

Faculty participation in community-campus partnerships

Includes:
Final Report

By: Dennis Badeen, Nadine Changfoot, Todd Barr

Completed for: Trent Community Research Centre
Supervising Professor: Nadine Changfoot

Department: Sustainability Studies
Course Code: No course - paid research internship
Course Name: n/a
Term: n/a
Date of Project Submission: March 2015

Project ID: 4551

Call Number:

**A Report on Enablers of and Barriers to Community Engaged Scholarship at
Trent University**

Date: April 22, 2015

By: Dennis Badeen, Nadine Changfoot, Todd Barr

Executive Summary

This report examines enablers of and barriers to faculty participation in community engaged scholarship (CES) at Trent University. CES can be characterized as scholarship that engages with a given university's local and/or regional community, or as a provision of service to the local and/or regional community. In many of its institutional statements, Trent University communicates its commitment to CES, especially regarding teaching. To help facilitate this commitment, this report focuses on the experiences of faculty who are heavily involved in CES and how CES can be more strongly integrated at Trent.

There are three aspects to CES—community based research, community based teaching (or learning, also known as experiential learning), and service. Each aspect, in its traditional, non-CES form, is related to faculty tenure and promotion. Insofar as faculty members are expected to practice CES, rewards and incentive structures need to be in place to encourage it. This is the main conclusion of the literature examining enablers of and barriers to CES documented in this report. In particular, the literature examined indicates that institutional (and departmental) priorities and culture are important determinants of faculty involvement in CES.

This report investigates Trent's commitment to CES by examining Trent's key documents and concludes that while there is substantial support for CES in terms of teaching and experiential learning, what constitutes research in CES is not specified. This is noted as an important shortcoming. The collective bargaining agreement does mention that a faculty member can choose to be evaluated for CES during

tenure and promotion procedures; however, in the absence of departmental definitions of CES, such evaluation is limited.

A focus group of faculty members engaged in CES was convened and enablers and barriers specific to Trent were identified. The following is the list of enablers: autonomy and encouragement for faculty to undertake CES; the existence and assistance of the Trent Community Research Centre (TRCR); enthusiastic colleagues who are engaged in CES; relevance to students; course based approach; and external drivers. The following is the list of barriers: perception of additional work for faculty; scheduling issues; ambiguity in the term “service”; lack of faculty understanding of CES and the role of TCRC; capacity for suitable projects in Peterborough; the incentive structure is fuzzy and there is no clear-cut way of assessing CES for tenure and promotion (at the institutional and departmental levels).

The group focused on raising the profile of CES at Trent and, to that end, made the following suggestions: Trent University should consider hiring faculty who have experience in community based education in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences; in concert with TCRC, conducting open houses displaying innovation projects; establish a Canada Research Chair in a high profile position. The Canada Research Chair would be a TUFA member and consideration should be given to whether they report directly to Provost, VP Academic in order to reflect the importance of CES.

This report, especially as represented by the results of the focus group, is an important first step towards more integration of CES at Trent. This report identified institutional priorities regarding CES (particularly as it involves teaching/experiential learning), and enablers of and barriers to CES from a faculty perspective. Although it was not possible to complete the overall objective of constructing a vision of success, many of the pieces needed do exist (in some form) and action will be needed to further develop existing pieces to put in place and discuss new ones.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction.....	6
1 What is Community Engaged Scholarship?.....	6
1.1 Elements of Community Engaged Scholarship (CES).....	6
1.2 Overview of the Challenges for Faculty to Practice CES.....	8
1.2.1 Institutions and CES.....	8
1.2.2 Departments and CES.....	10
1.3 Other Considerations.....	10
1.4 Summary.....	11
2 Research Methodologies.....	13
3 Institutional Analysis.....	14
4 Focus Group.....	20
5 Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Action.....	25
References.....	27
Appendix A.....	29
Appendix B.....	31

Introduction

This report has two goals. The first goal is to identify enablers of, and barriers to, community-engaged scholarship (CES) at Trent University. The second goal is the creation of vision where CES is more strongly integrated at Trent University.

Realizing this vision will require development of incentives and reward structures for faculty who practice CES, as well as the development of institutional and departmental cultures conducive to CES.

The study comprises 5 sections. Section 1 answers the question of what constitutes CES and examines the literature that investigates enablers and barriers regarding CES, particularly at institutional and departmental levels. Section 2 describes the research methods used to investigate Trent University and provides a justification for the methods used. Section 3 contains the results of the institutional analysis of Trent, and section 4 contains the results of the focus group of Trent faculty who practice CES. The study concludes with a summary of findings and list of recommendations.

Section 1: What is community engaged scholarship?

1.1 Elements of CES

Community engaged scholarship is described by three interrelated characteristics.

The first is community-based research. Community-based research is scholarly work conducted in concert with the applicable community that meets the community's needs. Community-based research can be defined as a "collaborative process of critical inquiry into problems of social practice in a learning context"

(Couto 2001, cited in Wade and Demb 2009, p. 7). Community-based research also

includes outreach scholarship, public scholarship, and action-based research.

Differing from traditional research, the goal of community-based research is to produce knowledge that is useful to the community and in meaningful collaboration with the community. This kind of research usually involves students in experiential learning (Wade and Demb 2009, p. 7). While peer review articles and academic journals are favoured in academic settings, community-based research outputs may be non-traditional and are not necessarily peer reviewed.

The teaching component of experiential learning is the second characteristic of CES. It connects classroom learning with community engagement in teaching and learning processes. It is a course or project based learning opportunity for students addressing the needs of the community. Community-based research often involves students in experiential learning (Wade and Demb 2009, p. 7). This type of teaching and learning differs from the traditional, in class model of student learning.

Service roles in CES includes professional services contributing to public welfare. Faculty members use their expertise to address socially relevant issues. Service can include technology transfer, policy analysis, program evaluation, community development, and consulting (Wade and Demb 2009, p. 7). These types of services do not necessarily fit the traditional mold of academic service roles.

CES embodies characteristics of research, teaching, and service, all of which are components of tenure and promotion. Because CES is not firmly associated with traditional forms of scholarship, there is a tendency to downplay its importance. As such, faculty who practice CES are disadvantaged if CES is not valued institutionally

and/or recognized in tenure and promotion. The importance of CES both institutionally and for faculty begs the following questions: what enablers and barriers can be identified at a given academic institution? Relatedly, are institutional incentives and supports in place to facilitate CES at a given academic institution?

1.2 Overview of the Challenges for Faculty to Practice CES

The literature investigating CES at academic institutions tends to focus on institutional and departmental enablers and barriers. Wade and Demb's important study identifies many of the relevant factors (2009). They use the Faculty Engagement Model (FEM) to identify and explain factors affecting a faculty member's willingness to participate in CES. These factors include institutional, professional (which itself includes the academic department to which a faculty member is assigned), and personal dimensions. For the purpose of this study, personal dimensions are omitted.¹ Institutional and professional (now termed departmental) factors are echoed throughout the literature as important determinants of a given faculty member's willingness to practice CES.

1.2.1 Institutions and CES

An institution's culture and the priorities it sets immensely influence faculty participation in CES. Of the more important institutional factors, Wade and Demb identify mission statements, resources devoted to CES (financial, faculty training, time to conduct CES, etc.), norms, and evaluation of faculty. Tenure and promotion is

¹ According to Wade and Demb, (2009), personal dimensions include race/ethnicity, gender, personal experience, epistemology, and beliefs and values. While Wade and Demb denote these as personal, it is important to note that these are social and political categories and themselves social and political. They are not addressed in this study, however, they should be included in a future study to support the understanding and development of CES at Trent.

the most important factor, according to Wade and Demb. If faculty think that CES is not recognized as serious scholarly activity by their institution, then they are less likely to become involved with CES. Without a clear definition of CES, its parameters, and tenure and promotion policies in place, little incentive exists for faculty participation in CES. In addition, resources are needed to support faculty such as funding to support CES training, and additional time allotted to develop various aspects of CES including curriculum for experiential learning and student training (Wade and Demb, 2009, p. 8).

These observations and recommendations regarding institutional changes are echoed throughout the literature. For example, Amy Oliphant (2009, pp. 21-24) emphasizes the institution's role in enabling and/or hindering CES. An institution's mission statement should reflect its commitment to CES, and this commitment would ideally be reflected throughout academic governance and policies governing faculty responsibilities. Open dialogue between faculty members about the necessary changes should occur to ensure clarity about expectations. This process should also include a clear definition of CES. Saltmarsh et al. (2009, pp. 25-26) suggest that if institutions demand that faculty connect campuses with communities, then institutions must clearly define CES and reward faculty who practice CES by recognizing faculty roles in assessing tenure and promotion. Similarly, Linda Hawkins et al. (2009) and Philip Nyden (2003) note that lack of institutional culture and support regarding CES by valuing only traditional academic outputs and teaching hinders faculty efforts to practice CES.

Chris Glass, Diane Doberneck, and John Schweitzer (2011) link institutional culture and practices to specific academic departments. Institutional commitment to CES in mission statements, espoused by institutional leaders, policies, funding, engagement structures, and institutional culture should be reflected by academic departments, especially in terms of departmental tenure and promotion guidelines, departmental culture, and types of academic appointments.

1.2.2 Departments and CES

Departmental culture is at least as important as institutional culture for enabling or hindering CES. Some disciplines, such as health, education, and social work, tend to carry out CES as a matter of normal academic practice. If faculty and a specific department hold favorable views of CES and, just as importantly, if the majority of faculty in a specific department carry out CES, then CES stands a far better chance of taking hold (Wade and Demb, 2009, p. 12). If CES is not valued at a departmental level but is valued institutionally, then specific department need to be encouraged to review their tenure and promotion guidelines and discuss the inclusion of CES.

Saltmarsh et.al. argue that tenure and promotion guidelines should be reviewed to ensure that CES can be practiced (2009, p. 29), however, creating a culture supportive of CES would be an important consideration prior and/or coincident with more formal change.

1.3 Other Considerations

In addition to institutional and departmental enablers and barriers, David Weerts and Elizabeth Hudson (2009) indicate that financial support is also important. The level of financial support can be determined by examining budget priorities and

determining what resources are allocated to development campaigns, examining the internal allocation of resources to support CES, marketing, branding, and fundraising activities used to financially support CES.

It should also be noted that while the studies I have examined focus almost exclusively on academic institutions in the US, similar issues can be found in Canadian academic institutions. In her presentation examining the Canadian institutional context, Sherril Gelmon (2010) argues that a connection needs to be made between the goals of a given institution, as articulated in mission statements especially if reference is made to meeting social responsibility commitments, contribution to civil society, and general outreach, and the attainment of these goals by institutional facilitation of CES. Since faculty members are ultimately responsible for practicing CES, this responsibility should be reflected in faculty reward structures and policies. Additionally, Gelmon (2010) notes that it is up to faculty to fight to have CES recognized in collective bargaining agreements.

1.4 Summary

CES includes research, teaching and service. As noted in the literature, CES activities are usually neither recognized nor rewarded by the institution or department. To encourage CES, reward/incentive systems need to be in place at both the institutional and departmental levels.

For CES to be well defined at the institutional and departmental levels, the following is required: defining CES to specify criteria for evaluating faculty performance; and

establishing policies and incentives that reward CES across research, teaching, and service both institutionally and departmentally.

Additional support for CES includes financial, training, and engagement structures. At Trent, this kind of support is provided by the Trent Community Research Centre (TCRC)² for teaching and community engagement.

Although I draw heavily on Wade and Demb's (2009) use of FEM to frame my review of the literature, I do not employ FEM as a research methodology. On the one hand, FEM studies synthesize literature and models identifying research agendas for CES and create knowledge that can be used by institutional leaders to develop policies and programs to enhance CES. By integrating institutional, professional, and personal factors, they argue that FEMs provide a holistic view and can be used to generate pilot studies of single institutions, which aligns FEMs with this study.³ On the other hand, Gelmon (2010) argues that faculty initiatives to push CES are crucially important because it is faculty who are ultimately responsible for seeing CES through, especially if the institution in question is advocating CES as part of its mission and/or obligation to its community. To put the matter differently, while FEMs identify aspects for institutional and departmental change with the category of personal dimension, FEMs do not identify the kind of agency required to affect such change, agency which is, moreover, collective (rather than simply individual) and engages in collective identification of barriers and enablers, planning processes, etc. Hence while FEMs may be holistic, they fail to address the dynamics required

² Formerly known as the Trent Centre for Community Based Education (TCCBE).

³ See Wade and Demb, 2009, p. 8 for an outline of the FEM model.

for change, which is the other half of the equation. As I will argue below, participatory action research (PAR) methods are better suited to address, holistically, the dynamics of change.

The purpose of the next section is to describe and justify the research methods used to identify barriers to and enablers of CES at Trent University at institutional and departmental levels. An institutional analysis of Trent University by analyzing key documents for mention of CES was undertaken. To gauge support and for and barriers to CES at the departmental level a focus group of Trent faculty was conducted using PAR methods.

Section 2: Research Methodologies

The institutional analysis examined key documents communicating the importance of CES to Trent's identity as an institution, Trent's culture and values. The following documents were examined:

Toward a Sustainable Future: The First Plan for Trent University 2010 – 2015 (Integrated Plan);

Introducing a New Positioning Statement for Trent University (February 2014);

Strategic Mandate Agreement (2014 – 2017) Between: The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and Trent University;

Four Hundred and Thirty Third Meeting of the Senate of Trent University 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 14, 2014;

Trent University — Strategic Research Plan (SRP) Summary: Planning Horizon 2014-2018;

Radical Recovery: An Academic Plan for Trent University (2012 – 2015);

About Trent (<http://www.trentu.ca/about/>); and

Trent University Faculty Collective Agreement 2013 – 2016, specifically the sections on tenure and promotion.

Sections of these documents pertaining to CES were identified and presented to faculty members who participated in the focus group.

The key difference between this and other studies examining CES is that this study employs a focus group of faculty engaged in and committed to CES. PAR methods used include free list and pile sort, and force field.⁴ PAR methods are used because they assist in identifying barriers to and enablers of CES that are specific to Trent faculty, as well as identifying which barriers and enablers are strong or weak, and how much control faculty has over specific barriers and enablers in a collaborative and collective manner. Furthermore, since faculty members can speak with each other, the possibility exists of at least a preliminary stab at developing strategies to advance CES at Trent.

Section 3 Institutional Analysis

Towards a Sustainable Future: The First Plan for Trent University 2010-2015 (Integrated Plan). This document identifies “Commitment to Strengthening

⁴ See Chevalier and Buckles (2013) for an introduction to PAR methods.

Community Engagement” as an institutional priority (p. 2). Most of this commitment is geared towards strengthening relationships with external partners (government, alumni, philanthropists). It suggests that strengthening these relationships will lead to the introduction of more co-op, intern, and community based experiential learning with community partners. The section itself (p. 7 “Commitment to Strengthening Community Engagement”) describes community outreach in its myriad forms and contains a paragraph about the steps that will be taken to advance experiential learning. According to this document, the teaching and learning portion of CES at Trent is an aspect of its commitment to its community. It is interesting to note that, on pp. 18–19 “Appendix II, Documentation History” point 5 mentions an emphasis on “the role and interpretation of community engagement and community-based research.” This is an interesting point because, while this document communicates the importance of community engagement and experiential learning, it says little about Trent’s commitment to faculty who pursue CES, especially as it pertains to the research component. In fairness, articulating this kind of commitment is beyond the scope of this document. Notably, this is the only place where community based research is specifically mentioned in any of the documents I examined.

Introducing a New Positioning Statement for Trent University (February 2014).

This document identifies Trent’s distinguishing characteristics one of which is Trent’s community engagement (p. 3). On p. 11 it asserts that education is grounded in (among other things) community development. On p. 17 it asserts that collaborative learning occurs through partnerships with communities outside of the

classroom and includes community based research projects. On p. 27 regarding community based learning it claims that “No other Canadian university owns this territory.” The focus of this document is on learning and teaching, but no mention is made of research (except as part of the student’s learning process), and service. Again, it may be beyond the scope of this document to identify how CES is supported, but the document does communicate an institutional commitment to the teaching/learning aspect of CES.

Strategic Mandate Agreement (2014-2017) Between: The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities & Trent University. This document communicates Trent’s unique pedagogical approach to community engagement in teaching and learning (p. 4). The section (p. 5) “Community Impact” spells out the role of TCRC in placing students within local community organizations to do research projects. It also identifies three critical areas for community engagement including curriculum development of service learning courses addressing the community’s needs, reaching out to the community by sharing institutional resources, and sharing teaching and research resources with community partners to funnel knowledge creation into economic opportunities. Also p. 18 “The Ministry and the University are committed to continue working together to: Point #2—Drive creativity, innovation, knowledge, and community engagement through teaching and research.” There are two important points to note here. The first is that, insofar as faculty are involved in research and knowledge creation processes with community partners, alternative forms of academic outputs and peer review processes are in order; thus there is a case for enhancing CES at the institutional level. The second is that the

commitment to community engagement mentioned in the quotation on p. 18 implies that both the teaching and research aspects of CBE are valued; thus another case can be made for enhancing CES at the institutional level.

Four Hundred and Thirty Third Meeting of the Senate of Trent University 2:00

p.m., Tuesday, January 14, 2014. This document contains another of the few mentions of Trent's pledge to the research portion of CES "community engagement as embodied in our various experiential learning programs and in our faculty members' research" (p. 7) and is mentioned as point 3 of the 5 things that make Trent unique. This is mentioned in the context of leveraging Trent's unique strengths to provide a high quality undergraduate experience (p. 10).

Trent University – Strategic Research Plan (SRP) Summary: Planning Horizon

2014-2018. This document mentions community-based research as essential aspects of psychology, nursing, education, and business programs. It provides an overview of where the research component of CES is valued. This document is potentially important because it could provide leverage for further community based research infrastructure to be put in place (training and finance). It is curious that while the SRP identifies the importance of community-based research in the disciplines mentioned, it does not make the link to other disciplines at Trent.

Radical Recovery: An Academic Plan for Trent University (2012-2015). This is

an interesting document because it lays out the importance of CES for faculty, both tenure track/tenured (TUFA) and contract (CUPE). For example "Trent will value teaching, research, and service (including community outreach) equitably,

recognizing that career trajectories for TUFA members often foreground one or two of the traditional 'pillars' at different times throughout a career; CUPE members will be valued and respected for their teaching and scholarship." Later on pp. 13–14 in the section of Community Service, Trent's unique history with Peterborough is mentioned in the context of the establishment of TCRC with the purpose of contributing to the development of student skills. It is also acknowledged that "Non-teaching activities such as community engagement and work on editorial boards of journals, varies across departments and are considered important aspects of faculty work but are not generally given much weight in workload calculations. These stresses contribute to the sense of overload of faculty and staff" (p. 60). This explicitly recognizes the importance of service work but that such service work is undervalued when calculating faculty workloads. Stated recognition of the difficulties associated with CES could also be leveraged for institutional change.

About Trent (<http://www.trentu.ca/about/>) Community engagement is used as a marketing tool to brand and sell Trent's uniqueness to potential students: "Here, [undergraduate](#) and [graduate students](#) connect and [collaborate](#) with faculty, staff and their peers through diverse communities that span [residential colleges](#), classrooms, disciplines, hands-on research, co-curricular and [community-based](#) activities."

"Across all disciplines, Trent brings critical, integrative thinking to life every day. As the University celebrates its [50th anniversary](#) this year, Trent's unique approach to personal development through supportive, collaborative community engagement is in more demand than ever. Students lead the way by co-creating experiences rooted

in dialogue, diverse perspectives and collaboration.” It is interesting to note that the “community-based” hyperlink in this document links to TCRC’s website.

TUFA Collective Agreement 2013-2016. The agreement recognizes CES in that it allows for CES to be part of the review process for tenure and promotion. However, the degree of recognition would depend upon how each department considers CES in tenure and promotion cases. As such a review of departmental criteria for tenure and promotion would be recommended. If CES were to be fully considered in tenure and promotion, one possibility would be to provide faculty members participating in CES to help set out criteria. General criteria for tenure are spelled out on p. 45 “demonstrated high quality in both teaching and research (III. 7.4.1). Tenure criteria established by the specific department, and a review process of the criteria takes place every seven years. If changes are made, faculty on probation are judged by the version they choose (either one set that existed at the time hired, or the new set) (III.7.4.5).” On p. 47 III.7.7.8 b) it is stated that “evidence of community-based research projects” is part of the materials to be considered for tenure. One question to address is whether CES would be better included in departmental/program level tenure and promotion criteria. For promotion to Associate and Full Professor (pp. 55-56, IV.1.1) it is stated that candidates must be highly regarded in one of teaching or research and satisfactory in the other two categories (including service). Identical to tenure, “evidence of community-based research projects” is part of a candidate’s materials to be considered for promotion.

In summary, there appears to be substantial commitment, at least on paper, to CES in terms of teaching and experiential learning. Furthermore, while experiential learning is well defined (and the existence of TCRC provides the support needed for experiential learning), what constitutes research in CES is not. The same is true of the service aspect of CES.

Section 4 Focus Group

A fundamental difference between this and other studies examining enablers and barriers of CES is that this study uses PAR methods. The overall purpose of this study is support the development of a stronger vision of CES at Trent University. Achieving this vision will require collective deliberation and action achieved by structured and guided interactions characteristic of the specific PAR methods used in this study. The deliberative process requires faculty participation to identify enablers and barriers specific to Trent. Faculty participants included the following individuals: Nadine Changfoot, Political Studies; Stephanie Rutherford, Environmental and Resource Studies; and Peter Lafleur, Geography. The focus group was conducted on Tuesday, November 6, 2014, Trent University, Otonabee College room 104, 1pm-3pm.

Agenda⁵

1:00pm-1:10pm	Introductions and background of the project.
1:10pm-1:50pm	Free-list and pile sort: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify 1 or 2 obstacles to, and enablers of, CES that are institutional and/or departmental in nature.

⁵ The full agenda is located in Appendix A.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each participant presents his or her identified obstacles and enablers to the group and collectively determines which pile each enabler and obstacle goes into. • Identify what might be missing from the piles. • Barriers and enablers sorted into short term, medium term, and long term.
1:50pm-2:50pm	<p>Force field:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate factors from weakest to strongest. • Identify factors that participants have a lot of control over, have some control over, and have little to no control over. • Relate control over factors to time dimension. • Discuss and define what success looks like and how long it would take to achieve.
2:55pm-3:00pm	Summing up and what will be done with the information gathered.

Free-list and pile sort outcomes⁶

The purpose of the free-list and pile sort exercises was to identify enablers of and barriers to CES at Trent. Participants presented and discussed their specific enablers and barriers during the free list exercise, and collectively organized their enablers and barriers into piles of similar enablers and barriers under more general headings, and identified each as either short term (ST), medium term (MT), or long term (LT) enabler or barrier.

The following enablers (general headings) were identified by the group: relevance to students (ST-MT); autonomy and encouragement for faculty to undertake CES (ST); course based approach (MT); external drivers (LT); the existence and assistance of TCRC (ST); and enthusiastic colleagues who are engaged in CES (ST).

⁶ See Chevalier and Buckles (2013, pp. 158–162) for a description of free-list and pile sort.

The following barriers (general headings) were identified by the group: perception of additional work for faculty (ST); scheduling issues (ST); lack of faculty understanding of CES and the role of TCRC (MT); ambiguity in the term “service” (ST); capacity for suitable projects in Peterborough (LT); and the incentive structure is fuzzy and there is no clear cut way of assessing CES for tenure and promotion (LT).

The group expanded on every identified enabler and barrier during general discussion. One barrier identified during discussion, which was missing from the pile sort, was the question of how engaged are students with experiential learning—do students perceive it as more work, how do they find out about it, what are the benefits to students? The role of TCRC in addressing these questions was also discussed. These questions spurred further elaboration regarding what is needed to promote CES in learning/teaching. This elaboration included the need to build a student culture around experiential learning and the role TCRC should take in helping to build this culture.

Force Field outcomes⁷

The purpose of the force field exercise was to determine what success would look like in terms of enabling CES at Trent. This goal was achieved through a series of steps that identify how barriers are to be overcome and how enablers can be leveraged by faculty to overcome barriers. Participants identified enablers and barriers as things over which they have a lot of control, some control, and little to no

⁷ See Chevalier and Buckles (2013, pp. 221–223) for a description of force field.

control, as well as the strength and weakness of each enabler and barrier. A lot of control is identified by **green font**, some control by **blue font**, and little to no control by **red font**. Cases in which there was a tie in responses over degree of control (e.g., a lot of control and some control; or a lot of control and no control) a mix of two fonts is used. After each enabler and barrier, participant responses follow in brackets relating to the time dimension (ST, MT, LT) for each and the strength of each (with the scale of 0-5 to denote the strongest to weakest enablers and barriers where 0 is the weakest and 5 is the strongest).

List of enablers identified during the focus group:

E1- **autonomy and encouragement for faculty to undertake CES** (ST, 4);

E2- **the existence and assistance of TRCR** (ST, 5);

E3- **enthusiastic colleagues who are engaged in CES** (ST, 3);

E4- **relevance to students** (ST-MT, 5);

E5- **course based approach** (MT, 5); and

E6- **external drivers** (LT, 4).

List of barriers identified during the focus group:

B1- **perception of additional work for faculty** (ST, 3);

B2- **scheduling issues** (ST, 3);

B3- **ambiguity in the term “service”** (ST, 2);

B4- lack of faculty understanding of CES and the role of TCRC (MT, 4);

B5- capacity for suitable projects in Peterborough (LT, 4); and

B6- the incentive structure is fuzzy and there is no clear-cut way of assessing CES for tenure and promotion (at the institutional and departmental levels) (ST-MT-LT, 5).⁸

Discussion that took place during and after the force field exercise did not initially focus on developing a vision of what success looks like, or on the steps needed to realize this vision. Instead there was a general discussion about the barriers and enablers themselves. A feature of this discussion was the drawing of connections between enablers and barriers. These connections included the following:

1. Connection between student engagement, the department, and the TCRC brand. The more involved TCRC is in promoting experiential learning, the more students will become involved. It was suggested that TCRC take on a larger role in building student culture;

2. Enthusiastic colleagues, department support of CES, and the TCRC.

Developing enthusiasm among faculty and departments was seen as the responsibility of the university and TCRC. But part of this enthusiasm also has to do with incentives and rewards for faculty, which falls squarely on the university. The relations between faculty understanding and institutional culture were also identified, especially in terms of the workload associated with CES. The culture required for CES needs to be created by faculty and the administration/institution; and

⁸ See Appendix B for the charts outlining enablers and barriers.

3. Marketing of departments. If departments are to be held accountable for promoting CES, then they should have more control over marketing. But marketing should also occur beyond Trent and TCRC. Students inquire about experiential learning because it is relevant for them, so marketing strategies should reflect Trent's commitment to experiential learning and departments should at least have some input into advertising and marketing campaigns.

A vision of success was discussed and includes several aspects as follows. In the short term, Trent University should consider hiring faculty who have experience in community based education in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. The profile of CES should be raised at Trent as well. In concert with TCRC, conducting open houses displaying innovation projects was discussed as a possibility. In the medium term, establish a Canada Research Chair in a high profile position. The Canada Research Chair would be a TUFA member and consideration should be given to whether they report directly to Provost, VP Academic in order to reflect the importance of CES.

Section 5 Conclusion

This study, especially as represented by the results of the focus group, is an important first step towards more integration of CES at Trent. This study identified institutional priorities regarding CES (particularly as it involves teaching/experiential learning), and enablers of and barriers to CES from a faculty perspective. Although it was not possible to complete the overall objective of constructing a vision of success, many of the pieces needed do exist (in some form)

and action will be needed to further develop existing pieces to put in place and discuss new ones.

Suggestions for future action

In addition to the aspects of success discussed by the participants, I believe that the effort to enable CES at Trent would benefit from the following suggestions:

1. A more thorough discussion of how to mobilize enablers for change, especially giving consideration to the cultural dimensions of change identified with CES. More faculty members should be part of this process as well since, presumably, faculty members will spearhead needed changes. Perhaps a working group or committee that includes TUFA and TCRC members would help;
2. An interview with Todd Barr regarding the role of TCRC in strengthening CES culture and practice amongst students and faculty alike;
3. A study of the personal dimension of faculty practicing CES should be conducted. The required culture shift itself needs more faculty willing to practice CES and an investigation of personal dimensions will go a long way to realizing this end; and
4. The language in the collective bargaining agreement may be a potential way forward. CES friendly language in a collective bargaining agreement should be developed further to strengthen the connection between CES and faculty tenure and promotion. If institutional documents communicate the importance of CES for Trent's identity and mission, and this importance is

reflected in language in the collective bargaining agreement, it then follows that resources, rewards, and incentive structures and policies should be in place so that faculty can practice CES. To that end a more explicit definition could be argued for by faculty, and a case could be made in specific departments to discuss adding CES friendly criteria for tenure and promotion.

References

About Trent. (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.trentu.ca/about/>

Chevalier J, and Buckles, D. (2013). *Participatory Action Research: Theory and Methods for Engaged Inquiry*. New York: Routledge.

Gelmon S. (2010). Setting the state: The landscape of engaged scholarship. <http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/events/other-ip-oriented-events/community-engaged-scholarship-conference-guelph-ontario>

Glass C, Doberneck D, Schweitzer J. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 15(1): 7–30.

Hawkins L. (2009). Summary — faculty survey on community engagement — CSAHS initiative on community engaged scholarship. <http://theresearchshop.ca/sites/default/files/Results%20summary%20CSAHS%20OCE%20faculty%20survey.pdf>

Nyden P (2003) Academic incentives for faculty participation in community-based participatory research. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 18(7): 576–585.

Oliphant A (2009) Re-conceptualizing the tenure and promotion process: A literature review. <http://www.theresearchshop.ca/sites/default/files/Reconceptualizing%20the%20Tenure%20and%20Promotion%20Process.pdf>

Saltmarsh J., Giles D., Ward E., & Buglione S. (2009). Rewarding community-engaged scholarship. *New Directions for Higher Education* 147: 25–35.

The Collective Agreement between the Board of Governors on Behalf of Trent University and the Trent University Faculty Association July 1, 2013 to June 30,

- 2016 (2013). Retrieved from Trent University website:
<https://www.trentu.ca/humanresources/documents/TUFACA2013-2016.pdf>
- Trent University. (2011, June 23). Towards a Sustainable Future: The First Plan for Trent University (2010-2015). Retrieved from Trent University website:
www.trentu.ca/administration/documents/integratedplan.pdf
- Trent University. (2012, February 14). Radical Recovery: An Academic Plan for Trent University (2012-2015). Retrieved from Trent University website:
[www.trentu.ca/vpacademic/.../Trent%20Academic%20Plan%20\(2012-2015\)%20-%20Feb%202012.pdf](http://www.trentu.ca/vpacademic/.../Trent%20Academic%20Plan%20(2012-2015)%20-%20Feb%202012.pdf)
- Trent University. (2014a, January 14). Four Hundred and Thirty Third Meeting of the Senate of Trent University 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 14, 2014. Retrieved from Trent University website:
www.trentu.ca/.../SenateJanuary142014AgendaandMeetingMaterials.pdf
- Trent University. (2014b, February 11). Introducing a New Positioning Statement for Trent University. Retrieved from Trent University website:
www.trentu.ca/collaborative/pdfs/140211_Positioning.pdf
- Trent University. (2014c, March 14). Trent University – Strategic Research Plan (SRP) Summary: Planning Horizon 2014-2018. Retrieved from Trent University website: <https://www.trentu.ca/.../SRP2014to2018SummaryrevMarch252014.pdf>
- Trent University. (2014d, August 7). Strategic Mandate Agreement (2014-2017) Between: The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities & Trent University. Retrieved from Trent University website:
<http://www.trentu.ca/newsevents/newsDetail.php?newsID=7797>
- Wade A, Demb A (2009) A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 15(2): 5–16.
- Weerts D, Hudson E (2009) Engagement and institutional advancement. *New Directions for Higher Education* 147: 65–74.

Appendix A

Agenda for CES Focus Group

1:00-1:10 Introductions and background of the project.

1:10-1:50. Free list and pile sort.

1:10-1:20 Step 1: Free List. Identify 1 or 2 obstacles to, and enablers of, CES that are institutional and/or departmental in nature. (2 cards, one for barriers and the other for enablers). Please be as specific as possible. Write the obstacle on one side of the card, and a brief explanation, or details, on the other side of the card. Same with enabler.

1:20-1:35 Step 2: Each participant presents his or her identified obstacles and enablers to the group. After all of the participants have presented, participants will, between themselves, determine which piles they should go into. Each pile represents a similar obstacle or enabler. Cards are placed on top of each other when they have the same meaning, or above or below if they represent a variation of a meaning. Create a label for each pile and column of cards. Possible general groupings: barriers, enablers. (institutional, departmental).

1:35-1:50 Step 3: As a group, identify what might be missing from the elements sorted into piles. General discussion of the results of the free list and pile sort. Ask group to sort barriers and enablers into short term, medium term, and long term.

1:50-2:50. Force Field. Overall goal—identify what success looks like and the steps needed to achieve it.

1:50-2:00. Step 1: Core Problem: Recognition for CES-Trent faculty (from research question and free list and pile sort exercise). Steps 2 and 3: identify factors (from free list and pile sort) that are barriers to, and enablers of, CES.

2:00-2:15. Step 4: Rating factors from weakest to strongest (0-x). First start by discussing the indicators that define the meaning of each number on the scale. Then rank each and record the rationale each person gave for each score.

2:15-2:30. Step 5: identify factors that participants have a lot of control over, have some control over, and have little to no control over and note how they relate to being short term, medium term, and long term barriers and enablers. This should indicate how long it may take to act on a factor.

2:30-2:55. Step 6: Define what success looks like and how long it would take to achieve. Develop tactics to 1) use enabling factors and 2) counteract or get rid of barriers and the time frames to do so as part of a (coherent) strategy. Are there short, medium, and long term strategies? Do the enabling factors contribute to mitigating the barriers and how? Can enablers be mobilized, as part of a strategy, to overcome or mitigate barriers? What actions are desirable and/or possible?

2:55-3:00 Summing up.

Appendix B

