

REWARDING
COMMUNITY-
ENGAGED
SCHOLARSHIP:

TRANSFORMING UNIVERSITY
POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Community Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices

Leonzo Barreno, Patricia W. Elliott,
Ijeoma Madueke and Dominique Sarny

Research Report prepared for the

Faculty Assessment Workgroup
Rewarding Community Engaged Scholarship:
Transforming University Policies and Practices

University of Regina
September 2013

Rewarding Community Engaged Scholarship: Transforming University Policies and Practices (CES Partnership)

Faculty Assessment Workgroup Members

Marc Arnal, Dean, Campus St Jean, University of Alberta

Stephen Bornstein, Professor, Political Science and Director, Centre of Applied Health Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland

Angeline Dubois, Coordonnatrice, Centre canadien de recherche sur les francophonies en milieu minoritaire (CRFM), Institut français, Université de Regina

Patricia W. Elliott, Assistant Professor and Director of the Community Research Unit, Faculty of Arts, University of Regina

Leslee Francis-Pelton, Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instructions and President, Faculty Association, University of Victoria

Sandy LeFort, Director, School of Nursing, Memorial University of Newfoundland

Rhonda Lenton, Associate Vice-President Academic and Vice Provost, York University

Linda McMullen, Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan

Gayle Rutherford, Associate Dean and Associate Professor, School of Nursing, University of Calgary

Dominique Sarny, Directeur, Centre de recherche sur les francophonies en milieu minoritaires (CRFM), Institut français, Université de Regina

Christine Walsh, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary

Peter Wolf, Director, Open Learning and Educational Support, University of Guelph.

Research Supervisors

Patricia W. Elliott and Dominique Sarny

Researchers

Leonzo Barreno and Ijeoma Madueke

Community Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices

Abstract

Across Canada, universities and other post-secondary institutions are grappling with promises and challenges of community engaged scholarship (CES). Spurred by a combination of new funding incentives and a general call for greater public accountability and relevance, university administrators have increasingly adopted the language of community engagement in their speeches and mission statements in recent years (Randall, 2010, p. 262). For many scholars who have been actively involved in community-rooted teaching, research and public service, or who would like to do this type of academic work, this is a very welcome development indeed. However, growing expectations of community engagement have not yet been fully matched by a growth in institutional supports for community-engaged scholarship, including professional recognition. This research report provides a review of policies and practices at selected Canadian universities regarding CES recognition in tenure and promotion policies and practices. It finds that although CES is unevenly represented in written documents, Canada enjoys a rich ground of practice and experience upon which to build improved policies.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	5
2.	Document Review – Introduction.....	12
	Nipissing University.....	15
	University of Saskatchewan	17
	University of Guelph.....	18
	Memorial University of Newfoundland.....	21
	University of Alberta.....	24
	Campus St. Jean.....	25
	University of Victoria.....	27
	University of Regina.....	28
	l’institut français.....	29
	University of Calgary	30
	Simon Fraser University.....	32
	University of Manitoba.....	34
	Brandon University.....	35
	Cape Breton University.....	36
	Université de Moncton.....	37
	Université du Quebec à Montreal...	37
	University of Toronto.....	38
	Concordia University	39
3.	Qualitative Inquiry.....	41
4.	Recommendations.....	74
5.	Draft criteria rubric.....	82
6.	References.....	84

Community Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices

Introduction

Across Canada, universities and other post-secondary institutions are grappling with promises and challenges of community engaged scholarship (CES). Spurred by a combination of new funding incentives and a general call for greater public accountability and relevance, Canadian university administrators have increasingly adopted the language of community engagement in their speeches and mission statements in recent years (Randall, 2010). For many scholars who have been actively involved in community-rooted teaching, research and public service, or who would like to do this type of academic work, this is a very welcome development indeed. However, growing expectations of community engagement have not yet been fully matched by a growth in institutional supports for community-engaged scholarship.

Recognizing this conundrum, in May 2010 the University of Guelph and the Campus-Community Partnership for Health issued a call to form a national partnership dedicated to analyzing the state of CES in Canadian universities, with a view to making recommendations for improvements. Among the respondents, eight universities and one national organization were selected to join the partnership. With the support of their highest administrative levels, the partners pledged to “work together to change university culture, policies and practices in order to recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship” (Daly, 2010, p. 4). The partners – Memorial University of Newfoundland, University of Alberta, University of Calgary, University of Guelph, University of Regina,

University of Saskatchewan, University of Victoria, York University and Community-Campus Partnerships for Health – agreed to pursue the following objectives:

- (a) Establish a learning community around institutional change strategies, policies and practices that support and advance community-engaged scholarship;
- (b) Ensure that university tenure and promotion policies and practices recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship;
- (c) Implement and evaluate innovative mechanisms for developing community-engaged faculty; and
- (d) Establish a vibrant, sustainable network of universities that support and advance community-engaged scholarship.

This paper is intended to help address Objective B: tenure and promotion policies. Several U.S.-based studies have identified lack of professional recognition for CES as a key barrier to building the community-engaged university in several U.S.-based studies. For example, a 2007 examination of obstacles to community engagement carried out by the Center for Urban and Environmental Solutions found:

The obstacle to engaged-community research most frequently mentioned is the typical reward system, which puts the highest value on individual in-depth, theory-based research that expands knowledge within a specific field. In that system, the often more interdisciplinary, collaborative, and real-world applied character of engaged-community research, where a specific problem is the primary focus, is looked down upon or not considered when it comes to determining tenure and promotion. (Scott, 2007, p. 9)

The result, the Center observed, is that there are few incentives for faculty to pursue CES, particularly among non-tenured faculty, who are under pressure to produce more

traditional scholarly work, such as journal articles, as the main foundation of their future tenure applications (p. 9).

While to date there have been few studies of the Canadian situation, what studies there are – including this one – support the general statement that formal mechanisms of recognition, such as collective agreements and tenure and promotion policies, are generally lacking in specific supportive language. A review of Canadian faculty collective agreements by Randall (2010) found that, while 23 of 39 university collective agreements (49%) use the word ‘community’ in some way in faculty evaluation, the overwhelming emphasis was on community service within one’s academic community (sitting on journal boards and professional associations, for example), or community service voluntarism outside the university. Scant recognition is paid to community engagement as an established research practice that may form the core of one’s academic work. The study further noted:

Finally, language in Collective Agreements does not necessarily translate directly into practice. Especially when review committees evaluate faculty colleagues, criteria for tenure, promotion and merit are interpreted through the filters of their own experiences and the cultural values held by the Departments and their respective disciplines, including what constitutes intellectual value. (Randall, 2010, p. 20)

This finding suggests that improved tenure and promotion policies must be connected to overarching cultural change. This paper is therefore nested within related CES Partnership studies that include examination of broad institutional change and scholar development, as well as the task of building supportive networks and resources in Canada (see www.cescholarship.ca).

Community members who work with community-engaged faculty members recognize the importance changing university cultures to foster greater engagement,

including improved faculty recognition and support. In the words of one community-based health worker:

Instead of being promoted for all the hard work, planning, implementation, evaluation, and re-planning, my academic partners have been ignored, except by their community partners, all of which have gladly sent letters to be part of any promotion process or committee. (Freeman, Gust & Aloschen, 2009, p. 89)

The lack of professional recognition negatively impacts community partners, reducing the scholar's ability to gain funding for community research. It also threatens the scholar's long-term employment and, therefore, long-term involvement in the community:

The community has made an "investment" in them. We have neither time nor resources to begin starting over each time. The work is not just project-based. The model in which the work is conducted is just as important. Faculty members that are engaged in community-based, scholarly work understand the essential purpose: social change and work for the common good is being put into place both within and outside of the academy. (Freeman, Gust & Aloschen, 2009, p. 89)

These community perspectives lift tenure and promotion policies from individual professional concern to broad public concern, in keeping with the CES Partnership's overarching goal "to realize the potential of universities to improve the quality of life for all Canadians through CES" (Daly, 2010, p. 6).

About the research

To lead the examination of promotion and tenure, the Partnership formed a Faculty Assessment Work Group, comprised of representatives of each of the participating institutions. Our work was guided by the following questions:

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

To this end, in 2012 the Faculty Assessment Work Group embarked on two related studies. The first involved a review of written documents at Canadian universities, based on the following keywords:

- Community engagement
- Engaged scholarship/scholarship of engagement/ citizenship
- Community engaged teaching/community engaged outreach, engaged citizen
- Public service
- Engaged research/engaging communities
- Scholarship of discovery, integration, application and translation
- Applied scholarship
- Innovative community learning
- Community-based research

As the study was conducted, additional terms were discovered and added to the keyword search, including:

- Extra university work and public service
- Academic service
- Supplementary professional service
- Outside professional activity
- Collective service
- Creative professional activity

In total, the documents of 16 universities and 3 colleges and institutes were examined, through a combination of purposeful sampling and snowball effect. Details of participant selection and examination methods are contained in the report that follows.

The purpose of the first study was to establish a picture of where CES stands at select Canadian universities in terms of tenure and promotion, as evidenced by written policies and documents. It was our hope that helpful examples would be uncovered that

could be shared with other universities. However, the Working Group members were aware that language may be disconnected from practice. Therefore, it was necessary to conduct a second qualitative study that would look more deeply and specifically at how selected community-engaged scholars understand and experience their work within their respective institutions. In the second phase, the researchers checked the reality of written documents via follow-up interviews with faculty members and university administrators. In the interviews, the research assistants sought identification of barriers and successes regarding the implementation of supportive language where it existed. Neither study was intended to be exhaustive, but rather to develop greater knowledge and understanding of the Canadian landscape *vis a vis* this topic, which has not previously been the subject of close study in this country.

Key Findings

Our document review found that, from a general point of view, the language of CES does not play a very significant role in the collective agreements and faculty assessment policies of the majority of the universities reviewed. The language that was uncovered revealed a rather fractured understanding of core concepts, a tendency to mix community-based research with voluntarism, and highly uneven application of standards and expectations across the country. While on the surface this is a disappointing finding for CES advocates, our subsequent qualitative review offered a more hopeful landscape. In depth interviews revealed that Canadian academics have a long and active history of CES, and that the core features of CES practice are relatively consistent across institutions. In other words, the fragmented and uneven understandings and definitions

expressed in written policies are less evident in on-the-ground practice. As well, we found faculty members struggle for professional recognition, but also enjoy many positive experiences to buoy their research, whether in the community or within their institutions. Their experiences provide rich grounding for the development of institutional policies that, while unique to each campus and community setting, are capable of sharing core principles recognizable across the nation. To this end, we have developed an implementation handbook, available at www.cescholarship.ca.

Much lively discussion arose among our Work Group members as we reviewed and prepared the information gathered, and not all of our questions were resolved. For example, will the act of formalizing and institutionalizing CES serve to undermine some of its more organic, altruistic qualities, as some of our qualitative interviews suggested? Are community projects to be subjected to peer review and, if so, who are the peers and what is the review process? How broadly should CES be interpreted, in terms of types of partnerships invited and its social intent? How can we ensure the action component of community-based research is understood and accepted, particularly when it raises social tension and public debate? How universally acceptable will our suggested signposts and yardsticks be to performance review committees? How can we best move our work from research to action? The Faculty Assessment Work Group members are well aware we have only scratched the surface of the emerging topic of CES recognition. It is our hope this research report and the appended handbook will lead to further research, discussion, and action on the important question of how to recognize and reward a field of academic work that is as exciting and well-established as it is misunderstood and under-recognized.

Patricia W. Elliott
September 2013

PART ONE: DOCUMENT REVIEW

Community Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices as Expressed in Written Institutional Documents

Compiled for the CES Faculty Assessment Workshop

Ijeoma Madueke, researcher
Patricia W. Elliott and Dominique Sarny, project supervisors

October 18, 2012

This research reviews the language of the CES at some Canadian universities. In addition to 7 of 8 universities directly participating in the CES partnership, the study was expanded to include a total of 16 universities and 3 colleges and institutes. The additional universities and colleges were selected in consultation with Partnership members, and following a call for suggestions via CES listservs. The goal was to examine policies at universities with a known track record of CES practice. In addition to the collective agreements, some tenure and promotion policy documents were also reviewed, as well as faculty-level policies, guidelines and performance review templates. As well, the researcher scoured general university and faculty websites, on the understanding that some of the language sought may be found in projects, websites and statements beyond the aforementioned documents.

In most cases, the research found collective agreements do not make a precise mention of community engagement scholarship; some merely recognize the essence of the relationship of the university with the community, while some do not place any

specific emphasis on community engagement. Also, there might be general indication of the role of faculty members in community initiatives but there is no evidence of this in the policies and procedures for faculty assessments and evaluation. Consequently, written language does not necessarily provide a precise picture of how community engagement is rewarded in most universities. However from the information gathered, it appears the nature, vision and objectives of some disciplines of study determine if community involvement will be promoted and rewarded. Health research institutions and agricultural faculties, for example, displayed a greater tendency to specifically recognize and seek to reward community engaged scholarship.

From a general point of view, our review found the language of the CES does not play a very significant role in the collective agreements of the majority of the universities reviewed. In some institutions where CES is clearly present, recognition and reward of CES is yet to be incorporated into their collective agreements. The majority of institutions reviewed do not have specific units dedicated to fostering and promoting CES, as exemplified by the University of Victoria's Office of Community-Based Research, which provides guidelines for incorporating CES into tenure and promotion policies (University of Victoria, nd.). Such units might devise strategies for the recognition and reward of CES that would be incorporated into collective agreements, policies and guidelines of the university.

Finally, for perhaps a uniform method of inclusion and encouragement of the CES in collective agreements, we suggest that universities should target a redefinition of the basic duties and assessment criteria of academic staff for the purpose of promotion and evaluation. These redefinitions would incorporate into each of them an explicit projection

of community engaged scholarship and works in the community. It is our hope that this review will contribute to the process by moving beyond pointing out deficiencies (which are readily apparent), and toward providing some examples of existing language and CES signposts (however limited they may be in their current forms) as potential starting points to build on within our institutions.

How the work is organized

A summary of the document(s) for each university is provided, with the researcher's comments at the end of each finding or at the tail end of the entire work on a particular university. Direct quotations from documents are so noted.

Institutions reviewed, in order of appearance:

1. Nipissing University (NU)
2. University of Saskatchewan (U of S)
3. University of Guelph (U of Guelph)
4. Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN)
5. University of Alberta (U of A)
6. Campus St. Jean
7. University of Victoria (UVIC)
8. University of Regina and affiliated colleges: Champion College, First Nations University, Luther College
9. l'institut français (U of R)
10. University of Calgary (U of C)
11. Simon Fraser University (SFU)
12. University of Manitoba (Umanitoba)
13. Brandon University (Brandon U)
14. University of Winnipeg (U of W)
15. Cape Breton University (CBU)
16. Université de Moncton (UMoncton)
17. Université du Quebec à Montreal (UQAM)
18. University of Toronto (U of T)
19. Concordia University (Concordia)

Terminologies

The language of community engagement varies from one institution to the other. Our objective was to examine any information that might relate to the objectives of the CES.

Thus we explored the following key words:

- Extra university work and public service (U of S)
- Academic service (MUN)
- Supplementary Professional service SPA (U of A)
- Engaged scholarship/scholarship of engagement/ citizenship (Fac. Of Extension U of A)
- Community engaged teaching/community engaged outreach, engaged citizen (UVIC)
- Outside Professional Activity OPA (U of C), (UManitoba), (U of W)
- Engaged Research/Engaging Communities (SFU)
- Scholarship of discovery, integration, application and translation (Fac. Of science, UManitoba)
- Applied Scholarship (Fac. of Architecture UManitoba)
- Innovative community learning (U of W)
- Community engagement (UMoncton)
- Collective service (Uqam)
- Creative Professional activity CPA (U of T), (Concordia)
- Public service (NU)

1. NIPISSING UNIVERSITY

Document: Standards for Tenure and Promotion Procedures at Nipissing University. Special Joint Committee on Tenure and Promotion. September 18, 2008. Revised January 2010.

The preamble to this document recognizes ‘People and Community’ as a core value of Nipissing University, however the ensuing language speaks to building a strong internal university community rather than to building external university-community relationships. The preamble goes on to state the tenure and promotion process should “embrace the four scholarships of discovery, integration, application, and teaching as

defined by Boyers.” Under this broad framework, four categories of assessment criteria are set out:

1. Academic or professional credentials
2. Teaching effectiveness
3. Research, scholarly and/or creative work
4. Service

Section E describes how each category should be documented and assessed. While the first three categories are accompanied by charts and lists of acceptable evidence, the service category contains a relatively brief narrative describing various types of service “within and outside the university.” The section’s preamble states that faculty members are “expected” to engage in the collegial decision-making process and are “encouraged” to be involved in academic and professional associations, as well as “in some cases, extension work.” Extension work is defined as student recruitment and university promotion. There is no separate mention of public service in the preamble, but in the subsequent definitions of each type of service, it is included under the heading ‘Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies.’ This sub-heading includes a single-sentence statement that public service includes “the faculty member's provision of expertise to the outside community and will be accorded recognition insofar as the activities entail application of expertise associated with the candidate's position in the university.”

Under ‘Application of the Criterion,’ the awarding of tenure and promotion to associate professor call for a record of service to “the wider professional community.” The criterion for full professorship drops the word “professional,” and calls for “a

sustained and satisfactory record of service to Nipissing, the profession and the community.” This presumably might accommodate a wider definition of community, although it is not so stated.

Comment: While the adoption of Boyer’s framework and the mention of public service suggest a well-rounded view of scholarship, from this document we can see these statements do not in themselves guarantee community-engaged scholarship will be a substantial, measurable part of the picture when it comes to assessment criteria and its application.

2. UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Document: The Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Saskatchewan. Second Integrated Plan.

This document shows that there is a strong focus on an effective engagement with communities and that aboriginal involvement and scholarship is strongly encouraged.

The third Integrated Plan seeks to enhance experiential learning and expand opportunities for direct engagement with the communities in research and transformational learning.

Comment: The College of Medicine teaching and research relies heavily on the support of faculty members who live in the communities throughout the province. This is an evidence of effective interaction with the faculty and the community. To prove the point, there is a Community Faculty Page, an initiative created to enhance communications with physicians who teach in clinics and hospitals in Saskatchewan.

Document: Categories for establishing standard of performance, University of Saskatchewan Collective Agreement 2010-2013

The 4th item in this section is research, scholarly and/or artistic work. The 7th item is public service and contributions to academic and professional bodies.

It is mentioned in article 17.2 that there can be an award of special increases to the staff as a result of unique aspects or expectations of the discipline that may be internal or external to the university. It is called **Extra-university work and public service**.

Art.17.2.4

Comment: We conclude in this case that such external work may be rewarded though it is not explicit.

2. UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

Document: University of Guelph collective agreement expiring June 30, 2011.

For any level of promotion, the University of Guelph recognizes among its academic excellence criteria other scholarly achievement within and outside of the university. The most explicit statement is contained in Article 30 of the collective agreement, which addresses the responsibilities of faculty in the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine. In Veterinary Medicine, emphasis is placed on community service, which is accorded the same weight as service activities performed within the university community.

Document: Template for the Development of Assessment Criteria for Community-engaged Scholarship, College of Social and Applied Human Sciences, March 2011.

This document provides definitional language and includes five suggested categories for assessing CES:

- “1. Goals and partnerships: Clear articulation of research goals and a program of activities including statements about the importance of the goals for community partners. Faculty might provide a scholarly rationale of methods used to develop the research, build partnerships and articulate the goals for social change.
2. Use of appropriate scientific methods in process and measurement: Describe the ways that social science and science methodologies have been used to design the research; activities in order to ensure that ethics, data collection, interpretation and results are robust and lead to effective change strategies; Identify success in getting grants or mobilizing community resources toward successful collaborations and social change; Indicate the inclusion of students in experiential learning related to the research; Describe effective research training of community partners (e.g. peer interviewing, writing grant proposals, etc.)
3. Significance of results: Outlines the ways in which the knowledge generation in the research has an impact on the existing literature, the community, social policy, organizations, or processes of change.” This section goes on to describe various possible knowledge dissemination forms, from websites to innovative programs.
4. Assessing impact: In assessing the value of some these products, that may be unfamiliar to some faculty submitting or reviewing portfolios, there are a number of possible strategies.” The list that follows includes peer review of CES academic and community leaders, independent peer review at www.ces4health.info, measures of community impact, and supporting letters from partners.
5. Assessing leadership and reputation: Provide evidence of national or international reputation arising from the work. Indicate how the success of a project has been used in other contexts which have extended the impact of the original work. Provide critical reflections on leadership, outcomes, factors related to success and needs for adjustment.”

3. MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

Document: MUN collective agreements Feb. 26, 2010- August 31, 2013

Without a specific mention of CES, the collective agreement however mentions

academic service, which includes but is not limited to the application of expertise in the community at large.

Document: MUN Strategic Plan 2007-2012

This has five pillars. The first pillar speaks to meeting student needs, while pillars 2 to 5 all make mention of some aspect of community engagement and/or collaborative practices.

2nd pillar: Research, creative activity and scholarship

- “Expand strategic research plan, relevant to provincial and global needs
- Promote collaborative and cross-disciplinary research
- Recognize successful faculty and graduate students especially in their research achievements”

3rd pillar: Needs of the province

- “Bring her expertise to the community
- Encourage rural engagement and research services
- Partner with aboriginal people/community in areas of research and teaching”

4th pillar: Conditions for success

- “Active participation in the international community
- Increase engagement in collaboration” etc.

5th pillar: Implement integrated planning,

- “Develop performance benchmarks for diversity and inclusiveness”

Comment: The pillars, without direct mention of community engaged scholarship, encompasses the work of faculty within the wider community; the last pillar aims at developing performance benchmarks that may facilitate the reward of these community services in the promotion criteria.

4. UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Document: Faculty collective agreement incorporating June 2007 and July 2008 amendments. Amended November 2010

SPA: Supplementary Professional Activity. This includes personal service, private practice of the staff member's profession. However, it is noted that all evaluations are based on teaching, research and service.

Document: The University of Alberta Strategic Plan, 2011-2015

The U of A strategic plan shows that the university aims at connecting with the communities through different ways; e.g. celebrating aboriginal cultures, maintaining an effective relationship with the local francophone community, strengthening international and intercultural perspectives in teaching and learning, producing a team of globally engaged students and scholars who are aware of pertinent global issues, creating more useful collaborative programs and celebrating the presence of international students in the university. The university aims at enhancing its presence in the world at large by promoting international research while establishing mutually beneficial relationship to the communities of Edmonton and Camrose. The Strategic Plan clearly defines the university as a community-engaged university. The university tends to reach its objectives by having dynamic campuses working effectively with the local communities.

Document: Faculty of Extension Tenure and Promotion standards. University of Alberta

The faculty FEC portfolio template was reviewed also. In the career context, there is provision for the academic staff to make known the following:

- Vision as engaged scholar
- Scholarship engagement focus

The part two of the template is entitled 'Activities for the Year.' The staff is required to make known his/her activities in the community context as it relates to his/her work, including:

- Community engagement activities
- Community development programs, both new or existing program

Under the section for external funding received for a research project, it is required to state the community involvement in the research for which a grant is awarded

Comment: This shows that the Faculty of Extension expressly recognizes CES under the monikers 'engaged scholarship' and 'community engagement.'

Document: Faculty of Extension Standards for salary increment, promotion and tenure

Just like the university, the faculty promotes the mandate for university-community engagement. Therefore, staff members are encouraged to insert their scholarly work into community issues. The FEC evaluation committee seeks to develop core values and practices associated with scholarship of engagement. The Faculty values community based research collaborative work/research within and outside the university.

The Faculty of Extension distinguishes between engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement.

Engaged scholarship: is constituted by teaching, research and service that respond to the aspirations and concerns of the community members who are external to the traditional boundaries of the university campuses, excluded by academic disciplines, or without access to funding agencies.

The scholarship of engagement: recasts teaching, research and service as **learning, discovery** and **citizenship**. It is the study of the processes and practices of engagement. Its purposes are to improve these processes and practices.

The evaluation is normally based on the three categories of teaching, research and service. In the document, we noted some important questions that relate to our research:

- Is the staff member's work based on an integral relationship with a community?
- Do teaching and research and service contribute beneficially to the community?

Teaching: Teaching is further explained or extended to include the role of the staff member as community/organizational developer.

Research consists of creating, interpreting and mobilizing knowledge and developing technology in fields of study and practice relevant to adult and continuing education, extension, engaged scholarship and the scholarship of engagement.

Service: Staff members are encouraged to provide services to external communities, establish community links and leadership roles in community-based organizations, promote inclusion and advancement of diverse groups and also show success in getting grants for community services activities.

The case of John Doe

The University of Alberta, Faculty of Extension has manifested the works and rewards of CES in the case of John Doe who is recommended for a merit increment of 4.0 because of his outstanding works in the local and international community.

Comment: Community work in this case is portrayed in what is called **citizenship**.

Community service is promoted and rewarded. The FEC standard shows that the Faculty of Extension is keen on promoting the engagement functions of the University of Alberta with its community partners.

5. CAMPUS SAINT JEAN, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

With the same objectives as the University of Alberta, Campus Saint Jean also emphasizes active relationships with the local, national and international community. The evaluation process recognizes community service activities, including service to the university community and to the civic community. The area of service and citizenship is considered. The document shows that Supplementary Professional Activities (SPA) are also evaluated. Campus Saint Jean provides examples of what are considered SPA. They include employment of a staff member by another employer, e.g. summer session at another university, consulting, personal services contracts, private practice of the staff member's profession etc. The staff member who is involved in SPA shall give pertinent information on the nature of his services in his annual statement on SPA.

6. UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

Document: Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

The Office of Community-Based Research has created a guiding document titled

Recognizing excellence in community-engaged scholarship.

Definition of CES: It involves “discovery, integration or synthesis and application of knowledge in ways that connect it to understanding and solving pressing social, civic and ethical problems or to aesthetic or celebratory projects”.

The UVIC document clearly states that there are many models available presently for recognizing excellence in community engagement in the promotion and tenure guidelines.

Recognizing community engaged scholarship

Tenure and promotion policies recognize CES by:

- Valuing publication of community-based / engaged research directed to academic audiences; evaluation of products by the users, for example: Academic publications, government reports, reports to aboriginal communities, newsletters etc.
- The policies of RPT recognize CES also by appreciating interdisciplinary research of all sorts: basic, applied, community-based research etc.

Community engaged teaching is defined as “transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge within and beyond the classroom setting through teaching, mentoring and other curricular activities that service communities within and outside of the university”.

The **Policies of Promotion and Tenure** (RPT) recognize community engagement teaching by:

- Appreciating not only classroom teaching but also all types of mentoring, and knowledge transmission activities: workshops, seminars, presentation etc.
- Recognizing achievements in the reformation of teaching curricula to accommodate community and university-community training opportunities.

Service to the university-community and other professionally related service is generally recognized in the current faculty evaluations and then should also be recognized with other services connected with the local community.

Community Engaged Outreach includes activities that contribute to the resolution of problems or issues in the society (locally, nationally and internationally) promising innovations as well as literary, aesthetic or celebratory activities.

Excellence in outreach is called to make a core part of the faculty member's responsibilities and it is highlighted that there should be a separate category for evaluating these responsibilities itself. The RPT will in this case value:

- The involvement of the faculty in social problem local and internationally
- Recognize actions that enrich artistic and cultural life of a community
- Value knowledge transfer activities that enhance the use of research based knowledge outside the university.

Comment: The language of CES can be seen in what the University of Victoria chooses to call **engaged citizen, civic engagement**.

- We noticed that the UVIC did a redefinition of the basic criteria for tenure and promotion, inserting them into community outreach

- The works and the rewards of the CES are spelled out and should serve as emulation for institutions that are yet to develop their policies regarding the rewards of CES.

7. UNIVERSITY OF REGINA

The collective agreements of the University of Regina and the affiliated colleges Champion College, Luther College and the First Nations University of Canada show recognition of teaching, research and service. The collective agreement of the First Nations University shows language specifically relating to community service and interaction. It indicates an emphasis on community work. The faculty members maintain in their work a relationship with the community of First Nations and Métis people and thus, get to know the needs of the community. They are encouraged also to maintain a relationship with First Nations Elders, who in turn hold seats on the board of directors of the university.

Document: U OF R Faculty of Arts Strategic Plan 2010-2014

This document shows the existence of **CRU Community Research Unit**, whose aim is to promote and recognize the many different forms of research and scholarship within the faculty. The coordinator of the CRU is the bridge between the community and faculty members. She reaches out into the community and identifies research needs and ensures that teaching profiles as well as researches undertaken by faculty members are communicated effectively to community organizations.

The **strategic plan** also shows the existence of a **Community Outreach Committee**.

Some of their functions include:

- To revise the criteria document to allow for better assessment of non-peer reviewed research in applications for promotions and tenure.
- Increase the opportunities for community organizations to access expertise of faculty members.

Document: Faculty of Science (U of R) Criteria document.

It is stated that public service contributions may provide partial support for recommendation of merit award in the Faculty of Science.

Also the **Faculty of Fine Arts** recognizes community public service affiliated with academic or professional interest.

8. L'INSTITUT FRANÇAIS (U OF R)

Document: Criteria for reviewing performance

In this document, it is explicitly stated that l'institute français is charged with the responsibility of community service through university programs, academic university-community research, and university-community initiatives for the Fransaskois community. The Institute is given the mandate to contribute to the development of the Fransaskois. As a result, the institute gives full recognition to high quality scholarship including research and other professional activities conducted with and within communities, especially the francophone community.

9. UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Document: University of Calgary collective agreement July 1, 2011 –June 30, 2013

The University of Calgary recognizes what is called **OPA Outside Professional Activity** (Art. 13.p. 17). It is defined as those activities which the academic staff member performs as a community service unless otherwise contractually arranged with the governors or those for which the academic member may receive remuneration. The Department of Veterinary Medicine has its own policies on OPA. OPA is restricted to the activities related to staff member's academic interests as an employee of the University of Calgary. It is noted that the governors encourage the staff members to get involved in OPA. For the recognition of OPA, the academic staff member who is involved in OPA may include the annual report of OPA in the academic Performance Report to the President.

Document: APT Manual: Appointment Promotion and Tenure Manual U of C

The evaluation is based on teaching, research and service just like other universities. Teaching is not limited to classroom teaching but also the transfer of state-of-art knowledge to persons in government, business, industries and the wider community through the organization and presentation of seminars, workshops etc. Research will be evaluated on the basis of formal review from disciplinary, interdisciplinary and beyond the university community. Service is not limited to the university professional community but to the general community, the province and the nation through the application of scholarly or professional knowledge and expertise.

Comment: The University encourages and recognizes community outreach and knowledge transfer though it is not called community engaged scholarship.

10. SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, VANCOUVER.

Document: Strategic Research Plan (SRP)

Simon Fraser University continues to optimize its strategic research plan. The university has demonstrated interest in interdisciplinary research which is aimed to reinforce the University in its pursuit of excellence: **excellence in research, excellence in teaching, and meaningful engagement with, and contributions to the community, both locally and globally.** This is shown in the third area of the mandate for the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure.

Document: The University Planning Framework 2012

This document shows the vision of the university. SFU's Vision/Mission has three Core Themes:

- Engaging Students
- Engaging Research and
- Engaging Communities

Every year, the framework is reviewed and updated based on SFU's priorities and previous year's performance assessment.

Engaged research:

The university aims at being a global leader in research mobilization by leveraging its fundamental research strengths, including interdisciplinary research, close community connections, and partnerships and collaborations.

Engaging communities:

The university aims at being Canada's most community-engaged research university. It hopes to maintain community connections as an indispensable part of its academic mission, creating opportunities for practical and experiential learning, informing and inspiring its research and contributing to its relevance and success. The university also hopes to maximize its capacities to enhance the societal, economic, environmental and cultural well being of communities both locally and globally, respectful and mutually beneficial community relationships.

Indicators for these include:

- Having community representatives on university boards and committees
- Promoting increased international alumni
- Conducting an annual survey on the public perception of SFU's value to the communities
- Producing participants in outreach programs

COMMENT: We notice that with Simon Fraser, the key words are **engaged research and community engaged Research University.**

Document: Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Review Date: March 1, 2003

Categories of evaluation

At Simon Fraser, a faculty member who is being considered for contract renewal, tenure and/or promotion and for salary review must be evaluated on the basis of their

performance in three key areas of activity: teaching effectiveness; scholarly activity and service to the University, their academic discipline or to **the broader community**.

The area of interest seen in the criteria document lies under the category of service.

Included in this category are the public service contributions which faculty members may make. However, it is noted in the document that there should be a strong focus on the academic content of the contribution by the faculty member.

11. UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Document: Collective Agreement, 2010-2013

In the Collective **Agreement**, 2010-2013, the University of Manitoba recognizes **OPA Outside Professional Activities** of academic staff members. It is stated that members have obligations to the university in administrative works and in public activities intended to maintain liaison between the University and the community. Member may engage in Outside Professional Activity provided this activity represents a contribution to the community which can be made by the member by virtue of his/her training, advanced study or research.

Document: Promotion Criteria

In the Promotion Criteria document, (Art. 20.A.1.2.3, p. 63) under service, the university recognizes the internal and external activities related to research and teaching function of the university, which includes **community service** where the individual is evaluated

based on essential non-remunerative contribution by virtue of special academic or professional competence.

Document: Faculty of Medicine Tenure and Promotion

Under the section for research and scholarly activity, the Faculty of Medicine outlines different kinds of scholarship namely:

Scholarship of discovery: Here collaborative research is mentioned.

Scholarship of integration: Achievement of peer-reviewed funding or research (individual or collaborative) that is directed toward improvement of health care, health services delivery, physician and health professional resource allocations, and the outcome of care in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada or internationally.

Scholarship of application and translation: General improvement of national and international health care etc.

Service and administration include, among other factors, participation and contribution (without remuneration) to external (non-university) community agencies or organizations related to the individual's role at the University. Among other multipurpose evidence that may be demonstrated for consideration during tenure and promotion is significant impact on an external community from outreach activity that also benefits the Faculty of Medicine.

COMMENT: There is no specific mention of engaged-scholarship, however the scholarship of application, of integration, of discovery and of translation describe the activities of CES to a great extent.

Document: Faculty of Architecture Tenure and Promotion guidelines. UManitoba. Endorsed 13th may 2002

Under the section for scholarship, there is what is called **Applied Scholarship**, which is defined as non-remunerative work that draws upon a faculty member's expertise or academic knowledge for the greater welfare of society-at-large. This includes work that requires multiple abilities and expertise to develop new knowledge; train others in areas of expertise through sharing knowledge and problem-solving skills; help build a community's capacity to generate their own solutions; and disseminate knowledge in accessible and useful ways for the general public and other identified groups. (Art. 3.1.)

Comment: This is similar to what is defined as community-engaged scholarship.

12. BRANDON UNIVERSITY, MANITOBA

Document: Collective agreement. April 1, 2008 - March 31, 2011

Service to the University and to the Community (Art. 8.5.1) refers to participation in University, Faculty/Unit, and Departmental Committees; service in professional organizations and community service where the member has made an essential non-remunerative contribution by virtue of special professional competence. It is noted that this criteria is not applicable to all levels of promotions. For promotion to lecturer, professional associate 1, this is **not** required; to be promoted to an assistant professor, **some** evidence of this service is required and for associate professor there **must** be an evidence of successful record of service to the university and the community (Art.8.4.3).

Also the definition of this criterion varies according to the rank of promotion.

For promotions, a record of accomplishment in scholarship or research is also expected.

13. UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

Document: Collective agreement 2010-2013

The university also recognizes **OPA** remunerated and non-remunerated (Art.18)

Also **Service** as a criterion for promotion is extended to service to the community beyond the university, which involves special academic/professional competence that may include, but is not limited to applied research, consultation and technical assistance, instruction and clinical work. (Art. 25.14c).

The University of Winnipeg has approved an innovative community learning policy for the university. U of W President Dr. Lloyd Axworthy in 2009 released a community learning policy paper entitled: *The University and Community Learning: An Evolving Mission*, in which he recognizes that the university must be an active partner in the social, cultural and educational life of the community. At the U of W, there are now some community-learning initiatives like the Experiential Learning Initiatives Network, Community Access Teacher Education Program etc. The policy dated April 1, 2011 defines community learning as the active integration of the university into the social, cultural and educational life of the community. Specifically, community learning according to the document consists of:

- Provision of innovative learning opportunities for various populations.
- The use of resources of the university to analyze and address social economic, cultural and environmental issues in partnership with community
- The cultivation of dynamic relationship between the university and surrounding community.

Comment: Although there is no explicit mention of faculty-community engagement, it is noted that these initiatives are directly linked to the activities of faculty members. It is the faculty member that plays the leading role in the execution of these projects through his or her teaching, research and collaborative works. There may be need for further definition and involvement of academic staff members in the policy.

14. CAPE BRETON UNIVERSITY, SYDNEY NOVA SCOTIA

Document: Collective agreement. Effective July 2009 - June 30, 2013

The university recognizes that research is an essential part of a faculty member's employment duties, responsibilities and professional developments and that basic and applied research should have equal value to society, the academic community and the university. Probation, promotion and tenure decisions are based on the teaching, research and service. Service includes participating in community activities, and activities of professional and academic organizations outside the university, where the faculty member's academic and/or research interests and competencies form the basis for such participation. Faculty members are encouraged and expected to engage in community and professional service and to provide statements of their accomplishments in this area with

their applications (during tenure and promotion assessment). It is up to the candidate to prove the relevance of the material to the assessment process.

15. UNIVERSITÉ DE MONCTON

One of the missions of the university is **community engagement**. The university upholds a strong relation with the community in order to participate in economic, community and cultural activities. Also the university aims to establish relationships that will facilitate an easy transfer of knowledge from the university community to the community at large. Another objective of the University of Moncton is to enhance the development of partnerships in the different sectors of activity in the society

Comment: These objectives demonstrate the university's commitments to the affairs of the community.

16. UNIVERSITÉ DU QUEBEC À MONTREAL

There is the recognition of exceptional work in the community by the award of Doctorat Honoris causa. This is an award given to persons who have shown exceptional accomplishment in the areas of the university professional scientific or artistic career, or accomplishments in the cultural, economic, administrative, artistic, philanthropic or humanitarian activities.

Document: Collective agreement (Convention Collective) to May 31, 2013

The academic member is evaluated according to the three enumerated tasks: teaching (enseignement), research or creation (recherche ou la création) and collective service

(service à la collectivité).

Teaching is defined to include learning and teaching activities realized under international cooperation projects. Research and creation includes basic, applied, and interdisciplinary researches. Collective service includes service within and outside the university (Art. 10.05). These activities outside the universities include volunteer activities, activities within government and international organizations etc. It is emphasized all activities must be in line with the staff academic functions and should constitute no indictment of the university.

Comment: The University of Quebec redefines the duties of the staff member to include activities in the community.

17. UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY

The department has initiatives of community involvement: the Toronto-Addis Ababa project TAPP, an initiative between the Department of Psychiatry University of Toronto and Addis Ababa Ethiopia. The department also has the Strategic Plan 2012- 2017. The plan focuses on engagement with the broad community in articulating the strengths of the department:

- To promote in the community, brain health and full social inclusion of people with mental illness and their families.
- To provide education and quality in collaborative mental health care within and across health professions.

The department also has the Global Mental Health Affairs G.M.A., which collaborates with international academic centres, non-governmental organizations and other local and regional agencies to build mental health research and treatment expertise around the world.

There is the provision for the recognition of such activities mentioned above in the tenure and promotion policies in what is called the **C.P.A: Creative Professional Activities**.

These activities are to be considered as scholarly activities in promotion decisions. There is also the C.P.A template to be filled and submitted by the staff during assessment and promotion.

18. CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

The collective agreement recognizes the C.P.A. Also, in the checklist of performance and evaluation, there is provision for the faculty member to submit additional materials concerning his duties if he so wishes. In the template, there are two columns entitled:

Service to the community: internal

Service to the community: external

Comment: This template gives the academic staff the opportunity to mention his service to the university community and to the external community, however the examples given for the external community service seem not to fall totally into the definition of the CES. There is should be further inclusion of such community services of the CES into the template.

- Document summary prepared by Madueke, I.C.S., Research Assistant

Final note: This document is not exhaustive. We could not study all the faculties and departments in a particular university but the information we have here shows that community engagement is not neglected in universities. There are kernels to build on for the purpose of inserting CES language in collective agreements and T&P documents.

PART TWO: QUALITATIVE INQUIRY

Community Engaged Scholarship:

A Qualitative Inquiry for the Community Engaged Scholarship Partnership

Faculty Assessment Workgroup, January 2013

By Leonzo Barreno and Ijeoma Madueke

Supervising faculty: Patricia W. Elliott and Dominique Sarny

Abstract

During the interviews to develop this paper, talking to academics representing Canadian universities from coast to coast, the authors realized that community engaged scholarship (CES), albeit not defined as such, has been practised in Canada as early as the 1970s.

While CES does not enjoy full administrative and institutional support within most institutions mentioned in this paper, the interviews show that among these professionals there are more similarities than differences when it comes to explaining the meaning of CES, how they use it, what are its components, what level of support (or lack thereof) it has from faculties and universities, the benefits for both university and community and, finally, whether or not their respective institutions had policies and guidelines to abide by when using CES.

The authors would like to thank Sandra LeFort, Director, School of Nursing, Memorial University of Newfoundland; Blair Stonechild, Professor of Indigenous Studies, First Nations University of Canada; Marc Arnal, Doyen et chef de la direction/Dean and Executive Officer, Campus Saint-Jean, University of Alberta; Marc Spooner, professor Faculty of Education, University of Regina; Leslie Brown, professor of Social Work and Associate Dean, Faculty of Human and Social Development, University of Victoria and John Archibald, Dean, Faculty of Humanities, University of Victoria for their time, expertise and insightful comments. We hope to have captured, shaped and disseminated their experiences and opinions in the same exciting and passionate way they see and practice CES.

INTRODUCTION

This paper follows from the first phase of a project which included language in the collective agreements and policies of Canadian universities regarding CES. The objectives of the second phase are:

- To discover working definitions of community engaged scholarship, including informal definitions as described by practitioners;
- To find out if there are cases where CES is used, promoted and evaluated and if such practice has some form of recognition in Canadian or abroad universities (see annexes “A” and “B”).
- To create a document based on interviews with faculty members who are practitioners of CES, to distinguish how the approach works in actual practice in different parts of the country.

An initial guide to our research was *Developing Criteria for Review of Community-Engaged Scholars for Promotion or Tenure* (2006) by Cathy Jordan, chair, Peer Review Workgroup of the Washington-based Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative. The article compressed information from institutions that have been involved in the promotion of CES, the majority being health institutions. The document shows different definitions, criteria for review and documentation for scholarly work. From the article, we noticed that CES is present when the goals and objectives of institutions, colleges or faculties or departments clearly delineate an effective relationship with local communities. Each faculty determines the promotion and implementation of CES, thus allowing different approaches to evolve. Jordan’s document presented approaches singular to each institution studied. However, to discover further definitions of CES, we went beyond institutional definitions to obtain other meanings. Our sources of information included Canadian scholars, organizations and individuals practising and promoting community involvement.

What is community?

The first question we attempted to answer was what is community? We did so because we were convinced that universities are part of an external community or communities. In his book *Community: The Structure of Belonging*, Peter Block (2009) states, “Community exists for the sake of belonging and takes its identity from the gifts, generosity, and accountability of its citizens. It is not defined by its fears, its isolation, or its penchant for retribution” (p. 30). However, Block observes that, in the west, ‘community’ tends to more a compilation of isolated fragments than a holistic concept. “Our isolation occurs because western culture, our individualist narrative, the inward attention of our institutions and our professions, and the messages from our media all fragments us,” he writes, noting, “We are broken into pieces... Businesses, schools, social service organizations, churches, government operate mostly in their own worlds” (p. 2). In the course of this research, especially after transcribing and analyzing the interviews and in writing this report, we realized that Block’s assertions about community fragmentation are in accordance with the experiences of the professionals cited here. But so, too, were his positive views about ‘community’ as a holistic entity that includes scholars among its members.

Terminology

Ernest Boyer (1990), in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, placed scholarship within four overlapping areas: discovery, application, integration and teaching. These terms would later motivate additional terms that involved community participation in the work of faculty members. It should therefore be noted that today there are a variety of names for the same kind of engagement in question. We have outlined some these terms in the phase one report of this research but the list is nearly inexhaustible, as we can see from the definitions below.

- **Scholarship of Engagement:** Boyer (1996) defines “Scholarship of Engagement” as “connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic and ethical problems” (p.11). Scholarship of engagement is defined by the National Review for the Scholarship of Engagement as scholarship that “engages faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs”. Engagement is a scholarly agenda that incorporates community issues and which can be within or integrative across teaching, research and service (<http://schoe.coe.uga.edu>).
- **Community Engagement:** According to *Carnegie Classification Project 2006* (Piercy et. al., 2011), “community engagement” “describes the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.”
- **Community Outreach:** Michigan State University’s Working Committee on Evaluating Outreach 1996-2000 defines “community outreach” “as a form of scholarship that involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit mission.” (MSU Working committee, accessed 11/12/2012)
- **Publicly Engaged Academic Work:** For the Imagining America consortium, “publicly engaged academic work refers to scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member’s academic area. It encompasses different forms of making knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value.” (Imagining America – Tenure and Promotion, accessed 15/12/2012)

- **Community-engaged Scholarship:** Working in the context of health professions, the CCPH (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health) uses the term “Community-engaged Scholarship” as an umbrella name for all other terms that represent the application of faculty work and expertise in the community. It is a scholarship without limitations since it can be applied to teaching, research and service. Metzger and Shirley Szekeres (2010) borrowed the definitions of Michigan State University (MSU) to explain the different components of engaged scholarship:
 - **Engaged teaching** occurs when credit bearing learning opportunities are presented to students in online and community-based settings to address community questions.
 - **Engaged research** occurs when collaborative college-community partnerships are used to address community problems or questions and results are reported back or owned by the community.
 - **Engaged service** occurs when college faculty, staff and / or students are involved in community based efforts to address community generated concerns, questions or problems.

- **Engaged Scholarship:** In the *White Paper on Engaged Scholarship*, Piercy, et. al. (2011) look at community engagement from a unifying point of view as that form of scholarship which take can place in all three commonly-stated arenas of faculty work – teaching, research, and scholarship – but which is targeted at solving public/community issues.

Engaged scholarship and community service

The relationship between engaged scholarship and community service bears reflection. Metzger and Szekeres (2010) distinguish between engaged scholarship and community service. For them, it is important for faculty members to present a viable and convincing community involvement that does not contradict their academic roles. They posit that community service focuses on rendering services in the community through a variety of means and for a variety of reasons, while engaged scholarship specifically focuses on

addressing public questions, concerns or problems. However, there must be room for discretion because some scholarly activities are a mixture of service and scholarship. To Metzger and Szekeres, engaged scholarship generally includes the following aspects:

1. Relates to a public problem;
2. Is reciprocal and collaborative with the public;
3. Addresses problems that are broadly public in nature;
4. Extends boundaries of discipline-specific knowledge;
5. Requires the faculty to demonstrate a leadership role;
6. Focuses on increasing public knowledge;
7. Involves discovery , integration and application of knowledge.

Context and methodology

This research report follows an analysis of institutional support for CES as expressed in written policies, vision statements and collective agreements. The purpose of a second phase qualitative inquiry was to understand via the personal experiences of community-engaged scholars how CES has evolved and is understood in actual practice, including perceived institutional barriers and supports. The selection of study participants was subjective, arrived at by examining written policy documents gathered in Phase One and then, in discussions with Faculty Assessment Working Group members, identifying which institutional policies seemed 'ripe' for further exploration. Budget and time frame necessarily constrained how many interviews could realistically be conducted, and doubtless there are many other valuable stories to be told; our priority was depth over quantity.

Interview participants were:

- Sandra LeFort, Director, School of Nursing, Memorial University of Newfoundland;
- Blair Stonechild, Professor, Indigenous Studies, First Nations University of Canada;

- Marc Arnal, Doyen et chef de la direction/Dean and Executive Officer, Campus Saint-Jean, University of Alberta;
- Marc Spooner, professor Faculty of Education, University of Regina;
- Leslie Brown, Associate Dean, Faculty of Human & Social Development, University of Victoria, and;
- John Archibald, Dean, Faculty of Humanities, University of Victoria.

Two researchers conducted active interviews with the selected participants, either in person or by telephone, depending on location. Our interview questionnaire (Annex C) was guided by the following research questions:

- How do promising-looking policy documents manifest themselves in actual practice?
- What conditions affect the successful implementation of such policies?

All interviews were conducted according to a research plan approved by the University of Regina Research Ethics Board, which included opportunities for anonymity and review of transcripts. Participants were provided with a draft copy of the study for correction and clarification of their comments.

Defining Community Engaged Scholarship

For Sandra LeFort, Director of Memorial University's School of Nursing, CES is a form of scholarship that is "rigorous, based in the field, with [public involvement in all stages], feedback and critique from the public." Blair Stonechild, Professor of Indigenous Studies at First Nations University of Canada, agrees with this definition, adding that CES involves "disseminating the information back to the community." John Archibald, Dean of Social Development at the University of Victoria, defined CES as research in which the research question and research methodology are informed by community need. Arnal goes further, stating CES is a "unique opportunity and privileged position to study inequalities and inequities in society," adding that "as professionals, academics can be part of shaping solutions to those problems."

Marc Spooner, a newly-tenured member of the University of Regina Faculty of Education, described a process of reaching out to the community with academic knowledge, expertise and technical knowledge for the collective benefit, while the community in turn reaches out to the university with its research questions. Like Stonechild, Spooner highlighted dissemination of the research back to the community as a critical component of CES.

For the University of Victoria's Leslie Brown, who works in an institution that formally recognizes CES, this form of scholarship emphasizes the utilization of community engaged work in teaching, research and any of the formal aspects of the university mandate, where the faculty member is recognized for such work. As such, the scholarship can be transferred to academic c.v.'s and professionally recognized.

CES is, therefore, composed of multiple layers typically involving academics and the community working for a common goal. For Arnal, that is precisely what CES means for the community: "Knowledge as a means of addressing problems and improving the lot of people who are not equal participants in society." CES is therefore more than scholarship. It is also about inclusion, about involving the marginalized, and moving outward from the fragmented worlds described by Block.

KEY CONCEPTS

- *Rigorous*
- *Field-based*
- *Addresses inequalities*
- *Problem-solving*
- *Invites public involvement and critique*
- *Disseminates findings back to the community*
- *Includes the marginalized*

CES in practice

The Canadian scholars' comments are very much in agreement with the view of Piercy et. al. (2011) that community engaged scholarship involves research, teaching and service. However, when it comes to involving the community, that is, the actual practice, the scholarship may not emanate from a pre-determined, systematic plan and

methodology, like the traditional models of teaching, research and service. Its emergence from the research question is typically more organic in nature.

For example, describing her work in pain management, Sandra LeFort reported that she didn't conceptualize the research as community engagement with specific methodologies or a plan. For her, CES is a new term and a matter of semantics, since ideas about it are evolving.

The participants in her research study, who suffered from chronic pain, were tested according to the typical requirements of a scientific study. But LeFort also gained their feedback and produced educational material about chronic pain. People, she said, "can be participants, provide comments and not just be objects of study. Before, their feedback was missing." CES is therefore, not just about her own scholarly contribution and leadership; it's about reaching out to people who in turn will respond by becoming involved.

Like LeFort, Stonechild did not set out to undertake a specific methodology labeled CES. Community engagement as part of his research and teaching evolved naturally from his life experience. He knew the First Nations communities and where the students came from. Attending the infamous residential schools gave him the knowledge and understanding of the effects suffered by his people. "Official version of treaties and history were biased; a new institution had to reinterpret them through research," he said. After reinterpreting history and teaching it from a First Nations perspective, Stonechild realized consulting Elders could shed light on other issues, including land claims and how floods affected their territories. Elders' knowledge about how their lands were prior to

KEY CONCEPTS

CES methods are often arrived at organically, instead of by a pre-determined systemic research plan, as with traditional research.

CES may be deeply integrated with the researcher's own community involvement and experiences, in contrast to a 'separate' professional activity.

Approaches are diverse, inventive and driven by necessity.

modern flooding gave researchers the First Nations angle to solve land-claim questions: “Elders provided valuable information not found in books.”

Spooner’s experience engaging with homeless people was similar to that of Stonechild’s. He recalled that when these levels of government first proposed the research into homelessness “they were talking to the experts, the service providers.

Nobody was taking to the actual experts, which are those who are living homeless.” The governments’ purpose was to develop policy and programs to address this issue. Spooner chose to capture on-the-street, on-the-ground knowledge. He talked to homeless youth in Regina, who told him there was nowhere for them to go in the city. He communicated that message to the various levels of government and they acted upon it. As a result of his research, a youth shelter was created.

In a second instance, similar to his experience with homeless youth, people accessing service agencies or visiting shelters told him there was not a centralized place for them to learn about their community and what services were available to them. People were blindly told “you have to go to social services for that,” with no further directions provided. It was very difficult, even for a literate person, to navigate through the different levels of government and service agencies. After researching the service labyrinth, Spooner created a community survival map for Regina, which he said was “overwhelmingly taken [up] by the community.” The map showed agencies offering food and shelter, as well as medical centres, needle exchange centres, hospitals and emergency phone numbers needed by people. The map crossed various language barriers through the use of icons. It was inexpensive to print and easy to update yearly, which he did happily.

Spooner does not categorize CES into research, teaching and service. For him, it involves all of those components and then some: “It’s my life. It’s what I do.” He reported he

KEY CONCEPT

Research products may include a program of action, a policy recommendation or a novel form of publishing and knowledge dissemination.

applies theory to his research, but that “theory is good as long as it is put into practice.” At the same time, practice requires knowledge and theorizing. He emphasizes the need “to be reflexive and critical: why or why not something is working and [to] explain it the best way we can.”

John Archibald, Dean of the University of Victoria Faculty of Humanities, agreed that CES “is a combination of teaching, research and service” rather than falling into a single category. He also agreed that community problem-solving is a characteristic of CES. In particular, UVIC’s teaching certification program for heritage language teachers has brought the academy in direct contact with community members. “Having been involved in language education, bilingual education and language policies, there have been workshops with parents, teachers and school principals. They come with a specific research question and they expect us to give them an answer,” he said. Brown, who like Archibald works for UVIC, has been involved in CES as a faculty member for 26 years. Initially trained as a community development worker, when she first became a faculty member “all her research and teaching were grounded in community work.” Consequently, whether it is in teaching, research or service, like Spooner, community work is simply part of everything she does.

Fundraising as CES

Even if they believe in the usefulness of CES, professionals, their peers and students have to find financial support to carry it out. All interviewees recognized that financial assistance is a key component to implementing CES. For example, Stonechild observed fundraising was crucial to create and develop the First Nations University of Canada.

KEY CONCEPT
CES involves fundraising for individual work or to create programs and institutions dedicated to CES.

Spooner said that though it is part of his life to serve the community, printing the survival map required donations and the financial support of government. To do her research, LeFort also obtained funding. Arnal, not as an academic *per se*, but as a senior

administrator and community leader, is part of a group setting up an institute across western and northern Canada which will focus on citizenship and cohesion. At the time of the interview, he was designing the proposal to create this institute and is seeking financial support from Immigration Canada. The creation of the institute is CES in itself in that it will involve working side by side with francophone communities to develop a program of activities that will potentially address issues of citizenship, cohesion, livings standards, self-perception and dignity. Arnal further noted the institute may provide a model that could be adapted by other communities, such as urban Aboriginals.

CES and scholarly development

Several study participants mentioned that working with community advances their knowledge and abilities as scholars. One element of CES is that academics can also learn from the community. In fact, Arnal called it “a privilege to study inequities and inequalities in the community.” Meanwhile, Spooner said that besides teaching the community he also learned from the community. Research, teaching and service are the traditional duties of a practising academic but Spooner said that he believes another duty is to learn and speak out about community needs. When that happens, he argued, people may change the view they have of the university as an “ivory tower.”

Models, methodology and methods

Although practiced since the 1970s (see Stonechild) CES does not have a universal model or methodology nor is it regularly employed by all disciplines. LeFort stated that most university scholarship has been about pure science, such as chemistry, physics and other sciences – however Arts “involves the community” as a matter of course. In her scholarly work, she understood CES as a concept rather than as a specific method. Brown similarly reported that when she began using CES “there was no specific model” and that for “different faculties, different models may be applicable.” Archibal agreed: “There is no single paradigm of community research. A specific methodology is used to answer a specific research question.”

Spooner defines himself as a qualitative researcher. Moreover, he does qualitative research that is valid and useful to the community. He adapts overall methodology about community research that is “laid out and well framed” and then adopts specific methods and research tools within that context. In his homeless research, for example, he made videos, with the consent of the participants, used in combination with a traditional written report.

Those who did not read the report could view short YouTube videos. That sparked public interest in reading the report to learn more. He found that a very effective method to affect policy. He described his methodology in his final report; the research was public, and it was reviewed by faculty and members of the public who had practical knowledge on the subject. Spooner said public review can be a parallel process to peer review.

For Spooner, it is important for academics to have theoretically informed and evidence - based recommendations to affect policy and actions. Similar sentiments were expressed by Arnal. It is this effect on policy and actions that forms the community transformation component of CES. For example, one of Arnal’s projects began with an observation that there was an apparent separation between established members of Saskatchewan’s francophone community and new francophone immigrants arriving from Africa, Cambodia and Vietnam. As a result, new immigrants assimilated into the English-speaking community. This led to an empirical study of public perceptions of the francophone community and its relationship to other ethnic groups and businesses. From this came the action idea of a foundation whose main goal would be to assist the development of successful ventures. One result of this activity was that the established francophone community was opened up to the reality of a more diverse society. Members became committed to improve the lives not just for themselves but for everybody, and developed more culturally inclusive programs and activities. Arnal said

KEY CONCEPT

Methods are diverse and specific to the research question.

Community transformation is an expected outcome. This may be manifested in many ways.

that today Saskatchewan's francophone situation has improved considerably through a commission of inclusion that recognizes one doesn't have to be white and Catholic, born and be raised in Saskatchewan, to be considered a Fransaskois.

Administrative support for CES

Stonechild recalled that in 1976, when developing FNUniv's forerunner, the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College (SIFC), "We had to listen and follow our [First Nations] college managers' direction. They had the experience; they knew the sentiments of the people. We had to rely on them for advice because they knew how to do it and whom to talk." No CES model of methodology was discussed, but nonetheless administrative support for community involvement was crucial to the SIFC's creation, he said. In addition to supporting their faculty members' community work, early college administrators had to "deal with the shortcoming of the previous higher education system and had to find funding to do this new form of higher education." As a result, administrative support is "absolutely" present at FNUniv.

That support, with the exception of University of Victoria, was not reported as a standard institution-wide practice in most universities in this study. CES was more commonly reported as being situated in specific faculties and disciplines. For example, various programs and faculties at the University of Regina are now positioning themselves as practitioners and promoters of CES. Spooner said his home faculty, the Faculty of Education, has a "good link [communication, contact] to professions in the community of service". Due to his faculty's support for CES, he was well positioned to get credit for his work and his peers received it well. However, for him, the support stopped at the faculty level. He observed that "the larger university, other departments such as psychology and the central administration, were less likely to view CES as serious scholarship."

External funding plays a role in the question of administrative support. LeFort noted that when because her research was externally funded, university support was not a major

concern. However when research projects are not self-reliant “it’s up to the faculties to include CES as scholarship,” she said.

Benefits to the university

It was consistently reported that institutional support for CES realizes substantial benefits for universities and individual faculty members alike. Stonechild said faculty members find this type of research is “more meaningful, effective and responsible because it is useful.” By extension, engaging the community gave credibility to FNUNiv, he said. In Brown’s view, “The benefits have been huge to the University [of Victoria]: the usefulness of knowledge, knowledge mobilization, better curriculum, Indigenous community knowledge, procreation of knowledge, modified curriculum and better knowledge.”

KEY CONCEPTS

CES offers tangible benefits to universities. Its practice boosts:

- *faculty morale*
- *student satisfaction*
- *procreation of new knowledge*
- *knowledge mobilization*
- *curriculum*
- *visibility*
- *credibility*
- *public understanding of the work of universities*
- *mutually beneficial community connections*

Arnal stated CES “enhances relevancy of a university” and “improves the perception people have of a university and the role it plays in the community. This results in greater public taxpayer and governmental support for the university, he said, noting that, “In order to attract students one has to be perceived as excellent and in order to attract support one has to be perceived as relevant.” His institution has been faced with the challenge of being situated in Alberta, a province that has little desire to recognize official languages. Strong community connections help the francophone community assert their presence and protect their heritage and language, which in turn translates into wider support for French faculty at the University of Alberta: “...it positions the university as a truly national university. It enhances our credibility with organizations in Quebec and France. The University of Alberta, not just this campus, is now a member of the Francophonie community.” This is important for the University of Alberta and the Francophonie alike.

For Spooner, the benefits are many: “It makes the university visible to the community; fosters an understanding of the work we do; citizens (taxpayers) have a better understanding of what the university does.” The act of working alongside community members and disseminating back the information through useful tools, policy and actions helps counter the change the perception of universities from ivory towers to lighthouses, he said. The university also benefits from increased recognition outside the academy, he noted. For example, one of his student’s work on Indian residential schools won a Governor General’s Award and was mentioned in its report by the Conference Board of Canada. As a result, the University of Regina looks very good, he said.

As well, participants observed that CES enhances student satisfaction. It was reported that students in community-engaged study programs see their studies as something practical; they want to see their education contributing to society in a way that was not afforded to them before and to make, or at least try to make, the world a better place. Brown adds that “students go on internships in the communities because agencies fund some of them so it promotes relation-building.” Archibald said CES “is a bridge between the university and the community. Both parties benefit from each other. It also gives the chance to give back to the community because most of the students at the universities come from these communities.”

Using the same analogy as Spooner, LeFort said that the university cannot be isolated from the community or be seen as an ivory tower because knowledge is a public event. Since CES is all about educating society, the public has to be engaged, she said. The public wants to be involved. People are more likely to embrace participation in university research because their voices count now, and because faculties have more options to broaden their research in the community. As an example, she cited new approaches to fishery education in Newfoundland. Before, nobody listened to fishermen, just to fishery scientists. Now fishery scientists are including local knowledge and local fishermen. In this way, the university benefits by looking at problems from a broad context, not just scientific. Therefore, knowledge becomes relevant. Spooner’s metaphor

of the lighthouse applies aptly in this region of Canada. No more the ivory tower, community members are no longer passive subjects of study.

Community benefits

LeFort acknowledged that there is still a broad range of research that can be done with and for the community: distance education, information sharing, policy-making and new research projects in other areas. Through these activities, the community has benefitted from CES. Stonechild said that CES gives the community the opportunity to reflect on its problems and how to solve them. For example, First Nations people now challenge the government approach that “government knows best.” He added: “Reflecting on their problems reinforces and clarifies, from their point of view, what the problems are and then they work to solve them. [CES] helps people to access information and figure out what is best for them.” Indeed, that is the point, Brown said, “The community has access to university resources. The fact that the universities can offer part of their resources, staff and services to the community is a great benefit.” The benefits for the community and individuals can also be transformative and liberationist.

CES supports communities, through resources, staff and services, to reflect on their problems and to act to solve them... It helps scholars to reflect on their way of thinking and behaving. In the process it may help them to “free” themselves from conventional thinking and behaving.

Arnal shared a very personal experience to make a point about how CES helped his francophone community and in the process “freed” himself. However, to reach that level “one has to have a little bit of a lack of humility in terms of who one thinks has to change something.” He explained the difference between the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (section 23) vs. cultural [francophone] rights in terms of “how can one community accept others who speak French but who are not from the same [dominant] background?” For instance, his children were not accepted into the French-Canadian community. He spoke to the French-Canadian association about it and told them they were wrong because “whether they like or not the French-Canadian term has a hyphen that contains an ethnic

connotation in it. On one hand, they welcomed people and on the other they told them to go away. That was stupidity.” This lack of inclusion affected Arnal’s children. When he told the Francophone School that his kids were French-Canadian-Hindus the school could not understand what they were dealing with. This situation gave him the opportunity to use CES as an opportunity to educate people and to get out of the “prison of ignorance” and to become “full participants in their community.”

Other benefits may not involve profound changes as that of Arnal but they still have meaning for the community. For instance, Spooner’s maps were used by people seeking services and assistance from a local Regina settlement agency for immigrants and refugees. Spooner says “The less inequity there is the best is to live in a community.” The support from citizens, according to LeFort, “will continue to grow. It will be strong in numbers, there will be a sense of commitment, and there will be more government support.” She bases her comments on the fact that “community is now involved in policy making bodies of the government. This would not have happened if not for CES. For example, there is now a chronic pain working group in Newfoundland’s Health Authority. That’s the direct outcome of CES.”

Gaining professional recognition

When collective agreements do not give general definition of research, there is always the avenue for the faculties to extend their definition of research and service. LeFort explained further: “It is the work of the faculties to make the argument that CES is valid scholarship.” LeFort reported that she successfully made recommendations to her Provost and Vice-president of Academics for the promotion of three individuals stressing that their works were under the rubric of scholarship. When there is a general understanding of CES understanding at the top level, it remains work of the each faculty to project what constitutes research and scholarship.

Arnal's administrative position, meanwhile, gives him "wide-latitude" to advance the needs and profile of his institution. He is convinced about the usefulness of CES in society. The new institute that he and his colleagues are building has the goal of "changing things in society" and he calls that advancement which comes with a "reward."

The University of Victoria has a track record of professional recognition of CES, according to Archibald. "There is always firm support of the University for community-based research. UVIC has a centre for community-based research and there is a policy to accommodate such work as it concerns tenure promotion [and] salary assessment to ensure that faculty members have this work taken into account."

Brown clarified that although there is a centre for community-based research at UVIC, professional recognition varies among Faculties. "There can be a difference between one faculty member's case and someone else who is engaged in community work but in a different Faculty. If she was in a Faculty that does not give much support to that kind of research there could be problems [of recognition]," said Brown.

Brown said she has heard young faculty members complain that they are involved in CES but they have no support from their senior colleagues. The younger faculty members are advised "to save that work until after getting tenure." This advice is likely given because senior colleagues are aware CES recognition "takes a lot of time and [for] many other reasons," she said. Finally, Brown acknowledged UVIC's support but said there is still lingering doubts about CES that may need to be shifted from people's minds. Brown further noted it's not easy and quick for a university to accept criteria documents for

KEY CONCEPT

Faculty members do their own fundraising and in most cases have to 'fight' for tenure and promotion if they base their application using CES.

Even institutions with well developed supportive policies may have these policies unevenly applied across faculties.

tenure and promotion prepared based on CES; for example when the policy of the Human and Social Development Faculty was prepared, it took a while for it to be approved.

CES and recognition for promotion and tenure

The support of the Faculty of Education, University of Regina, and their commitment to CES was a crucial element for Marc Spooner obtaining tenure even if others told him to stick to peer review articles if he wanted to pursue tenure. LeFort went ahead and involved the community in her research. Arnal is so convinced of the CES benefits that he is leading a national committee to create a new institute that will focus on community needs. Stonechild, from day-one back in 1976 was encouraged to involve the community in his work and a vibrant college was born out of that inclusion. Recognition of CES as valid scholarship, nevertheless, is not standard practice in Canadian higher education institutions. The support from all interviewees, however, was unanimous: universities should recognize CES for tenure and promotion purposes. John Archibald pursues and enjoys this kind of scholarship because it gave him the opportunity to answer some questions of pressing social needs.

Kerry Ann O'Meara in *Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service as Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Decisions* (2001) studied how four American universities were able to incorporate university-community research into their policies; such is the case of MWSU. This shows that universities can distinguish themselves through their involvement in practices through the reorganization of the country's pressing social issues. That's precisely what Brown was able to show when she applied for tenure. As an individual faculty member, when she applied her CV looked quite different from what a "normal one" looked like. She had to make the argument that "the impact of research [in the community] was more important than reviewing journal articles." It took a while but at the end the university conceded and gave her tenure despite that it was nonstandard at the time. They conceded, she says because "maybe they were curious or something." In UVIC, the Faculty of Human and Social Development includes seven professional schools including social work, nursing, public administration, Indigenous government,

child and youth care, health information science, and public health and social policy. By definition, she argues, all the Faculty's disciplines call for public involvement. Faculty members have been involved in community development through community engaged scholarship because it is part of how they teach and practice their profession. It is a part of the professional values. Other Faculties have varying types of community engagement depending on the nature of the Faculty.

Calleson, Kauper and Seifer (2010) noted the problems associated with the promotion or tenure of faculty who are involved in community work. They found there is a gap between scholars who are active in community work and those who are not regarding promotion and tenure. Richards in *Building Partnerships: Educating Health Professionals for the Communities they Serve* (1996) observes that the untenured faculty have better chance of receiving promotions and tenure for publishing peer-reviewed journals than for being committed to addressing community issues and problem. Therefore, "many untenured faculty find they must choose between doing the work that would contribute to career advancement and doing the work of the institution in linking with communities and educating students." It is important to clearly define, document and present such activities in order to obtain academic rewards. Equally important is to constitute viable criteria for the evaluation of scholarship performed in the community. Recognition of CES and relevant criteria, as expressed below, are lacking in various institutions.

LeFort said "definitely." CES should be recognized by senior management. She warns, though, "Of course not in all disciplines (especially those in charge of pure science or English) because there is a shifting in people's perspectives around CES. It's incumbent on units to argue that what they are doing [CES] is scholarship. It will be for the development of tenure and promotion policies and not just because it looks nice".

Spooner said "Absolutely." In his case, CES was recognized by outsiders first. That was not the case in the university at large. He thinks that CES has to be recognized by the university for promotion, tenure and for merit awards. Really, he says, "it is legitimate

research; it is a legitimate way to engage the community.” Archibald of UVIC says “CES should be recognized. People should be given the opportunity to make the argument of what kind of research they are doing” but warns “it is the responsibility of the researcher to show how results of the research go beyond the academic unit; how it reaches a broader audience and how the results of the research will benefit the community.”

Arnal agrees with CES being recognized. “Of course it should be recognized.” He understands the difficulties universities face when deciding whether or not to recognize CES for tenure and promotion purposes. He says, “The academic culture is important, it is rigorous and ethics have to be respected. However, knowledge for knowledge’s sake is not enough. Knowledge has to be at the service of humankind.” For him is a trust issue: “If we live by trusting each other we would have no problems.” He adds, “We have to find ways to evaluate credible, professional and meaningful CES, the same way we evaluate articles and journals.”

Brown says, “Evaluation is the critical point.” Is it time to recognize CES? Brown thinks it is. Not only that, she compares the case of Canada to that of South Africa. She recently heard that the University of South Africa has placed, in its guidelines, that faculty will be evaluated on the bases on “teaching,” “research” and “community engagement”. The University of South Africa is investing significant money in helping faculty members to be community engaged. Faculties are therefore running helter-skelter trying to find out how to make their faculty members to be community engaged. There are funds but they can only access it after coming up with strategic planning for how the money is going to be invested in community work. That is the opposite of Canada, where the struggle is from the grassroots, from the individual faculty members who seek their community scholarship to be recognized, while in South Africa the mandate comes from the top.

Policies and guidelines

All our interviewees use or used CES in their research, teaching and serving the community but in most cases there are no wordings of it in the policies and guidelines or the collective agreements. Arnal says he has “no clue” how to build policy and guidelines about CES. However, recognizing CES, he argues, “requires a whole attitudinal change. He points out some difficulties associated with creating policies and guidelines based on CES. It requires knowing whether CES is valid scholarship and that, presently, there are no ways to measure CES impact. UVIC sheds some light to Arnal’s concerns.

The most important sets of policies and guidelines regarding CES are from UVIC. Leslie Brown suggests that in order for a university to adapt a set of policies “There has to be workshops to create the necessary environment, provide information concerning the document and the training of review committees [that will be applying it].” The University of Victoria Faculty of Human and Social Development evaluation policy document approved October 13, 2010 is typical example of how CES is recognized in tenure and promotion guidelines. It is a comprehensive assessment of applications for reappointment, tenure or continuing status, promotion and for the award of salary increments on the basis of demonstrated achievement.

The language in this document, concerning CES, is engaged teaching, scholarship (scholarship of teaching, integration, and application and discovery) and other contributions. Staff members are evaluated on these three criteria. The Faculty of Human and Social Development values community-engaged teaching which includes transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge within and beyond the classroom setting through teaching, mentoring and other curricular activities that service communities within or outside of the university. The evaluation of their teaching may include an assessment of the ability to teach professional work in community settings and/or their ability to teach in the classroom and by distance education where these form part of their teaching responsibilities.

Scholarship: The Faculty values community-engaged scholarship. A faculty member can have a research portfolio that balances publications directed at academic audiences with other professional or creative activities. Other creative community activities are given specific consideration and recognition for their varieties in methodologies of community engaged scholarship. Examples of scholarship include refereed publications (see below); un-reviewed material, films, videos, computer software, websites, podcasts invited addresses to professional associations/societies/community groups, building university-community partnerships; distance, or blended learning, course development;

Un-reviewed material: These are publications, papers and other materials that have not been peer-reviewed prior to publication. For example, articles in association newsletters or journals; publications for clients; papers presented at scholarly or professional meetings; occasional papers; educational pamphlets; technical reports; program manuals; briefs to governments, Aboriginal communities or other bodies; reviews of scholarly articles and research grant applications etc.

Other contributions include all form of engaged citizenship and professionally-related service, community-engaged outreach which include community-based education, development, action or advocacy; advocacy for students, faculty members or community members, the organization of literary, aesthetic or celebratory activities that promote university and community collaborations and connections, activities that promote the use of research based knowledge outside of the university etc.

UVICs' Faculty of Humanities *Evaluation Guidelines for Collaborative, Community-Based, and Interdisciplinary Research* (2010) have recognized among teaching all other forms of scholarly engagement of faculty. They are classified under the rubric of collaborative, community-based and interdisciplinary research. The document shows a progress from the highly individualistic, disciplinary-bound model of research to focus on a less traditional form of research. Terms associated with community-based research are participatory research, participatory action, action, etc. These may involve teaming up with:

- (i) grass-roots, voluntary organizations, individuals or networks with or without a formal organizational structure
- (ii) governments and formal, non-profit organizations
- (iii) for-profit organizations
- (iv) a combination of all or some of the above

The document maintains that the criteria of excellence should be of great importance to candidates and evaluation committees alike, and that the criteria will be invoked in the evaluation process. The candidate is advised to present a wide variety of evidence to prove his work and in the case where all the three forms of scholarship research teaching and service are integrated into the community work; the candidate is required to provide information about the nature of and contributions arising from this integration. The criteria for selecting members of evaluation committee should be based on the experience on community based scholarship and knowledge on a social problem and issues connected with the research.

UVIC's evaluation policy documents from the Faculty of Human and Social Development and Faculty of Humanities (for tenure and promotion purposes) are a start for other Canadian institutions. Other resources include: In *Making the best case for Community-Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Review*, Sarena Seifa (2008) noted that a good place to start is to become familiar with three influential reports on scholarship that help to "make the case" for community –engaged scholarship (CES) namely: *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990), *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997), *Linking Scholarship and Communities: Report of the commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Profession* p.426. A third alternative is to involve faculty, the community and students.

Memorial University Faculty of Nursing points out the difficulty of putting to have a set of guidelines due to the diversity of work done by staff members involved in community work. Stonechild offers a recommendation: "We could organize consultations with stakeholders to identify what the [CES] policy and guidelines will look like. Stonechild's

suggestion may be an answer to Arnal's dilemma: involve the stakeholders as well. Very much in that line of thought, involving academia and community, Spooner recommends "to measure the impact CES has in policy changes; changes in the community; how many and what kind of students are attracted by CES to the universities; how much funding comes from government and other agencies because of CES?"

Final Comments

As a form of conclusion, Sandra LeFort thinks that teaching, not just research, can be part of CES. Some schools of nursing, she says, have been working on developing new teaching models as part of CES. Stonechild says that CES is a good alternative model for universities - in addition to the two dominant visions: "One vision is the traditional ivory tower in which scholars engage in research that is pure but that is not necessarily based on community needs. The second vision is the type of research that is relevant to communities". It includes both local and international experiences. Maybe, he says, "universities need both because scholars come from all over the world with different areas of knowledge and specialization. However, there are faculty who are resistant to this type of research because of what they call academic freedom. They should be able to relate to the community needs and make it more meaningful."

For Arnal, there is a paradox: "University is at the service of the community. However, universities became sophisticated, they became detached from the community, and they see themselves as are the only producers of knowledge. If they are not part of the community, if they are not relevant, people (taxpayers) will get tired of paying for them." He adds "If they want to become sustainable they have to be able to demonstrate to the public and to government that what they are doing is having positive influence in society." Finally, he admonishes that staff members should not do research nor write things just to show intellectual superiority.

Spooner is glad that this research is on the ground because in this way CES can be acknowledged as a legitimate form of scholarship because of the impact it has in the

community. For Brown, “CES is fascinating, it’s everywhere, is in South Africa, Ireland... It’s through the relation with the community that universities can make a difference. There is no separation from the other.” And she concludes with something this paper did not consider at the beginning: the growth of social media and technology: “Bringing multiple forms of knowledge to facilitate learning and deliver content that is relevant to the community. For instance, having people attending [online] classroom or using podcasting.”

This paper was able to capture and disseminate what CES means; how it is practised across Canada; how it benefits universities, communities and individuals involved; and presented views about CES recognition for tenure and promotion purposes. The number of faculty members who are involved in CES is on the increase. Whether recognized or not, at the present there is the urgent need build useful relationship with the community through the involvement of faculty in the three kinds of scholarships (teaching, research and service) that take into account the community. There is already enough data for faculties to start developing their own evaluation policies and for universities to start incorporating them in their policies and guideline.

Below (Annexes “A” and “B”) are some of the suggestions that might help in formulating the criteria for CES.

Annex “A”

The criterion for engagement scholarship is offered by the *National Criteria for the Scholarship of Engagement*. The questions serve as guide to include the criteria for the assessment of faculty works as indicated by Glassick et al (1997).

Goals/questions

- a. Does the scholar state the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good?
- b. Is there an “academic fit” with the scholar’s role, departmental and college mission?

- c. Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?
- d. Does the scholar identify intellectual and significant questions in the discipline and in the community?
- e. Does the scholar show an understanding of relevant existing scholarship?
- f. Does the scholar bring necessary skills to the collaboration?
- g. Does the scholar make significant contributions to the work?
- h. Is the work intellectually compelling?

Methods

- Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions and context of the work?
- Does the scholar describe rationale for election of methods in relation to the context and the issue?
- Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?
- Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

Results

- Does the scholar achieve the goals?
- Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the discipline and to the community?
- Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration and collaboration?
- Does the scholar's work achieve impact or change? Are those outcomes evaluated and by whom?
- Does the scholar's work make a contribution consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time?

Communication/Dissemination

- Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present the work?

- Does the scholar communicate/disseminate to appropriate academic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the institution?
- Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to the intended audience?
- Does the scholar present information with clarity and integrity?

Reflective Critique

- Does the scholar critically evaluate the work?
- What are the sources of evidence informing the critique?
- Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique?
- In what way has the community perspective informed the critique?
- Does the scholar use evaluation to learn from the work and to direct future work?
- Is the scholar involved in a local, state and national dialogue related to the work?

Annex “B”

Standards for Assessment of Community-Based Scholarship, Maurana et al (2000)
adapted by the CCPH.

Note. The term 'partnership' in this annex is used to reflect an ongoing and sustained relationship one might have with a community group or organization. The term program can also be changed to research or teaching.

Clear Goals

1. What are your goals? Are they clearly stated?
2. Did you and your community partner develop goals and objectives based upon community-identified needs and strengths?
3. Did both community and academia consider the needs to be significant and/or important?
4. What is your vision for the future of the partnership(s)?

Adequate Preparation

1. What attitudes, knowledge and skills have you used to conduct the assessment of community needs and assets, and to implement the program(s)?
2. How was the development of the program(s) based on the most recent work in the field?
3. How did you consider important economic, social, cultural and political factors that affect the issue(s) being addressed?
4. How did you recognize, respect and incorporate community expertise into the program(s)?

Appropriate Methods

1. Do you describe how the partners been actively involved in each component of the program (e.g., assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation)?
2. What methods did you use to assess the needs and strengths of the community and how were these based on the most recent work in the field?
3. Has the partnership's work followed a planned process that has been tested in multiple environments and proven to be effective?
4. Have partnerships been developed according the most recent evidence on building partnerships?

Approach

1. Do you describe how the methods used are appropriately matched to the identified needs and strengths with attention to local circumstances and continuous feedback from the community?
2. Does the approach focus on sustainability?
3. What lessons did you learn about the program development and implementation?
4. Does the program reflect the culture of the community?
5. Does the work involve innovative and original approaches?

Significant Results

1. Did the program result in positive community outcomes, what were they, and how do you know?
2. Did the program result in positive institutional outcomes, what were they and how do you know?
3. Did the program result in positive learner outcomes, what were they and how do you know?
4. Did you develop new theories, models, frameworks or approaches that can be used by others?
5. Did the program generate new resources (e.g., grant funding) for the program, community or institution, and what were they?
6. Is the program being sustained?
7. Does the community believe the results are significant and how do you know?

Effective Presentation

1. How has the work (process and outcomes) of the partnership been disseminated in the community?
2. How has the work (process and outcomes) of the partnership been disseminated in academic circles?
3. How has the community contributed to developing and disseminating papers, presentations and other dissemination products from the work?
4. How have the results been disseminated in a wide variety of formats to the appropriate community and academic audiences?

Ongoing Reflective Critique

1. What evaluation has occurred?
2. How have you thought and reflected about the activity?
3. Would the community work with you again? Why?
4. Would you work with the community again? Why?
5. What lessons have you learned from your community-based work?

6. How have these lessons informed your future career plans?

In Imagining America, an integrated approach to assessment is admonished. They developed the **five core values of this kind of assessment namely: collaboration, reciprocity, generativity, rigor, and practicability.** When evaluation is approached in this manner, it contributes to both transformative outcomes which can be seen in the following: improved campus-community partnerships, impact in relation to defined civic, social, and academic goals)

Annex “C”

Questionnaire

**Questionnaire
Community Engagement Scholarship (CES)**

Date: _____ Time: _____ Interviewer:

Interviewee: _____ No.

Faculty and university/college: _____

1. In your opinion what is Community Engaged Scholarship (CES)?
2. Have you been involved in CES? If so, can you tell me about it in terms of whether it was teaching, research, service or a combination of these and other expertise?
3. When you were involved in CES did you have a model to follow or did you create your own with a plan? For example, did it include goals and methodology, was it documented and can it be reviewed by faculty and community peers? If not, what was its purpose and results?
4. When you carry out CES work, in what way do you have the support, or no support, of your faculty/university? Is there a policy about CES in your university or you do it at your own volition and time?
5. In what way CES benefits your faculty/university? Is there any documentation or how do you think it can be documented?

6. In your opinion, what are the CES benefits for your community? Is there any documentation available or if not how do you think it can be documented?
7. If not recognized, do you think CES should be recognized in some form (i.e., for promotional and tenure purposes, awards, other) at your faculty/university?
8. If CES is recognized in your faculty/university through policy and guidelines, can you tell me what are they or where I can find them?
9. If your faculty/university does not have a policy and guidelines about CES what would you recommend in terms of policy and guidelines?
10. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about CES?

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our two research studies found that CES has been practiced in Canadian universities for many decades, and that the principles standards of practice are fairly consistent across institutions. What is not consistent is the manner in which different institutions recognise CES within institutional policies. Because community-engaged scholars work primarily in the public sphere, CES is often taken out of the research realm and placed in a realm of public service, voluntarism and community outreach. This negatively impacts the level of institutional support community-engaged scholars are able to leverage for their community-based research projects. In response, we recommend that Canadian researchers and academic administrators seek a more universally understood place for CES within our institutions. The CES Partnership offers the following key definitions to guide this institutional change:

Scholarship is teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement that has clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique that is rigorous and peer-reviewed.

Community-engaged scholarship encompasses intellectual and creative activities that generate, validate, synthesize and apply knowledge through partnerships with people and organizations outside of the academy.

Thus scholars apply their expertise to real-world problems, working side by side with community members who bring their own leadership, knowledge and expertise to the

table. But more than building partnerships, our study participants clearly expressed that their work is focused on rebalancing the relationship between university and community to ensure fulsome knowledge generation for the public good. It is important not to lose sight of this mission in the rush to establish community-university partnerships. Well-practiced CES is part of a larger journey toward social equality and justice, resulting in highly dynamic, impactful research practice.

Why should we recognize CES in faculty assessment?

Our study found that the simple answer is because faculty members are doing CES. Its popularity as a research approach is growing, providing a viable alternative to the ‘ivory tower.’ It is not a better or worse research approach. It is *another* approach, one with easily identifiable markers of success. As CES becomes more central to the research agenda, it should therefore be professionally recognized like any other work we carry out as part of our academic responsibilities.

As well, recognizing CES may help raise the glass ceiling at Canadian universities.

Women are much more likely than men to report carrying out CES (Voglegesang et al., 2005); one study found 90 per cent of faculty who self-identified as community-engaged scholars were women (O’Meara, 2002). We might extrapolate that recognizing community engagement in essence recognizes the undervalued work of women scholars.

Finally, full recognition of CES in promotion and tenure will encourage a practice that contains substantial tangible benefits to the university, including an opportunity to adjust its practices to reflect a more collaborative, networked world. An engaged university is a place where students and faculty alike find their work has meaning and social relevance.

How can we implement change?

The complaints about the constraints of traditional faculty assessment approaches – emphasizing journal publications and single authorship – have long been voiced. Adding to those complaints is not likely to gain institutional change. Neither will blanket recommendations that institutions ‘do something’ help faculty members achieve T&P reform. Faculty members themselves must take the issue in hand and methodically forge paths to institutional change. With this in mind, our recommendations focus on practical steps to lead change in our institutions.

It was clear in both our documentary research and our qualitative interviews that the language of CES varies according to institutions, and methods and understandings vary according to individual researchers. However, some common denominators were apparent. In particular, our qualitative interviews highlighted the following CES characteristics:

1. Seeks solutions to problems identified by community partners.
2. Respects and explores community members’ knowledge about their history, conditions and aspirations.
3. Is based in collaborative, mutually beneficial relationships.
4. Selects from the full toolkit of research methods – both quantitative and qualitative – according to the problem to be solved. May involve the development of new research methods.

5. Is often interdisciplinary.
6. Authorship is generally shared with or transferred to community collaborators. Seldom single-authored.
7. Seeks peer review from the community, regarding the research's accuracy, ethics and social value.
8. Often emphasizes novel, public-oriented, highly accessible research dissemination practices over traditional academic journal writing.
9. Typically involves fundraising and capacity-building.
10. May have long timelines of involvement and engagement, extending over years rather than months.

Despite the similarities encountered in our interviews, however, it is clear from our Work Group discussions that a single 'silver bullet' is unlikely to satisfy all institutions, or even all faculties and departments within institutions, when it comes to professional recognition of CES. Each institution has its own history, culture and language, as was evident in our document search. Therefore, we recommend locally-derived solutions and approaches as the most effective path, with the first step being broad agreement on the principles of community engagement, through review of the definitions and understandings presented in this research report. Regarding implementation, we recommend a ground-up approach along the following general steps:

1. Identify institutional inroads

One method is to identify champions – people you know will be interested. They might be faculty engaged in CES, T&P committee members, or faculty

administrators. Another method is to get it on the agenda of an existing group's next meeting. Possible avenues include:

- A tenure and promotion committee
- A community engagement office
- A union committee

2. Determine the most effective levels of engagement

Some universities have a single T&P process for all faculty, others give responsibility to faculties or departments. Federated colleges and institutes may also have their own separate policies. You might decide to model your work in a smaller environment, and then grow it to other parts of the university, or you may find your university structure is more amenable to a single sweeping change for all.

3. Create a local work group

After identifying what structural level to promote change, create a working group of people within that environment. Ideally your group should include representation from:

- Community-engaged researchers
- T&P committee members
- Faculty administrators
- The faculty union

Set out a schedule of regular meetings, with a chair and minute-taker identified.

Community representatives can be invited to participate, although not expected to do so. If you are fortunate enough to have a community member who is interested in

sitting on the committee, he/she will doubtless have valuable insights into how researchers should be expected to interact with the community.

4. Review existing policies and language

Our research found that, although most institutions lack specific policies, almost all have some kind of broad statement that addresses community engagement. If an existing term seems suitable – for example ‘publicly engaged’ as opposed to ‘community engaged’ – consider adopting the existing institutional language for your work. Have a close look at your existing T&P policy. Can CES fit comfortably into existing guidelines for faculty assessment? What are the barriers and limits? Your recommendations will have a far better chance of success if expressed in language already understood at your university. Likewise, you may find there are some corners of your university that have quietly gone about implementing T&P changes to accommodate CES, formally or informally. Make use of this foundational work. Review what the Partnership found at your institution, and add to it, if promising local examples are missing from the list. If your institution is not included among the 16 that were inventoried in this study, you will need to carry out this step yourself. Our report will still be useful, however, as a guide to the type of documents you need to examine. This may include:

- Your collective agreement
- T&P guidelines
- Institutional vision statements
- Strategic planning documents

7. Educate and engage your colleagues and the community

Our research found that language has little value if colleagues on T&P committees do not understand or value the essence of CES. Seeking recognition for CES involves a process of cultural change, not just policy change. Community members should be invited to participate in this process, for example by helping define qualities of effective community engagement, or by identifying appropriate reviewers of community-based research.

8. Address the question of peer review

Peer review remains the single biggest perceived barrier to recognition, although it need not be. Various networks are springing up across North America to provide suitable peer review of CES. Institutions should consider innovative methods of inviting review, such as community-based review. Faculty members wishing to be recognized must spend time developing a model that will work within their institution.

9. Operationalize reform

Because there is no single organizational template for Canadian university structures, a locally-authored summary document of recommendations must be developed. This could include targets of which policies need to be changed, where these policies are located, and how to go about it.

2. Key Performance Indicators

We have developed the attached grid of key performance indicators for T&P committees. However, this is meant as a starting point only, and should be treated as

a draft document for consideration, not the final answer. To ensure maximum co-operation and agreement, accommodating input from others is essential.

In summary, formal recognition of community-engaged scholarship is both a challenge and a source of tangible benefits to Canadian universities. We remain inspired by our colleagues and community partners who seek to elevate university-community engagement to its highest potential for the common good:

Sharing power—leveling the playing field—is a revolutionary act. It requires courage tenacity, selfless-ness, transparency, ethical and moral leadership, and a commitment to do emotional and intellectual work for the common good. It is also the very essence of building a democracy. Education, especially higher education, is what helps us to insure these democratic principles. Therefore, those within an institution who are living and practicing those democratic principles deserve to be rewarded through promotion and tenure. This will be one of the key ways for these community-university partnerships to become even more mainstream and to insure that deep, systemic social change will be possible both inside of the academy and out in the world. (Freeman, et. al., 2009 p. 89)

Characteristics of Community Engaged Scholarship (CES) A Rubric for Evidencing CES

This rubric is meant to be a guide for community-engaged scholars and those assessing their scholarship. This rubric may be completed by faculty, promotion and tenure committees, and/or community stakeholders. Please refer to the associated Handbook for more information on CES.

Given the sometimes unpredictable nature of CES, this rubric may be adapted to reflect long-term, multi-faceted projects, with different phases, by, for example, breaking down the CES initiative into phases, and completing a separate rubric for each phase. For example, part of a project may have extensive participant involvement, but another part may not, either by design or by the relative level of interest among community members. As well, most projects are multi-year.

The *Characteristics* are meant as a guide and may have to be adapted based on the project, community and institutional contexts. The *Weight* section, left blank, allows for customization and prioritization of *Characteristics*.

Weight	Characteristic	Lowest	Mod- erate	High	Highest	Total
	<i>Problem identification by the community</i>	Conducting research on issues identified by the researcher.			Stakeholder partnership defines research.	
	<i>Clear and important academic and community Change Goals - relevant research question</i>	Unidentifiable or unclear community outcomes			Clear and measurable community outcomes	
	<i>Community involvement in research process</i>	Engaging with community stakeholders as subjects			Includes all stakeholders and elicits under-represented perspectives	

Weight	Characteristic	Lowest	Mod- erate	High	Highest	Total
	<i>Clear and measurable community outcomes/transformation</i>	Ambiguous and vague community outcomes			Clear, measurable, and observable community outcomes	
	<i>Significant results: Builds community and institutional capacity</i>	Does not build capacity within the institution or community			Builds significant institutional and community capacity	
	<i>Effective dissemination to academic and community audiences</i>	No dissemination of impact or lessons learned			Collaborative scholarship and dissemination through a variety of community and peer-reviewed academic routes	
	<i>Reflective critique: Lessons learned to improve scholarship and community engagement</i>	Does not include self-reflexive, peer, community and stakeholder critique/evaluation			Clear evidence of praxis for both community and academic stakeholders	
	<i>Leadership and personal contribution</i>	Inflexible in adapting/anticipation changing contexts			Demonstrates ability to adapt to changing contexts	
	<i>Consistently ethical behaviour: socially responsible conduct of research and teaching</i>	Does not demonstrate social responsibility			Evidence of academic focus on equalizing power imbalances between stakeholders	
TOTAL						

References

- Block, P. (2009). *Community: the structure of belonging*. San Francisco: BK Business Book.
- Boyer E.L. (2009). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brandon University (2008). *Collective agreement, April 1, 2008 - March 31, 2011*.
- Cape Breton University (2009). *Collective agreement, 2009-2013*.
- Celleson, D., Kauper-Brown, J. & Seifer, S.D. (2005). *Community-engaged scholarship toolkit*. Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2005. Retrieved Sept. 11, 2013 at <http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info>
- Daly, K. (2010). *Letter of intent. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council application*. Guelph, ON: University of Guelph.
- Ellison, J. & Eatman, T.K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imaging America.
- Freeman, E., Gust, S. & Aloschen, D (2009). *Why faculty promotion and tenure matters to community partners. Metropolitan Universities Journal. 20(2), 87-103.*
- Giles, Jr., D.E. (2013). *Being an engaged institution and the 2015 Carnegie application*. Retrieved Dec. 15, 2012 from imagingamerica.org at http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php
- Glassick C.E., Huber M.R., & Maeroff G.I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publisher.
- Jordan, C. (2006). *Developing criteria for review of community-engaged scholars for promotion or tenure*. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative. Retrieved from Sept. 12, 2013 from <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/healthcollab.html>
- Memorial University of Newfoundland. (2010). *Collective agreement Feb. 26, 2010- August 31, 2013*.
- Metzger, J. & S. Szekeres. (2005) *The scholarship of engagement*. Retrieved Dec. 16, 2012 from <http://www.naz.edu/academic-affairs/documents/Engaged%20scholarship.pdf>
- Michigan State University. *Faculty guide for reappointment, promotion and tenure review*. Retrieved Nov. 11, 2012 from <http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm#Criteria>
- Michigan State University Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (2000). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning & evaluating quality outreach*, Michigan State University. Retrieved Dec. 11, 2012 at: <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents/pod.pdf>
- New England Resource Centre for Higher Education (n.d.). *University of Massachusetts, Boston*. Retrieved Dec. 11, 2012 from <http://www.nerche.org>

Nipissing University Special Joint Committee on Tenure and Promotion (2010). Standards for Tenure and Promotion Procedures at Nipissing University. September 18, 2008. Revised January 2010.

O'Meara, K.A. (2001). Working Paper No. 25 Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship in promotion and tenure. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE). Retrieved Dec. 12, 2012 from http://www.nerche.org/working25/working_paper_25.html

Randall, J. (2010) Community engagement and collective agreements: patterns at Canadian universities. In P. Inman and H. G. Schuetze, Eds., *The Community Engagement and Service Mission of Universities*. Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (England and Wales). 261-277.

Scott, J. (2007). Engaging academia in community research: overcoming obstacles and providing incentives. Boca Raton, FL: Center for Urban and Environmental Solutions at Florida Atlantic University.

Simon Fraser University (2010). Strategic research plan. Accessed Sept. 11, 2013 from http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/vpresearch/pdfs/docs/SRP2010_15.pdf

Simon Fraser University (2012). The university planning framework 2012.

Simon Fraser University (2003). Criteria for appointment, contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and Salary, Review Date: March 1, 2003

Université du Québec à Montreal (2009). Convention collective, 2009-2013.

University of Alberta (n.d.). Faculty of Extension tenure and promotion standards.

University of Alberta (n.d.). Faculty of Extension standards for salary increment, promotion and tenure.

University of Alberta (2010). Faculty collective agreement incorporating June 2007 and July 2008 amendments. Amended November 2010.

University of Alberta (2011). Strategic Plan, 2011-2015.

University of Calgary (2009). APT manual: Appointment, promotion and tenure. Retrieved Sept. 11, 2013 from http://www.ucalgary.ca/hr/system/files/apt_manual_current.pdf

University of Calgary (2011). Collective agreement July 1, 2011 –June 30, 2013.

University of Guelph (2008). Collective agreement expiring June 30, 2011.

University of Manitoba. Faculty of Medicine. (n.d.) Promotion and tenure document. Retrieved Sept. 11, 2013 from http://umanitoba.ca/faculties/medicine/alumni/media/PROMOTION_AND_TENURE_DOCUMENT_vAP_RIL_11_2012%282%29.pdf

University of Manitoba. Faculty of Architecture (2002). Tenure and promotion guidelines.

University of Manitoba (2010). Collective agreement. 2010-2013.

University of Regina (2010). Faculty of Arts strategic plan 2010-2014.

University of Regina (n.d.) Faculty of science criteria document.

University of Regina. l'institut français. (n.d.) Criteria for reviewing performance.

University of Saskatchewan. School of Public Health. Dept. of Community Health and Epidemiology (2007). Second Integrated Plan. Retrieved Sept. 11, 2013 from <http://www.medicine.usask.ca/che/Final%20Compiled%202nd%20Integrated%20Plan%20with%20appendices.pdf>

University of Saskatchewan. (2013). Categories for establishing standard of performance, University of Saskatchewan collective agreement, 2010-2013.

University of Victoria (n.d.) Guidelines for tenure and promotion decisions.

University of Victoria. Office of Community-Based Research (n.d.) Recognizing excellence in community-engaged scholarship.

University of Washington. Community-Campus Partnership for Health. (n.d.) Standards for Assessment of Community-Based Scholarship. Retrieved Dec. 16, 2012 from <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit-career.html>

University of Winnipeg. (2010). Collective agreement, 2010-2013.

University of Victoria (2001) Faculty of Human and Social Development criteria document. Retrieved Dec. 13, 2012 from http://www.uvic.ca/hsd/assets/docs/pdf/Faculty%20Evaluation%20Policy%20March_2011.pdf

University of Victoria. Faculty of Humanities (2010). Evaluation guidelines for collaborative, community-Based, and interdisciplinary research. Retrieved Dec. 13, 2012 from http://web.uvic.ca/humanities/faculty/evaluation_CBR.php