOE, should include:

- An abstract
- A narrative outlining your scholarly community engagement experiences
- A reflective statement describing what you have learned about scholarly community engagement from your experiences
- Assignments from the core competency seminars (or approved alternatives)
- Evidence of your mentored community engagement experience
- An updated resume or curriculum vitae

In addition to your preparing your portfolio for review, you will present it to your graduate student colleagues and UOE faculty and staff as the final step in the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement. A portfolio workshop is held every semester to provide guidance about successful portfolios and presentations.

-
- A group of people having shared gender, racial, or ethnic characteristics (community of identity).
 - A group of people having a cultural, religious, political, professional, or production modes in common (community of affiliation or interest).
 - A group of people who share a common experience (community of circumstance).

REQUIREMENT 1. APPLICATION AND ACCEPTANCE INTO THE PROGRAM

Who Should Apply?

Graduate and professional students from every college, department, school, and program are invited to consider earning the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement. Students with scholarly interests in community engaged research, community engaged teaching, or community engaged service are encouraged to complete this Certification as part of their graduate education at MSU. This Certification is especially designed for graduate students whose scholarly and career interests include any of the following types of activities:

- Employing community-based research methods and techniques for solving society's problems
- Involving undergraduates in community-based learning through service-learning or civic engagement
- Translating health and science research findings for general public audiences
- Collaborating with business or industry to develop new technology, licenses, or patents
- Creating learning experiences and continuing education programs for working professionals
- Using university knowledge to address community issues through technical assistance
- Involving members of the community in the creative arts, humanities, design, or performance

Learning More About the Program

To get started, you are encouraged to meet with UOE staff to discuss your scholarly and professional interests and to learn more about the details of the Graduate Certification. This initial meeting is the first step in developing your plan to earn the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement.

Discussing your Application with your Guidance Committee Chairperson

Next, you should meet with your Guidance Committee chairperson to talk about the Graduate Certification. Key questions to discuss include:

- How will you master the core competencies—UOE seminars, approved alternatives, or some combination?

- What might be a meaningful and significant mentored community engagement experience for you? What would its focus be—community engaged research, community engaged teaching, or community engaged service?
- Who might serve as your community partners and your faculty mentors (especially if the faculty mentor is not your Guidance Committee chairperson)?
- What is the best timing of this experience, given your other responsibilities towards degree completion?

Together, you should make decisions about the most appropriate way for you to complete the Certification. At any point, you should feel free to contact UOE staff to ask questions, discuss options, or identify community partners that match your scholarly and professional interests.

Making Your Application

Once you have sorted out the details, you should submit a complete application to UOE **by Friday, September 17 at 5:00 pm**. The complete application includes these elements:

- A completed and **signed application form** that specifies your plan for mastering the core competencies and completing the mentored community engagement experience
- A **statement of interest** that explains your interest in the Graduate Certification, your rationale for the mentored community engagement experience, and how/why you believe earning the Graduate Certification will fulfil your personal and professional goals
- A **letter of support** from your Guidance Committee chairperson
- A copy of your **Graduate Program Plan**
- An up-to-date **resume or curriculum vitae**

Review Process

Once UOE receives the application, we will review it in light of acceptance criteria. We will be in touch with you with any questions we have as we review your materials. For example, your application may be considered “pending” if your application is strong but missing materials; if approval of alternatives to the UOE seminars is not yet finalized; and/or if UOE needs to arrange for a mentored community engagement experience. We will let you know the specific reason for pending status and clarify what remaining requirements you need to meet.

UOE will notify you and your Guidance Committee chairperson of the status of the application. Once the application is approved, UOE will notify the Registrar’s Office to officially enroll you in the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement.

Changes to Approved Plans

If, for some reason, you need to make changes to the materials you originally submitted—for mastering core competencies, mentored community engagement experience, or other aspects of

the Graduate Certification—you will need to complete a Change to Approved Plan form. This form must be signed by you and your Graduate Committee chairperson before you submit it to UOE for approval. You should wait to have your proposed changes approved before moving forward with your new plans.

Preparing to Complete the Certification

As you near completion of the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement, you should review the requirements for the engagement portfolio and the Final Certification Checklist to ensure you are fulfilling all requirements. Once a semester, portfolio workshops will be held to provide guidance on the successful preparation of your portfolio and final presentation. In addition, you should feel free to contact UOE with your questions or clarifications at any point during your program and especially prior to graduation.

Final Review

After you complete the Graduate Certification Final Materials Checklist, submit your portfolio materials, and present your engagement portfolio, UOE staff will review your materials to make sure you have documented mastery of core competencies, completed the mentored community engagement experience, written reflections about mentored community engagement experience, and organized your engagement portfolio.

UOE may recommend final approval. If this is the case, you will receive a printed certificate of completion from Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement and the Graduate School and an official notation on your academic transcript from the Office of the Registrar.

If there are issues that require further documentation, UOE may return your materials for further revision or ask that additional materials be submitted. If this is the case, we will outline specific reasons and suggestions for revision in a letter to you and your Guidance Committee chairperson.

In very rare instances, UOE may ultimately decline to recommend final approval. If this is the case, you and your Guidance Committee chairperson will be notified in writing with a reason specified for the lack of approval.

**REQUIREMENT 2.
CORE COMPETENCIES**

Coursework

Coursework on the core competencies can be completed in three ways.

<i>Coursework</i>	<i>Required Approvals</i>
1. Attend and participate in the Core Competency Seminars offered by University Outreach and Engagement	Agreement of your Guidance Committee chairperson
2. Attend and participate in department courses that cover the UOE seminar material	Agreement of your Guidance Committee chairperson and the concurrence of the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement
3. Attend and participate in a combination of UOE Seminars and Department course work	Agreement of your Guidance Committee chairperson and the concurrence of the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement

Learning Objectives

NOTE: Departmental courses that substitute for UOE Seminars (numbers 2-6) must cover these learning objectives. No substitutions are allowed for Seminars 1 and 7.

Seminar 1. Engaged Scholarship and the Scholarship of Engagement

- Describe and define what it means to be an engaged scholar
- Describe what constitutes engaged scholarship—research, teaching, and service
- Indicate how engaged scholarship is embedded in systems
- Describe historical context for land grant institutions as background for the contemporary challenge for higher education to return to its roots and re-engage with society
- Describe how engaged teaching, engaged research, and engaged service differ from non-engaged teaching, research, and service
- Define similarities and differences among scholarship of engagement, civic engagement, community engagement, engaged scholarship, and public scholarship

Seminar 2. Co-Building Effective Partnerships

- Understand basic principles of building effective community partnerships
- Identify core practices and approaches used to implement these principles
- Connect principles, practice, and scholarship

Seminars 3 & 4. Capacity Building for Mutual Benefit

- Define a capacity-building approach to engaged scholarship
- Understand reasons to use a capacity-building approach
- Become familiar with levels and types of capacity building
- Recognize how culture and context affect capacity building
- Consider how your graduate research might include capacity-building approaches
- Understand ethical issues associated with capacity building and your engaged scholarship

Seminars 5 & 6. Community-Based Participatory Research and Evaluation (CBPRE)

- What is CBPRE? How is it different from other approaches to research?
- What are the historical and philosophical roots of CBPRE?
- What are the guiding principles of CBPRE?
- What are key issues in CBPRE?
- How are CBPRE projects developed and carried out?
- What are the outcomes of CBPRE projects?

Seminars 7 & 8. Confirming Agreement Among Partners

- Understand how logic models can be used to:
 - Provide a common understanding and vision for partners in the community
 - Report a performance story to key stakeholders and decision makers
 - Guide evaluation efforts
- Learn how to construct logic models

Seminars 9 & 10. Evaluating Engaged Partnerships

- A brief introduction to program evaluation
- Participatory evaluation approaches
- Using logic models to guide evaluation design
- Measuring key partnerships processes and outcomes
- Approaches to data collection and analysis
- Putting it all together: developing an evaluation plan

Seminar 11. Ethics of Engaged Scholarship

- Identify ethical issues that are unique to engaged scholarship
- Understand how ethical issues in engaged scholarship apply to your discipline
- Be able to do a risk-benefit analysis of conducting an engaged scholarship activity or project

Seminar 1.

Engaged Scholarship and the Scholarship of Engagement

Learning Objectives

- Describe what it means to be an engaged scholar
- Describe what constitutes engaged scholarship research, teaching, and service
- Indicate how engaged scholarship is embedded within systems
- Describe the historical context for land grant institutions as background for the contemporary challenge for higher education to return to its roots and re-engage with society
- Describe how engaged teaching, engaged research, and engaged service differ from non-engaged teaching, research, and service
- Define similarities and differences among scholarship of engagement, civic engagement, community engagement, engaged scholarship, and public scholarship.
- Define what it means to be an engaged scholar

Integration with Other Seminars

This seminar introduces engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement and places them within institutional and community contexts. These concepts provide the foundation for the remaining seminars. Assignments completed as part of Seminar 1 form the basis of the portfolio.

Pre-Seminar Readings

Readings will be made available at the time you register for the seminar.

Foundational thinking about engaged scholarship: Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Outreach, 1*, 11-20.

Engaged scholarship in historical context: Glass, C. R., & Fitzgerald, H. E. (2010). Engaged scholarship: Historical roots, contemporary challenges. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape. Vol. 1. Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Leadership for engaged scholarship in the land-grant university: Simon, L.A.K. (2010). Engaged scholarship in land-grant and research universities. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape. Vol. 1. Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Engaged research and systemic change: Foster-Fishman, P., & Watson, E. R. (2010). Action research as systems change. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of*

engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape. Vol. 2. Community-campus partnerships. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Perspectives on engaged scholarship for different groups and at multiple levels: Ward, K., & Moore, T. L. (2010). Engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement: Defining engagement. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape. Vol. 1. Institutional change.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Attending to your career as an engaged scholar: Sandmann, L. R., Foster-Fishman, P. G., Lloyd, J., Rauhe, W., & Rosaen, C. (2000). Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change*, 32, 44-52.

Suggested Additional Readings (Optional)

Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, rev. 2000). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning and evaluating quality outreach.* East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available in PDF format from: outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp

Fitzgerald, H. E., Allen, A., & Roberts, P. (2010). Campus-community partnerships: Perspectives on engaged research. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape. Vol. 2. Community-campus partnerships.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Zimmerman, D. L., et al. (2005, July). *Carnegie Reclassification Pilot Study: Michigan State University Response.* East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available in PDF format from: outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp

Maurrasse, D. J. (2010). Standards of practice in community engagement. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape. Vol. 2. Community-campus partnerships.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Michigan State University. (2006). *HLC/NCA Re-Accreditation Self Studies at MSU: Chapter 7. Criterion 5 – Engagement and service.* East Lansing: Author. Available in PDF format from: outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp

Provost's Committee on University Outreach. (1993). *University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society.* East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available in PDF format from: outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp.

Seminar Agenda

- I. What is engaged scholarship?
 - a. Definition and scope of engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement
 - i. Community engagement
 - ii. Civic engagement
 - iii. Public engagement
 - iv. Engaged scholarship
 - b. Forms of engaged scholarship
 - i. Engaged research/discovery/creative works
 - ii. Engaged teaching/learning
 - iii. Engaged service
 - c. Opportunities and challenges
 - d. Disciplinary perspectives on engagement
- II. Activity: Meeting your cohort
- III. Systems Theory, Systems Models and Engaged Scholarship
 - a. Within institutions of higher education: Supporting engaged scholarship
 - i. Leadership and administrative support
 - ii. Networks and connections
 - iii. Capacity (skills and abilities)
 - iv. Readiness (motivation)
 - b. Community systems and transformational change
 - i. Critical reflection
 - ii. Embeddedness
 - iii. Participatory engagement
- IV. Building a portfolio: Focusing on and framing your career

Pre-Seminar Assignment

Students should identify three things they hope to gain from the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement.

Note: This assignment will become part of your portfolio.

Post-Seminar Assignment

Within two weeks following the seminar, you must submit a statement about engaged research or a statement about engaged teaching/learning consistent with your individual career path.

However you plan to practice engagement in your careers—research, teaching, service, or some combination—this statement should discuss how you think about engagement in that context and anticipate putting engaged scholarship into practice. Consider the values, concepts and/or models you use to think about and enact engaged scholarship. Illustrate with examples if available. You should consider this to be a first draft—that is, a document that you can review as you proceed through this program and reflect on how your initial engaged research or teaching statement has changed or expanded as you absorb the concepts and content. The instructors will review and provide feedback on the engagement statements.

Note: This assignment will become part of your portfolio.

Seminar 2. Co-Building Effective Partnerships

MSU strives to construct community-based collaborations within the framework of its scholarship-based model of outreach and engagement. While every major academic unit articulates outreach and engagement within the perspective of its mission, there are three common foundational principles in the MSU model:

- 1. Outreach and engagement is reciprocal and mutually beneficial. There is mutual planning, implementation, and assessment among engagement partners.*
- 2. Outreach and engagement cuts across the mission of teaching, research and service. It is not a separate activity.*
- 3. Outreach is scholarly. The scholarship-based model of engagement involves both the act of engaging (bringing universities and communities together) and the product of engagement (the spread of discipline-generated, evidence-based practices in communities).*

Michigan State University. (2006). *HLC/NCA Re-Accreditation Self Studies at MSU: Chapter 7. Criterion 5 – Engagement and service*. East Lansing: Author. Available from: accreditation2006.msu.edu/report/index.html.

Learning Objectives

- Understand basic principles of building effective community partnerships
- Identify core practices and approaches to implement these principles
- Connect principles, practice and scholarship

Integration with Other Seminars

In combination with the other seminars, the session on Co-Building Effective Partnerships explores the basic principles and practices of engaged teaching, engaged research and engaged service in the contexts of collaborating and engaging with community constituencies, e.g. municipalities, schools, school districts, health care institutions, non-profit agencies, non-governmental organizations, etc., in ways that are reciprocal and mutually beneficial for the university scholar and the community-based partner. Co-Building Effective Partnerships will specifically examine the question, *how do I co-build and co-sustain an engaged partnership?*

Required Reading

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (2007). *Achieving the promise of authentic community-higher education partnerships: Community partners speak out!* [Proceedings of Community Partners Summit held April 24-26, 2006, Wingspread Conference Center, Racine, WI]. Seattle, WA: Author.

- Full report available from:
http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CPSReport_final1.15.08.pdf.
- Executive Summary available from:
http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/FINALCPS_Executive_Summary.pdf

Optional Readings

Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zaph, J., & Goss, M. (2002). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives*. Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges. Available from: http://www.cic.edu/caphe/grants/engaging_brochure.pdf

McNall, M., Reed, C. S., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2009). Brokering community-university engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33, 317-331. Available from Graduate Certification in Community Engagement ANGEL site, *Co-Building Effective Partnerships*, “Content.”

Simon, L.A.K. (2009). *Embracing the world grant ideal: Affirming the Morrill Act for a twenty-first-century global society*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from <http://www.worldgrantideal.msu.edu/page1.php>

Seminar Agenda

1. Principles of building effective community partnerships
 - The importance of strong relationships as a foundation for successful university-community engagement
 - Partnerships with culturally and economically diverse communities
 - Community views of university engagement
2. Core practices and approaches used to implement principles
 - MSU’s principles of outreach and engagement
 - Ways and methods in which these principles play out in engaged teaching, engaged research and engaged service
 - Creating systemic partnerships to support faculty/student engagement
 - Understanding the “Green” and “Red” lights in creating partnerships
3. Connecting principles, practices and scholarship

- Examples of best practices in
 - a. Academic service-learning and civic engagement
 - b. Faculty engaged work related to research/scholarship and application other than service-learning
- Tools for teaching others about partnership principles
- Methods and approaches of assessing partnership quality
- Issues in building your own partnership

Seminar Experiential Activities

- Question and Answer session following faculty-specialist, student and community partner panel discussion
- Group discussion regarding examining the partnership principles and practices in conjunction with the students' current and/or proposed engaged work.
- In follow-up to the seminar presentation, Q&A and discussion, students will be asked to compose a reflective piece designed to promote learning and to build their portfolios. Reflection is to be completed after the Partnerships seminar and submitted to the facilitators for review and critique

Discussion Group Assignment and Readings

Readings are the same as noted under "Required" and Optional." The session will include hand-outs.

Possible discussion group questions include:

1. What are the principles of engagement?
2. Why should we be concerned about building relationships to do community-based work?
3. Are any of the principles likely to be more difficult to apply than others?
4. Are these principles applied differently in engaged teaching, engaged research or engaged service?
5. Is community-based work different in diverse communities?
6. Are these relationship principles applicable to academic service-learning and student civic engagement?
7. What if I am involved in a partnership that is not using these principles?

Suggested Additional Readings

Barnes, J. V., Altimare, E. L., Farrell, P. A., Brown, R. E., Burnett III, C. R., Gamble, L., & Davis, J. (2009). Creating and sustaining authentic partnerships with community in a systemic model. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 13(4), 15-29.

Boyle, M., & Silver, I. (2005). Poverty, partnerships, and privilege: elite institutions and community empowerment. *City and Community*, 4, 233-253.

Bell-Elkins, J. (2002). Assessing the CCPH principles of partnership in community campus partnerships [originally published as part of doctoral dissertation, *Case study of a successful community-campus partnership: Changing the environment through collaboration*]. Framingham, MA: Framingham State University. Available from: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/friendly%20principles2.pdf

Brown, R. E., Casey, K. M., Springer, N. C., Doberneck, D. M., Thornton, D. W., & Georgis, G. (2008). *Tools of engagement* [web-based curriculum modules]. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://outreach.msu.edu/tools/>

Burhansstipanov, L., Christopher, S., & Schimacher, A. (2005, November). Lessons learned from community-based participatory research in Indian country. *Cancer Control*, 12, 70-76. Available from: <http://www.moffitt.org/CCJRoot/v12s5/pdf/70.pdf>

Campus to Campus Partnership Team. (2007, June). *Community-based participatory research and service-learning* [PowerPoint]. Presentation to 2007 Summer Institute on Community Based Participatory Research: A Pathway to Sustainable Partnerships, Jackson, MS. Available from: http://outreach.msu.edu/documents/JACKSON_HBCU_PRESENTATION_i.pdf

Center for Community and Economic Development. (2005). *Problem solving model: Principles of community development*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://www.ced.msu.edu/probsolvingmodel2.html>

Clinical and Translational Science Award Consortium (n.d.). *Researchers and their communities: The challenge of meaningful community engagement*. Bethesda, MD: National Center for Research Resources. Available from: http://www.ctsaweb.org/uploadedfiles/Best%20Practices%20in%20Community%20Engagement_Summary_2007-08.pdf

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (2007). *About us: Principles of good community-campus partnerships adopted by the CCPH Board of Directors, October 2006*. Seattle, WA: Author. Available from: <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/principles.html#principles>

Fitzgerald, H. E., Zimmerman, D. L., et al. (2005, July). *Carnegie reclassification pilot study: Michigan State University response*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents/carnegiereport.pdf>

Israel, B. A., Eng, E., Schultz, A., & Parker, E. (2005). *Methods in community-based participatory research for health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Israel, B. A., Parker, E. A., & Rowe, Z. (2005, October). Community-based participatory research: Lessons learned from the Centers for Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention research. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 113, 1463-71.

Kimmel, M., & Ferber, A. (2003). *Privilege: A reader*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lerner, R. M., & Chibucos, T.R. (1999). *Serving children and families through community-university partnerships*. Boston: Kluwer.

Lerner, R. M., & Simon, L.A.K. (1998). *University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century*. New York: Garland.

McNall, M., Reed, C. S., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2009). Brokering community-university engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33, 317-331.

Tableman, B. (Ed.). (2005, April). Universities working with communities: An evolving partnership. *Best Practice Briefs* No. 32. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://outreach.msu.edu/bpbriefs/issues/brief32.pdf>

Walsh, D. (2006). Best practices in university-community partnerships: Lessons learned from a physical-activity-based program. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 77, 45-56.

Seminars 3 and 4. Capacity Building for Mutual Benefit

Capacity building activities are designed to improve the ability of citizens and their organizations to solve immediate, specific problems and improve their ability to anticipate and solve future community problems. The expertise needed to conduct capacity building activities may reside with local citizens or in outside consultants/experts or both. However, successful capacity building always results in improved skills of local individuals and organizations, sustained over an extended period of time. When one is engaged in capacity building, one is not only getting fish but is also “learning how to fish.”

Capacity building is process-oriented as well as product-oriented. This is in contrast to technical assistance activities, which are only product oriented. The outcomes of capacity building often include improved organizational structures, increased and improved citizen participation, greater community/organizational self-reliance, improved leadership abilities, and, in general, stronger local community-based organizations which are more successful in addressing local concerns. The aim of capacity building is to enable individuals and organizations to continue to learn and grow. When capacity building is effective, the power of active and engaged citizens to bring about positive social transformation is improved.

Community and Economic Development Program,
Urban and Regional Planning Program, and School of
Planning, Design, and Construction. (2006, April).
*Community and Economic Development Program
self-study report*. East Lansing: Michigan State
University. Available from:
<http://www.ced.msu.edu/techresearchreportspg1.html>

Learning Objectives

- Define a capacity-building approach to engaged scholarship
- Understand the reasons to use a capacity-building approach
- Become familiar with levels and types of capacity building
- Recognize how culture and context affect capacity building
- Consider how your graduate scholarship might include capacity-building approaches
- Understand ethical issues associated with capacity building and your engaged scholarship

Integration with Other Seminars

In prior seminars, you will have learned how to build and sustain partnerships. In this seminar, you will learn about capacity building approaches to community engagement—key concepts

which will be incorporated into seminars 7 & 8 about logic modeling and seminars 9 & 10 about evaluating engaged partnerships.

Pre-Seminar Readings

Participants should complete the following readings prior to the first capacity building seminar:

1. James, R., & Wrigley, R. (2007, March). *Investigating the mystery of capacity building: Learning from the Praxis programme* (Praxis Paper No. 18). Oxford, UK: INTRAC. Available from: www.intrac.org/pages/PraxisPaper18.html.
2. Pigg, K. E., & Bradshaw, T. K. (2003). Catalytic community development: A theory of practice for changing rural society. In D. L. Brown & L. E. Swanson (Eds.), *Challenges for rural America in the twenty-first century* (pp. 385-396). University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
3. Simpson, L., Wood, L., & Daws, L. (2003). Community capacity building: Starting with people not projects. *Community Development Journal*, 38, 277-286.
4. St. Onge, P., Cole, B., & Petty, S. (2003). *Through the lens of culture: Building capacity for social change and sustainable communities*. Oakland, CA: National Community Development Institute. Available from: www.ncdinet.org/index.php?s=100.
5. Rural Economic Policy Program. (1996, March). *Measuring community capacity building: A workbook in progress for rural communities*. Queenstown, MD: Aspen Institute. Available from: www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/measuring-community-capacity-building.

Seminar Agendas

Seminar 3

- I. Capacity-building definitions
- II. Capacity-building approaches to community engagement
- III. Levels at which capacity may be built
- IV. Types of capacities that may be built
- V. Assignment for Seminar 4—due November 5th

Seminar 4

- VI. CCED's principles of community development
- VII. Group discussion: Culture and context
- VIII. Group discussion: Ethical issues and capacity building
- IX. Group discussion: Capacity building and your engaged scholarship
- X. Portfolio Assignment—due November 19th

Seminar Assignment

Due November 5th at the beginning of the second capacity-building seminar. Please bring a written copy of your answers to these discussion questions. Be prepared to share your answers with the group.

1. Is a capacity-building approach for your engaged scholarship (e.g., engaged research, engaged teaching, or engaged service) appropriate? Why or why not?
2. What are the opportunities for capacity building? At what level? For whom? What types of capacities?
3. What are the impediments?
4. What are the ethical issues associated with capacity building and your engaged scholarship?

Portfolio Assignment

Due November 19th by email to connordm@msu.edu, lamore@msu.edu, and melcher@msu.edu and to be included in your final portfolio.

In 1-2 pages, describe a capacity-building approach to engaged scholarship (e.g., engaged research, engaged teaching, or engaged service) from your discipline. Be sure to:

1. Draw upon your own scholarship or the work of others (provide a copy or link for the article or project summary your assignment is based on).
2. Explain how the example embodies a capacity-building approach.
3. Describe the level at which capacity is being built and how you would assess it.
4. Explain what types of capacities are being built and for whom.
5. Describe how culture and context affect the capacity-building activities.

We will read your assignment and provide you with written comments.

Suggested Additional Readings

Community and Economic Development Program. (2006, April). *Self-study report*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, School of Planning, Design, and Construction. Available from: www.ced.msu.edu/reports/progmrevap2006.pdf

Craig, G. (2007). Community capacity-building: Something old, something new...? *Critical Social Policy*, 27, 335. Available from: csp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/27/3/335.

Flicker, S., et al. (2008). "If I could change one thing..." What community based researchers wish they could have done differently. *Community Development Journal*, 43, 239-253.

Sandmann, L. R., Foster-Fishman, P. G., Lloyd, J., Rauhe, W., & Rosean, C. (2000). Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change*, 32, 45-52.

Stanton, T. (2008). New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*, 3(19). Available from: online.sagepub.com/cgi/search?src=selected&journal_set=spesj.

Taylor, P. (2008). Where crocodiles find their power: Learning and teaching participation for community development. *Community Development Journal*, 43, 358-370.

Capacity Building

Chambers, R. (1995). *Rural development: Putting the last first*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking “participation” models, meanings, and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43, 269-283.

Craig, G. (2005). *Community capacity-building: Definitions, scope, measurements, and critiques*. Falkland, Scotland, UK: International Association for Community Development. Available from: www.iacdglobal.org/en/node/134.

Dubb, S. (August 2007). *Linking colleges to communities: Engaging the university for community development*. College Park: University of Maryland Press.

Eade, D. (1997). *Capacity-building: An approach to people-centred development*. Oxford: Oxfam.

European Centre for Development Policy Management. (2005, January). Exploring the soft side of capacity development. *Capacity.org*, Issue 24. Available from: [capacity.org/en/journal/archives/\(offset\)/10](http://capacity.org/en/journal/archives/(offset)/10)

Foster-Fishman, P., Berkowitz, S. L., Lounsbury, D. W., Jacobson, S., & Allen, N. A. (2001). Building collaborative community capacity in community coalitions: A review and integrative framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 241-261.

Foster-Fishman, P., Cantillon, D., Pierce, S. J., & Van Egeren, L.A. (2007). Building an active citizenry: The role of neighborhood problems, readiness, and capacity for change. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39, 91-106.

Fraser, H. (2005). Four different approaches to community participation. *Community Development Journal*, 40, 286-300.

Gibbon, M., Labonte, R., & Laverack, G. (2002). Evaluating community capacity. *Health and Social Care in the Community* 10, 1-7. Available from: www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118958246/abstract

Gilchrist, A. (2009). *The well-connected community: A networking approach to community development, 2nd edition*. University of Bristol: The Policy Press.

Kaplan, A. (2000). Capacity-building: Shifting the paradigm of practice. *Development in Practice*, 10, 517-526.

Kelly, S. B. (2004). *Community planning: How to solve urban and environmental problems*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Laverack, G. (2001). An identification and interpretation of the organizational aspects of community empowerment. *Community Development Journal*, 36, 134-145.

Mattessich, P., & Monsey, B. (1997). *Community building: What makes it work*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

Potter, C., & Brought, R. (2004). Systemic capacity building: A hierarchy of needs. *Health Policy and Planning*, 19, 336-345.

Verity, F. (2007). *Community capacity building: A review of the literature*. South Australia Department of Health, Health Promotion.

Assets and Capacity Building

Flora, C. B., Flora, J., & Fey, S. (2008). *Rural communities legacy and change, 3rd edition*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Green, G. P., & Haines, A. (2008). *Asset building and community development, 2nd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kretzmann, J. P. & McKnight, J. L. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. Chicago, IL: ACTA.

O'Leary, T. (n.d). Asset-based approaches to rural community development literature review and resources. Falkland, Scotland: Carnegie Trust UK. Available from: www.iacdglobal.org/files/rpt250407AssetBasedApproachesIACD2_0.pdf

Assessments, Guides, Tools, and Workbooks for Assessing Capacity

Dewar, T. (1997). *A guide to evaluating asset-based community development: Lessons, challenges, and opportunities*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Emery, M., Fey, S., & Flora, C. B. (2006). Using community capital to develop assets for positive community change. *CD Practice*, 13.

Fossum, H. L. (1993). *Communities in the lead: The Northwest rural development sourcebook*. Seattle: University of Washington, Northwest Policy Center. NOTE: See chapter 4 for community self-assessment tools.

Gubbels, P., & Koss, C. (2000). *From the roots up: Strengthening organizational capacity through guided self-assessment* (2nd ed.). Oklahoma City: World Neighbors.

James, R. (2005, October). "Quick and Dirty" evaluation of capacity building: Using participatory exercises (Praxis Note No. 15). Oxford, UK: INTRAC. Available from: www.intrac.org/pages/PraxisNote15.html

Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1996). *A guide to mapping and mobilizing the economic capacities of local residents*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1996). *A guide to mapping consumer expenditures and mobilizing consumer expenditure capacities*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1996). *A guide to mapping local business assets and mobilizing local business capacities*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1997). *A guide to capacity inventories: Mobilizing the community skills of local residents*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Kretzmann, J. P., McKnight, J. L., & Puntenny, D. (1998). *A guide to creating a neighborhood information exchange: Building communities by connecting local skills and knowledge*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Moore, H., & Putenney, D. (1999). *Leading by stepping back: A guide for city officials on building neighborhood capacity*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Puntenny, D. (1998). *City-sponsored community building: Savannah's grants for blocks story*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Rural Economic Policy Program. (1996, March). *Measuring community capacity building: A workbook in progress for rural communities*. Queenstown, MD: Aspen Institute. Available from: www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/measuring-community-capacity-building.

Tuner, N., McKnight, J. L., & Kretzmann, J. P. (1999). *A guide to mapping and mobilizing the associations in local neighborhoods*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.

Vincent, R. (2005, March). *What do we do with culture? Engaging culture in development* (Exchange Findings No. 3). Available from: www.healthcomms.org/pdf/findings3.pdf

Discipline Specific Examples of Capacity Building

Chino, M., & DeBruyn, L. (2006). Building true capacity: Indigenous models for indigenous communities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 96, 596-599. [health policy & practice]

Clark, N., Hall, A., & Naik, G. (2003). Research as capacity building: The case of an NGO facilitated post-harvest innovation system for the Himalayan Hills. *World Development*, 31, 1845-1863. [international agricultural development]

Copland, M.A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25, 375-394. [school administration]

Fullwood, P.C. (n.d.) *Culture and context: Capacity building for youth-led social change*. New York: Ms. Foundation for Women. Available from: www.ms.foundation.org/user-assets/PDF/Program/Book_2.pdf. [youth development]

Honadle, B. W. (1981). A capacity-building framework: A search for concept and purpose. *Public Administration Review*, 41, 575-580. Available from: www.jstor.org/stable/976270. [public administration]

Plummer, J. (2000). *Municipalities and community participation: A sourcebook for capacity building*. London: Earthscan. [government]

Scott, W., & Gough, S. (2003). Rethinking relationships between education and capacity-building: Remodeling the learning process. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication*, 2, 213-219. [environmental education]

Yachakaschi, S. (2005). *Capacity-building at the grassroots: Piloting organizational development of community-based organizations in South Africa*. Oxford, UK: INTRAC. Available from: www.intrac.org/pages/PraxisNote18.html. [international development]

Web Sites of Interest for Capacity Building

Allen Neighborhood Center (Lansing, MI): www.allenneighborhoodcenter.org

Asset Based Community Development Institute (Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University): www.sesp.northwestern.edu/abcd/

Campus Community Partnerships for Health (much more than health related resources) depts.washington.edu/ccph/

Campus Compact: www.compact.org/

Capacity.org (portal for international NGOs): www.capacity.org

Center for Neighborhood Technology (Chicago): www.cnt.org

Democratic Collaborative (research, training, and action agenda to strengthen civic and democratic life): www.democracycollaborative.org/

Development in Practice (on-line journal, practice-based analysis and research on social dimensions of development and humanitarianism): www.developmentinpractice.org/

Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop: ncsue.msu.edu/eesw.aspx

International Assn. Research on Service Learning and Civic Engagement:
www.researchslce.org/index.html

Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education: www1.indstate.edu/jcehe/

Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship: www.jces.ua.edu/index.html

Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement: www.uga.edu/ihe/jheoe.html

Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning: www.umich.edu/~mjcs/

MSU Office of University Outreach and Engagement: www.outreach.msu.edu

Michigan Campus Compact: www.micampuscompact.org/

PolicyLink (national research and action institute advancing economic and social equity):
www.policylink.org/

Seminars 5 & 6.

Community-Based Participatory Evaluation and Research

Learning Objectives

The primary objective of this seminar is to provide the participant with an overview of the major theories and practices associated with community-based participatory research and evaluation (CBPRE). Throughout this seminar, we will address the following questions:

- What is CBPRE? How is it different from other approaches to research?
- What are the historical and philosophical roots of CBPRE?
- What are the guiding principles of CBPRE?
- What are key issues in CBPRE?
- How are CBPRE projects developed and carried out?
- What are the outcomes of CBPRE projects?

Integration with Other Seminars

The theory and practice of CBPRE touches on the questions raised in seminars 3-5:

Seminar 3: How do I co-build and co-sustain an engaged partnership?

Seminar 4: How do I co-build capacity within and through an engaged partnership?

Seminar 5: How do I co-create mutual understanding and agreement among partners for taking action?

Pre-Seminar Readings

Participants should complete the following readings prior to the seminar. Materials will be made available at the time you register for the session.

History and Background of CBPRE

Wallerstein, N. B., & Duran, B. (2003). The conceptual, historical, and practice roots of community based participatory research and related participatory traditions. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health* (pp. 27-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Principles of CBPRE

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., Becker, A. B., Allen, A., & Guzman, J. R. (2003). Critical issues in developing and following community-based participatory research principles. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health* (pp. 56-73). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McTaggart, R. (1991). Principles for participatory action research. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 41, 168-187.

Case Examples of CBPRE

Angell, K. L., Kreshka, M. A., McCoy, R., et al. (2003). Psychosocial intervention for rural women with breast cancer: The sierra Stanford partnership. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 18, 499-507.

Banner, R. O., Decambra, H., Enos, R., et al. (1995). A breast and cervical cancer project in a native Hawaiian community: Wai'anae Cancer Research Project. *Preventive Medicine*, 24, 447-453.

Gotay, C. C., Banner, R. O., Matsunaga, D. S., et al. (2000). Impact of a culturally appropriate intervention on breast and cervical screening among native Hawaiian women. *Preventive Medicine*, 31, 529-537.

Koopman, C., Angell, K., Turner-Cobb, et al. (2001, January). Distress, coping, and social support among rural women recently diagnosed with primary breast cancer. *The Breast Journal*, 7(1), 25-33.

Matsunaga, D. S., Enos, R., Gotay, C. C., et al. (1996). Participatory research in a native Hawaiian community: The Wai'anae cancer research project. *Cancer* [Supplement: Native American Cancer Conference III: Risk factors, outreach and intervention strategies], 78(S7), 1582-1586.

Seminar Agenda

- I. Definitions: Research, evaluation, community-based research and evaluation, and community-based *participatory* research and evaluation
- II. Historical roots of collaborative inquiry
 - A. Northern tradition
 - B. Southern tradition
- III. Principles of collaborative inquiry and major issues
 - A. Major guiding principles
 - B. Key issues
 1. Who are the “communities”?
 2. What roles do race, class, power, and privilege play in CBPRE?
 3. Competing values and priorities

4. Levels of participation

IV. Methods of collaborative inquiry (types of partner involvement)

- A. Participants as researchers (methods to involve participants in the research process)
- B. Community partners as researchers (methods to involve community partners as “co-creators” of the research)
 - 1. Range of decision making authority
 - 2. Structure of the collaboration

V. Varieties of practice

- A. Range of issues addressed by CBPR/PAR
- B. Areas/regions involved in CBPR/PAR
- C. Final products resulting from CBPR/PAR

VI. Examples from UOE (include non-UOE examples also)

- A. Wiba Anung
- B. Genesee County Collaborative
- C. Birth to Work

Seminar Experiential Activity

Participants will observe a meeting of a community-campus partnership for research attended by faculty and community members and complete a follow-up reflection exercise. The reflection exercise will be guided by the following questions. Participants are encouraged to discuss their observations with at least one of the university partners.

- How was “the community” represented at the meeting?
- How was “the university” represented at the meeting?
- Who/what else was represented at the meeting?
- Based on what you observed, what were the levels of participation of community members in the partnership? (Consider using the participation framework of Cousins and Whitmore.)
- What principles of collaborative inquiry were evident in the meeting? Which principles were not?
- What differences in race, class, gender, power were apparent in the meeting? How did these appear to affect partnership dynamics?

Possible Discussion Group Topics

History and Background of CBPR

- What are some of the factors contributing to the increasing popularity of collaborative approaches to inquiry?
- What are the central themes of the Northern and Southern traditions of collaborative inquiry? Where do they intersect? Where do they diverge?
- Some have criticized the Northern Tradition for supporting existing power arrangements. Is this a fair criticism?

Partnership Benefits

- What do you see as the benefits most relevant to you if engaged in CBPR?
- What do you see as the benefits most relevant to communities engaged in CBPR?

Partnership Issues and Challenges

- What do you see as the challenges most likely to affect you if engaged in CBPR?
- What do you see as the challenges most likely to affect communities engaged in CBPR? What are different ways of dealing with the challenges posed?
- Why might it be important to openly address differences in race, class, gender, power and privilege in community-campus partnerships for research? How might such differences be addressed?

Possible Additional Discussion Group Readings

History and Background of CBPR

Brisolara, S. (1998). The history of participatory evaluation and current debates in the field. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 80 (Winter), 25-41.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 567-606). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Partnership Benefits

Flicker, S. (2008). Who benefits from community-based participatory research? A case study of the Positive Youth Project. *Health Education and Behavior*, 35, 70-86.

Schulz, J., Israel, B. A., & Lantz, P. (2003). Instrument for evaluating dimensions of group dynamics within community-based participatory research partnerships. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 26, 249-262.

Partnership Issues and Challenges

Chavez, V., Duran, B., Baker, Q., Avila, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2003). The dance of race and privilege in community based participatory research. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community based participatory research in health* (pp. 81-97). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Flicker, S., Travers, R., Guta, A., McDonald, S., & Meagher, A. (2007). Ethical dilemmas in community-based participatory research: Recommendations for institutional review boards. *Journal of Urban Health, 84*, 478-493.

Seifer, S. (2006). Building and sustaining community-institutional partnerships for prevention research: Findings from a national collaborative. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*, 989-1003.

Further Readings

Action Research

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). *Handbook of action research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., & Becker, A.B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Reviews of Public Health, 19*, 173–202.

Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Gartlehner, G., Lohr, K. N., Griffith, D., Rhodes, S., Samuel-Hodge, C., Maty, S., Lux, L., Webb L., Sutton, S. F., Swinson, T., Jackman A., & Whitener, L. (2004). *Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence*. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99. (AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Case Studies

Rhodes, S. D., Eng, E., Hergenrather, K. C., Remnitz, I. M., Arceo, R., Montano, J., & Alegria-Ortega, J. (2007). Exploring Latino men's HIV risk using community-based participatory research. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 13*, 146-158.

Schulz, A. J., Israel, B.A., Parker, E.A., Lockett, M., Hill, Y., & Wills, R. (2001). The East Side Village Health Worker Partnership: Integrating research with action to reduce health disparities. *Public Health Reports, 116*, 548-557.

Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., Israel, B. A., Becker, A. B., Maciak, B. J., & Hollis, R. (1998). Conducting a participatory community-based survey for a community health intervention on Detroit's East Side. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice, 4*, 10-24.

Ethics

Flicker, S. (2008). Who benefits from community-based participatory research? A case study of the Positive Youth Project. *Health Education and Behavior, 35*, 70-86.

Flicker, S., & Guta, A. (2008). Ethical approaches to adolescent participation in sexual health research. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 42*, 3-10.

Flicker, S., Travers, R., Guta, A., McDonald, S., & Meagher, A. (2007). Ethical dilemmas in community-based participatory research: Recommendations for institutional review boards. *Journal of Urban Health, 84*, 478-493.

Shore, N., Wong, K. A., Seifer, S. D., Grignon, J., & Northington-Gamble, V. (2008). Advancing the ethics of community-based participatory research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics, 3*(2).

History and Background

Brisolara, S. (1998, Winter). The history of participatory evaluation and current debates in the field. *New Directions for Evaluation, 80*, 25-41.

Methods

Cashman, S., Adeky, S., Allen, A., Corburn, J., Israel, B., Montano, J., Rafelito, A., Rhodes, S., Swanston, S., Wallerstein, N., & Eng, E. (2008). The power and the promise: Working with communities to analyze data, interpret findings, and get to outcomes. *American Journal of Public Health, 98*, 1407-1417.

Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education and Behavior, 24*, 369-387.

Participatory Evaluation

Cousins, J. B., & Whitmore, E. (1998, Winter). Framing participatory evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation, 80*, 5-23.

Partnerships

Becker, A.B., Israel, B.A., & Allen, A. J. (2005). Strategies and techniques for effective group process in community-based participatory research partnerships. In B. A. Israel, E. Eng., A. J. Schulz, & E. Parker (Eds.), *Methods in community-based participatory research for health* (pp. 52-72). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Christopher, S., Watts, V., McCormick, A., & Young, S. (2008). Building and maintaining trust in a community-based participatory research partnership. *American Journal of Public Health, 98*, 1398-1406.

Minkler, M. (2005). Community-based research partnerships: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Urban Health*, 82 (2 Supplement 2), 3-12.

Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. B. (2008). *Community-based participatory research for health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seifer, S. (2006). Building and sustaining community-institutional partnerships for prevention research: Findings from a national collaborative. *Journal of Urban Health*, 83, 989-1003.

Power and Privilege

Chavez, V., Duran, B., Baker, Q., Avila, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2003). The dance of race and privilege in community based participatory research. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community based participatory research in health* (pp. 81-97). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Web Resources

Community-Based Research Canada
communityresearchcanada.ca/

CBRnet.org: Connecting community-based research practitioners
www.cbrnet.org/index.html

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
depts.washington.edu/ccph/index.html

Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium
www.cbrc.org/

Community Toolbox
ctb.ku.edu/en/Default.htm

Developing and sustaining community-based participatory research partnerships: A skill-building curriculum
www.cbprcurriculum.info/

National CBR Networking Initiative
www.bonner.org/campus/cbr/home.htm

Seminars 7 & 8.
Confirming Agreement among Community and University Partners:
One Useful Technique

Learning Objectives

- Understand how logic models can be used to:
 - Provide a common understanding and vision for taking action with partners in the community
 - Report a performance story to key stakeholders and decision makers
 - Guide evaluation efforts
- Learn how to construct logic models

Integration with Other Seminars

Using understandings from the previous sessions, Session 5 integrates applying principles of community engagement, building capacity among partners and community, and implementing community-based participatory research strategies.

Pre-Seminar Readings

Readings will be made available at the time you register for the seminar.

Reed, C. S., & Brown, R. (2001). Outcome/impact assessment model: Linking outcomes and assets. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 24, 287-295.

University of Wisconsin – Extension, Program Development and Evaluation. (2005). *Logic model* [Web site]. Available August 5, 2009, from: www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html. Materials available at the site include:

- *Enhancing program performance with logic models* (2002) [online self-study module]. Available from: www.uwex.edu/ces/lmcourse/interface/coop_M1_Overview.htm.
- *Logic models to enhance program performance* (n.d.) [presentation]. Available from: www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html (32 pages, 1767 KB).
- *Logic models: A framework for program planning and evaluation* (2005, March) [presentation]. Available from: www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html (34 pages, 1007 KB).

Seminar Agenda

- I. What is a logic model?
 - A. A tool that describes the *theory of change* underlying an intervention, product or policy. It characterizes a project through a system of elements that include components and connections, with context being an important qualification. *Joy A. Frechtling, LOGIC MODELING METHODS IN PROGRAM EVALUATION (2007), p. 1*
- II. What can it be used for?
 - A. Clarifying what's really intended
 - B. Enhancing communication among team members
 - C. Managing projects
 - D. Designing evaluation plans
 - E. Documenting a project and how it worked
- III. What are the parts of a logic model?
 - A. Inputs – definition and application
 - B. Activities – definition and application
 - C. Outputs – definition and application
 - D. Initial outcomes – definition and application
 - E. Intermediate outcomes – definition and application
 - F. Long-term outcomes – definition and application
- IV. How do the parts fit together?
 - A. Understanding the relationship between outcomes and impact
 - B. Tricks of the trade: Constructing logic models
- V. What is a multi-level logic model?
 - A. Developmental and systemic foundations
 - B. Why multiple levels?
 - C. What can it be used for?
 - D. What are the parts of a multi-level logic model?
 1. Levels
 2. Spectrum of outcomes across levels
- VI. What are the limitations?
 - A. A logic model only represents reality, it is not reality
 1. Programs are not linear

- 2. Programs are dynamic interrelationships that rarely follow sequential order
- B. Logic model focuses only on expected outcomes (also need to pay attention to unintended or unexpected outcomes – positive, negative, neutral)
- C. Challenge of causal attribution
 - 1. Program is likely to be just one of many factors influencing outcomes
 - 2. Consider other factors that may be affecting observed outcomes
- D. Doesn't address: Are we doing the right thing?
- E. Weak commitment to logic modeling and evaluation
 - 1. We do it because funders want it
 - 2. We do it because we believe it is our foundation
- F. Limited understanding of program logic or program theory of change
- G. Limited access to resources delineating evidenced-based practices

Seminar Experiential Activity: Constructing Logic Models

Session participants will construct two inter-related, multi-level logic models. The first will outline the actions and outcomes necessary to achieve partnerships built on community engagement principles that use community-based participatory research strategies to co-create partnership activities. The second will outline the actions and outcomes sought in the participant engagement experience including capacities increased as a result of the experience.

Suggested Additional Readings

Anderson, A. (2005). *The Community Builder's Approach to a Theory of Change: A Practice Guide to Theory Development*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.

Frechtling, J.A. (2007). Logic modeling methods in program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holman, P., Devane, T., Cady, S. (eds.) (2007). *The change handbook: The definitive resource on today's best methods for engaging whole systems*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Julian, D. (1997). The utilization of the logic model as a system level planning and evaluation device. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 20 (3), 251-257.

Web Sites

Kellogg Foundation. (2001). Logic model development guide: Logic models to bring together planning, evaluation & action. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
<http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2010/Logic-Model-Development-Guide.aspx>

Targeting Outcomes of Programs (TOP) includes a seven-level hierarchy that integrates program evaluation within the program development process. It was developed by Dr. Kay Rockwell of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and Dr. Claude Bennett of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, USDA. <http://citnews.unl.edu/TOP/downloads/TOP.pdf>

United Way of America's Outcome Measurement Resource Network. The Resource Network's purpose is to provide United Way of America's and other organizations' outcome measurement resources and learnings. <http://www.unitedway.org/outcomes/>

CDC Evaluation Working Group: <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/resources.htm#logic>

Outcome mapping as an approach:
http://www.idrc.ca/evaluation/ev-26586-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

Seminars 9 & 10.

Evaluating Engaged Partnerships

University Outreach and Engagement promotes the idea that relationships between community and university partners should be reciprocal and mutually beneficial. However, the literature on community-university partnerships tells us that partnerships often fall short of achieving the anticipated benefits or fail to distribute benefits equitably. The systematic evaluation of engaged partnerships holds the promise of documenting the kinds of benefits that partnerships yield, learning how widely benefits are shared, and identifying what kinds of partnership processes are likely to maximize benefits for all partners. This seminar will focus on approaches to evaluating partnerships and guide participants through the process of designing evaluations of their own engaged partnerships.

Learning Objectives

The objectives of this seminar are to provide participants with a basic understanding of principles and practices of program evaluation and to guide participants in designing evaluations of their own engaged partnerships. Seminar topics will include:

1. A brief introduction to program evaluation
2. Participatory evaluation approaches
3. Using logic models to guide evaluation designs
4. Measuring key partnership processes and outcomes
5. Approaches to data collection and analysis
6. Putting it all together: Developing an evaluation plan

Integration with Other Seminars

In prior seminars, participants will have learned (1) how to build and sustain engaged partnerships; (2) how to build capacity within engaged partnerships; (3) how to conduct community-engaged research/evaluation; and (4) how to develop partnership logic models that capture the key activities, processes, and intended outcomes of engaged partnerships. In this seminar, participants will use their partnership logic models as the point of departure for developing a plan to evaluate their own engaged partnerships.

Pre-Seminar Readings

Participants should complete the following readings prior to the first session of the seminar:

1. Cousins, J. B., & Whitmore, E. (1998). Framing participatory evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 80, 5-23.

2. Schulz, J., Israel, B. A., & Lantz, P. (2003). Instrument for evaluating dimensions of group dynamics within community-based participatory research partnerships. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 26*, 249–262.
3. McNall, M. A., Reed, C. S., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2009). Brokering community-university engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*, 317-331.

Portfolio Assignment

Between the first and second sessions of the seminar, participants will develop draft evaluation plans for their partnerships. It is preferable, but not required, that these plans be developed with input from community partners. In the second session, we will discuss issues and challenges encountered in developing evaluation plans. A final evaluation plan should be submitted as part of your portfolio. There is no expectation that you actually conduct an evaluation.

Evaluation plans should contain the following elements:

1. Evaluation purpose
2. Approach to engaging stakeholders in evaluation design and implementation
3. Key evaluation questions
4. Key process and outcomes measures
5. Data collection plan
6. Data analysis plan
7. Reporting/dissemination plan

Seminar 11.

The Ethics of Engaged Scholarship

Learning Objectives

- Identify ethical issues that are unique to engaged scholarship
- Describe how ethical issues in engaged scholarship apply to your discipline
- Be able to do a risk-benefit analysis of conducting an engaged scholarship activity or project

Integration with Other Seminars

In this session, we will examine a variety of ethical issues related to scholarly work in communities, including those that may have been raised in previous sessions as well as those that may be forthcoming during the discussion.

Pre-Seminar Readings

Readings will be made available at the time you register for the seminar.

Buchanan, D. R., Miller, F. G., & Wallerstein, N. (2007). Ethical issues in community-based participatory research: Balancing rigorous research with community participation in community intervention studies. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 1*, 153-160.

Chapdelaine, A., Ruiz, A., Warchal, J., & Wells, C. (2005). *Service-learning code of ethics* (chapters 1-2, pp. 3-21). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Flicker, S., Travers, R., Guta, A., McDonald, & Meagher, A. (2007). Ethical dilemmas in community-based participatory research: Recommendations for institutional review boards. *Journal of Urban Health, 84*, 478-493.

Shore, N. (2007). Re-conceptualizing the Belmont Report: A community-based participatory research perspective. *Journal of Community Practice, 14*, 5-26.

Suggested Additional Readings (Optional)

Grignon, J., Wong, K. A., & Seifer, S.D. (2008). *Ensuring community-level research protections: Proceedings of the 2007 Educational Conference Call Series on Institutional Review Boards and Ethical Issues in Research*. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Available from:
http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/FinalResearchEthicsCallSeriesReport.pdf.

Minkler, M. (2004). Ethical challenges for the "outside" researcher in community-based participatory research. *Health Education and Behavior*, 31, 684-697.

Silka, L., Cleghorn, G. D., Grullon, M., & Tellez, T. (2008). Creating community-based participatory research in a diverse community: A case study. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 3, 5-16.

Seminar Agenda

- I. Critical ethical issues in engaged scholarship
 - a. Presentation of common ethical issues
 - b. Activity: Ethical dilemmas you have experienced or anticipate in your engaged scholarship
- II. IRBs: Navigating human subjects protection within the engaged scholarship context
 - a. Current context of IRBs with respect to engaged scholarship
 - b. Areas to address in an IRB application when doing an engaged scholarship project
 - c. Activity: Risk-benefit analysis
- III. Ethical issues in engaged scholarship and disciplinary differences
 - a. Activity: Ethical issues in your discipline

Pre-Seminar Assignment

- I. One week prior to the seminar, each student must submit her/his certificate indicating that the initial educational requirement for MSU's IRB training has been completed.
 - a. If training has been completed prior to participation in this program, submit the certificate. To access your certificate, search on your name at: http://35.8.104.116:591/ucrihs/ucrihs_training_reg/search.htm
 - b. If you have never completed IRB training, go to: <http://www.humanresearch.msu.edu/requiredtraining.html>, follow the instructions under "Initial Educational Requirement," complete the requirements, and submit the certificate.
- II. Identify ethical issues specific to your discipline that may need to be considered in pursuing engaged scholarship.
 - a. See if you have a disciplinary code of ethics; if so, consider how these relate to ethical issues in engaged scholarship.

- b. You may want to talk to faculty in your area who do engaged work to see what kinds of issues they have encountered.
- c. Reflect on what you have learned and be prepared to discuss during the seminar.

Note: This will become part of your portfolio.

Seminar Activities

1. *Ethical dilemmas in engaged scholarship:* Informed by the preceding presentation on ethical issues common to engaged scholarship, participants in this small-group activity will discuss the kinds of ethical issues they have experienced or anticipate experiencing in their mentored engagement experience and potential strategies for handling such issues.
2. *Risk-benefit analysis:* In this small-group activity, you will be presented with a case example. Using what you have learned about ethical principles and human subjects research, you will analyze the risks and benefits of conducting the project and determine how to minimize risk and maximize benefits.
3. *Ethical issues in your discipline:* In this large-group discussion, students will share ethical issues unique to their disciplines that can potentially arise during engaged scholarship work.

Post-Seminar Assignment

Within two weeks of the seminar, submit a three to five page paper in which you reflect on ethical issues in your engaged scholarship project. Identify the key ethical issues *specific to engaged scholarship* and discuss how these are being addressed, as well as alternative ways they could be addressed if appropriate. Include an analysis of the risks and benefits and ways to minimize risks. The instructors will review and provide feedback.

Note: This will become part of your portfolio.

Program Completion Assignment

This is the last seminar prior to your presentation and final portfolio review. In preparation for the portfolio review, please do the following:

1. Review your original statement of engaged research or teaching submitted for Seminar 1.
2. Revise the statement to reflect changes in your thinking emerging from participation in the Graduate Certification program.
3. Include both the original and the revised statements in your portfolio, clearly identifying which is which.

Note: This will become part of your portfolio.

REQUIREMENT 3. MENTORED COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCE

A mentored community engaged experience brings a community partner, graduate student, and faculty mentor together for an intentional learning experience. The purpose of the experience is support the graduate student in learning key collaboration practices with community partners and developing engagement skills.

A mentored community engagement experience may be developed and overseen in one of two ways:

- Facilitated by the student's Guidance Committee chairperson, department, or college and overseen by department/college faculty mentor, or
- Organized by the Office of University Outreach and Engagement and overseen by UOE faculty and staff

Regardless of how the experience comes about, consultation with University Outreach and Engagement is available and encouraged in developing and solidifying the mentored community engagement experience. Ongoing consultation with UOE through the implementation and reflection stages also is highly recommended.

Co-developed by the community partner, faculty mentor, and graduate student, the mentored community engagement experience should:

- Be approved by both your Guidance Committee chairperson and University Outreach and Engagement in advance of the experience.
- Include a written agreement between the community partner, faculty mentor, and graduate student clarifying expectations, roles, responsibilities, and focus of the experience.
- Meet the required minimum of 2 hours per week for two semesters or a total of 60 hours. Any alternatives to this time commitment should be discussed in advance with University Outreach and Engagement.
- Include written documentation of hours and activities during the 60 hours.

Mentored community engagement experiences may vary by discipline and by college. For example, different disciplines may emphasize scholarly and community engaged research or teaching or service (see Table 1 below for common examples). Appropriate community partners may vary as well (e.g., industry groups, businesses, local schools, social service agencies, neighborhoods, etc.; see Table 2 for examples).

Every mentored community engagement experience should involve *significant, direct interaction* with community partners. Although your mentored community engagement experiences may

involve some administrative or clerical work, your main focus should be learning collaboration and community engagement skills. For example, involvement in data analysis for a community-based research project in an on-campus office is not sufficient. However, if you also collaborated with community partners around data interpretation and dissemination of results, the experience could be considered as part of your program for the Graduate Certification.

Table 1. Types of Acceptable Engagement Experiences*

<i>Engaged Research, Discovery, and Creative Works</i>	<i>Engaged Teaching</i>	<i>Engaged Service</i>
Applied research Community-based research Contractual research Demonstration projects Exhibitions/ performances Needs and assets assessment/ evaluation Program evaluations Translation of scholarship through publications, Web sites	Online and off-campus education Continuing education Occupational short courses, certificates, licensure programs Contractual instructional programs Participatory curriculum development Non-credit classes and programs Educational enrichment programs for the public and alumni Pre-college programs Conferences, seminars, and workshops Service-learning Study-abroad programs with an engagement component Contributions to managed learning environments	Clinical services Consulting Policy analysis Service to community- based institutions Knowledge transfer Expert testimony Technical assistance Commercialization of discoveries Creation of new business ventures Human and animal patient care

*See definitions in handbook glossary

The above listed activities are considered to be community engaged scholarship when they are *based on* research or creative activity or *generate* research and creative activity.

Table 2. Examples of Mentored Engagement Experiences*

<p>Degree: Ph.D. College/Department: Agriculture & Natural Resources/Fisheries & Wildlife Type of O&E: Outreach teaching (non-credit instruction) Example: A Ph.D. student collaborated with an advisory group composed of teachers, community organizations, and state agencies to design and implement a series of professional development workshops for teachers in mid-Michigan schools. This mentored community engagement experience was under the direction of a CARRS professor, who provided guidance on taking place-based education concepts and making them relevant for teachers and elementary students.</p>
--

<p>Degree: Ph.D. College/Department: College of Arts and Letters/Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures Type of O&E: Outreach research (creative activities) Example: A visual artist returned to school to pursue a Ph.D. Drawing upon primary source materials created by community members, she developed multi-media documentaries telling the stories of farm women through film, print, video, and audiotape. With input from the farmers and the guidance of MSU faculty members, she created a traveling exhibition telling the stories of farm women.</p>
<p>Degree: M.S. College/Department: College of Business/Graduate School of Management Type of O&E: Outreach teaching (public understanding) Example: A master's student was part of an MSU faculty-student team that developed a one-stop shop for business executives from around the world to access international business knowledge. With support from the PI of the project, he interviewed and surveyed business textbook publishers about their information needs and then customized the globalEdge Web site to make sure those information needs were met.</p>
<p>Degree: Ph.D. College/Department: College of Communication Arts and Sciences/Communicative Sciences and Disorders Type of O&E: Outreach service (clinical services/international) Example: A Ph.D. student took part in a department-sponsored overseas experience at a school for students with special needs in Mexico. As part of the MSU engagement with Angel Notion, a non-profit organization that runs a clinic in Playa del Carmen, he collaborated with Angel Notion staff, MSU faculty, and other graduate students to develop and deliver presentations in Spanish for teachers, parents, and community members on special health issues and their treatments.</p>
<p>Degree: M.S. College/Department: College of Education/Student Affairs Administration Type of O&E: Outreach teaching (service-learning) Example: As part of a summer internship placement, a master's student worked closely with faculty from a small liberal arts college to create a service-learning component for three existing classes. His contribution focused on developing community partners for service-learning. He identified potential community organizations, organized meetings with their leadership and the college faculty, facilitated conversations about shared expectations, and developed a process for matching students with community partners. In addition to mentoring from his major professor and faculty at the small liberal arts college, he also accessed resources and guidance from MSU's Office of Service Learning and Civic Engagement.</p>
<p>Degree: M.S. College/Department: College of Engineering/Mechanical Engineering Type of O&E: Outreach service (technical assistance) Example: A master's student worked with her major professor, other Mechanical Engineering students, and a Michigan-based nonprofit organization called Solar Circle for the summer in Tanzania. Along with the multidisciplinary MSU team, she provided advice on manufacturing solar ovens given the locally available materials and manufacturing skills, traveled to different Tanzanian communities, and demonstrated how the ovens work at</p>

<p>community gatherings. At the urging of her faculty mentor, she wrote an article for the Society of Women Engineers magazine about the challenges and joys of making manufacturing relevant in a non-American context.</p>
<p>Degree: M.D./Ph.D. College/Department: College of Human or Osteopathic Medicine Type of O&E: Outreach research (international) Example: An M.D./Ph.D. student worked closely with his major professor to research community-based interventions aimed at improving the lives of people with epilepsy in Zambia. His summer field work consisted of working with health care providers and traditional healers in Zambia to develop and conduct a survey of contextual factors that influence how people with epilepsy view treatment in the clinic. Working under the MSU faculty director of this program, he gained valuable experience in doing culturally sensitive, community-based research.</p>
<p>Degree: M.A./M.M. College/Department: College of Music/Music Education Type of O&E: Outreach teaching (pre-college programs) Example: A dual degree student worked in the MSU Community Music School for the summer to fulfill her degree requirements. She worked as a music educator in three summer music camps—Spartan Choral Camp, Children’s Choir Camp, and Middle School Band Camp. In addition to music instruction, she was also responsible for meeting with parents and interacting with the public during the final concerts. Her major professor encouraged her to write a reflection about the differences between individual, private instruction and community-based camps for the School of Music’s alumni magazine.</p>
<p>Degree: Ph.D. College/Department: College of Natural Science/Microbiology Type of O&E: Outreach research Example: A Ph.D. student worked as a research assistant at MSU’s Center for Microbial Ecology on the hazardous waste remediation project known as the Schoolcraft Project. This ongoing project is a coordinated effort by MSU researchers and Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) to field-test a new method of environmental detoxification using a microbe that transforms carbon tetrachloride into carbon dioxide without producing chloroform. In addition to the lab work and field work, the student attended meetings with MDEQ with his major professor and learned how to work effectively with a governmental partner on research.</p>
<p>Degree: Ph.D. College/Department: College of Nursing/Nursing Type of O&E: Outreach service (clinical services) Example: A Ph.D. student worked with a caregiver support group at a local community center for a semester. Under the direction of her major professor, she learned how to put the ideas she learned in her classes into action with a group of individuals who were caring for family members who have cancer. Her work with the caregiver support helped her identify the main research question for her dissertation.</p>
<p>Degree: M.S. College/Department: College of Social Science/Community Psychology Type of O&E: Outreach research (CBPR) Example: A master’s student worked with her major professor at a community-based nonprofit</p>

organization, Turning Point, which offers programs and resources to help victims and survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and homelessness regain control of their lives. The student collaborated with the director of Turning Point and her major advisor to develop and conduct a survey focused on cultural differences in how individuals cope with the aftermath of violence.

* Fictitious examples inspired by real life.

Helpful Suggestions for Mentors and Mentees

The term “mentor” arose from Homer’s Odyssey as the name of Odysseus’ trusted friend Mentor who, in Odysseus’ absence, nurtures, protects, and educates Odysseus’ son, Telemachus. Mentor introduced Telemachus to other leaders and guided him in assuming his rightful social and political place. Mentor’s instruction went far beyond the teaching of specific skills; it encompassed personal, professional, and civic development, that is, development of the whole person to full capacity, and integration of that person into the existing community through socialization of its norms and expectations.

Reynolds, P. P. (1994). Reaffirming professionalism through the education community. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 120, 609-614.

Graduate education, research, and creative activities take place within a community of scholars where constructive relationships between graduate students and their advisors and mentors are essential for the promotion of excellence in graduate education and for adherence to the highest standards of scholarship, ethics, and professional integrity. The effective advising and mentoring of graduate students is the joint responsibility of the graduate degree-granting and program units, the faculty advisors, and the students.

Task Force on Research Mentoring (H. Kende, Chair). (2004, Spring). Guidelines for graduate student advising and mentoring relationships. *Research Integrity*, 7(2), pp. 9-11. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: grad.msu.edu/researchintegrity/.

Faculty mentors provide guidance about the scope of the community engaged project, convene discussions with community partners, and help graduate students learn and reflect on community engagement scholarship and practice. As the mentored community engagement experience begins to take shape, it is important to clarify expectations so that misunderstandings are less likely to occur. Table 3, adapted from the *MSU Graduate School’s Certification in College Teaching 2007-2008 Guidebook*, summarizes common expectations mentors and mentees have of one another and may serve as a good starting point for discussion.

Table 3. Student and Mentor Expectations

<i>The student expects...</i>	<i>The mentor expects...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A mentor will be available when needed.• A mentor will be friendly, open, and supportive.• A mentor will structure advisory sessions for easy exchange of ideas.• A mentor should provide guidance on teaching and suggest relevant readings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students will keep in touch and schedule regular meetings.• Students will be honest in reporting their progress and openly discuss any difficulties they encounter.• Students will be excited about their work.• Students will follow the advice given.• Students will be independent, self-motivated, and responsible for managing their teaching, research and service obligations.

In addition, community partners, faculty mentors, and graduate students may want to discuss these key questions at the outset of the mentored community engagement experience:

- What is the project’s background? How was it identified as a community priority?
- Who are key people the student should talk to about the project?
- What resources are available to the student (i.e., space in a community center to work, access to software at the faculty mentor’s office, etc.)?
- What is the final goal or outcome? What would a final product look like?
- What is the best way for all parties to communicate with each other (i.e., weekly meetings, email, cell phone, etc.)?

Along with your community partners, your faculty mentor will work with you as you learn community collaboration skills and effective partnership practices, including the “principles of engagement” listed in the next section. Your faculty mentor should also help you with reflections so that your understanding and practice of community collaboration evolves and deepens overtime.

Principles of Engagement

The following principles were developed by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, a nonprofit organization that promotes health (broadly defined) through partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions. Founded in 1996, CCPH is a growing network of more than 1,800 communities and campuses around the world that are collaborating to promote health through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions and other partnership strategies. Visit www.ccphe.info/ for more information.

Organization of the Principles

The principles are organized around two general areas. Principles 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 pertain to communication and relationship (strengthening the relationship between partners). Principles 1, 3, 8, and 9 pertain to structure and action (the collective action we want to take and the structure through which we act).

CCPH Principles for Effective Partnerships

Successful partnerships...

1. Have mutually agreed upon mission, values, goals and measurable outcomes for the partnership.

These can be written or verbal. Most effective partnerships have written outcomes that are measurable.

- Mission describes what we do, why we do it and who we do it for.
- Values reflect our core ideology, what we hold deeply that doesn't change over time.
- Goals and measurable outcomes guide our daily, weekly, and monthly actions.

2. Are characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness, and commitment.

Trustworthiness is created over time as partners:

- Give value and worth to each other's feelings, needs, thoughts, ideas, wishes and preferences
- Fulfill their agreed upon responsibilities
- Interact in open ways without hidden agendas
- Show their belief in and caring for the partnership

3. Are built upon identified strengths and assets, and address needs.

Assets are strengths (such as positive relationships) and resources (such as skills, talents, and opportunities) An asset-based partnership:

- Builds on partner and community talents, skills and assets (importance of past and existing success)
- Nurtures and strengthens relationships (importance of social capital)
- Uses participatory approaches (importance of partner and community driven work)

4. Have balanced power and shared resources.

Power differentials exist within any group of people who are attempting to work together. A more level playing field is created as partners:

- Identify the resources that they bring to the partnership
- Identify their needs – what they seek to gain from the partnership
- Identify the partnership needs – what collective they seek from the partnership
- Share the resources to meet individual and collective needs

5. *Have clear, open and accessible communication.*

Clear, open, and accessible communication increases as partners:

- Build mutual respect for each other
- Come to understand each other (worldviews, organizational cultures, etc.)
- Freely share information with each other

6. *Have mutually-agreed upon and established roles, norms and processes.*

All partnerships go through stages where roles, norms and processes are established as the partnership evolves from a collection of individuals to an effective team.

- **Forming.** Initially the partnership is developing trust, setting up “rules” and “norms,” making commitments with each other; determining each team member’s strengths and assigning roles and responsibilities.
- **Storming.** Most partnerships experience some conflict as they begin to take action, such as questioning purpose, leadership, roles and norms. Since conflict is natural, it shouldn’t be avoided. Working through conflict in a positive way is particularly important to the formation of trust within the group. Partners are becoming aware of their differences and trying to determine how they will work together.
- **Norming.** Partners establish norms and patterns of work within which the partnership functions. A group consensus emerges; partners come to an agreement on the partnership’s purpose or function. Members are clear about what their roles and responsibilities are. The group has a sense of identity and members strive to work together.
- **Performing.** Finally, the work gets done. Partnership structure, norms and behavior are understood and accepted. Members know how to work with each other; they can handle disagreements and misunderstandings effectively. The partnership is focused on accomplishing its purpose.

7. *Have free-flowing feedback to, among, and from all stakeholders in the partnership.*

Simply asking questions to determine something we want to know:

- How the partnership is perceived by partners
- What the partnership really needs

- The priority of the work at hand
- Are we staying on track

Effective partnerships create ways to share information and ensure that feedback is used to improve both the partner relationship and partnership action.

8. *Have partners who share the credit for accomplishments.*

It is important to understand that this means in both worlds—community and academic. In the academic world this means ensuring that our partners are cited and/or credited on all articles and reports as authors.

9. *Take time to develop and evolve.*

Partnerships do take time. As we work on our partnerships, it is important to reflect on each principle by asking:

- To what extent are we applying this principle?
- How important is it to our partnership’s success?
- How could we improve in this area?
- What are the barriers to fully implementing this principle and how can we overcome them?

University Outreach and Engagement has also identified 10 indicators of successful community-university partnerships:

1. Share a common vision
2. Share agreement about goals and strategies
3. Have mutual trust and respect
4. Share power and responsibility
5. Communicate clearly and listen carefully
6. Understand and empathize with one another’s circumstances
7. Remain flexible, with your eye on the target
8. Achieve mutual benefits
9. Enhance community partner’s capacity for self sufficiency
10. Enhance faculty member’s scholarly career

See also University Outreach and Engagement’s online “Tools of Engagement,” a series of five modules designed to help students learn how to work collaboratively with community partners. The modules focus on effectively working in groups, successful partnerships, negotiation techniques, and so on. Visit outreach.msu.edu/tools/ for more information and the curriculum.

REQUIREMENT 4. REFLECTION AND ENGAGEMENT PORTFOLIO

When thinking about your engagement portfolio and how you will be using it to summarize your engagement experience, there are exercises that can help you think about your scholarship and how it relates to you on a personal level. These exercises are reflections. Reflection is a critical element in the process of connecting your engagement activities to the learning components of this scholarly practice. People who reflect take time to look inward and ask themselves some tough evaluative questions that relate directly to their own morals, goals, and objectives. These activities allow you to internalize who you are as an engaged scholar.

Reflective practices can also help you examine your service and the community with whom you work. During this process you will be able to understand how you relate to issues of diversity, including those of power, and privilege. This can lead you to a desire to change your personal choices and behavior, to have a different outlook, or to encourage you to continue to search for long-term solutions to inequalities. All of these experiences are a vital part of your engagement portfolio, both for creation and maintenance.

In: Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., & Schmiede, A. (1996). *A practitioner's guide to reflection in service-learning*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.

Your Engagement Portfolio

Your engagement portfolio is a collection of different types of evidence relating to your community engagement experiences. Your engagement portfolio may include materials that are self-generated, collaboratively generated with your community partner, and/or partner generated materials that address the scholarship that undergirds your engagement, the processes of engagement, the outcomes of engagement, and the practitioner and scholarly oriented products that result from your engagement. Elements of your collection may be selected to illustrate different aspects of your on-going development as an engaged scholar. For example, you may draw upon your engagement portfolio during job interviews.

A few of the reasons for keeping an engagement portfolio include:

- As a tool for individual reflection on community engagement processes and resulting scholarship—a tool for continuous improvement over time
- As part of a process of soliciting informal feedback from other engaged colleagues
- As a methodical way of documenting your partnership with community members

- As a tool for collecting evidence to be used in promotion and tenure packages
- As a collection of materials to be put forward for peer review
- As a source of materials to draw from for publicity and awards nominations

As you complete your Graduate Certification in Community Engagement, you will need to prepare a special engagement portfolio that documents your learning and experience. The portfolio, along with other evidence of your participation in the graduate certification program (e.g., participation in UOE seminars), will be considered by UOE in the final certification process. The following sections list the required elements and some potential supporting materials for your portfolio.

Engagement Portfolio Required Elements

1. Abstract for portfolio overall
2. Narrative/description of engaged scholarship activities
 - *Biography.* Student's background, including disciplinary experience, preparation for experience, and approach to engaged scholarship
 - *Context.* Context for activity, including setting, available resources, constraints, and political considerations
 - *Goals.* Basic description of activity, including purpose, intended goals, participants or stakeholders
 - *Scholarship.* Connection of the engagement activity to the graduate student's scholarly agenda, appropriate theory, literature, and best practices
 - *Collaboration.* Description of the degree and focus of the community partner's involvement in framing, implementing, evaluating, and dissemination the activity
 - *Methods.* Choice of goals and methods, including specific linkages to scholarship and practice literature
 - *Results.* Outcomes and impacts of the activity, including perspectives on what the graduate student and community members learned throughout the process
3. Reflection on engagement
 - *Criticality.* Critical examination of the engagement experience based upon multiple sources of evidence, including personal reflection and outside perspectives; expression of what went well, what could be improved, what went poorly, including evidence and suggestions for improved future practice
 - *Identity and cultural context.* Thoughtful consideration and reframing of your own background, experience, race, class, privilege, and other differences and consideration of how these have affected your engagement experience
 - *Change.* Acknowledgement of changes that took place during the engagement experience and description of how those changes necessitated adjustments or adaptations

- *Multiple perspectives.* Inclusion of community, faculty mentor, scholarly, and practice perspectives in reflective critique
 - *Future.* Discussion of how your experience in the Graduate Certification has changed or shaped your ideas about future community engaged scholarship and career choices
4. Up-to-date resume or curriculum vitae
 5. Other supporting materials

Potential Supporting Materials to Include in Engagement Portfolio

Graduate student-generated materials:

- Career statement
- Engaged teaching philosophy statement
- Engaged research philosophy statement
- Descriptions of community collaboration techniques—rationales and results
- Case studies of community agencies, neighborhoods, or projects
- Reflections on steps taken to improve engagement processes
- Journal or field book entries
- Reflections on steps taken to improve scholarly aspects of engagement
- Reports, journal articles, publications, presentations about engaged scholarship

Materials generated collaboratively (scholarly and community partners):

- Diagrams of collaborative processes
- Charts of accomplishments
- Memos that demonstrate process and communication
- Meeting minutes that document process of engagement
- Chronological tables or graphs that illustrate process and results
- Agendas from community meetings
- Curriculum or content from community trainings

Recognition by others:

- Newspaper reports
- Magazine features
- Radio or TV stories
- Web sites
- Videos
- Photographs
- Awards or honors received

Materials from community members:

- Needs assessments
- Results from surveys of clients, community partners, other stakeholders
- Letters of support or testimonial letters from community partners
- Recommendations from community partners
- Formative evaluations
- Impact evaluations
- Community publications or presentations about the engaged activity

Materials from undergraduate students involved in graduate student supervised service-learning or community-based learning experiences:

- Syllabi from service-learning classes or activities
- Curriculum or content from community meetings
- Undergraduate student evaluations of graduate student supervision or performance
- Portfolios of student work
- Undergraduate student publications or presentations about the engaged activity
- Pre/post test scores
- Other learning assessments
- Written comments from student participants
- Interview data from students after activity

APPENDIX A. RESOURCES FOR COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARS

MSU Campus Resources

Office of the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement outreach.msu.edu/

The Office of the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement (UOE) fosters MSU's land grant mission by connecting university knowledge with community knowledge in mutually beneficial ways. UOE provides resources to assist academic departments, centers and institutes, and MSU Extension on priority issues of concern to society by encouraging, supporting, and collaborating with MSU faculty and academic staff to generate, apply, transmit and preserve knowledge.

This scholarship focus is applied to a broad range of community-defined needs, with special focus on children, youth, and families; community and economic development; the technology-human interface; and community health and well-being.

Within these contexts, UOE also engages in research designed to demonstrate the disciplinary and inter-disciplinary impact of engaged scholarship and on faculty work and university-community partnerships.

In all of its work, UOE emphasizes university-community partnerships that are collaborative, participatory, empowering, systemic, transformative, and anchored in scholarship.

Materials available at UOE's Web site include the following.

The Engaged Scholar Magazine, E-Newsletter, and Speaker Series

- *The Engaged Scholar Magazine* focuses on collaborative partnerships between Michigan State University and its external constituents—partnerships forged for mutual benefit and learning, with an emphasis on research. Available from engagedscholar.msu.edu/.
- *The Engaged Scholar E-Newsletter* is a quarterly supplement to the ES Magazine. The more frequent publication schedule allows for timely updates about upcoming events, partnership and other announcements. Available from engagedscholar.msu.edu/.
- *The Engaged Scholar Speaker Series* brings nationally renowned experts and leaders to MSU to discuss the theory and practice of community-engaged scholarship with faculty and graduate students, and through public forums that are typically recorded and Web-

streamed. Archived presentations are available from the National Center for the Study of University Engagement, ncsue.msu.edu/esss/.

Other Documents

In recent years MSU has taken the lead in fostering a national discussion about what it means for an institution to meet its responsibilities, both to both the public and to scholarship, through engagement. The UOE “Documents” page (outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp) contains descriptions of and links to the online versions of publications and documents the University has contributed to this discussion.

- Fitzgerald, H. E., Zimmerman, D. L., et al. (2005, July). *Carnegie Reclassification Pilot Study: Michigan State University Response*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (www.carnegiefoundation.org), as part of an overall revision of its university classification system, has created a new “Community Engagement” classification that allows higher education institutions the option to describe and represent their engagement work. In 2005, MSU and 12 other colleges and universities helped to develop a set of indicators and a framework for the classification. Dr. Fitzgerald, the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement, and Dr. Zimmerman, the Director for the National Center for the Study of University Engagement, represented MSU in this pilot project and are the primary authors of the MSU report.
- Michigan State University. (2006). *HLC/NCA Re-Accreditation Self Studies at MSU: Criterion Five – Engagement and Service*. East Lansing: Author. MSU is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (HLC/NCA) of Colleges and Schools (ncahigherlearningcommission.org/). Every ten years the University voluntarily undergoes an institution-wide accreditation review, one component of which is a self-study report for the evaluation committee. Every unit on campus contributes to the re-accreditation self-study. To maintain its accreditation the University must provide evidence-based assessment of five criteria, and must demonstrate that it is using those assessment outcomes for continuing improvement. Criterion 5 of the self-study addresses engagement and service. The report from the latest review, in 2005, indicates that MSU has fulfilled all requirements for its 10-year re-accreditation.

In addition to drafting the chapter on engagement and service, UOE prepared guidelines to help unit administrators respond to Criterion 5. These tools and techniques, which are also available from the UOE “Documents” page, include a checklist for compliance, a constituent analysis guide, and a guide to building constituent relationships.

- Provost’s Committee on University Outreach. (1993). *University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. This landmark 1993 report articulates an intellectual foundation for engagement and

makes recommendations for further strengthening university engagement at MSU. The report's two major sections define dimensions and strategic directions for strengthening the University's outreach efforts. Content and audience are discussed in the Preface, which also includes an overview of the history and status of engagement at Michigan State. A postscript briefly envisions university outreach for the twenty-first century.

- Fear, F. A. (Ed.). (1994, July). *Background papers to "University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society."* East Lansing: Michigan State University.

A companion to the 1993 report, this volume contains background material that was not included in the 1993 final report to the Provost's Office. Although this material was not officially published, it provides additional depth and breadth to the 1993 report.

- Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, rev. 2000). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning and evaluating quality outreach.* East Lansing: Michigan State University.

With *Points of Distinction*, a faculty group at Michigan State University has developed helpful tools to assist academic units, faculty, and the higher education community plan, monitor, evaluate, and reward engagement efforts. Published in 1996 and revised in 2000, the three sections of this 50-page guidebook assist academic units in planning and evaluating the outreach enterprise; individual faculty members in planning and evaluating their outreach efforts; and project investigators in evaluating outreach projects. A four-page matrix describes the dimensions of quality engagement—significance, context, scholarship, and impact. An appendix includes tools for defining engagement, unit planning and priority setting, rewarding quality engagement, evaluating unit engagement, developing a faculty engagement portfolio, and evaluating individual engagement.

- Josephs, M. J., & Zimmerman, D. L. (Eds.). (1996). *Fulfilling higher education's covenant with society: The emerging outreach agenda. Summary of the Capstone Symposium of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation – MSU Lifelong Education Grant.* East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of the Vice Provost for University Outreach. In 1988, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation awarded MSU a \$10.2 million grant to help support an institution-wide realignment process aimed at broadening, strengthening, and more fully integrating engagement as a primary mission of each of its major academic units. In October 1995 the University celebrated the completion of the grant with a capstone symposium focused on institutional strategies to strengthen and integrate engagement, sharing what MSU had learned as well as learning from similar efforts at other universities. *Fulfilling Higher Education's Covenant with Society* was published in 1996 as both an archival repository of the symposium and a reference tool to promote continued dialogue about and development of higher education's engagement agenda. Rather than providing full text of the symposium's sessions, the 186-page document offers short summaries organized into topical sections, along with a prologue, epilogue, and appendices.

Michigan State University Extension

msue.msu.edu/portal/

Since its beginning, Michigan State University Extension (MSUE) has focused on bringing knowledge-based educational programs to the people of the state to improve their lives and communities. Today, county-based staff members, in concert with on-campus faculty members, serve every county with programming focused on agriculture and natural resources; children, youth and families; and community and economic development.

Today's problems are very complex. Solutions require the expertise of numerous disciplines and the collaboration of many partners. Operating synergistically with the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station (maes.msu.edu) and other MSU units, MSUE extends the University's knowledge resources to all Michigan citizens and assists them in meeting their learning needs through a variety of educational strategies, technologies and collaborative arrangements. MSUE helps people improve their lives through an educational process that applies knowledge to critical issues, needs and opportunities.

National Resources

National Conferences

- National Outreach Scholarship Conference
www.georgiacenter.uga.edu/conferences/outreach_conference/
- International Research Conference on Service-Learning and Community Engagement
www.researchslce.org/Files/Conference_Sites/2009Conference/Conference_Main.html
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Annual Conference
www.ccpb.info/

Professional Organizations and Associations

- International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE)
www.researchslce.org/
- Campus Compact
www.compact.org/
www.compact.org/state/list (for list of state Campus Compact offices)
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
www.ccpb.info/

Learning Opportunities for Graduate Students

- Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop
(in association with the National Outreach Scholarship Conference)
ncsue.msu.edu/eesw/
- PAGE Fellows Program
(in association with the Imagining America annual conference)
pageia.com/
- Graduate Student Network and Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop
(in association with the IARSLCE annual conference)
www.researchslce.org/Files/Public_Site/About_Us_Files/aboutus.html#GSN
- Annual Professional Development Institute for Service and Service Learning Staff
(Campus Compact Professional Development Institute)
www.compact.org/initiatives/csd_institute/

Awards for Graduate Students and Early Career Faculty

- Dissertation Award and Early Career Research Award (both IARSLCE)
www.researchslce.org/Files/Public_Site/Conference_Awards_Files/conferences.html

Awards for Engaged Scholarship

- Thomas Ehrlich Civically Engaged Faculty Award (Campus Compact)
www.compact.org/awards/ehrich/
- Ernest A. Lynton Award for the Scholarship of Engagement (NERCHE)
www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=26&Itemid=68
- Annual Award for Distinguished Research (IARSLCE)
www.researchslce.org/Files/Public_Site/Conference_Awards_Files/conferences.html
- Leadership Award for Campus and Community Engagement (Campus Compact)
www.compact.org/awards/leadership/

Web Sites

American Association of Higher Education
www.aahe.org

American Democracy Project (AASCU)
www.aascu.org/programs/adp/default.htm

American Political Science Association
Civic Education Resources
www.apsanet.org/section_245.cfm

Center for the Advancement of
Collaborative Strategies in Health's
Partnership Assessment Tool
www.partnershiptool.net

Center for Civic Education
www.civiced.org/

Center for Democracy and Citizenship (at
the University of Minnesota)
www.publicwork.org/

Center for Information and Research on
Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)
www.civicyouth.org/

Center for Liberal Education and Civic
Engagement
www.aacu.org/civic_engagement/index.cfm

Character Education and Civic Engagement
technical Assistance Center (CETAC)
www.cetac.org/

Civic Learning Assessment Database
www.ecs.org/qna/splash_new.asp

The Civic Mind
www.civicmind.com/

Civic Mission of Schools, by CIRCLE (The
Center for Information and Research on
Civic Learning and Engagement) and
Carnegie Corporation of New York
www.civicmissionofschools.org

Civic Practices Network
www.cpn.org

CivicReflection.org
www.civicreflection.org/

Civics, Service, and History Links (from the
National Service-Learning Clearinghouse)
www.servicelearning.org/nslc/csh_links/index.php

CIVNET
www.civnet.org/

Close Up Foundation
www.closeup.org/

Community College National Center for
Community Engagement
www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement

Community College Survey of Student
Engagement (CCSSE)
www.ccsse.org/

Constitutional Rights Foundation
www.crf-usa.org/

Constitutional Rights Foundation – Chicago
www.crfc.org/

The Content of Our Character Project
www.contentofourcharacter.org/data/index.htm

Defining the Engaged Campus
www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/defining.html

The Kettering Foundation
www.kettering.org/

Learning In Deed
www.servicelearningcommission.org

National Service-Learning Clearinghouse
www.servicelearning.org

National Service Resource Center
www.nationalservice.org/resources/epicenter

Michigan Journal of Community Service
Learning
www.umich.edu/~mjcsl

Paul Loeb's Soul of a Citizen
www.soulofacitizen.org

The Scholarship of Engagement Online
www.scholarshipofengagement.org

National Survey of Student Engagement
www.indiana.edu/%7ensse/

Office of University Partnerships – U.S.
Department of Housing and Urban
Development
www.oup.org

Outreach Scholarship
www.outreachscholarship.org

Project Pericles
www.projectpericles.org/

The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in
America
www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguaro/

Service-Learning and Civic Engagement
National Research Directory (from UC
Berkeley)
gse.berkeley.edu/research/slrdc/resdirectory/

The Society for College and University
Planning
www.scup.org for the town/gown listserv

Sustainable Communities Network: Civic
Engagement Resources
www.sustainable.org/creating/civic.html

University of Washington Center for
Communication and Civic Engagement
depts.washington.edu/ccce/

Engagement Portfolio Resources

Clearinghouse and National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement
schoe.coe.uga.edu/evaluation/evaluation_criteria.html

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis. (1997, April 25). *Indiana University Faculty Service Fellows Program: Strategic Direction Project on Defining, Documenting, and Evaluating Professional Service – Report from first year of a three year project*. Indianapolis: Author.

Jordan, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion, and tenure package*. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-engaged scholarship for health collaborative, community-campus partnerships for health.
depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CES_RPT_Package.pdf

Klomprens, K. & Johston, K. (2008). *MSU Certificate in College Teaching*.
grad.msu.edu/all/cctguide.pdf

Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, rev. 2000). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning and evaluating quality outreach*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: http://outreach.msu.edu/documents/pod_2009ed.pdf

Seifer, S. D. (2007). *Making the best case for community-engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure review: Appendix E*. hsc.unm.edu/som/fcm/cpr/events/Seifer-Ap-E-CBPR.pdf

APPENDIX B. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, G., Chickering, A., Clark, M. A., Eyler, J., Ivel, H., Lazarus, F., Morton, K., & Zlotkowski, E. (1998). Foundations of experiential education. *NSEE Quarterly*, 23, 18-22.
- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.
- Ayers, G. E., & Ray, D. B. (Eds.). (1996). *Service-learning: Listening to different voices*. Fairfax, VA: The College Fund/UNCF.
- Barber, B. R., & Battistoni, R. M. (1993). *Education for democracy*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Becker, T. L., & Couto, R. A. (1996). *Teaching democracy by being democratic*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Berger-Kaye, C. (2004). *The complete guide to service learning: Proven, practical ways to engage students in civic responsibility, academic curriculum, and social action*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing, Inc.
- Berry, H. A., & Chisholm, L. A. (1992). *How to serve and learn abroad effectively: Students tell students*. New York, NY: Partnership for Service-Learning.
- Berson, J. S. (1994). A marriage made in heaven: Community colleges and service learning. *Community College Journal*, 64, 14-19.
- Bjorhovde, P. O. (2002). *Creating tomorrow's philanthropists: Curriculum development for youth*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, 1, 11-20.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bringle, R. G. et. al. (1999). *Colleges and universities as citizens*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bringle, R. G., Phillips, M. A., & Hudson, M. (2004). *The measure of service learning: Research scales to assess student experiences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Brodsky, R. M. (2003). Service-learning as it relates to the attainment of employability skills for adolescents in Maryland. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 14, 3.
- Butin, D. W (2005). *Service-learning in higher education*. New York, NY: Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Cha, S., & Rothman, M. (1993). *Service matters: A sourcebook for community service in higher education*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Chibucos, T. R., & Lerner, R. M. (Eds) (1999). *Serving children and families through community-university partnerships: Success stories*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Chuppa-Cornell, K., & Schnick, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Small miracles: Service learning essays, 1997-1998*. Chandler, AZ: Chandler-Gilbert Community College.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Coles, R. (1993). *The call of service: A witness to idealism*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, Rev. 2000). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning & evaluating quality outreach* East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Connors, K., & Seifer, S. D. (Eds) (1998). *Partnership perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.
- Cooper, D. (2004). Education for democracy: A conversation in two keys. *Higher Education Exchange* (pp. 30-43). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation. Available from: www.kettering.org/media_room/periodicals/higher_education_exchange.
- Council on Foundations (1994). *A grantmaker's guide to national and community service*. Washington, DC: COF.
- Curtler, H. M. (2001). *Recalling education*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books.
- Daynes, G., & Wygant, S. (2003). Service-learning as a pathway to civic engagement: A comparative study. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 14, 3.
- DeVitis, J. L., Johns, R. W., & Simpson, D. J. (1998). *To serve and learn: The spirit of community in liberal education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Driscoll, A., Lynton, E. A., Gelmon, S., Holland, B., Kerrigan, S., Longley, M. J., & Spring, A. (1997). *Assessing the impact of service learning: A workbook of strategies and methods*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Ellis, J., & Noyes, H. (1990). *By the people: A history of Americans as volunteers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Environmental Protection Agency. (2002, September). *Service-learning: Education beyond the classroom*. Washington, DC: Author. Available: www.epa.gov/osw/education/pdf/svclearn.pdf.

- Exley, R. J. (1998). *Service learning and curricular integration*. AACC Service Learning Resource Guide. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Exley, R. J., & Johnson, D. (Eds) (1998). *Teachers of life—learners for life: Faculty stories in service learning from Miami-Dade Community College*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Community College.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, Jr., D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, J., Giles, Jr., D. E., & Schmiede, A. (1996). *A practitioner's guide to reflection in service-learning: Student voices and reflections*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Fraser, H. (2005). Four different approaches to community participation. *Community Development Journal*, 40, 286-300.
- Galura, J., Howard, J., Waterhouse, D., & Ross, R. (Eds) (1995). *Praxis III: Voices in dialogue*. Ann Arbor, MI: OSCL Press.
- Giles, D., Eyler, J. & Schmiede, A. (Eds.). (1996). *A practitioner's guide to reflection in service learning*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Gilson, J., & Ottenritter, N. (1999). The service learning journal: Writing to learn. *AACC Service Learning Resource Guide*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Goldsmith, S. (1995). *Journal reflection: A resource guide for community service leaders and educators engaged in service learning*. Washington, DC: American Alliance for Rights & Responsibilities.
- Gray, M. J., Ondaatje, E. H., & Zakaras, L. (1999). *Combining service and learning in higher education: Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America Higher Education program*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Harkavy, I., & Benson, L. (1998). De-Platonizing and democratizing education as the bases of service learning. *Service learning: Pedagogy and research*, 11-19.
- Heffner, G. G., & Beversluis, C. D. (2002). *Commitment and connection: Service-learning and Christian higher education*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4, 37-43.
- Holland, B. A. (2002). Private and public institutional views of civic engagement and the urban mission. *Metropolitan Universities* 131, 11-21.
- Holland, B. A., & Gelmon, S. (1998). The state of the “engaged campus”: What have we learned about building and sustaining university-community partnership? *AAHE Bulletin* 51, 3-6.
- Hollander, E., & Saltmarsh, J. (2000). The engaged university. *Academe* 86, 29-31.
- Howard, J. (2001). *Service-learning course design workbook*. Ann Arbor, MI: OSCL Press.
- Jacoby, B. et. al. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jacoby, B. et. al. (2003). *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Kaufman, J. (2002). *For the common good: American civic life and the golden age of fraternity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (2001, January). *Returning to our roots: Executive summaries of the reports of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges*. New York/Washington: Association of Public and Land-grant Universities. Available from:
www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=305.
- Kendall, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Education.
- Kenny, M., Brabeck, K., Simon, L., & Lerner, R. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service-learning*. Norwell, MI: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kerrigan, S., Gelmon, S., & Spring, A. (2003). The community as classroom: Multiple perspectives on student learning. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 14, 3.
- Kozeracki, C. A. (2000). ERIC review: Service learning in the community college. *Community College Review*, 27, 54-70.
- Kramer, M., & Weiner, S. S. (1994). *Dialogues for diversity: community and ethnicity on campus*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.
- Kupiec, T. Y. (Ed.). (1993). *Rethinking tradition: Integrating service with academic study on college campuses*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Langseth, M., Plater, W. M., & Dillon, S. (2004). *Public work and the academy: An academic administrator's guide to civic engagement and service-learning*. Bolton, MA: Anker Pub.
- Lankard Brown, B. (1998). *Service learning: More than community service*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education ED421640.
- Lappe, F. M., & Du Bois, P.M. (1994). *The quickening of America: Rebuilding our nation, remaking our lives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, L. (1997). *Civic literacy, service learning, and community renewal*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges ED405913.
- Lisman, C. D. (1998). *Toward a civil society: Civic literacy and service learning*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Lisman, C. D. (1999). Integrating reflection on ethical issues to promote civic responsibility. *AACC Service Learning Resource Guide*. Washington DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Loeb, P. R. (2001) Against apathy: Role models for engagement. *Academe*, 87, 42-47.

- Lynton, E. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Markus, G. B., Howard, J. P. F., & King, D. C. (1993). Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15*, 410-419.
- Maurrasse, D. J. (2001). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCroskey, J., & Einbinder, S. D. (1998). *Universities and communities: Remaking professional and inter-professional education for the next century*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- McGoldrick, K. M., & Ziegert, A. L. (2002). *Putting the invisible hand to work: Concepts and models for service-learning in economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- McMahon, E. R. (2002). *Democratic institution performance: Research and policy perspectives*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing.
- McTighe Musil, C. (2003, Spring). Education for citizenship. *Peer Review, 5*(3), 4-8. Available from: www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-sp03/index.cfm.
- Morgan, W., & Streb, M. J. (2003). First, do no harm: Student ownership and service-learning. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 14*, 3.
- Myers-Lipton, S. J. (2003). Developing a service-learning minor: Its impact and lessons for the future. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 14*, 3.
- National Center for Education Statistics (1998). *Community service activities following high school*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Educational Resources Information Center.
- Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic phoenix: Reinventing political activism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Northwest Service Academy. (n.d.). *Reflection toolkit*. Portland, OR: Metro Center.
- O'Grady, C. R. (Ed.). (2000). *Integrating service-learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Oates, K., & Leavitt, L. H. (2003). *Service-learning and learning communities: Tools for integrations and assessment*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Office of Policy and Urban Development, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (1999). *Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program: Colleges and universities in service to their communities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Office of University Partnerships, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2000). *Colleges and communities – Gateway to the American dream: The state of the Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Office of University Partnerships. (2003). *Minority-serving institutions of higher education: Developing partnerships to revitalize communities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Available from: www.oup.org/publications/oup_pubs.asp.

- Okie, A., & Wiggins, M. (1997). *Into the field: mobilizing students to work with farmworkers on campuses and in communities*. Durham, Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Educational Resources Information Center.
- Olszewski, W., & Bussler, D. (1993). *Learning to serve, serving to learn: A view from higher education*. Mankato, MN: Minnesota State University.
- Ottenritter, N., & Lisman, C. D. (1998). Weaving service learning into the fabric of your college. *NSEE Quarterly*, 23, 10-11, 26-28.
- Parsons, M. H., & Lisman, C. D. (Eds.). (1996). Promoting community renewal through civic literacy and service learning. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 93. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Prentice, M. (2002). Institutionalizing service learning in community colleges. *AACC Research Briefs*. Washington DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Princeton Review (2005). *Colleges with a conscience: 81 great schools with outstanding community involvement*. New York, NY: Princeton Review.
- Quigley, C. N. (2003, May). Promoting civic education. Presented at the White House Forum on American History, Civics, and Service, Washington, DC. Calabasas, CA/Washington, DC: Center for Civic Education. Available from: www.civiced.org/index.php?page=papers_speeches
- Raybuck, J. (1996). *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.
- Raybuck, J. (1997). *Expanding boundaries: Building civic responsibility within higher education*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.
- Rhoads, R. A., & Howard, J. P. F. (1998). *Academic service learning: Pedagogy of action and reflection*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rich, B. (2003). Ethical issues and questions for service-learning faculty and administrators in urban universities. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 14, 3.
- Robinson, C. (2002). *Real world research* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Robinson, G. (1998). Best practices in service learning: Building a national community college network, 1994-1997. *AACC Project Briefs*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Robinson, G. (2000). Creating sustainable service learning programs: Lessons learned from the Horizons Project, 1997-2000. *AACC Project Briefs*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Robinson, G. (2001). Community colleges broadening horizons through service learning, 2000-2003. *AACC Project Briefs*. Washington DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Robinson, G., & Barnett, L. (1996). Service learning and community colleges: Where we are. *AACC Survey Reports*. Washington DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Root, S., Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (2003). The Bonner Scholars Program: A study of the impact of stipends on indicators of a community service ethic. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 14, 3.

- Sandmann, L. R., Foster-Fishman, P.G., Lloyd, J., Rauhe, W., & Rosaen, C. (2000). Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change*, 32, 44-52.
- Schine, J. (1997). *Service learning*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Seidman, A., & Tremper, C. (1994). *Legal issues for service-learning programs: A community service brief*. Washington DC: Nonprofit Risk Management Center.
- Seifer, S. D., & Connors, K. M. (Eds) (1997). *Community-campus partnerships for health: A guide for developing community-responsive models in health professions education*. San Francisco, CA: UCSF Center for the Health Professions.
- Shenk, G. E., & Takacs, D. (2002). History and civic participation: An example of the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Perspectives*, 40, 4. Available from: www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2002/0204/0204teach2.htm
- Sigmon, R. L. (1994). *Linking service with learning*. Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.
- Sigmon, R. L., et. al. (1996). *Journey to service-learning: Experiences from independent liberal arts colleges and universities*. Washington DC: Council of Independent Colleges.
- Silcox, H. C. (1993). *A how-to guide to reflection: Adding cognitive learning to community service programs*. Philadelphia, PA: Brighton Press.
- Simon, L. A., Kenny, M., Brabeck, K., & Lerner, R. M. (2002). *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service-learning*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sirianni, C., & Friedland, L. (2001). *Civic innovation in America: Community empowerment, public policy, and the movement for civic renewal*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Skocpol, T., & Fiorina, M. (1999). *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Spikes, W. F. (1995). *Workplace learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stanczykiewicz, B. (2003). *Engaging youth in philanthropy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stevens, C. S. (2003). Unrecognized roots of service-learning in African American social thought and action, 1890-1930. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 25-34.
- Waldorf, D., et. al. (Eds.). (1973). *The university and the city: Eight cases of involvement*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. Washington, DC: George Washington University. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education ED480469.
- Warren, M. R. (2001). *Dry bones rattling: Community building to revitalize American democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Welch, M., & Billig, S. H. (2004). *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Westacott, B. M., & Hegeman, C. R. (Eds) (1996). *Service learning in elder care: A resource manual*. Albany, NY: Foundation for Long Term Care.

- Willette, Z., Magevney, M., & Mann, L. (1994). *Curriculum-based alternative breaks*. Nashville, TN: Break Away: The Alternative Break Connection.
- Williams, T. T. (2004, July/August). Engagement. *Orion Online*. Available from: www.orionmagazine.org/index.php/articles/article/143.
- Zlotkowski, E. (1998). *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2001). Mapping the new terrain: Service-learning across the disciplines. *Change*, 33, 25-33.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2002). *Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic engagement*. Columbus, SC: University of South Carolina, National Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Zlotkowski, E. (Ed.). (1997-2000). *AAHE's series on service-learning in the disciplines*. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Zlotkowski, E., & Williams, D. (2003, Spring). The faculty role in civic engagement. *Peer Review*, 5, 9-11. Available from: www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-sp03/index.cfm.

APPENDIX C. GLOSSARY OF COMMON ENGAGEMENT TERMS

Audience

See Stakeholder

Clinical service

[e.g., MSU Clinical Center – providing psychological counseling services to at-risk youth and families]

Collaborate

To work jointly with others on a project. Those collaborating with others take on specified tasks within the project and share responsibility for its ultimate success. Preferable to the term “cooperate,” which implies a lead group with primary project management responsibilities and others who support and implement project goals (a less equitable relationship).

Community

The collective group of individuals and organizations with common interests and objectives, external to the university, with whom (or a subset of whom) the university collaborates in engagement. Successful engagement projects blur the distinctions between the university and the external community. Indeed, in engagement the university strives to project an image that it is part of the community. Nevertheless, in the sense of the university as an institution and employer, it is often important to recognize that there are university interests that are distinct from those of the community.

Conference, seminar, or workshop

A set of training events, often live, presented by an expert to those with varying degrees of knowledge (e.g., MSU Extension workshops on communication strategies for non-profit organizations).

Constituent

See Stakeholder

Consulting

[e.g., Statistical expert consults with non-profit organization on how to manage and analyze their membership rates]

Context

As one of the four fundamental characteristics of an engagement project, “context” carries with it the active sense of “contextualize.” Responsible planners will gather as much information, expertise, and experience as possible to adequately assess the situation into which an “intervention” is planned. An engagement project with the potential for success has recognized, as fully as necessary, the broad and complex context within which it would be situated and how it would alter the lives of people it touched, trying to optimize the potential benefits and to avoid unnecessary dangers and risks. Embedded in our responsibility to assess

the extent of our effect on context is the expectation of a multidisciplinary, multi-resource approach to planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Contract course or program

A contract course is designed for a specific audience and evolves from a documented agreement between the University and an outside entity. Unlike conventional courses for which tuition payments are made by individuals, contract courses are paid for on a group basis, usually by the entity whose employees are course participants.

Cross-disciplinary approach

One of the fundamental engagement values, based on an inclusive, multi-resource approach to problem-solving. Although a term of the academy, “discipline” should be viewed broadly to include practices and professions as well as scholarly disciplines, as defined by scholarly associations and journals. A cross-disciplinary approach assumes that professionals are working collaboratively as a team as they assemble disciplinary and practical expertise and apply appropriate, yet various, ways of looking at the issues. As a term, “cross-disciplinary” tries to avoid the association with superficiality, a criticism often leveled against “interdisciplinary” approaches, and the concern that little synthesis or interaction among scholars occurs in a “multidisciplinary” approach.

Deliverable

Tangible product of a project or services provided, usually those that have been negotiated, planned in advance; often generating income for the developers. Important objects in outcomes assessment.

Demonstration project

The action or process of showing the existence of truth of something by giving proof or evidence (www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O999-demonstration.html).

Disciplinary approach

See cross-disciplinary approach

Education – Continuing

(1) An instructional program that brings participants up to date in a particular area of knowledge or skills. (2) Instructional courses designed especially for part-time adult students (e.g., teaching practical course at flexible times that allow mid-career professions to advance their education).

Education – Distance education and off-campus instruction

As defined by Michael Moore, then director of the American Center for the Study of Distance Education, Penn State: “Distance education is planned learning that normally occurs in a different place from teaching and as a result requires special techniques of course design, special instructional techniques, special methods of communication by electronic and other technology, as well as special organizational and administrative arrangements.” From *Distance Education: A Systems View*, co-authored by Greg Kearsley, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1996).

Engagement

At Michigan State University, engagement is “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).

Exhibition/performance

The showing of art works in a public place; a collection of things for public display. The act of performing or the state of being performed (www.thefreedictionary.com/performance).
Examples: MSU Museum, Wharton Center.

Expert testimony

[e.g., Expert on juvenile justice provides testimony on racial discrimination of traffic stopping practices of the Michigan State Police]

Impact

Those effects (products, insights, and new practices), resulting from an engagement project, that lead to significant changes in the way people are able to live their personal and professional lives. Impacts can result from anticipated outcomes, as seen in project planning, or in the inevitable, unanticipated outcomes that have eventuated during the project. Impacts can be positive, neutral, or negative, and it is important that the project document impacts in ways that will assist in future planning in both the professional and practical world.

Indicator

In the evaluation of engagement, indicators provide evidence of quality. An indicator in its own right does not imply quality; evaluators must judge the value and efficacy of the indicators presented to them. Quantitative indicators, for example, may measure quality if value is embedded in them. Without embedded value, however raw numbers are meaningless as a measure of quality. Narrative reports by stakeholders and project directors are important indicators of quality, which are subject to critical review by the evaluators for credibility and the strength of argument and supportive documentation.

Issue

A matter of public or professional concern or interest. An issue often provides the motivation for initiating an engagement project. Avoid the term “problem” wherever possible, because engagement is not fundamentally a “problem-solving” exercise. While an issue may be viewed as a problem by the stakeholders, filling a need or responding to an opportunity to enhance the quality of life may better describe the goal of an engagement project.

Managed learning environment

A public educational venue for specialized learning about culture, the arts, and the sciences (e.g., a museum, library, garden, gallery, or exhibition).

Multidisciplinary Approach

See Cross-Disciplinary Approach

Needs assessment/evaluation

Evaluation is an applied inquiry process for collecting and synthesizing evidence that culminates in conclusions about the state of affairs, value, merit, worth, significance, or quality of a program, product, person, policy, proposal, or plan. Needs assessment is a process or a systematic set of procedures undertaken for the purpose of setting priorities and making decisions about program or organizational improvement or allocation of resources (Encyclopedia of Evaluation).

New business venture

[e.g., A group of chemists develops a line of research that result in products that have a high commercial potential and falls outside of traditional university-based research. They form a chemistry-tech business with affiliations with the University]

Outcome

See Impact

Outreach

MSU defines engagement as “a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. Outreach involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions” (*University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society*, 1993, p. 1). Please note, however, the discussion of “audience” under “stakeholder.”

Participatory curriculum development

The aim is to development a curriculum from the interchanges of experience and information between the various stakeholders in the education and training programme. PCD seeks to identify all the stakeholder, including educationalists, researchers, policy makers, extensionists, and farmers. It seeks to involve them in the construction of the curriculum—the full curriculum, including not just the subject matter being taught but also the experiences and activities which the learners engage in during the course. It seeks to explore with them, collectively or individually, their views about the desired learning objectives and the processes intended to bring about the achievement of those objectives. Rather than belonging to a small select group of experts, the process of curriculum development now involves as many of the stakeholders as possible. Most important, a top-down structure will disappear.

Partner

See Stakeholder

Partnership

See Project

Project

The general term used to designate any one of the variety of engagement activities undertaken by the university. These include lecture series, off-campus courses, broad-service partnerships, community interventions with specific goals in mind, extended consulting arrangements, etc. A project can be a set of activities sponsored by on individual; it can also consist of a number of activities that serve a common purpose and are overseen by a common leadership group. As the basis of engagement evaluation in this guidebook, the project should be sufficiently significant to merit evaluation but not so complex that the evaluation results are of little practical use to participants. Projects involve planning, consultation, implementation, a set of desired outcomes, and evaluation. When encountering the term “project,” interpret the surrounding discussion to refer to the specific type of engagement activity that is being planned or evaluated.

Research – And knowledge transfer

Within a modern, knowledge driven economy, knowledge transfer is about transferring good ideas, research results and skills between universities, other research organizations, business

and the wider community to enable innovative new products and services to be developed (www.ost.gov.uk).

Research – Applied

Refers to scientific study and research that seeks to solve practical problems. Applied research is used to find solutions to everyday problems, cure illness, and develop innovative technologies. Example: conducting developmental research to improve Early Head Start programs (psychology.about.com/od/aindex/g/appres.htm).

Research – Community-based

Takes place in community settings and involves community members in the design and implementation of research projects. Such activities should demonstrate respect for the contributions of success which are made by community partners as well as respect for the principle of “doing no harm” to the communities involved (comm-org.wisc.edu/sif/page.php?5). Example: Working with a church group to develop a community resource center for teen mothers.

Research – Contractual

To enter into by contract; establish or settle by formal agreement (www.answers.com/topic/contract). Example: contractual work for U.S. Navy on best personality types for submarine crew.

Scholarship

Scholarship is a term of the academy. Similar activities in the community may go by other names. Scholarship is the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge. Within higher education, the activity is based in the ideas and methods of recognized disciplines, professions and interdisciplinary fields. Scholarship is deeply informed by the most recent knowledge in the field and carried out with intelligent openness to new information, debate and criticism. If it is to be recognized, utilized, and rewarded, it goes without saying that scholarly activity must be shared with receptive groups in appropriate ways. Publication in scholarly journals or by respected presses, or presentation at professional forums are the traditional means of dissemination in the disciplines and professions. However, these may not be the most appropriate or the only means of sharing scholarship in an engagement context. Active presentation or utilization in practice, the reflection of scholarly findings in public policy, appearance of results in the media, electronic reporting of results on the World Wide Web, the updating of syllabi, and so forth, may better reach those nonacademic groups for whom the scholarship is most useful or who have been co-engaged in generating it. The quality of scholarly activity, as valued by the academy, may be measured by qualified professionals regardless of the form taken by its dissemination. In addition, evaluators should consider how the scholarly activity has been shared and the extent to which that communication has effectively reached those potentially affected by its findings.

Service-learning

Service-learning is a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities (www.servicelearning.org/what_is_service-learning/service-learning_is/index.php). Example: MSU Center for Service-Learning and

Civic Engagement providing opportunities for students to volunteer and gain experiential learning through placements in community organizations.

Significance

A fundamental characteristic and qualitative measure of an engagement project. The relative significance of a project is a critical factor in the initial decision whether or not to invest scarce resources to address it. In an era of increasing demand and expanding responsibilities for university faculty, the significance of our activities must be reexamined. Significance is often an matter of perception and affirmed through persuasive argument. Is the issue found in current public, political, or professional discourse, in the media? What documentation support the urgency with which the issue should be addressed? Is the issue found in a unit's list of priorities?

Stakeholder

The general term used designate all external and internal individuals or groups who care about the project, who have an interest in seeing that it succeeds. The term implies consultation, that the stakeholders have had some input in project design, implementation, evaluation. Thus it is stronger than the more neutral term, "constituent." All stakeholders may not have equal responsibility for the project or share fully in its design, but usually some financial or resource contribution to the project has been made. They have bought in to the project in a meaningful way. We try to avoid the terms "audience" and "target audience" since they imply passive receiving of goods and services, those for whom a project is intended, the primary beneficiaries. A "partner" is a type of stakeholder who is actively associating on an equal footing with other groups. Partners share central responsibilities for the project. The disadvantage in using this term is that it tends to depersonalize and set a business or goal-orientation tone to the engagement project.

Study abroad program

"We want all MSU students to have opportunities and experiences that contribute to becoming global citizens," said Jeffrey Riedinger, dean of International Studies and Programs. "Today it is not only important to know about what goes on in the world, but also to develop an appreciation and understanding of different cultures. Our study abroad programs and recruitment of international students strive to do just that."

Target audience

See Stakeholder

Technical assistance

May take forms such as instruction, skills training, working knowledge, consulting services, and may also involve the transfer of technical data; has a basis in science/scholarship.

Translational scholarship

Publications, presentations, and Web sites co-created by scholars and community partners for consumption at both scholarly and community venues.

Unit

An academic department, school, institute, center or similar structural organization with administrative leadership and stated goals and objectives (the mission).

APPENDIX D.
**LIST OF JOURNALS THAT PUBLISH SCHOLARLY OUTREACH
AND ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP**

Community Engaged Scholarship and the Scholarship of Engagement

Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement
epress.lib.uts.edu.au/ojs/index.php/ijcre

Principal contact: Pauline O'Loughlin, e-mail: Pauline.Oloughlin@uts.edu
On-line journal. Peer reviewed. One volume per year.

Journal for Civic Commitment

www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/index.shtml

Principal contact: Gary Daynes, e-mail: gdaynes@westminstercollege.edu
On-line journal. Reviewed. Two volumes per year. Deadlines July 30 and December 30.

Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education

www1.indstate.edu/jcehe/

Principal contact: Nancy Brattain Rogers, e-mail: nancyrogers@indstate.edu
On-line journal. Double-blind, peer reviewed. On-going acceptance of papers.

Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship

www.jces.ua.edu/

Principal contact: Cassandra Simon, e-mail: csimon@sw.ua.edu
Print journal. Blind, peer reviewed. On-going acceptance of papers. On-line submission.

Journal of Community Practice

www.acosa.org/jcpwhat.html

Principal contact: Ana H. Santiago, e-mail: jcp@acosa.org
Print journal. On-going acceptance of papers.

Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement

www.uga.edu/ihe/jheoe/about.html

Principal contact: Melvin B. Hill, e-mail: mbhill@uga.edu
Print journal. Peer reviewed. Four volumes per year. Deadlines: Jan. 1, April 1, July 1, Oct. 1.

Manifestations: Journal of Community Engaged Research and Learning Partnerships

www.uga.edu/ihe/jheoe/about.html

Principal contact: Peter Levesque, e-mail: pnlevesque@gmail.com
On-line journal. Peer reviewed. Themed editions, each with own submission deadline.

Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning

www.umich.edu/~mjcs/

Principal contact: Jeffrey Howard e-mail: jphoward@umich.edu
Print journal. Peer reviewed. Two vols. per year. Intent by Dec. 20. If invited, paper in March.

Other Journals that Publish Community Engaged Scholarship

Academe Online	Community Schools Online
Academic Exchange Extra	Community Works Online
Academic Exchange Quarterly	Community, Work, & Family
Academic Leader	Compact Current
Academic Medicine	Comparative Education Review
Academy of Management Learning and Education Journal	Concepts and Transformations: International Journal of Action Research and Organizational Renewal
Accounting and the Public Interest	Connect for Kids Weekly
Action Research	Counselor Education and Supervision
Active Learning in Higher Education	Curriculum Inquiry
Administration and Society	Economic Development Quarterly
Adolescence	Education and Behavioral Statistics
Advances in Service-Learning Research: Volumes 1-7	Education and Urban Society
American Behavioral Scientist	Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis
American Educational Research Journal	Education for Health: Change in Learning and Practice
American Journal of Community Psychology	Education Week
American Journal of Education	Education, Citizenship and Social Justice
American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education	Education, The Digest
American Sociologist	Educational Leadership
Applied Developmental Science	Educational Policy
Around the CIRCLE Newsletter	Educational Psychology Review
Art Education	Educational Researcher
Arts and Activities	Elementary School Journal, The
Assessment in Experimental Education	Equity & Excellence in Education
Business Communication Quarterly	Evaluation Exchange, The
Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning	Field Methods
Chemical Educator	Florida Journal of Service-Learning in Teacher Education (FASITE)
CIRCLE Working Paper Series	Gifted Child Quarterly
Citizen Studies	Harvard Educational Review
Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research	High School Journal, The
College Composition and Communication	Higher Education Perspectives
College Student Journal	Higher Education Policy
College Teaching	Hispania-A Journal Devoted to the Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese
Community College Journal of Research and Practice	Human Organization
Community Development Journal	Human Relations
	Human Rights Quarterly

Innovative Higher Education
 International Journal for Service Learning
 and Engineering
 International Journal of Education and the
 Arts
 International Journal of Teaching and
 Learning in Higher Education
 Intervention in School and Clinic
 Journal of Adolescence
 Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
 Journal of Adolescent Research
 Journal of American History
 Journal of Business Education
 Journal of Career Development
 Journal of Children and Poverty
 Journal of Civic Commitment
 Journal of Civic Engagement
 Journal of Classroom Instruction
 Journal of College and Character
 Journal of College Student Development
 Journal of Community Practice
 Journal of Community Psychology
 Journal of Community Work and
 Development
 Journal of Continuing Education
 Journal of Curriculum Studies
 Journal of Democracy
 Journal of Early Adolescence
 Journal of Excellence in Teaching
 Journal of Experiential Education
 Journal of General Education
 Journal of Geography
 Journal of Health Education
 Journal of Higher Education
 Journal of Interprofessional Care
 Journal of Latinos and Education
 Journal of Moral Education
 Journal of Multicultural Counseling and
 Development
 Journal of Planning Education and Research
 Journal of Public Affairs
 Journal of Public Service and Outreach
 Journal of Qualitative Research
 Journal of Research in Character Education
 Journal of Rural and Community
 Development
 Journal of Social Issues
 Journal of Social Work Education
 Journal of Statistics Education
 Journal of Studies in International Education
 Journal of Teacher Education
 Journal of the American Planning
 Association
 Journal of Urban Affairs
 Journal of Youth and Adolescence
 Journal of Youth Development: Bridging
 Research and Practice
 Learn and Serve Wisconsin
 Liberal Education
 Metropolitan Universities
 Music Educators Journal
 NASPA Journal: The Journal of Student
 Affairs Administration, Research, and
 Practice
 National Service News
 National Society of Experiential Education
 Quarterly
 New Directions for Higher Education
 New Directions in Institutional Research
 Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
 Partnership Matters
 Pen Weekly NewsBlast
 Perspectives in Education
 Phi Delta Kappan
 Planning for Higher Education
 Political Science
 Progress in Community Health Partnerships:
 Research, Education, and Action
 PS: Political Science and Politics
 Public Administration Review
 Reflection on Community-Based Writing
 Instruction
 Reflections
 Research in Higher Education
 Review of Educational Research
 Review of Higher Education
 SERVENet News
 Service-Learning Advances
 Social Justice
 Social Policy Report
 Social Science Quarterly
 Social Studies

Sociological Imagination
Synergy E-Newsletter
Teaching and Teacher Education
Teaching of Psychology
Teaching Sociology
The Generator: A Journal for Service-
Learning and Youth Leadership
The Tutor Newsletter
Theory and Research in Social Education
Theory into Practice

Universities and Community Schools
Urban Affairs
Urban Affairs Quarterly
Urban Affairs Review
Urban Education
Urban Review
Urban Studies
Voluntary Action
Voluntas
Youth & Society

APPENDIX E.
FORMS AND CHECKLISTS

APPLICATION FORM
Graduate Certification in Community Engagement

Contact Information

Last Name/First Name: _____	Student Number: _____
Degree Sought: _____	Expected Graduation Date: _____
Department: _____	Office Address: _____
Home/Cell Phone: _____	E-mail: _____
Local Address: _____	
GC Chair Name: _____	Chair Address: _____
Chair Phone: _____	Chair E-mail: _____

Application Materials

Check if each required element of the application is included in this application packet:

<input type="checkbox"/> Application Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Statement of Interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Resume or CV
<input type="checkbox"/> GC Chair Letter of Support	<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Program Plan	

Requirements

Core Competencies

Check either UOE Seminar (Column 1) or Approved Alternative (Column 2) to indicate how you plan to master each core competency.

1. Engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement
2. Co-building effective partnerships
3. Capacity building for mutual benefit
4. Community based participatory research
5. Confirming agreement among partners & community: logic models
6. Evaluating engagement partnerships
7. Ethics of engaged scholarship

UOE Seminar	Approved Alternative

Mentored Community Engagement Experience

On a separate page, describe the plan for your mentored community engagement experience. Include focus of experience (engaged research, engaged teaching, or engaged service), name of community partner, name of faculty mentor, semester it will take place, and details about the scholarly aspect of the experience.

Signatures

	Signature: _____	Type or Print Name: _____	Date: _____
Student:	_____	_____	_____
GC Chair:	_____	_____	_____
UOE:	_____	_____	_____

Once approved by UOE, signed copies go to the student, the GC chairperson, the graduate secretary for department, and UOE. The Registrar's office is also contacted to enroll student in certification.

**ACCEPTANCE EVALUATION SHEET [INTERNAL TO UOE]
Graduate Certification in Community Engagement**

Date Received at UOE: _____ Student Number: _____
Last Name/First Name: _____
Degree and Program: _____
Evaluator: _____ Date Review Due: _____

Decision

Evaluator to check admit, pending, or decline based on criteria for acceptance. Note conditions, if any. Return application and this evaluation sheet to Diane Doberneck by review due date.

- Admit
- Pending (if application materials are missing, approved alternative forms pending, or UOE needs to arrange for mentored community engaged experience)
- Decline (note reason for decline)

Criteria for Acceptance

Evaluator to check if these criteria are met in the application form.

Core Competencies

- Specified either UOE Seminar or Approved Alternative
- If approved alternatives, please complete forms describing them (attached)

Mentored Community Engagement Experience

- Form of engagement: Research Teaching Service
- Community partner specified
- Faculty mentor specified
- Semester specified
- Scholarly aspect of experience described in detail
- Applicant needs UOE to arrange mentored community engagement experience

Statement of Interest

- Reason for Grad. Certification in Community Engagement described clearly
- Reason for mentored community engagement experience described clearly
- Connection to professional and career goals explained clearly
- Coincides with learning emphasis reflected in graduate program plan

GC Chair Support

- Letter of support included
- GC chair's signature on Application Form

Evaluator Comments or Suggestions:

Official Use

Accept or decline date: _____
Notification letter sent to student and GC Chair: _____
Official contact made at Registrar's Office: _____

REQUEST TO APPROVE ALTERNATIVES TO UOE SEMINARS
Graduate Certification in Community Engagement

Student to complete and sign top of form. GC chairperson to sign it. Student to submit form to UOE.

Date: _____ Student Number: _____
 Last Name/First Name: _____
 Degree and Program: _____

Check the core competency for which you are requesting an approved alternative in the column on the left and name the proposed alternative in the column on the right.

Core Competency	Proposed Alternative
_____ Engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement	_____
_____ Co-building effective partnerships	_____
_____ Capacity-building for mutual benefit	_____
_____ Community-based participatory research	_____
_____ Confirming agreement among partners (logic models)	_____
_____ Evaluating engaged partnerships	_____
_____ Ethics of engaged scholarship	_____

Attach an explanation of how the proposed alternative meets the learning objects of the core competence. Refer to the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement Handbook, if needed. If the proposed alternative is a university course, please include copy of the syllabus, required readings, assignments, and evaluations.

Signatures

	Signature:	Type or Print Name:	Date:
Student:	_____	_____	_____
GC Chair:	_____	_____	_____
UOE:	_____	_____	_____

UOE Review and Decisions

Evaluator to approve or decline changes. Note conditions, if any. Return materials and this evaluation sheet to Diane Doberneck by the review due date.

Date Received at UOE: _____	UOE Evaluator: _____	Date Review Due: _____
-----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------

_____ Approve alternative _____ Decline alternative (note reason for decline below):

Official Use

Approve or decline date: _____
 Notification letter sent to student and GC chair: _____

CHANGES TO APPROVED PLAN
Graduate Certification in Community Engagement

Student to complete and sign top of form. GC Chairperson to sign it. Student to submit form to UOE.

Date: _____ Student Number: _____
Last Name/First Name: _____
Degree and Program: _____

Specify proposed change to your plan for the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement.

Original Plan:	Proposed Change:
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Provide a rationale for each of the proposed changes. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Signatures

	Signature:	Type or Print Name:	Date:
Student:	_____	_____	_____
GC Chair:	_____	_____	_____
UOE:	_____	_____	_____

UOE Review

Date Received at UOE:	UOE Evaluator:	Date Review Due:
_____	_____	_____

Decision

Evaluator to check approve or decline changes. Note conditions, if any. Return application and this evaluation sheet to Diane Doberneck by review due date.

_____ Approve alternative _____ Decline alternative (note reason for decline):

Official Use

Approve or decline date: _____
Notification letter sent to student and GC chair: _____

GRADUATE CERTIFICATION FINAL MATERIALS CHECKLIST
Graduate Certification in Community Engagement

Student to complete and sign this checklist as the cover sheet for the engagement portfolio submitted to UOE.

Date: _____ Student Number: _____
 Last Name/First Name: _____
 Degree and Program: _____

Requirements

_____ **Core Competencies**

Check either UOE Seminar (Column 1) or Approved Alternative (Column 2) to indicate how have mastered each core competency.

1. Engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement
2. Co-building effective partnerships
3. Capacity-building for mutual benefit
4. Community-based participatory research
5. Confirming agreement among partners (logic models)
6. Evaluating engaged partnerships
7. Ethics of engaged scholarship

UOE Seminar	Approved Alternative

_____ **Mentored Community Engagement Experience**

In 2-3 sentences, describe your mentored community engagement experience.

_____ **Reflection**

_____ **Engagement Portfolio**

- _____ Abstract
- _____ Narrative
- _____ Reflective statement
- _____ Assignments from core competency seminars
- _____ Documentation of mentored community engagement experience
- _____ Updated resume or curriculum vitae
- _____ Other supporting materials

Signatures

	Signature:	Type or Print Name:	Date:
Student:	_____	_____	_____
GC Chair:	_____	_____	_____
UOE:	_____	_____	_____

**FINAL CERTIFICATION COMPLETION CHECKLIST [INTERNAL USE]
Graduate Certification in Community Engagement**

Date Received at UOE: _____ Student Number: _____
Last Name/First Name: _____
Degree and Program: _____
Evaluator: _____ Date Review Due: _____

Decision

Evaluator to check admit, pending, or decline based on criteria for acceptance. Note conditions, if any. Return application and this evaluation sheet to Diane Doberneck by review due date.

- _____ Approve final certification
- _____ Send materials back for one revision (if application is strong, but missing a key element)
- _____ Decline final certification. Reason for decline: _____

Criteria for Final Certification

Evaluator to check if these criteria are met in the engagement portfolio.

Core Competencies or Approved Alternatives

- ___ 1. Engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement
- ___ 2. Co-building effective partnerships
- ___ 3. Capacity-building for mutual benefit
- ___ 4. Community-based participatory research
- ___ 5. Confirming agreement among partners (logic models)
- ___ 6. Evaluating engaged partnerships
- ___ 7. Ethics of engaged scholarship
- ___ *If any are approved alternatives, be certain approval was made in advance.*

Mentored Community Engagement Experience

- ___ Was engaged scholarship, not simply clerical work in a community setting
- ___ Met the minimum time requirements (2 hours/week for 15 weeks = 60 hours)
- ___ Student reflection on experience
- ___ Feedback or evaluations from faculty mentor
- ___ Feedback or evaluation from community partner
- ___ Evidence student learned skills for collaborating with community partners

Engagement Portfolio

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|
| ___ Abstract | ___ Core Competency Assignments | ___ Resume or CV |
| ___ Narrative | ___ Documentation of mentored engagement experience | ___ Supporting materials |
| ___ Reflection | | |

Official Use

Approve, send back, or decline date: _____
Notification letter sent to student and GC Chair: _____
Official contact made at Registrar's Office: _____