Imagine Engaged Scholarship at the University of Louisville:

A Research Report to the Provost

By

Cate Fosl, PhD

Associate Professor of Women's and Gender Studies/Associate in History
Director, Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research
Special Assistant to the Provost for Engaged Scholarship, 2014-15

**FINAL REVISED REPORT with FACULTY RECOMMENDATIONS:
JUNE 30, 2015**

Table of Contents

"O*ne thing I've seen be successful here is to start with a core faculty group who believed in Engaged Scholarship and go through a purposeful process to build it."*

-Lynn Blanchard, PhD, director, University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill's Carolina Center for Public Service (CCPS, est. 1999), whose mission is to "engage and support…faculty, students, and staff in meeting the needs of North Carolina and beyond…by promoting scholarship and service that are responsive to the concerns of the state and contribute to the common good."

Introduction

Imagine a welcoming, accessible space with staff well-prepared to provide mentoring, support, student assistance, and an array of community and interdisciplinary contacts to a new faculty member in any field who is interested to learn about community-engaged research. Imagine a campus that partners equally with modestly- funded social justice, civil rights, humanistic, and violence-prevention community organizations and with industry and governmental entities that bring in major gifts and research contracts. Imagine a campus in which every graduate has a working understanding of concepts like "civic democracy" and has had the chance to apply for a community-engaged service scholarship that would allow them to work with a professor on a community partnership. Imagine a campus in which each and every graduating senior has completed a capstone, working with both a faculty member and a community partner. Imagine a rambling old house at the edge of campus (with free parking and a bus stop!) where community partners, faculty, and graduate students come to meet, use the library, join monthly discussions, or participate in a 2-year endowed faculty engaged fellows program designed to boost interdisciplinary, community-based research across a wide variety of fields leading to multiple products, scholarly and otherwise, benefiting the local community.

I observed each of those scenarios in action in spring/summer 2014 during my visits to seven engaged campuses chosen from among our benchmarks, ACC schools, and a small set of national exemplars. The energy and dedication my hosts revealed are indicative of an increasing trend among public universities toward greater community engagement that includes research, scholarship, and teaching as well as the more traditional community service, increasingly made reciprocal.

As assigned by Provost Willihnganz, this report grew out of a conviction that community-engaged scholarship is vital to the health and progress of the University of Louisville as a premier metropolitan research university. The university has made tremendous strides forward in its commitment to engage deeply with its metropolitan community, as evidenced by its designation in 2008 as a community-engaged institution by the Carnegie Foundation for Teaching and Learning, and by its 2014 redesignation in the course of this project. Yet the processes and data gathering set in motion by the 2012-13 Carnegie recertification also reveal the finding, validated by this study, that more avenues for boosting and coordinating faculty engaged-research and curricular engagement, in particular, are sorely needed in order to actualize its potential, as a metropolitan university, to effect positive change in metro Louisville and beyond—and, indeed, to live up fully to its claim to be an engaged university. Cultivating more and broader faculty leadership in engaged teaching, research, and scholarship requires a different campus culture as well as a different set of infrastructure, processes, supports, rewards, and messaging than the ones currently in place.

The purpose of this report is to examine and assess the status of Engaged Scholarship (ES) in peer institutions and from those findings to develop a set of best

practices for Engaged Scholarship that, if implemented, will enhance both engaged

scholarly outcomes and experiential, engaged learning at the University of Louisville.

Research Process

"We've thrown words around: partnerships, community engagement… We needed some vehicle to understand what this activity amounts to, not as a top-down approach but as a way to hold and lift up all the community-engaged work we've done. Imagine building a house one room at a time without a blueprint!"

-Erin Flynn, Associate Vice-President for Research and Strategic Partnerships, Portland State University

Appointed as Special Assistant to the Provost for Engaged Scholarship in January 2014, I

devoted most of the first few months to intensive reading in the field and in particular to

studying the relevant policies, practices, and administrative structures of our national

counterparts.[1] An initial inventory of our 17 benchmark institutions, the 12 ACC schools,

and a small group of seven other exemplars of Engaged Scholarship (see Appendix B)

revealed a great variety of approaches, emphases, and visibility.   Ten of the 36 schools

profiled use the language of Engaged Scholarship explicitly, and in those that do, a wider

range of disciplines is involved than at the others—especially as regards fuller integration

of the arts and humanities into each university's interdisciplinary engagement activities.

For the next phase of my research, from April-July 2014, I visited seven Carnegie

community-engaged campuses, where I met with and interviewed more than two dozen

---

[1] Background reading comprised a list of sources too numerous to list here, but this report incorporates insights in particular from a volume focusing on taking stock of national trends: see Lorilee Sandmann et al, *Institutionalizing Engagement in Higher Education: The First Wave of Carnegie Classified Institutions* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009). I was also influenced by Ronald Barnett, *Imagining the University* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

administrative and faculty engagement leaders ranging from vice presidents to assistant

professors and service learning coordinators. Three of the seven also offered their recent

Carnegie recertification reports, which I read in advance. Campuses visited included two

benchmarks, two ACC schools, and three other national exemplars of engagement:

- Indiana University Purdue University of Indiana (IUPUI) —among the early (2006) wave of Carnegie designees and a national exemplar of urban engagement
- University of Cincinnati (UC)—one of our benchmarks and the national originator of student co-ops
- University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (UNC) —a benchmark with a highly visible Engaged Scholarship research profile
- North Carolina State University (NCSU) —among the first wave of Carnegie designees and an ACC school
- University of Memphis (UM)-- among the initial 6 Carnegie designees, recommended by engagement consultant Barbara Holland for its early expansion of tenure and promotion policies to value Engaged Scholarship
- Portland State University (PSU)—an internationally recognized leader in community engagement involving faculty and students
- Duke University—an ACC school[2]

A summary of findings from those interviews appears as Appendix C.

The focus of my research was mostly external, and evidence from the inventory

and in particular from those seven campus visits undergirds this report. Yet

understanding the national is meaningless without attention to the local. I brought to this

post my own experience as an engaged scholar and teacher-- having spent the past few

years involved in several local community-based, community-partnered studies that,

while not peer reviewed in a traditional sense, produced scholarly products that have

contributed to local and national policy debates,[3] as well as having developed and led a

2013 research-intensive international study-abroad class that worked with a community

---

[2] For a listing of personnel, units, and dates on each campus, see Appendix C.

[3] *Making Louisville Home for Us All: A 20 Year Action Plan for Fair Housing* [Link]. Corbin, April. "Ahead of the Curve: A Conversation about Fair Housing and Louisville's Vision for Achieving It." *Www.leoweekly.com*. N.p., 11 June 2014. Web [Link]. In Appendix A, find more about that study's processes and outcomes and another example of UofL engaged scholars' products.

partner in South Africa and produced a digital, ethnographic collective journal outcome

that both students and partner have found useful.[4]   I met monthly with supervisors Dale

Billingsley and Gale Rhodes, and later Tracy Eells, to develop and refine the current

research plan to relate to our campus needs. I have had in-depth conversations with

national engagement consultant Barbara Holland to get her impressions of my

observations internally and externally. Since January 2014, I also deepened my

understanding of Engaged Scholarship at the University of Louisville and of our overall

engagement agenda through scores of dialogues with colleagues at every level—

including diverse leaders of the provost's staff, the Office for Community Engagement

(OCE), the Delphi Center/Ideas2Action, Human Resources, and Development, as well as

department chairs, associate deans, directors, faculty, staff, and students from various

academic and service units of the Belknap campus. My contact with the Health Sciences

campus *per se* has taken place mainly through my service on the 21st Century

Engagement Subcommittee, Community Engagement Steering Committee (since 2008),

and the Signature Partnership Faculty Liaisons (since 2012)—as well as through my edits

of and meetings concerning the 2014 UofL Carnegie reclassification report draft and

through participation-observer work with the Spring 2014 Faculty Learning Community

(FLC) on Community Engagement facilitated by Nisha Gupta and Henry Cunningham

(composed of faculty from both campuses). In preparing this report, I also gathered

reflective data by means of a short, informal, qualitative questionnaire sent to the 11

---

[4] Following a 500-level spring seminar entitled "Race, Gender, and Social Justice Histories-US/SA Compared," I took 8 graduate and undergraduate WGS students on a 17-day trip to Cape Town, where we worked with Institute for Justice and Reconciliation and produced a collective online journal that IJR has continued to publicize: see, for example, http://wgst591.omeka.net.

attenders of the 2013-14 FLC, whose responses--while not enough of a sample to be representative—were insightful and revealing. I have drawn from those comments and others across our campus to infuse the recommendations in this report.

Based on findings from my research, the report summarizes the state of the field of Engaged Scholarship, outlines ES best practices and common challenges as observed on the ground at seven peer institutions, lays out an overarching vision for transformative action in this regard within our university, and recommends several levels of action steps in that direction. This study suggests that as we stand poised to move forward with a plan for the 21st century, imbued with the success of our capital campaign and with anticipated new resources from our VSIP program, there is no more effective means to fulfill our mission as a premier metropolitan research university than to concentrate more of our institutional and intellectual resources to achieve excellence in community engagement and Engaged Scholarship.

Definition(s)

"Community engagement could be a functional relationship with another institution, or even between two schools. That's not Engaged Scholarship. By engagement, you may develop questions and new insights. It becomes Engaged Scholarship when you're adding to the body of knowledge [through] an interactive relationship with people outside the academy.

ES is an intellectual enterprise. It is when you work with a community to come up with a question, to determine how to approach it, and to determine what one delivers. "

--David Cox, PhD, public administration professor and Executive Assistant to the President for Partnerships and Administration, University of Memphis

“ About 4 years ago, our provost was there at a campus-wide [workshop]. We gave out laminated strips listing different kinds of Engaged Scholarship products, including “being published in a refereed journal in your field,” “being asked to consult nationally on a topic related to community outreach,” “having your research be instrumental in the successful passage of legislation connected to your area of scholarship,” and so on. We put the strips into piles: definitely counts toward tenure and promotion, maybe counts, or would never count. The provost stood up and said, “No wonder we get into trouble with some of this stuff!” He created a follow-up discussion that he also attended with A&S that showed some slow movement forward.”

--Janelle Voegele, EdD, Director for Teaching & Learning, and Assessment, Portland State University

The focus of this report is Engaged Scholarship, not community engagement overall.

The two are deeply related, however, as Cox's comment above indicates. Some

practitioners would identify Engaged Scholarship as a subset of community engagement;

others, as an evolution from it. Engaged Scholarship, in the words of a recent

commentator, "embraces knowledge discovery, application, dissemination, and

preservation."[5] For the purposes of this report I refer to Engaged Scholarship as a

process that involves community-engaged research or teaching. In truth, however,

Engaged Scholarship is a continuum whose processes and products unfold in the context

of an evolving set of community relationships and often involve a blend of research,

teaching, and service. The fact that those boundaries are blurred, and that the concept of

academic expertise is destabilized or at least complicated once authority is shared with a

community partner, are at the heart of much of the skepticism, even hostility, that

---

[5] Hiram Fitzgerald et al., "The Centrality of Engagement in Higher Education," *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, v. 16, no 3 (2012): 13.

engaged scholars encounter when they bring their work to an audience of their university peers, chairs, and review committees. Still, based on the increased attention paid to engagement at the nation's universities, it looks as if Engaged Scholarship is an important emerging pedagogical and epistemological scholarly approach for the 21st-century university.

State of the Field

"Our Engaged Scholarship was not strategic at the outset. People genuinely wanted to learn and do together. We always stayed in touch with the provost's office. It was academic, not student affairs, not teaching and learning, we needed to emphasize that."

--Mike Smith, dean of the UNC School of Government, former vice-chancellor for Public Service and Engagement

Although its roots are much older, Ernest Boyer first set the current generation of American universities on the course of community engagement and Engaged Scholarship with his 1990s challenge to higher education to lead in the "search for answers to the most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems" by becoming "a more vigorous partner" to its surrounding communities.[6] Boyer's clarion call and his ideas on valuing applied knowledge launched the first generation of Engaged Scholarship *as such*,[7] spawning new conversations and new community initiatives in the academy, albeit

---

[6] Quoted in Sandmann et al., p. 1.

[7] This is not to suggest that academic involvement in community work began in the 1990s: indeed, it can be traced back at least a century earlier, to the "progressive" generation of late 19th-century reformers such as, in Chicago, for example, Jane Addams, John Dewey, Ida B. Wells, and (Kentucky-born) Sophonisba Breckinridge, who influenced the approach of academic programs, including philosophy and social work, at University of Chicago.   Many scholars of engagement roots its origins in the 1862 Morrill Act, which created land-grant universities.

far more vigorously on some campuses (for example, Portland State and U-Memphis) than others.   This turn-of-the-century generation of engaged scholars have relied upon but also expanded older, John Dewey- based, largely social-science-oriented ideas of universities as mechanisms for solving social/urban problems to a more reciprocal view of community partnerships and to a more expansive embrace the power of imagination and the arts as an integral part of what it means to "engage" with the public.

Economic and socio-political turns of the 21st century have given more urgency to those ideas even as public dollars for higher education have declined.   Since the Carnegie Foundation for Teaching and Learning began its elective community engagement certification in 2006, 235 universities have joined the initial 76 who signed on. This collective push to embed engagement in universities has heightened its identification not only with the service mission of the university but, increasingly, with its core teaching and research missions since they are most universities' *raison d'etre*.

Community engagement is distinct from traditional "service" or even from "community outreach" because it depends on mutuality, whereas the latter are "more informed by a notion of one-way transfer or translation of knowledge from the university to the community."[8] The impetus for authentic, mutually beneficial community partnerships is perhaps especially pressing for urban and metropolitan universities such as ours, facing recurring cuts in public funding, yet functioning as anchor institutions for cities contending with more than a generation of starved municipal budgets, aging deindustrialized infrastructures, and spiraling social and employment needs.

---

[8] Holland, D., et al., "Models of Engaged Scholarship: An Interdisciplinary Discussion." *Collaborative Anthropologies, 3*, p. 29. (2010).

The growth of community engagement and Engaged Scholarship as focal points for the academy in the 1990s also saw a concomitant rise of several national consortia to promote and refine university engagement strategies. These range, for example, from the more student-learning-centered Campus Compact to Imagining America, a national consortium to promote university-community engagement in the arts, humanities, and design—as well as an more recent, expanding array of other engagement networks with a particular niche, including several (Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities or CUMU, Urban -Serving Universities or USU, The Research University Civic Engagement Network or TRUCEN, for example) that are especially geared toward urban and metropolitan research universities. Membership in each of these networks is costly, and—according to many of the campuses I visited—is becoming part of a calculus about its value in relation to an increasingly strategic calculation about the optimal engagement strategy particular to each campus.

The literature on community engagement generally and Engaged Scholarship in particular identifies two primary sources of motivation for doing this kind of work. First is the "democratic," locating higher education (and the liberal arts in particular) as the most hopeful site for reinvigorating democracy, citizen/civic responsibility, and a sense of shared purpose in an age of declining investment in the collective and public institutions that make up society. This model, as my various campus hosts emphasized, was the initial locus point for most community-engaged scholarship, teaching, and service, and continues to be an important motivating force. This democratic agenda has had wide and longstanding appeal to a subset of scholars across virtually every discipline and to many voices in and out of the university concerned with social justice, and it has

often entailed deploying university resources (intellectual, human-service, and fiscal) for community improvement or change even as it pushes academics to value wider forms of knowledge and to be more reciprocal. Too often, scholars seeking tenure or promotion at research universities (especially those in less applied fields) have had to pursue such endeavors on top of a more traditional scholarly agenda with little acknowledgment from their peers even when their classes responded positively to fieldwork and/or their research had demonstrated wider public or social merit.   The second basis is what I will call the "technocratic," a more recent and pragmatic response to the spread of neoliberalism and its emphasis on individualism and private enterprise.[9] This motivator may or may not be democratic, and it seeks to replace public universities' declining revenues with dollars generated through partnerships with industry, government, and the nonprofit sector. To this end, many universities are now deploying their Development offices as well as their Sponsored Programs toward a strategic assessment of which partnerships have potential to fill that function and how to better coordinate engagement work with those units.

These two bases for engagement are not necessarily at odds, but they obviously carry different implications and kinds of communication strategies.   Grappling and making peace with those two rationales and the sometimes-competing strategies they suggest is a current challenge for community-engaged universities whether they discuss it openly or not. This is true, as I observed, even among longtime leaders in community engagement such as Portland State University (whose mission, carved prominently on a

---

[9] These designations have received some attention as such in the literature and are consistent with engagement consultant Patti Clayton's discussions on our campus. The democratic approach is more asset-focused, highlighting reciprocity or work "with" a community, whereas the technocratic often describes community "needs" and reprises an older language of "helping" or "serving" communities.

bridge above a major thoroughfare of the campus, is "let knowledge serve the city").

Pitting the two strategies against each other is not rational, as Stan Hyland, dean of

University of Memphis School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, puts it: "In the long

run, this is the only solution for cities." In most cases, the social justice commitments of

longtime engaged scholars and leaders have kept the democratic orientation of

community engagement vibrant at their universities even as a new generation of

leadership seeks to expand and systematize wider partnerships that can generate revenue.

University of Cincinnati, for example--where co-ops, internships, and service learning

serve more than 5000 students per year-- has adopted a policy requiring all for-profits to

pay interns and co-op students, whereas nonprofits are not mandated to do so. In the case

of PSU, a recent reorganization has brought more centralization to their relatively

decentralized, broad-based engagement initiatives, along with a new vice-presidency (for

Research and Strategic Partnerships) that seeks not to oversee faculty-led and student-

centered partnerships directly but to coordinate, assess, and leverage them for greater

revenue as well as greater impact. In that process, alongside expanding partnerships with

Intel Corporation (for example), more longstanding grassroots-oriented partnerships

continue to thrive through their designation as "Institutional Priority" projects: these may

require internal rather than generate external funding. At IUPUI, this tension between

the two rationales has raised institutional questions about widespread use of the word

"civic" (which is how the university has most often described its engagement strategies

for a decade or more) since it seems to have little currency outside the academy.

The practice of Engaged Scholarship remains contested in some fields and on

some campuses, especially in terms of how to evaluate the products of engagement for

faculty tenure and promotion, as discussed on pp. 16, 17. Re-envisioning more expansive

criteria for tenure and promotion is a central part of the conversations on many

campuses—leading to and then spurred forward by a widely read study on that topic,

conducted and released in 2008 by Imagining America: "Scholarship in Public:

Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University."[Link] While the

reward structures remain variable, the heightened discourse in American universities on

community engagement and Engaged Scholarship continues to give rise to new interest in

more "public" or "applied" fields such as Public Health, Public History, and Public (as

we have) or Applied (as U-Memphis has) Anthropology. Throughout health sciences

disciplines, community-based participatory research has increasing visibility and stature

as a method of inquiry.

Most recently, the spread of Engaged Scholarship has its analysts and arbiters

turning to thorny questions of how to deepen and assess its impact. Traditionally, since

university scholars pursued Engaged Scholarship largely from their own passions, the

issues and areas of inquiry have been extremely diverse, even idiosyncratic: what might

be called "scattershot." But as university-community engagement has become

increasingly institutionalized, its leaders on many campuses—including several of those I

visited--are now looking at either directing significant portions of their engagement

resources to more "place-based" engagement (a model associated with University of

Pennsylvania, and one which our Signature Partnership Initiative leans toward) or more

topic-based engagement, such as sustainability (also manifested in part on our campus

through the Sustainability Council and the Sustainability Scholars' Roundtable) in search

of greater impact. A third approach is to try and better coordinate (and in some cases

limit the number of) partnerships in order to deepen a more manageable number of them.

That process of assessing impact in hopes of deepening it is still new, put in motion in

part by questions raised in the Carnegie recertification inquiries.

Common Challenges

> *"If someone had asked me ten years ago if this campus would be talking about T&P guidelines valuing engagement, I'd have said it's never going to happen."*

–Lynn Blanchard, UNC CCPS

The opening imagery in this report might suggest that, for an engaged scholar, versions of

Nirvana exist on the seven campuses visited for this study. Not so. While it is true that

they are all, in some respects, somewhat farther along this path than UofL, each

interviewee revealed continuing obstacles to their progress in regard to engaged

scholarship and engagement generally. The open-endedness and experimental nature of

Engaged Scholarship turns out to make it a challenging crop to fertilize and harvest amid

the sometimes rigid structures of any university, especially a large public one. Challenges

among the seven were particular and varied, but because they also reflected

commonalities, I will summarize and discuss them briefly under three headings:

1) **SILO-IZATION AND ENGAGEMENT ARE NOT FRIENDS:** Engaged scholars

and leaders lamented the persistence of silos at every campus I visited.   This aspect of

universities as an organization makes coordination and support of these kinds of activities

quite a task.   At NCSU, for ex., the construction and extension of a very impressive

cross-referenced website showcases all engaged projects and activities and has brought

people into a wider range of collaborations and alerted the public to a wider range of

opportunities for connecting with the campus. Yet the site's leaders acknowledge that it

is a "bridge" through which they are still working to get the entirety of engagement

initiatives on their campus documented, publicized, and in communication with one

another. Not only are siloes discrete and separate from one another: they are rigid,

whereas Engaged Scholarship is boundary-crossing and requires an ability to innovate.

The challenge, I heard repeatedly, lies in creating structures and processes that are

adaptive and flexible, not just allowing for but in fact encouraging innovation.

2) **TO RESTRUCTURE OR NOT TO RESTRUCTURE, THAT IS THE**

QUESTION: Reorganization in search of better coordination, visibility, and support for

engagement is very common in the campuses I visited, often revolving around questions

such as the value of centralized vs. decentralized approaches; whether and how much to

confine ES support measures to tenure-line faculty (versus including or emphasizing term

or PTL since they are often among the most interested in it); as well as concerns about

how to connect processes and structures for Engaged Scholarship (typically reporting to

the or a chief academic officer) more clearly with university research offices—an

important step for getting it valued for P&T. Many engaged-research-and-teaching

initiatives started small: some had an office assigned to coordinate them, while others

grew organically and without any support at all, other than perhaps a supportive

department chair (as in the case of the Anthropology Department at Memphis).

Engagement initiatives had clearly passed through several incarnations in virtually every

case, and interviewees on every campus had a story of an administrative oversight position that had once existed but no more. Even UNC's Carolina Center for Public Service, which has shown a great deal of continuity since its founding in 1999, has refined its focus from community service to ES, has been put in charge of the campus student service-learning program (APPLES), and has seen various changes in its funding structure and relationship to the provost and chancellor. Several of the campuses had recently taken or were in the process of taking steps toward more centralization: at IUPUI, for example, their Center for Service Learning (est. 1993, which coordinates extensive faculty and student engagement programs that include nine service learning collaboratives serving 8000 students annually) and their Solution Center (which operates as a front door for community partners or prospective partners) have recently come under direction from the newly created Vice-President for Community Engagement, whose former title was Vice-President for External Affairs.[10]   A similarly broad student service-learning center at PSU has just been redeployed as part of a newly created Office for Academic Innovation from what had once been their teaching and learning center. These changes bespeak a continuing search for ways to synchronize, optimize, and sustain ES as part of combining the two rationales for it, as discussed on p. 12, and in search of bridging siloes and seeking better funding.

3) **REVISING P&T GUIDELINES IS A KEY STEP, BUT NOT A MAGIC FIX**: In every case except that of Duke—where valuing engagement for tenure review "is not going to happen," according to the director of their ambitious DukeEngage student-

---

[10] That reorganization is still in process, but it looks as if CSL will also continue to have a report line to the chief academic officer.

focused program—each of the campuses has struggled or is still struggling for a more expansive set of faculty personnel guidelines that can value ES. But what was also striking is that even among those with longstanding language to validate ES (such as PSU and UM, which adopted more inclusive personnel language in the late 1990s), I heard of continuing battles to get that language understood, implemented, and interpreted favorably, from the perspective of engaged scholars on the campus.   For UM, as an example, language in the university-level policy that explicitly cites ES as a scholarly product has not prevented struggles at the department level, convincing the Engaged Scholarship Faculty Committee, as its co-chair told me, they need to go back to meet with individual departments with whom they had not done so in years past. Even with better language in place in personnel documents, earning tenure as an engaged scholar requires extensive documentation/explanation of scholarly products and can sometimes mean going an extra mile to produce written products that may seem an addendum to the intended outcome, or simply accepting that an experiential class will take more time than one's work plan will ever convey. Positive measures taken to support tenure-seeking engaged scholars include-- at PSU, for ex.—a biennial faculty learning community devoted to academic writing (a similar program at IUPUI is called "portfolio development"), which includes modules on scholarly products of ES and how to document them for review committees, as well as modules on reading and interpreting interdisciplinary writing for tenure review. Chairs are asked to attend one session of this program with their untenured faculty member.

MEANING OF THESE CHALLENGES FOR UOFL:

UofL faces these same challenges, which is on the one hand a comfort. Yet the conversations and even explications of the philosophical purposes surrounding scholarly engagement were more advanced on each of the seven campuses than I have observed them to be at UofL. On our campus, community engagement has not actually spread campus-wide and is not yet, as they like to say at PSU and IUPUI, "in our DNA." There are important initiatives already in motion at UofL that hold incredible promise for interdisciplinary Engaged Scholarship, including the Signature Partnership Initiative (in particular, its YMCA project); the Sustainability Council; the housing-justice work of the Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research; the community garden project; the Digital Humanities initiative; and the Martin Luther King Jr. Scholars program, to name what I would identify as some leading candidates for wider development and support.

Yet despite the best efforts of OCE and I2A, periodic endorsements from our top leadership, substantial progress in a few units (SPHIS, for ex.), and the small but vigorous efforts of committed ES faculty, staff, and (a few) students, community engagement generally and Engaged Scholarship in particular remain poorly coordinated, poorly understood, under-resourced, and marginalized into a few units and offices which may or may not be in conversation or even aware of one another and may indeed be duplicative and competing for scarce resources. ES depends on collaboration, information-sharing, and camaraderie, but too often what we have are, in the words of one member of the 2013-14 engagement FLC, "functional fiefdoms" more concerned with protecting their survival than with relationship-building. ES often starts small, with the result that even the best initiatives may too often go unnoticed or under-recognized without a very careful process of coordination. Two examples among many include (a) for years IT allocated 5 GB of server space to each UL professor, but a failure to make that option known to any but the most persistent faculty or to have IT technology support for enacting it, along with the rigid constraints of the university's Graphic Identity Policy, retard UofL's potential to match its peer institutions' forward motion in Digital Humanities; (b) the Sustainability initiative has made huge strides at UofL, including in the area of ES (the Sustainability Scholars' Roundtable), yet there is no Development officer working on it and no time in anyone's work plan for fund-raising. Until or unless critical university apparatuses including Development, IT, Research, and Communication and Marketing—as well as the promise of the University-Community Partnership Council-- can be deployed to become boundary-crossers in order to realize our hopes for Engaged Scholarship, we cannot realize our enormous potential.

Foundational Best Practices

‘‘ W hat you see here is purposeful, and it's been transformative."

–Terri Helmlinger-Ratcliff, Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement, North Carolina State University

It is clear from both the inventory of 36 universities and my more in-depth observation of seven of them that leadership, messaging, administrative structures, processes surrounding engagement, systems of support and reward, kinds of partnerships, and points or fields of emphasis vary a great deal among different institutions. There is no "one size fits all" formula for success in ES.

Yet there were several thematic "big picture" strengths that emerged in interviews across all seven campuses visited, all of which stem from <u>an institutional commitment to community (including scholarly) engagement that advances a culture increasingly conducive to it.</u> These four over-arching and foundational best practices are as follows, along with examples of each. Each foundational best practice is followed by 1 or more recommendations for UofL. Note: these are only a few of the most outstanding examples of each practice, and many of them could easily have fit into more than one of these four categories. Each of these recommendations, while correlated to one foundational practice, also addresses more than one of them.

1) **NEED FOR ENGAGED FACULTY LEADERSHIP:** A visible groundswell of faculty (and, to a lesser extent, student) leadership across many divisions and disciplines is crucial to developing and sustaining significant community engagement in research and teaching. Engagement leaders were all emphatic that <u>developing faculty engagement has proven harder when an engagement office is not directly connected to academic affairs, so ES initiatives typically report directly or co-report to a provost or her associate/vice.</u> On each campus, I noted that the motivations of engaged-faculty leaders still typically spring from the desire to work for a more just society, and they are passionate and eloquent on the subject. Forms range from UNC, where a 2-year cohort of funded faculty fellows—intentionally recruited from both health and social sciences, as well as arts and humanities-- work to develop collaborative research projects with a wide range of outcomes; to PSU, where every graduating senior has completed a community-based

"It's not going to happen without top leadership support, but it's also not going to happen without support at the bottom. There are faculty members on all levels on any campus interested in what we are calling Engaged Scholarship, so you've got to create venues for those people to find each other and begin to build a community of support for them within the institution."

-- David Cox, PhD, public administration professor and Executive Assistant to the President for Partnerships and Administration, University of Memphis

capstone course with both a faculty member and a community partner; to

University of Memphis, where an unfunded Engaged Scholarship Faculty

Committee established in 2002 built a hub of engagement that got the attention of

the Carnegie Foundation as it initiated its community-engagement classification.

Administrators, faculty, and/or engagement personnel on every one of the

campuses I visited volunteered some variation of the need for substantial and

committed faculty leadership. Several (IUPUI, UNC, Memphis, for example)

emphasized it as *the* central element for success.   Even in terms of cultivating

student engagement, the role of the faculty is key, many interviewees emphasized.

Recommendation for UofL based on this foundational best practice:
With representation from every college/school, and with faculty from all levels,
create a Provost's Council for Community-Engaged Scholarship, ether as an
independent body or as an arm of the newly reconstituted (spring 2015)
Community Engagement Steering Committee. Similar models exist at IUPUI,
PSU, and UNC. Service on Council should be mandated at unit level to receive
AWP credit split between research and service. Council is ongoing but its
immediate purpose would be to undertake an academic- year-long NEEDS
ASSESSMENT of policies, processes, and type of structure optimal to advance
Engaged Scholarship at UofL, devoting some of its attention to steps toward
mechanisms for assisting engaged scholars in effectively producing scholarl
outcomes and documenting them effectively for P&T, as well as expanding P&T
guidelines. More detailed recommendations from these 2014 campus visits
should be made available help to guide the Council. Council should be small
enough, at least for its initial year, to work as a task force. It should be tenured-
faculty-led and possess a faculty majority, with representatives from wider
metropolitan community (with at least one member of the UCP Council), OCE,
I2A, and 2-3 staff from service units that have close community ties (examples
include the Sustainability initiative or the LGBT Center, though the latter appears
never to have been consulted or counted in any Carnegie data).
[NOTE: A new or revised administrative structure for supporting ES may well be
called for, and I recommend holding out UNC's CCPS as a model, generally
speaking: see Appendix B for overview of models. But to create or restructure
now, and appoint a new Vice Provost or top leader to head the result, would
recapitulate the error we have made so far by offering limited faculty leadership
opportunities cross-cutting all colleges and schools. The proposed process allows
more and more diverse engaged-faculty perspectives to be heard, including those

in disciplines or colleges that have not taken the lead in supporting them. It is recommended that for now, this initiative report directly to the provost, or if that is not possible, to Vice Provost Tracy Eells and VP Dan Hall jointly, in consultation with Dale Billingsley, Gale Rhodes, Bob Goldstein/ Connie Shumake, and Mordean Taylor-Archer.]

2) **TOP ADMINISTRATIVE ADVOCACY AND INCENTIVIZATION:**

Support from the top is equally crucial. Their titles and frames of reference may vary, but leading administrators must be conversant with the principles, challenges, breadth, and rationale(s) for Engaged Scholarship, as well as able to describe its specific manifestations on their own campus. That language should be commonplace both externally and internally, but rhetoric alone is not enough: it must also be coupled with concrete rewards for doing this kind of work and a demonstrated commitment to creating mechanisms for facilitating it. Many provosts and presidents concerned with their legacy made a sizeable personal commitment of money and/or time to create new entities to advance ES. Over and over I heard tales of a single administrator with both commitment and resources who then shifted the ground for Engaged Scholarship in significant ways. At UNC, for example, an outgoing chancellor led an impressive endowment campaign for the Carolina Center for Public Service. At PSU, a new president (Wim Wiewel) in 2008 whose academic background was in connecting campuses with communities garnered what was then the single largest gift ($25 million in matching funds) from a private foundation (Miller) to boost sustainability and incentivize literally hundreds of classes and research projects. Current or recent leadership at campuses I visited have demonstrated their

commitments to Engaged Scholarship by diverse initiatives, including (among others) these examples:

a) working assiduously through existing processes to build support for an expanded set of tenure and promotion guidelines that value Engaged Scholarship (achieved in 4 of the 7: see Appendix C*)* and, in some cases (IUPUI), value community-engaged service for tenure and promotion*;*

b) mandating administrative structural changes to facilitate the conditions for increasing/supporting/rewarding faculty scholarly engagement (with recent major reorganizations evident at IUPUI, UC, NCSU, and PSU, as discussed on p. 14 and 35-6);

c) committing major pools of new resources to fund Engaged Scholarship in research (e.g., in 2013-14, UM committed $50,000 annually for three years of retention-related funds for engaged research using students in the field);

d) committing funds to launch or boost engaged teaching/learning (in 2011, the U-Cinn. Provost set aside a major lump sum to launch UC Forward, which now enrolls 1800 students/year in "trans-disciplinary," "transformative" classes incentivized at $10k-per-class for faculty and leading to undergraduate certificate programs in innovative transformation, critical visions, minority health, medical humanities and bioethics, and historic preservation. [Link]

e) overseeing and funding the development of major new ways to synthesize, package, and present that university's story of Engaged Scholarship, both to the larger public and across the university. An impressive example comes from NCSU, where leadership commissioned an outside web developer (at a cost of

approx. $19,000) to produce and keep current (costing $400/month) a sweeping

Outreach and Engagement website [Link] that would attach to the university

server and present a user-friendly "front door" for the external community with

cross-referenced topic listings that also laid basis for new internal collaborations

and for Carnegie review data collection;

f) in both Portland and Memphis, partnering with the home city's Community

Foundation to fund an Engaged Scholarship research project annually (negotiated

by the president or provost);

g) lacking major resources, another way to highlight Engaged Scholarship in

research both internally and externally comes from a university-wide annual

"Excellence in Engaged Scholarship" [Link] award—one example is at University

of Memphis, administered through the Vice-President's Office for Research

(which gives it more weight for P&T purposes) and carrying a $2000 award as

well as public recognition.

Three Recommendations for UofL based on this foundational best practice:
- Mandate that all campus leadership structures that might benefit ES by becoming more connected to it (Development, Grants and Contracts, IT, Communications and Marketing, etc) attend a meeting with provost, ES special assistant, and other senior engagement leadership officials to discuss how to better support faculty and student engagement initiatives; make necessary infrastructure changes to operationalize those practices;
- Establish and publicize 2 competitive research incentives for ES, to be administered by an academic office, with faculty composing the selection committee: amount for each should be significant, at least $10,000, to be awarded annually for the coming three years at least. Guidelines for awards would stipulate a minimum of 2 departments collaborating if cross-college/school or a minimum of 3 if within one school; a demonstrated community partner; involvement of students either as a class or as research assistants; and a plan for a (broadly construed) scholarly outcome. Winners would be expected to deliver a presentation at the next Celebration of Faculty Excellence. Priority should be

given to tenure-line faculty and to at least 1 project involving the arts and humanities (disciplines inherently less competitive for external funding). A committee of the Council could fine-tune these guidelines and form a selection panel. One or both of the awards might possibly target a certain topic, prioritizing (for example) the geographic area of the Signature Partnership Initiative, Sustainability, 55k, or the results of the Metro Violence Prevention Task Force.

- After Year One of the above project, approach Community Foundation of Louisville and propose a partnered fund to support Engaged Scholarship coming out of UofL: again, as above, this might be targeted to suit one of the above topics, or negotiated according to CFL's interests.

3) **ADVANCING A CULTURE OF COLLABORATION:** Engaged Scholarship can flourish only amid a culture of collaboration. Interdisciplinarity is a vital part of that culture—but only a part, because what I observed goes deeper than bridging disciplinary divides to bridging administrative structural and programmatic ones even when there are no tangible incentives for doing so, other than good communication and the hope of positive larger outcomes. Each of the seven campuses profiled has dedicated initiatives to encourage that kind of collaborative culture, although the specifics of them varied greatly—from a Cooperative Extension Faculty Council of representatives from each college and school at NCSU who have historically connected the campus to communities in and around Raleigh, to funded faculty fellowships with the aim of producing or advancing collaborative interdisciplinary and community-partnered research (UNC, 2-year Thorpe Faculty-Engaged Scholars for tenured or tenure-track faculty) or propagating innovative new forms of faculty and student engagement (PSU, Faculty-in-Residence program incentivizes both tenure-line and term faculty to develop new student and faculty initiatives that spread the mission of ES, with specific emphases such as "Academic Writing" and "Student Success"

[Link]). Bridging academic-community as well as disciplinary divides to expand

opportunities for experiential learning often requires an adaptivity, collaborativity,

innovation, experimentation, and risk (as seen in the

UC Forward program, for example) that university

structures do not typically allow, so a great deal of

intentionality is required.

2 Recommendations for UofL based on this foundational best practice:
- Using the NCSU outreach and engagement site as a model, reassign OCE staff to work with ES special and administrative assistants to develop such a site for UofL, correlating it with the Carnegie data collection process. [NCSU leaders have volunteered their development team's contact info and have agreed to provide complimentary advice for proceeding.] The value of this project is readily evident in visiting it [Link] because it functions as a "front door" for the community, but the process of creating it is also a major initiative toward creating a culture of collaboration.
- Mandate an umbrella (structure and processes to be determined) drawing together all diversity and social justice-related engagement and service units, centers, and institutes to begin conversations about how to overcome silos, become more collaborative, and achieve greater cumulative impacts: embed incentives for that kind of cross-unit collaboration leading to documented impact.

4) **DYNAMIC, COMMITTED ENGAGEMENT**

PERSONNEL AT ALL LEVELS: Tangible

commitments to community work in their jobs and in

their own research and practice, along with a diverse

Six of the 8 respondents who completed the 2013-14 UofL faculty learning community on engagement ranked "a contact person on campus to whom you could turn regularly for support and mentoring as you develop engaged research, experiential classes, or your engaged portfolio for T&P" as their number 1 need going forward as an engaged scholar, compared to any web-based support resources or an ongoing discussion group. Yet there is no one at UofL tasked with that as their primary role. The service learning coordinator we once had was ineffective, in part because her report line was to Student Affairs rather than to any academic office. Yet it is a handicap to faculty ES in teaching, and to building student-centered curricular community-engagement not to have at least one person dedicated fully to that role.

28

toolbox of contacts, teaching tools, and reading matter, characterized engagement personnel (faculty and staff) I met on all seven campuses at both the operational and policy level of Engaged Scholarship. Conversations moved quickly past jargon to discuss actual problems, people, and examples-- as well as philosophies and pedagogies. Many of them, in fact, deluged me later with reading matter and weblinks that enriched my next steps. Frankly, only a few of the campus representatives spoke directly of this dimension of their work, and those who did tended to put it in individualistic terms such as "Amy's commitment has really moved PSU's engagement agenda." This point may seem too obvious even to mention, but it bears emphasis because so many of the front-line engagement personnel at UofL are wearing too many hats or have been redeployed from another area of expertise. I observed a sense of dedication and a close match of skill sets with faculty and student needs in most if not all of the people I met on all seven campuses, from service learning coordinators to associate VP's. This quality is closely linked to #3 above, and it seems to form a strong component of claims made at both PSU and IUPUI that "engagement is in our DNA." Many of the rank-and-file personnel I met on the visits appeared more committed to empowering faculty and students to engage than they were to any particular framework, office, or set of procedures. At UNC, for example, the CCPS in its early stages found great success in regards to the dynamism of its people-profile by bringing in a longtime civil rights advocate as a community consultant based on her knowledge of collaborative academic-community-based research and teaching. The spirit I observed in all these venues appeared to make possible

many successes in bridging academic-community and disciplinary divides, as well

as to attract more scholars, even resistant ones, into Engaged Scholarship by

providing needed teaching- and research-related resources, as well as community

contacts.

Recommendation for UofL based on this foundational best practice:
Assign ES Special Assistant to work with Billingsley, Rhodes, Hall, Payette, Cunningham, Gupta to develop immediate guidelines for a job search for a resource coordinator for Engaged Scholarship and Experiential Teaching, to report to an academic office, and ideally to more than one, as well as jointly to the Office for Community Engagement. Person's expertise should include participatory pedagogies and they should have experience working with faculty development, multi-disciplinarity, community partnerships, and experiential teaching, with an expertise level through which they could conceivably co-publish with a faculty member. Person could begin, apprised of fact that job could shift somewhat and move into different administrative structure in the future.

Best Practices Building Blocks

"*Engaged Scholarship is not taking away from our existing assets [as a research university], it is a new way to support them.*"

–Barry Messer, Faculty Fellow, Institute for Sustainable Solutions, PSU

The four points that follow stood out from my campus visits as highly successful

practices with powerful lessons and applicability for UofL even though they were not

manifested in every university I observed. Undertaking all of these initiatives would not

be possible, but each should be strategically considered on its own merit. Each one is

paired with one or more recommendation(s) for UofL.

1. **BUILD ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP INTO EXISTING STRENGTHS:** This point may seem obvious, but bears stating as it was emphasized in several of the campus interviews (PSU, UC, and NCSU). Rather than starting something new, many ES leaders recommend building on what is already there by bringing more resources, coordination, and units to bear on growing it. Transformation cannot happen overnight, and unless they have major NIH or other external funding, ES projects tend to start very small. Based on what I observed, there needs to be more strategic decision-making here about which ones we want to help to expand.

   UC, for example, pioneered the concept of co-ops in the early 20th century—a milestone they have marketed to good effect--and they have developed that point of pride into a major academic unit called PROPEL (Division of Professional Practice [Link]) a student engagement-focused academic unit that serves more than 5000 students annually and includes co-ops, practica, internships, community-partnered service-learning, and the new UC Forward program mentioned previously. NCSU has transformed its Cooperative Extension mission into an engagement focus, while UNC has built CCPS on its long history of socially-relevant scholarship that traces back to Frank Porter Graham and Howard Odum in the 1930s. The concept of a "deep dive" relative to greater impact and strategic use of resources was also repeatedly stressed to me at PSU.

   RELATED RECOMMENDATION FOR UofL:
   When I asked many UofL personnel individually what they see as our greatest strengths, the two most common answers spun around a) our urban/metropolitan mission and our status as the "hometown university"; or b) our diversity and

social justice initiatives. A major failing, I was told anecdotally but repeatedly, was that—given our declining state support-- in saying yes to so many things, we do too few things well and have too many, therefore too few, directions.   As one member of the 2013-14 engagement FLC put it, "We have great parts, but no whole. When that summation happens, it's the institutional structures that make it happen or not." Consistent with research recommendations form the 21st century processes, I propose that, integrating information provided by the strategic assessment suggested below, we lift up a few key research themes relative to our metropolitan mission that are or could be the focus of interdisciplinary ES across all (especially our largest) colleges and schools; resource collaborations relevant to them across all colleges and schools, publicize them, deepen community ties relative to them; and dedicate personnel from our Development apparatus to them. Because of our success in diversity and social justice, which is an essential tenet of our urban/metropolitan mission, this process should intentionally involve Diversity and Social Justice leaders across the campus.

> *"I recommend starting small: figure out how to do five of these experiential classes really well."*
>
> *– Seanna Kerrigan, Capstone Program Director, PSU*

2. **SUPPORT STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AS A WAY TO BUILD ENGAGED-SCHOLARSHIP**

CAPACITY: While most of this report has focused on cultivating faculty engagement, several of the campuses I visited devoted rather extensive scholarly engagement efforts exclusively (Duke) or almost exclusively (UC) to curricular engagement.   Both at Duke and at IUPUI, engagement leaders also stressed to me that building greater community- based and experiential learning capacity, besides serving a seminal role in engaging students, can be the best route to greater faculty engagement. IUPUI, where nearly all undergraduate scholarship aid now contains some service requirement, is the most instructive example: IUPUI administers nine Sam Jones service-learning, community-service, or community-engaged research scholarships which since 1994 have awarded $3.8 million to

more than 1800 students. Their longstanding engagement leader, Julie Hatcher,

reported that more than any other single factor, IUPUI's engaged-scholarship

profile has been built on the basis of the service-learning assistant scholarships

(about $247,000 budget and the only of the Jones scholarships that serves

undergraduate and graduate equally). Through these programs, dozens of faculty

members and staff each year can get 5, 10, 15, or even 20 hours weekly of student

assistance for time and energy required to do the outreach groundwork to build a

community-engaged or experiential class, research, or service project. Working

with mentors from IUPUI's Center for Service Learning, faculty who have not

previously developed such courses or classes are thus incentivized to do so, while

their students gain valuable community experience in these positions.

At the graduate student level, ES initiatives I observed included, for ex., a

thriving participatory research graduate certificate program at UNC [Link] that

involves both health sciences and social sciences, especially Anthropology.

RELATED RECOMMENDATION FOR UofL:
Explore a) developing a community engagement scholarship program based on
the one at IUPUI that uses both undergrad and grad students and supports faculty-
led engagement initiatives on both campuses and makes student assistants
available for community partnership development; and/or b) developing a
successful undergraduate academic experiential-learning program at UofL—
consistent with the new QEP development processes and as GenEd requirements
are under revision. In consultation with the ES Special Assistant, consider using
the Martin Luther King Scholars program as a pilot since they are an academic
group recruited on the basis of community engagement and overseen by Luke
Buckman in Honors. In the case of an undergraduate program, involve in the
conversation Pam Curtis, Errol Wint, and other Student Affairs/Admissions
leaders who have displayed serious commitments to community engagement, but
make project report to an academic officer. Consider if endowing a program like
just one of the IUPUI Jones Scholars program at UofL might become a legacy
request of our president, outgoing provost, or other UofL leaders.

3. **SUPPORT ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP IN THE ARTS AND
   HUMANITIES:** As mentioned earlier, ES initiatives dating back to the 1990s
   have increasingly incorporated arts/culture and humanities projects into their
   implementation on many campuses. No university can be fully community-
   engaged, and certainly not civically engaged, if it does not incorporate those
   disciplines that are a cornerstone of the liberal arts—touching the more
   imaginative and symbolic aspects of the human experience-- and instead relies
   only on units that are more predisposed to engagement for economic development
   or even social progress. I observed ES related to arts and humanities on most of
   the campuses I visited: leaders from NCSU, Duke, and IUPUI suggested
   Imagining America membership as an important resource in their successes n this
   regard. At UNC, in part through contacts made in their Faculty Fellows programs
   (which have been conscientious in outreach across many disciplines), health
   sciences researchers whose expertise is in participatory methods have initiated a
   major collaboration with visual arts professors on health-disparities research
   funding initiative. Even at UC, which emphasizes faculty engagement (apart
   from community-engaged teaching) the least of any of the 7 schools visited, their
   VP for Research convened art, music, humanities and "soft" social sciences
   disciplines into a group called "Pathway B" (with Pathways A and C being STEM
   and industry-based) to help advance those faculty's research productivity. At
   Duke, the College of Arts and Sciences supports many forms of ES in the

humanities and social sciences (see for example, their Forum for Scholars and Publics [Link]), which many supporters identify as a kind of "soft engagement" (what we might call public intellectualism). Digital Humanities is an emerging field of scholarly innovation for engagement, and all of the schools queried are offering IT support and resources in this regard—from modest (NCSU provides substantial server space) to moderate (IUPUI supports its Public History program and other digital humanities initiatives through its ScholarWorks [Link]) to expansive (UNC's College of Arts and Sciences supports a technology program that teaches faculty how to blog and build wordpress sites to showcase both student and faculty products [Link]). Indeed, there are many promising but small ES arts-and-humanities-related initiatives in our own School of Music, College of Education, and College of Arts and Sciences, but in many cases, they are not that visible even in their own College because of lack of IT capacity (Anthropology's impressive community-based courses, for ex.), and most are not well-connected to broader UofL engagement initiatives. The lack of priority given to arts/culture/humanities in other units was made evident in the first round of 21st-century research focus topics and in the 2014 OCE call for Faculty Engagement grants, which included no appropriate category (typically "culture) for such projects from a set of fixed choices, only subsuming them under "education" or "health."

RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UofL:
1) Facilitate digital scholarship by initiating a conversation about a loosening of the UofL graphic design policy and a review of the IT cost-recovery system to allow for more creative web communication from UofL units that may not have funding available to support it or whose products will not fit within the confines of Plone 4; **2)** Partner with the College of Arts and Sciences to support UofL

membership in Imagining America arts, humanities, and design national engagement consortium; **3)** initiate a larger conversation between provost, ES special assistant, Arts and Culture Partnership, Music School Dean, and new A&S dean about needs and opportunities for advancing ES in College and in arts more broadly; **4)** co-host with A&S a major lecture in 2015-16 by a prominent engaged scholar/policymaker in arts/humanities: engagement faculty at Duke recommend David Scobey (author of *The Copernican Moment* and co-founder of Imagining America, whom they brought very successfully in 2014 for lecture fee of $3000).

4. **STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT OF PARTNERSHIPS:** PSU's recent process of assessing its partnerships strategically looks to be an excellent model for determining just what is meant by "partnerships" and for assessing desired and actual impacts in relation to the 21st century, as well as for offering a realistic appraisal of the value of existing partnerships and predicting which generate revenue and which require it. This project was mentioned on p. 14: briefly, PSU's newly created Vice President's Office for Research and Strategic Partnerships hired a former Portland urban planner (Political Science PhD) with the aim of creating a "one-stop shop for industry," and of establishing a governing structure with each of PSU's major partners to coordinate work done for and with them. The process inventories Grants and Sponsored Programs and all philanthropic gifts to determine the leading partners and where/ what interests and issues are they supporting or is PSU supporting for them. This process would have little value to, and might even pose a threat to, the civic/social justice orientation of PSU's engagement orientation were it not for the care taken by that office to work in tandem with the more civic end of PSU's Engaged Scholarship apparatus.   The end result is a Partnership Council that attempts to be what PSU Associate VP Erin Flynn calls "a passageway between silos." A similar process is

underway at NCSU in search of a more focused and synchronistic engagement

agenda.

RELATED RECOMMENDATION FOR UOFL: Immediately undertake an assessment of top 15 UofL partnerships (based on our Carnegie recertification report and assuming that is the proper starting pool), working with the rubric used at PSU by their new associate VP for Research and Strategic Partnerships, to find out which are our leading partners in terms of philanthropic, grant and contract dollars [PSU Associate V-P Erin Flynn volunteered to come to our campus and give a presentation about this process for expenses only.].

Conclusions

"You can't force culture, but we have done some things to harness the elements of community engagement and allow people to see they can be part of this effort if they want to be."

--Amy Conrad Warner, Vice Chancellor for External Affairs [title changing], IUPUI

In closing, please allow me to return to the opening imagery of this report because those

positive manifestations of what Engaged Scholarship can become are important to keep

in mind. These findings have laid out many germs, opportunities, and challenges for the

University of Louisville. But what is the most positive BIG vision here regarding the

promise of Engaged Scholarship? From what I observed, I would say that the strongest

Engaged Scholarship structure and personnel I observed were at UNC's Carolina Center

for Public Service (CCPS). That was the old house with the free parking and the bus

stop. It also has a community garden across the street from it that its network of engaged

scholars and students launched and help to grow into a truly multi-disciplinary and thriving endeavor involving a blend of teaching, research, and service. The contrast between their community garden and ours at UofL is a metaphor for our respective apparatuses in support of Engaged Scholarship. Do most visitors even know UofL has a garden? Will the MLK or Brown Scholars be encouraged to go there and to learn about Louisville's local foods movement to address the food deserts in western Louisville? But with tending and fertilizer, our garden could easily rival the UNC garden.

The concept of the Carolina Center –adapted to fit our specific constellation here at UofL—looks from this research to be an important vision to which to aspire, but these findings suggest that we need to expand our faculty base first. As one of the longtime ES leaders at Memphis told me about their odyssey, "Building Engaged Scholarship is like building a social movement, you have to build it from the bottom up." (He also added with a wink, "MSU didn't always have deep pockets.")

With the energy and blueprints laid out in this report, we could transform the ground for Engaged Scholarship in our campus and our community in much the same way that the Ramsey-Willihnganz administration has transformed the physical space of our campus. In doing so, we could and should lift up the METROPOLITAN heart of our mission to consider new ways we can be the best possible partner in improving metro Louisville and the commonwealth of Kentucky. Even though no one cannot see social progress quite the same way as one's name on a building, we have substantial philanthropic support in Louisville for truly democratic engagement, and certainly for the arts and humanities once we engage people in those ways and when they can see the fruits of our real and lasting commitments to empowering both the larger community and

ourselves in the process. Thank you for taking seriously these findings and

recommendations.

**Faculty Recommendations for Advancing Engaged Scholarship: May
2015**

*The following recommendations emerged from a culminating session held on May 15,
2015, as part of the Spring 2015 "Engaged Scholarship in Action" faculty discussion
series sponsored by the Office of the Provost, along with seven supporting dean's
offices, and organized by the Special Assistant to the Provost for Engaged
Scholarship.*

*The recommendations were generated from a group of 28 attenders—mostly faculty
from several colleges across both campuses-- who broke into five working groups to
generate UofL priorities in this regard. The recommendations were then vetted or
refined by attenders of all earlier programs of the series.*

*These priorities are organized within two major categories: infrastructure and policy
reforms. Within infrastructure (I), the leading recommendation of a faculty
community engagement specialist is listed first along with its many iterations as
reported by the 5 working groups. Remaining infrastructural reforms are organized
within greater framework/funding avenues, and visibility/leadership development. A
broad array of policy reforms were generated, but the two that received the most
attention were revisitation of promotion and tenure guidelines as related to engaged
scholarship and an "idea incubator" series similar to the recently concluded Engaged
Scholarship in Action series but with greater capacity.*

I. INFRASTRUCTURE

    A. Faculty Community Engagement Specialist (raised repeatedly across small groups: comments follow)

        1. similar to a grants management specialist but to work with faculty on engaged scholarship

        2. a "matchmaker" to mentor those new to engagement and shepherd faculty thru institutional barriers (IRB, PCF, etc), introduce to other engaged faculty, and mentor through processes of engaged scholarship

        3. someone who can connect faculty to resources, others doing work, and who can help to remove institutional barriers

        4. expert in Engaged Scholarship to build support for central physical location for faculty to engage with community partners, resources and others on campus, across colleges, doing this work

        5. someone to coordinate logistics and event planning to avoid duplication and redundancy and who can be in touch with scholarly engagement that is going on across all colleges

        6. Dedicated administrative support for faculty wishing to engage

    B. Need for Greater Framework and Funding Avenues for Scholarly Engagement

        1. develop widely understood and widely shared definition across colleges of both CE and of community-engaged scholarship and how it is adapted and looks in different fields

        2. have each college/school advance unit-level engagement plans that have teeth, timelines, and measurable goals, should also include department-level plans for scholarly engagement

        3. restructuring may be needed to eliminate duplication/redundancy and to acknowledge and bridge silos

        4. make sure conversations happen to bring CE-scholarship to attention to Development and EVPR so that it is part of what we raise money for and allocate research dollars to (this could be part of what community engagement specialist above should do, but it must be mandated from the top)

        5. creating or revising existing structures so that CE-faculty liaisons in each college can provide guidance to other engaged or interested faculty

C. Visibility and Leadership Development

   1. a welcoming physical space for both faculty and community partners to gather: a "front door" for community members that also acts as a one-stop shop for faculty or even students who are interested in doing work in the community. In the space there is information about opportunities and policies, a meeting and conversational space, and an office with staff who can help people get started

   2. establish a university-wide community-engaged faculty steering committee

   3. build and maintain a user-friendly Community Engagement website (one model is oe.ncsu.edu) that draws together all we are doing in outreach, engaged service, community-based learning, and engaged scholarship. This will be more successful if it interfaces with the annual Carnegie data collection process.

   4. establish more of a central communication apparatus connecting CE-faculty, OCE, and engagement work within each college so that left hand knows what right hand is doing

   5. offer professional development opportunities in Engaged Scholarship, externally but also internally (workshops on methodologies, philosophies, how to build and maintain community partnerships, etc)

   6. strategically link to other key UofL initiatives (21st Century, QEP, ETC)

   7. in hiring decisions, strategically recruit faculty with track record of CE scholarship (if this occurs at the unit level, it could include some incentives for deans who participate)

II. POLICY REFORMS

A. Promotion and Tenure Revision

   1. validate broader forms of peer review to value wider array of scholarly products

   2. change value of CE in work plans across all colleges so that CE-scholarship can be adequately recognized in all three categories, not just service

B. Idea Incubators (this idea came out of one small group of culminating

conversation but was largely embraced by all so is cited distinctly here)

    1. both a vertical and horizontal integration of people and space

    2. initiates and continues an ongoing talk series (like Engaged Scholarship in Action) whose purpose is to provide more multidisciplinary emphasis and opportunities for CE-research

    3. contains funding opportunities and can implement multidisciplinary research designs from such series

C. Shift or enlarge campus-wide understandings of CE to emphasize scholarly engagement as well as service. Set up concrete avenues to include faculty, students, and staff in CE-scholarship.

D. Allocate dedicated funding to above: faculty incentive grants or course releases for CE-scholarship projects, CE- assignments of student assistants.

E. Inclusion on president's score card would institutionalize CE-scholarship.

Postscript: **TOP FIVE RELATIVELY PAINLESS FIXES**: These basic, compelling steps—which I originally proposed for the 2014-15 academic year—would move us in the direction of a more collaborative, adaptive campus culture that values Engaged Scholarship even if none of the more substantial recommendations above are enacted. Every one of these ideas can be implemented in with existing staff resources and no new operating budget beyond continuing the amount committed for my post for 2013-14 (approximately $4400). Some redeployment of human and fiscal resources is required, but nothing major or structural. These steps would yield positive outcomes either alone or with the larger measures recommended elsewhere in this report.

1) Have Vice-Provost for Faculty Affairs, VP for Community Engagement, and ES special assistant meet w Office of Executive VP for Research to discuss ES, especially as related to a) developing funding mechanisms for community-engaged scholarship; b) discussing with those responsible for the IRB's Human Subjects review barriers current processes pose and more flexible potential

solutions; and c) the internal research grants programs (including engaged research). Goals here are multiple but top two are a) greater understanding and embrace; and b) directing a portion of indirect (F&A:RIF) funds to be dedicated for engaged research projects.

2) Direct ES Administrative Assistant and OCE Carnegie data-collection analyst to collaborate, with IT support, to build and post a webpage assembling readings on Engaged Scholarship relevant to both research and teaching in multiple and multi-disciplinary fields [sample syllabi, articles on participatory methods, CBPR, links to other resource pages, etc], as well as examples of UofL products of Engaged Scholarship [Note: from my work as ES special assistant, I have assembled an Engaged Scholarship listserv and intend to continue it in at least a modest fashion through the Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research to spread the word of research, conference, and community-based collaborative opportunities.]

3) Work with Institutional Effectiveness to conduct a campus-wide faculty survey about ES (instrument used at UM available); using its results, convene, with support from Vice-Provost for Faculty Affairs, OCE, and I2A, campus-wide lunchtime or late-afternoon forum on Engaged Scholarship on each of the two campuses, featuring opening remarks from panel of engaged scholars from 3 disciplines and discussing issues such as faculty needs, myths/ realities, supports/ barriers, shared authority, disciplinary variations, scholarly and community products, tenure and promotion. At least one these forums should be attended in full by the provost;

4) Mandate that the Vice-Provost for Faculty Affairs and VP for Community Engagement meet with all college and school deans, and unit personnel committees at both college and department levels to discuss ES and products of engagement: as outcome of this meeting, charge each to instruct each department or office in their unit to have a conversation this academic year about how to define Engaged Scholarship in their field; hold provost-mandated A&S chairs' workshop on Engaged Scholarship led by Vice-Provost for faculty affairs and visiting faculty from one of resource contacts made through campus visits [not a consultant: list of contacts of A&S engaged scholars to be provided]

5) Direct the restructuring of SPI Faculty Liaisons group to a) promote more leadership and define clearer paths for their responsibilites to and from their respective units with respect to the flow of ideas; and b) refine and better specify Faculty Engagement Grant guidelines to clarify what level of priority SPI and faculty research (as opposed to service) have in funding, and to clarify what sorts of community partner relations are expected.

Appendix A: Two Examples of UofL Engaged Scholarship

1. DIGITAL MEDIA ACADEMY

Dr. Mary P. Sheridan (English) and five graduate students collaboratively designed the Digital Media Academy (DMA) as a two-week digital media summer camp for rising sixth-grade girls offered free of charge at the University of Louisville. Camp participants are selected from three partnering Jefferson County Public School schools: Atkinson, Cochran, and Lincoln (Atkinson and Cochran are both Signature Partnership Initiative schools). The camp aims to combat the conflicting narratives around the intersections of gender, technology, education, and identity by facilitating girls in gaining comfort and confidence as capable, active creators of digital texts in a community of other girls making design contributions. Educators and literacy researchers benefit by exploring ways to facilitate full digital participation in and beyond the classroom, and by thinking about how digital technologies and learning experiences inform identity.

SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS
Slated for publication in 2015

- Chamberlain, Elizabeth, Rachel Gramer, and Megan Hartline. "Mess Not Mastery: Encouraging Digital Design Dispositions in Girls." Computers and Composition Online (Fall 2015). Web. (also winner of 2015 Carolyn Krause Maddox Prize in Women's & Gender Studies) http://elizzybeth.com/DMAarticle This is an article three graduate students from DMA 2014 wrote, and it has been accepted with revision.

- Sheridan, Mary P. "Extending the Responsive Reach of 'Scholarship in Composition.'" College Composition and Communication 66.4 (June 2015). Print.

SCHOLARLY TALKS

- Gramer, Rachel. "Designing a New Camp Curriculum of Digital Collaboration: What the Teachers Learned." Conference on College Composition and Communication, Tampa, FL, March 2015.
- Hartline, Megan. "Engaged Scholars in the Making: Designing, Teaching, and Researching the Digital Media Academy." Conference on Community Writing, Boulder, CO, October 2015.
- Hartline, Megan. "What Counts as Success?: Examining the Digital Literacy Practices of Middle School Girls." Conference on College Composition and Communication, Tampa, FL, March 2015.
- Sheridan, Mary P. "Paving the Way: Efforts to Promote Community Engagement in Graduate Student Programs at the University of Louisville," Conference on Community Writing, Boulder, CO, October 2015.
- Sheridan, Mary P. "Graduate Student Mentoring through Community Engagement." Talk presented for panel on "Leveraging Your Digital Scholarship

for Community Engagement." Engaged Scholarship in Action Series, University of Louisville, April 2015.

- Sheridan, Mary P. "The Promise and Pitfalls of Feminist Frameworks as Responsive Practice: Conversations on Risk and Reward." Conference on College Composition and Communication, Tampa, FL, March 2015.

AWARDS
2015

- Elizabeth Chamberlin, Rachel Gramer, and Megan Hartline, Carolyn Krause Maddox Prize in Women's & Gender Studies, University of Louisville.

EXTERNAL GRANTS

- Mary P Sheridan, Rachel Gramer, Megan Harline. DIGITAL MEDIA ACADEMY: DESIGNING RESPONSIVE STRUCTURES OF GRADUATE STUDENT PROFESSIONALIZATION, 2014-2015 CCCC Research Initiative Grant, Conference on College Composition and Communication. ($8,750)

2. FAIR HOUSING ACTION PLAN

This 2012-14 project was a community-based research study funded by a $19,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) subcontracted through Louisville Metro's Human Relations Commission to the University of Louisville's Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research (ABI). The community partner on the project was Metropolitan Housing Coalition (MHC), a local housing-advocacy organization, and the primary investigator (PI) was Dr. Cate Fosl, associate professor of Women's and Gender Studies and ABI director. The research team, consisting of Fosl, a graduate student assistant from the Dept. of History, and MHC staff conducted oral history interviews and archival research to present a full history of housing discrimination in Jefferson County. MHC and ABI personnel also held four community conversations across metro Louisville to develop recommendations for action steps for improving fair housing opportunities locally.

The resulting report, *Making Louisville Home for Us All: A 20-Year Action Plan for Fair Housing*, (available at
https://louisvilleky.gov/sites/default/files/human_relations/reports_publications/louisville_metro_20-year_action_plan.pdf
) was peer-reviewed by metro agencies, HUD officials, and an interdisciplinary team of assisting editors (including one additional UofL professor) before its release in February 2014. It couples a complete history of residential discrimination and segregation in Louisville Metro with 70 policy recommendations for improving housing choice and ending housing segregation in one generation. The plan received considerable local attention (including page one *Courier-Journal* coverage: see, for example,
http://www.courier-journal.com/story/news/local/2014/02/12/nearly-half-of-louisville-

lives-in-extreme-segregation/5436439/) and generated follow-up attention from Louisville Metro Council and various agencies of metro government. It then garnered praise from HUD as a national model (see http://www.leoweekly.com/2014/06/ahead-of-the-curve/) and remains under active conversation as a policy vehicle in Louisville Metro government.

** Appendices B and C, charts featuring in-depth information benchmark institutions, ACC schools, and ES leaders, have been removed from the online report but are available upon request.

Appendix D: Executive Summary

This report examines and assesses the status of Engaged Scholarship (ES) in peer institutions and from those findings develops a set of best practices for Engaged Scholarship that, if implemented, will enhance both engaged scholarly outcomes and experiential, engaged learning at UofL. The processes and data from the 2012-13 Carnegie Foundation for Teaching and Learning community-engagement recertification reveal a finding, validated by this study, that more avenues for boosting, coordinating, and supporting faculty engaged-research and curricular engagement are needed in order to actualize UofL's potential, as a metropolitan university, to effect positive change in metro Louisville and beyond—and, indeed, to live up fully to its claim to be an engaged university.[11]

The research process was mostly external, supplemented by participant-observation on our campus and many internal conversations at different levels. An initial inventory of our 17 benchmark institutions, the 12 ACC schools, and a small group of seven other exemplars of Engaged Scholarship revealed a great variety of approaches, emphases, and visibility (see Appendix B).   Ten of the 36 schools profiled use the language of ES explicitly, and in those that do, a wider range of disciplines is evident than at others, especially as regards fuller integration of the arts and humanities into each

---

[11] This is not to suggest that there is no significant community-engaged scholarship in motion at UofL: see Appendix A for examples.

university's interdisciplinary engagement activities. I then visited seven Carnegie community-engaged campuses that I identified as exemplars of ES (for list of schools, see Appendix C). There I met with and interviewed more than two dozen administrative and faculty engagement leaders ranging from vice presidents to assistant professors and service learning coordinators. Evidence from both the inventory and in particular the visits form the basis for this report and its internal recommendations.

The focus here is Engaged Scholarship, not community engagement overall. Yet the two are deeply related. For the purposes of this report I refer to ES as a process that involves community-engaged research or teaching. In truth, however, Engaged Scholarship is a continuum whose processes and products unfold in the context of an evolving set of community relationships and often involve a blend of research, teaching, and service that produce(s) scholarship. The fact that those boundaries are blurred, and that the concept of academic expertise is destabilized or at least complicated once authority is shared with a community partner, are at the heart of much of the skepticism that engaged scholars encounter when they bring their work to an audience of their university peers and review committees. Still, based on the increased attention paid to engagement at the nation's universities, it looks as if Engaged Scholarship is an important emerging pedagogical and epistemological scholarly approach for the 21st-century university and will prompt more expansive tenure and promotion review processes as it gives new life to "applied" and "public" fields such as Public Health, Public History, and Public or Applied Anthropology and Sociology.

Common challenges observed on most or all of the campuses, which are shared by UofL, include: 1) the prevalence of silos poses barriers to advancing ES; 2)

administrative reorganization in search of better coordination, visibility, and support for engagement is common; and 3) although revising tenure/promotion guidelines is a key step, too often implementation problems persist. Specifically, the challenges for UofL are to find means to combat its widespread "functional fiefdoms", to support and coordinate ES, and to advance and secure broad-based support for revisions of T&P.

The conversations and even explications of the philosophical purposes surrounding engagement were more advanced on each of the seven campuses than I have observed them to be at UofL. Although leadership, administrative structures, messaging, and communicative processes surrounding ES varied greatly, four foundational ES best practices—as listed below-- were evident across all campuses visited, and especially the first two were emphasized across many interviews:

- Need for substantial faculty leadership
- Equal need for top administrative advocacy and incentivization
- Necessity of advancing a culture of collaboration
- Need for dynamic, boundary-crossing ES personnel at all levels

While not observed across all seven visited campuses, four additional best practices provide effective building blocks for advancing ES at UofL:

- the importance of building ES onto existing strengths
- the value of student curricular engagement as an avenue for developing more engaged faculty leadership
- the important of arts- and humanities-related engagement working multi-disciplinarily
- a strategic assessment of existing partnerships.

Recommendations relative to each of these findings are detailed in the body of the report. The top recommendations from these observations include establishing a faculty-led, provost-supported Council for Engaged Scholarship to lead and refine plans for a center or administrative oversight structure; provost-initiated steps toward providing better

recognition and reward; the development of a coordinated website to message ES; and assignment of personnel with resources to implement these and other specific ES needs, particularly of faculty and students. The report concludes with a vision and rationale for a structure at UofL similar to the ES center at UNC-Chapel Hill. Its final revised version of June 2015 concludes with a list of faculty recommendations generated through a campus discussion event on May 15, 2015, entitled "Advancing Faculty Leadership in UofL Engaged Scholarship," attended by 28 faculty (and a few graduate students and administrative staff).   Following those recommendation is a set of five "painless" recommended fixes I developed based on my 2014 external research: these small measures could enhance broader-based, cross-college faculty leadership in community engagement, and advance a campus culture more conducive to scholarly community engagement even without additional resources for the larger suggested reforms.