

Excellence in Community Engagement Visioning & Planning Advisory Committee (E-CEVPAC)

December 6, 2011

Meeting held at UNCG in 2711 MHRA

ATTENDEES (14):

Kristin Buchner (notetaker)	Celia Hooper	Cathryne Schmitz
Patti Clayton	Emily Janke	Terri Shelton
Susan Feit	Spoma Jovanovic	Jim Summey
Jonathan Gonzalez	Patrick Lee Lucas	Bob Wineburg
Cathy Hamilton	Chris Payne	

ABSENTEES (20):

Chelsea Boccardo	Laurie Kennedy-Malone	Hollie Rose-Galli
Cherry Callahan	Ed Kitchen	Jim Settle
Kathleen Edwards	Bonnie Landaverdy	Stephen Sills
Brenda Elliott	Jerry McGuire	Sheron Sumner
Colleen Fairbanks	Donna Newton	Anthony Wade
Helen Hebert	Diane Picciuto	Dianne Welsh
Julia Jackson-Newsom	Nell Pynes	

Agenda:

- I. Survey – top five points (*Community-University Engagement in the Piedmont Triad*)
 - II. Database & Website Update
 - show sample pages (under development)
 - timeline for Database development and launch
 - North Carolina Campus Compact 10-year celebration meeting (contact OLSL to register!)
 - Speaker Series update (People/topics/Report from 2009-2011)
 - Spring/Summer Activities – White Paper for Community Engagement
 - III. Speaker Series Updates
 - IV. E-CEVPAC Committee Updates
 - V. Activity: "Criteria and considerations" for CEI priorities
-

I. Survey – top five points

This fall the Community Engagement Initiative (CEI) conducted a community-university engagement survey with members of the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce and the Guilford Nonprofit Consortium. The data collected is intended to inform the CEI's current work in partnership development and sustainability. The top five take-aways from this survey were:

1. **Personalized approach:** phone call and in-person visits are key for initial connections to partner (Educate and inspire, then explore opportunities)

2. ***Understanding and overcoming the hurdles:*** participants identified the biggest hurdles to effective collaboration as “finding the right person with which to partner” and “the bureaucracy associated with the university”
3. Most businesses/nonprofits work with universities in a variety of capacities: The majority ***speak to a class/group, attend a conference/meeting, or seek student interns***
4. When looking to universities for resources, most businesses/nonprofits are looking for ***interns, partnerships, and employees***
5. Most businesses/nonprofits learn information about resources/partners at universities through ***word of mouth, referrals, and existing partnerships***

(*see appendix for other activities in which the CEI is involved)

II. Database & Website Update

- Database: *(see appendix for timeline)*
 - 77 partnership stories collected to date (and counting – will be contacting a variety of E-CEVPAC members with regard to their partnerships)
 - December – currently collecting partnership stories; our work-study student is helping us input these into the database
 - In January we will be contacting E-CEVPAC members to beta-test our new website and database. We will be asking you to review and improve your partnership information, and to help us determine if there are any refinements that need to be addressed before we go live publicly in late February.
 - We will be particularly asking E-CEVPAC members to add media to their profiles, as we will not have access to these resources during the data collection/input phase. Users will have the opportunity to upload photos and link to resumes/CV’s and personal/departmental websites.
- Website
 - We shared the website design that was developed with our vendor, Blue Mandolin Marketing + Design. This website will be unique, in that it will be geared primarily toward the community, acting as a referral agent. The site will also contain the information that will cater primarily to faculty/administration (as the current CEI website does), but this will not be the primary focus of the site design. The site will immediately show community partners one of eight “bucket categories,” which we have developed as a result of previous conversations and surveys about what resources people come to UNCG for. If a community member is looking for volunteers, they could click on the Volunteerism bucket and be directed to relevant resources on campus, such as the Office of Leadership & Service-Learning. The Volunteerism bucket would also contain information about faculty community-service leave, as well as other resources on campus that might be of interest relating to volunteerism.

The bucket categories are as follows:

- Curricular Engagement
- Volunteerism
- Clinics & Services
- Research & Evaluation
- Economic & Social Innovation
- News & Events
- UNCG Expertise
- Community Expertise

REQUEST to E-CEVPAC members:

Help us identify high impact projects and partnerships to display on the database when the site goes live in February 2012! The intent is that visitors to the site will learn about community engagement, and what it is, by seeing examples of it (rather than definitions!) and be inspired to consider how they might also partner. Our beta version of the database will be available in Oct/Nov, and we hope to ask our first round of partners to assist us in providing information about their partnerships using the new database system. Would you be willing to help us in the first phase by being one of the first to use (and test) our system? Also, what other high impact projects and partnerships could you recommend to us? **We would like to have a diverse sample of types of projects, partnerships, sectors, and impacts. Please send any suggestions (names, e-mail addresses, and a brief description of the partnership so we know what we are requesting to include!!) E-mail suggestions to kdbuchne@uncg.edu or emjanke@uncg.edu.**

III. Speaker Series Updates

- Each year a variety of departments/offices around campus collaborate to bring some national speakers together around community engagement and community-engaged work. We have a GREAT lineup of speakers for Spring 2012:
 - Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater (UNCG English Dept)
 - Nadine Cruz (Independent Consultant and community activist)
 - Sam Wineburg (History Professor, Stanford University)
 - Rebecca Dumalo (Communication Professor, East Carolina University)
 - Kermit Bailey (Graphic Design Faculty, NCSU)
 - Barbara Holland (Independent Consultant)
- Patrick Lee Lucas' wonderful marketing flyer was shared, in which he created a farming metaphor (*see appendix*)
- Both graduate and undergraduate students will have time with Nadine Cruz
- In addition to the general public, we plan to target a variety of large and diverse groups (e.g., faculty, deans, research networks, students, community colleagues, etc.)
- Question posed to the group: would community colleagues listen to a session on the role of the university in community organizing? How do we get groups of diverse people to campus?
- Concern raised about the target of the speaker series – need to be more deliberate about how it will benefit the community.

IV. E-CEVPAC Committee Updates

- In the letter that invited you last year, it stated that this committee would serve until December.
- Given we still have more work to do after these conversations we will be spending the spring working on a concept paper and creating strategies/recommendations for the next stage of development around community engagement.
- **We would like to bring the committee back together one more time in late spring/early summer to review strategy that we put forth.**
- We may send emails requesting feedback in the interim, and would appreciate any feedback throughout the process

- **As more models/concepts come up, please send them to us – don't assume we know about them, send them on and we'll be thankful!**

VI. Activity: "Criteria and considerations" for CEI priorities (see Appendix A)

- Patti led the group in an activity to examine the CEI's key commitments that would help us determine (a) what we focus on, and (b) how we craft the conditions under which we do our work so that it can be maximized. She shared four sample models of the criteria and conditions they use to determine what they will invest in/support (*see appendix*)
- Patti then invited the group to "put on the hat" of one of four stakeholder groups (student, administrator, faculty member, or community colleague).

Report Out – feedback on text provided for review and discussion

Community Colleagues

- Reads like a university document, and not for partners. Is this a university document to guide how we make decisions? Does it guide us, or is it something out there for a region/all partners?
- Is "scholarly" the right word for the first category? Perhaps "innovation" instead?
- The priorities might be different depending on the stakeholder group (e.g., community most likely cares the most about partners and processes, then the impact of partnerships, then integration, and then whether or not it's scholarly.)
- How does this impact the mission of the community colleague?
- Community organizations vs. individuals as a vehicle for impacting the community
- At UNCG, we have a commitment to this process at different levels, community colleagues don't have this.

Students

- Even though this emphasizes reciprocity among all partners, students are often not empowered/given authority to be a co-collaborator
- What kind of space are students able to claim?
- Curricular vs. co-curricular innovation. Do the legitimate partnerships that are *not* tied to the curriculum get left out? Do we preference ones with curricular ties? What should be emphasized?

Administrators

- What is the purpose of this document?
- Discussed cost/benefit and return on investment. What is the process of using these criteria?
- "Scholarly" – if we kept this, is what's represented broad enough so people could see themselves within it? The scientific process is not always the generation of new knowledge – sometimes it's translational or confirming/improving existing understandings.
- When you create a set of something, then something is always left out. If we put this out, would every aspect of research, creative arts, etc., see themselves in

this? Is the generation/dissemination of new knowledge something that is too narrow to encompass work from a university point of view?

- Means vs. ends
- Is this a set of questions/thought processes you'd apply thinking about where this is occurring?
- Quality of life is hard to define; as defined by whom?

The discussion generated by this meeting will help to inform the future work and documents generated by the Community Engagement Initiative.

APPENDIX A - handout

Discussion: “Criteria and Considerations” for Community Engagement University-wide Initiatives

Context:

- North Stars = Why we do what we do
 - Enhanced capacities to understand issues of public concern, mobilize resources to address them, and create a shared sense of future possibilities (*still under development*)

- Core Values = The ideals and codes of conduct that underlie what we do
 - Reciprocity, collaboration, inclusiveness, responsibility, sustainability, transparency

- Strategy = How we do what we do
 - Scholarly and reciprocal community-campus **partnerships** that make a significant, positive, and sustained impact in the communities of which we are a part (*still under development*)

- **Criteria and Considerations** = The key commitments that guide and determine the selection of what we do so as to advance progress toward our *north stars* through well-activated *core strategies* that operationalize our *values*.

Questions related to “Criteria and Considerations”:

- ❖ What are the guiding parameters within which the CEI will focus its efforts?
- ❖ What should characterize institutionally-supported partnerships?
- ❖ Under what conditions will the work of the CEI be maximized?

Key Criteria and Considerations

Scholarly:

- Advances collaborative community-university **generation and dissemination of new knowledge and promising practices**
- Includes as a focal area new **models for effecting change through collaboration**
- Contributes to curricular innovation in support of **transformational undergraduate and graduate education**

Integrated:

- Encourages **inter-/trans- disciplinary** and **inter-/trans- sector collaboration**
- Nurtures **connections** between individuals, units, and organizations with the potential to enhance one another's work in order to enable and support new synergies
- Contributes to the development and ongoing refinement of **systems that institutionalize community-campus collaboration** within the evolving culture of UNCG, including embedding partnership work within standard operating procedures and norms related to teaching, research, and service

Reciprocal partnerships:

- **Builds on assets and interests** within the community and the university / Honors and taps the assets of the diverse people and places of the Piedmont Triad
- Contributes to **equitable access to resources** and **participation in decision-making** processes
- Assumes the value of and builds capacity for **collaboration among the full range of stakeholders** as potential partners

Significant, positive impact:

- Focuses on understanding and addressing **questions of public concern** and/or on **leveraging opportunities to enhance quality of life** in contexts that impact, are applicable to, or otherwise connected with the **Piedmont Triad** (not necessarily in the Piedmont Triad)
- Enables and supports positive change that is both **systemic and sustainable**, including measurable short- and long-term outcomes
- Creates **new and transformative visions** for the Piedmont Triad, including the UNCG campus

+++++

- What would you add to this set / what is missing?
- What is unclear about the expression of these criteria and considerations?
- What are some potential tension points or contradictions within this set?
- What is most exciting about this set of criteria and considerations / what opportunities does it open?

Sample models of “criteria and considerations”

1. Action Greensboro’s “key considerations”:

- a. Will it enhance wage/tax base/per capita income?
- b. Will it create excitement/sense of community pride?
- c. Will it attract visitors/potential newcomers or young professionals?
- d. Does it build on our strengths?
- e. Is the environmental impact positive?
- f. Are we ready to accept an advocacy role?

2. National Science Foundation merit review criteria and considerations

All NSF proposals are evaluated through use of two National Science Board approved merit review criteria. In some instances, however, NSF will employ additional criteria as required to highlight the specific objectives of certain programs and activities. The two merit review criteria are listed below. The criteria include considerations that help define them. These considerations are suggestions, and not all will apply to any given proposal.

What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity?

How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields? How well qualified is the proposer (individual or team) to conduct the project? (If appropriate, the reviewer will comment on the quality of prior work.) To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts? How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is there sufficient access to resources?

What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?

How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, disability, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society?

NSF staff will give careful consideration to the following in making funding decisions:

Integration of Research and Education

One of the principal strategies in support of NSF's goals is to foster integration of research and education through the programs, projects and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions provide abundant opportunities where individuals may concurrently assume responsibilities as researchers, educators, and students, and where all can engage in joint efforts that infuse education with the excitement of discovery and enrich research through the diversity of learning perspectives.

Integrating Diversity into NSF Programs, Projects, and Activities

Broadening opportunities and enabling the participation of all citizens, women and men, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities, are essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering. NSF is committed to this principle of diversity and deems it central to the programs, projects, and activities it considers and supports.

[Excerpts: <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pappguide/nsf11001/gpgprint.pdf>]

3. National Institutes of Health evaluation criteria

The goals of NIH supported research are to advance our understanding of biological systems, to improve the control of disease, and to enhance health. Reviewers will be asked to comment on each of the following criteria in order to judge the likelihood that the proposed research will have a substantial impact on the pursuit of these goals. Note that an application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

1. Significance. Does this study address an important problem? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge or clinical practice be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

2. Approach. Are the conceptual or clinical framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, well reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

3. Innovation. Is the project original and innovative? For example: Does the project challenge existing paradigms or clinical practice; address an innovative hypothesis or critical barrier to progress in the field? Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies for this area?

4. Investigators. Are the investigators appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers? Does the investigative team bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project (if applicable)?

5. Environment. Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed studies benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, or subject populations, or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?

Additional Review Criteria:

Protection of Human Subjects from Research Risk

Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children in Research

Care and Use of Vertebrate Animals in Research

Additional Review Considerations:

Budget: The reasonableness of the proposed budget and the requested period of support in relation to the proposed research.

[Excerpts: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not-od-05-002.html>]

4. CCPH characteristics of high quality community engaged scholarship

1. Clear Academic and Community Change Goals
2. Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community
3. Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement
4. Significant Results: Impact on the Field and the Community
5. Effective Presentation/Dissemination to Academic and Community Audiences
6. Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement
7. Leadership and Personal Contribution
8. Consistently Ethical Behavior: Socially Responsible Conduct of Research and Teaching

[<http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info/>]