

University of Massachusetts Boston

## ScholarWorks at UMass Boston

---

Public Policy and Public Affairs Faculty  
Publication Series

Public Policy and Public Affairs

---

3-28-2014

# Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston: A Report of the Working Group for an Urban Research-Based Action Initiative

Mark Warren

*University of Massachusetts Boston*, mark.warren@umb.edu

John Saltmarsh

*University of Massachusetts Boston*, john.saltmarsh@umb.edu

Patricia Krueger-Henney

*University of Massachusetts Boston*, patricia.krueger@umb.edu

Lorna Rivera

*University of Massachusetts Boston*, lorna.rivera@umb.edu

Miren Uriarte

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umb.edu/pppa\\_faculty\\_pubs](https://scholarworks.umb.edu/pppa_faculty_pubs)

*University of Massachusetts Boston*, miren.uriarte@umb.edu



Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

See next page for additional authors

### Recommended Citation

Warren, Mark; Saltmarsh, John; Krueger-Henney, Patricia; Rivera, Lorna; Uriarte, Miren; Friedman, Donna; Fleming, Richard; Yadira-Salas, Diana; and Ramos, Luciano, "Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston: A Report of the Working Group for an Urban Research-Based Action Initiative" (2014). *Public Policy and Public Affairs Faculty Publication Series*. 50.

[https://scholarworks.umb.edu/pppa\\_faculty\\_pubs/50](https://scholarworks.umb.edu/pppa_faculty_pubs/50)

This Research Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Public Policy and Public Affairs at ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in Public Policy and Public Affairs Faculty Publication Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@umb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@umb.edu).

---

## Authors

Mark Warren, John Saltmarsh, Patricia Krueger-Henney, Lorna Rivera, Miren Uriarte, Donna Friedman, Richard Fleming, Diana Yadira-Salas, and Luciano Ramos

**Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship  
and Community Engagement  
at the  
University of Massachusetts Boston**

A Report of the Working Group for an  
Urban Research-Based Action Initiative  
2014

Submitted March 28, 2014



# **Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston**

## **A Report of the Working Group for an Urban Research-Based Action Initiative**

### **Executive Summary**

The University of Massachusetts Boston has a rich history of mission-driven commitments that engage the campus with local, state, regional, national, and global communities. In the context of a public urban research university, the mission of community engagement is most clearly expressed through community-engaged scholarship.

In the fall of 2012, the Provost established a nine-member Working Group comprised of faculty, center directors, and a graduate student, to provide a report on effective ways for promoting, supporting, evaluating and rewarding community-based research and engaged scholarship. The Working Group solicited the views of faculty, researchers and graduate students about both the strengths of the campus in community engagement as well as ongoing challenges and unmet needs. While remaining focused on scholarship, the Working Group expanded its lens to include community engaged teaching and learning and community engaged service as it became clear that community engaged scholarship was typically integrated with other faculty roles. In order to advance community-engaged scholarship, the Working Group concluded that an integrated approach was necessary, one that supported community engagement across faculty roles

After a year of study, the Working Group was charged by the Provost with producing a set of recommendations for addressing two key areas.

The Working Group was asked to recommend better ways to evaluate and reward faculty for community engagement and community engaged scholarship. The Working Group found that the dominant perception was that there are not clearly stated policies in place that articulate the value of community engagement as core academic work of the faculty in their scholarship and in their teaching. The pervasive perspective is that if community engagement is going to be part of the institutional identity of a research university, it has to be encouraged, supported, and valued as scholarly activity. The Working Group studied best practices at other institutions of higher education and recommends new guidelines for tenure and review, additions to the Annual Faculty Report, and a new chancellor's award for community engaged scholarship.

The Working Group was also asked to recommend organizational structures to better support, enhance, and deepen community engagement and community engaged

scholarship at the University. The Working Group found that the dominant perception was that while there is a deep commitment to mission-driven community engagement at the University, there is not an adequate organizational structure in place to enable the fulfillment of the commitment. The Working Group studied best practices at other institutions of higher education and recommends establishing a coordinating structure for the university in the form of an office located in academic affairs.

In order to promote and deepen community engagement at the University and establish the University as an international model for community engagement, the campus should build upon its strengths in community engagement and strengthen its community engaged scholarship as well as its structures for enhancing campus-wide capacity for community engagement and community engaged scholarship.

The Working Group is recommending specific actions related to faculty rewards and recognition and the establishment of an Office of Community Engaged Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning in the office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

The Office of Community Engaged Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning will 1) facilitate building the capacity of faculty to conduct community engaged scholarship and teaching and assist faculty and units in raising external funds to support these projects; 2) connect faculty researchers located in diverse departments and centers who are doing community engaged scholarship and community engagement and provide greater and more strategic support to them; and 3) allow for support for community engagement as core academic work across the campus to effectively propel many engagement efforts to new levels of achievement and impact.

For faculty rewards and recognition, the Working Group recommends 1) that the Provost issue guidelines for the evaluation and reward of community engaged scholarship in the “Suggested Guidelines for Major Faculty Personnel Reviews” and encouraging departments to address how the guidelines would be applied in an appropriate manner to faculty in their departments; 2) revision of the Annual Faculty Report (AFR) to include specific opportunities to document community engagement activities in teaching, research, and service; and 3) the creation of a Chancellor’s Award for Distinguished Community Engaged Scholarship.

Detailed recommendations, resource commitments, and a timeline are included in the report.

# **Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston**

## **A Report of the Working Group for an Urban Research-Based Action Initiative**

*The University of Massachusetts Boston is a public research university with a dynamic culture of teaching and learning, and a special commitment to urban and global engagement...*

*As a campus community, we address critical social issues and contribute to the public good, both local and global. We participate in teaching and public service, as well as in basic, applied, and engaged research, to support the intellectual, scientific, cultural, artistic, social, political, and economic development of the communities we serve. We forge partnerships with communities, the private sector, government, health care organizations, other colleges and universities, and K-12 public education, and bring the intellectual, technical, and human resources of our faculty, staff, and students to bear on pressing economic and social needs.*

**Mission and Values of the University of Massachusetts, Boston**

### **Introduction**

The University of Massachusetts Boston has a rich history of mission-driven commitments that engage the campus with local, state, regional, national, and global communities. In the context of a public urban research university, a mission of community engagement is most clearly expressed through community-engaged scholarship. The University is positioned to build upon its strengths in community engagement and strengthen its community-engaged scholarship to become an international model for community engagement.

In the fall of 2012, the Provost established a nine-member Working Group comprised of faculty, center directors, and a graduate student, with the following purpose:

1. To coordinate, promote and lead our university-wide efforts in community-based research and engaged scholarship,
2. To play a key role in establishing and supporting a Boston Node of the national Urban Research Based Action Network (URBAN<sup>1</sup>) “to connect scholars across

---

<sup>1</sup> Urban Research-Based Action Network (URBAN) is an emerging network of researchers and community members who have come together (1) in order to identify opportunities for collaborative research (and thinking) that addresses critical needs facing urban communities. Additionally, (2) URBAN provides a platform for ‘engaged’ scholarship where individual faculty members from multiple disciplines (and institutions) can connect with one another and members of communities to share ideas and be supported within the academy as they endeavor to pursue a community based ‘activist’ research agendas. URBAN.BOSTON is the local node of the URBAN network and is committed to building and sustaining an emerging network in the Boston metropolitan area. UMASS Boston has played an important role in the establishment of URBAN. Associate Professor Mark R. Warren serves as a national

local higher education institutions and community organization leaders to foster collaborative research that serves the needs of Boston area communities,”

3. To facilitate and organize interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and trans-disciplinary teams across departments, colleges, and institutions to seek external resources to support our projects or programs in community-based research and engaged scholarship, and
4. To advise the provost and his research leadership team on effective ways for promoting, supporting, evaluating and rewarding community-based research and engaged scholarship.

While remaining focused on scholarship, the Working Group expanded its lens to include community engaged teaching and learning and community engaged service as it became clear that community engaged scholarship (CES) was typically integrated with other faculty roles. In order to advance community-engaged scholarship, the Working Group concluded that an integrated approach was necessary, one that supported community engagement across faculty roles.

Based on an internal study by the working group in the fall of 2012 and spring of 2013 that included a series of campus-wide meetings with faculty, staff, graduate students, and community partners designed to gather information and assess successes and challenges associated with community engagement (see Appendix D), the Working Group reported that two key areas needed to be addressed in order to advance community engagement and CES at the University.

One area was the kind of organizational structures needed to support, enhance, and deepen community engagement and CES at the University. The dominant perception was that while there is a deep commitment to mission-driven community engagement at the University, there is not an adequate organizational structure in place to enable the fulfillment of the commitment.

A second area was the importance of faculty rewards for CES and community engagement. The dominant perception was that there are not clearly articulated policies in place that articulate the value of community engagement as core academic work of the faculty in their scholarship and in their teaching. The pervasive perspective is that if community engagement is going to be part of the institutional identity of a research university, it has to be encouraged, supported, and valued as scholarly activity.

The Working Group concluded that effective work in accomplishing the original charges from the Provost, including supporting the URBAN network and organizing cross-campus teams to raise external support for CES depended on the creation of an infrastructure and better reward systems for faculty.

---

co-chair of URBAN and chairs the Boston node planning team. Several other UMASS Boston faculty members and graduate students serve on the Boston planning team as well.

Based on these findings, the Working Group was charged in the fall of 2013 with producing a set of recommendations for addressing these two key areas. The purpose of this report is to provide recommendations to the Provost for specific ways to advance CES and community engagement at the University of Massachusetts, Boston. The report includes specific recommendations related to faculty rewards to recognize and encourage community engaged teaching and learning and CES, and recommendations related to infrastructure to support community engagement. With the larger goal of advancing the institutional commitment to and recognition of community engagement as a recognized and celebrated institutional identity of the University of Massachusetts Boston, we also recommend that this report be widely distributed across campus as a basis for facilitating deeper dialogue around advancing community engagement and CES at the university.

### **Context**

Community engagement and CES has been central to the mission of the University since its founding. In the 1965 *Founding Statement of Purpose*, it was envisioned that the University of Massachusetts, Boston would be a University that “must stand with the city” and extend “the service and leadership given rural communities over the past century by the land-grant universities” to urban communities. The University was established with a strong urban mission aimed at responsiveness to community needs.

Community engagement is impacting and changing higher education across the United States and globally. The establishment of the URBAN network, which received an immediate and widespread response from over one thousand faculty members across multiple disciplines, is the latest evidence of the growing trend toward CES across U.S. colleges and universities. One recent example of the significance of global engagement is the 2014 5th World Report from the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI), *Higher Education in the World 5: Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*, that looks at the critical dimensions in understanding the roles, and potential roles, of higher education institutions as active players in addressing social problems. From a global perspective, community engagement focuses on changing understandings about who the agents of knowledge creation are and how the creation, distribution and use of knowledge are linked to social improvement. According to the authors of the report, community engagement represents “one of the most significant trends in higher education over the past 10–15 years: the growth of the theory and practice of engagement as a key feature in the evolution of higher education.”<sup>2</sup>

Higher Education’s community engagement positively impacts the local, regional, national, and global community, which in turn enhances the University’s local, national, and global reputation. In the 2002 report from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place*, a community engaged campus was described as “fully committed to direct, two-way interaction

---

<sup>2</sup> Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI), 2014. *Higher Education in the World 5 : Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*. Palgrave Macmillan.



with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit” (2002, 9). When we refer to “engagement” in this report, we are defining **engagement as a two-way, collaborative interaction between the university and communities, variously defined, in which there is mutual benefit and reciprocity.**

One indicator of the national importance of community engagement in higher education is the Elective Classification for Community Engagement from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The University of Massachusetts, Boston applied for and received the classification in 2006. The Carnegie Foundation defines community engagement in this way:

*Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.*

*The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.*

The University of Massachusetts Boston is poised to be a national and global leader in community engagement and community engaged scholarship. The university already features a wide array of community partnerships (over 450). A large number of its faculty conducts community-engaged scholarship. Indeed, in a 2009 survey, one third of the faculty identified its research as community or publicly engaged. The faculty’s central role in the establishment of the URBAN network offers a key opportunity for leadership in this growing field. However, in order to advance this leadership, community engagement and especially community engaged scholarship need to be better supported. Its value needs to be understood as central to the academic work of the university.

Community engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston can and should play a meaningful role in the University’s primary outcomes:

- **Quality Research**  
From a community engagement perspective, engaged research provides new means of discovery through collaboration, interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary approaches, and reciprocity in order to build and apply knowledge to address social problems. Engaged research practices not only contribute to appropriate intellectual and disciplinary traditions, but also impact the community and broadly disseminate knowledge.

- **Quality Instruction**  
From an community engagement perspective, teaching involves directed, experiential learning that brings theory and practice together to build knowledge and includes student participation in community engaged research projects, academic service learning (integrated into courses), as well as internships and practica in the community.
- **Student recruitment, retention, and success**  
From a community engagement perspective, student participation in Engaged Scholarship projects provides students with opportunities to use theory and principles they are learning through their coursework to address practical problems in their own community, enhances student retention through active and collaborative pedagogies, creates more engaged community members post-graduation, and leads to professional skills development, leadership development, and career opportunities post-graduation.

Community Engagement takes place primarily through

- *Community-Engaged Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities*
- *Community-Engaged Teaching and Learning*
- *Community-Engaged Service*

In each of these areas, faculty, staff, and students are involved in collaborative and reciprocal partnerships with individuals and organizations outside of the campus in processes in which academics recognize, respect, and value the knowledge, perspectives, and resources of community partners. Community partnerships are at the core of engagement activity allowing for individuals, groups, and organizations to collaboratively understand and address issues of common concern.

The Working Group also acknowledges that its findings and recommendations build upon the work of many faculty and staff who have produced a number of earlier reports over the past two decades aimed at advancing the community engagement mission of this public urban research campus. The most recent of those reports was issued in 2010 (Civic Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston: Report of the Working Group on Civic Engagement) and included, as does this report, a series of recommendations, many of which align with the recommendations offered here.

## **I. Faculty Recognition and Reward**

As it currently stands, the faculty's work in community engagement is typically recognized and rewarded as part of service, sometimes in teaching (e.g. service learning), and seldom if at all in research. The Working Group reached this conclusion based upon an examination of university policy (e.g. current tenure and review guidelines), a survey about department and college practice from unit leaders, and a solicitation of views from faculty, researchers and graduate students. As a research university, however, community engaged scholarship (CES) should be a central form of community engagement. The purpose of this section of the report is to recommend

and clarify reward structures for community engagement across all three forms of work: research, teaching and service. Indeed, community engagement projects variously combine areas of faculty work, for example, integrating research with teaching and service. In this context, however, we stress the importance of rewarding faculty for CES.

Community engaged research and creative activity results from a partnership between faculty member(s) and community groups or members, broadly conceived. Scholarship is community engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships and addresses public purposes. It also meets the standards of scholarship when it involves inquiry, advances knowledge, and is open to review and critique by relevant scholar and community or professional peers. Scholarship is community engaged when faculty, students, community-based organizations, government agencies, policy makers, and/or other actors work together to identify areas of inquiry, design studies and/or creative activities, implement activities that contribute to shared learning and capacity building, disseminate findings and make recommendations or develop initiatives for change. The findings of community-engaged scholarship can be published in academic venues like peer-reviewed journals and university press books. However, this kind of scholarship often produces other kind of products, including but not limited to published reports, exhibits and multimedia forms of presentation, installations, clinical and other service procedures, programs and events, court briefings and legislation.

The kinds of community partnerships involved with CES fall along a continuum, and it often requires a process of advancing through phases of partnership development to achieve a deeper level of collaboration and reciprocity. Those actively pursuing the kind of collaborative efforts of CES are best served by understanding it as a continuum of relationship building, and the recommendations in this report, in both the area of infrastructure development and reward structures, are made in the spirit of assisting partnerships to move, where appropriate, along the continuum to deeper collaboration and advancing partnerships tied to research and scholarship.

Advancing CES does not mean that all faculty will be involved with CES, but that those who are doing CES or aspire to do CES will be recognized and rewarded for their community engaged research, scholarship, and creative activities. Our proposals are aimed primarily at addressing the situation of faculty involved with CES who are not being appropriately recognized within the existing structures. Thus, we are recommending changes in the reward structure to explicitly recognize and reward community engagement across the faculty roles – in research, scholarship and creative activity, and in teaching, as well as within service – even as we highlight the particular importance of CES.

A review of practices at campuses nationally indicates that in order to expand and strengthen community-engaged scholarship, the work of faculty in this area needs to be documented, recognized and rewarded. The working group first reviewed the current state of faculty recognition and reward for community engaged scholarship (See Appendix F). It then investigated recognition and reward structures at other institutions of higher education. Finally, the working group developed a set of

recommendations to implement at UMB. Reviews and recommendations fall into three areas:

- Guidelines for inclusion in tenure and promotion policies;
- Changes to the Annual Faculty Report; and
- A new award for community engaged scholarship

### **Findings: Tenure and Promotion**

Tenure and Promotion practices for all Colleges, Schools, and Departments at the University of Massachusetts, Boston are guided by the “Red Book”- *Academic Personnel Policy of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Boston, and Worcester* (Doc. T76-081, 1976) and by the document “Clarification of Policies in T-76-081.” Additionally, promotion and tenure policies are guided by a 2011 document used by the Provost, “Suggested Guidelines for Major Faculty Personnel Reviews.”

#### **The Redbook and Official Policies**

The Redbook and other official documents are not clear on the value and role of community engaged scholarship as part of tenure and promotion review. However, the language used does not preclude its inclusion. In discussing tenure and promotion, the Redbook consistently uses expansive language for scholarship. It refers to evidence of excellence in “research, creative or professional activity” (see, for example, Section 4.6.b and Section 4.9.a).

The Redbook is also not clear on the process for evaluation of the quality of contribution in community-engaged scholarship. However, the Redbook and associated documents consistently identify both “scholars and professionals” as qualified to make an assessment (see, for example, Section 6.4.c). The FSU contract also uses open language, referring to creating a list of “scholars and/or professionals” (section XII.6(d)).

In the general guidelines for major personnel decisions, the document entitled “Clarification of Policies in T76-081” also uses expansive language, stating that “Letters on the candidate’s scholarly activities should come from persons qualified to judge and comment upon the candidate’s contributions in his or her particular field” (section III.A.6). This same language is used in the document entitled “University of Massachusetts Boston Campus Implementation Guidelines T76-081” (see III.A.6). Under the sections in both documents on tenure review, the language on reviewers is similarly open, stating “Letters of recommendation from appropriate colleagues, administrators, committee chairpersons, former department chairpersons, students, etc. who are qualified to speak to the issues of scholarship, professional activity, service, and/or teaching contributions of the candidate...” (section II.D.4).

We conclude from this review that the inclusion of community engagement and community engaged scholarship in tenure and review, and the inclusion of relevant and qualified community experts as evaluators, falls within the current guidelines of

the University of Massachusetts as stated in the Redbook and associated documents as well as the Faculty Staff Union contract. Again, we are not recommending that CES become a required form of scholarship; rather, that it be included as one possible form of research and creative activity.

### **College and Department Policies**

With the exception of the College of Education and Human Development, no college or department has written guidelines for tenure and promotion beyond the Red Book and associated university-wide guidelines. Based on reports from the 2013/14 NEASC/Carnegie survey of college and department practice in this area, we found evidence that community engagement is valued in hiring and for tenure and promotion but mostly as a form of service and sometimes teaching. Findings indicate that most units value community engagement as part of the service category in tenure and review. However, there is little evidence that community engaged scholarship is recognized and rewarded as scholarship during the tenure and promotion process. It appears that reward for community engaged scholarship is limited to a few departments or units.

### **Scan of Tenure and Promotion Policies at Other Campuses**

There are an increasing number of colleges and universities that include community engagement in the tenure and promotion process, including in the research and scholarship category. These institutions of higher education include urban public universities like the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Portland State University and the University of Memphis. They also include other prominent public research universities like Michigan State University and prestigious private institutions like Syracuse University. Additionally, we looked at campuses that are moving toward revision of promotion and tenure guidelines to support CES, such as Tulane University, which has concluded that “given the centrality of engagement to Tulane’s mission and to the ongoing strategic planning process, we cannot continue to sustain a culture of academic review that is silent on engagement” (2013, p.3).

Current practice is based upon an understanding of community engagement that incorporates community-engaged scholarship both as a vital way to fulfill the mission of these institutions and as an important way to create new knowledge. We draw excerpts from the tenure and promotion policies of Syracuse University and the University of Memphis.

*Syracuse University* (a campus that has a Carnegie Classification of Research Very High Activity and Community Engagement)

(quoted from the 2008 Faculty Manual)

Syracuse University recognizes that the role of academia is not static, and that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines change over time. The University will continue to support scholars in all of these

traditions, including faculty who choose to participate in publicly engaged scholarship. Publicly engaged scholarship may involve partnerships of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, creative activity, and public knowledge; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address and help solve critical social problems; and contribute to the public good.

One can contribute to these goals in many ways -- individually through each of teaching, service and scholarship or in an integrated form, all highly valued by Syracuse University-- but such activity counts as scholarship only when it makes a contribution to knowledge in specific field(s) or relevant disciplines. Such scholarship is to be evaluated with the same rigor and standards as all scholarship.

Reviewers should be chosen from the relevant publics and audiences for the achievements of the candidates. Reviewers should be of sufficient rank, status, and accomplishment to make the judgment asked of them. Those qualities should be assessed by such factors as institutional affiliation, academic rank, prestige in a non-academic enterprise, or membership and knowledgeable participation in a relevant community of experts. The outside reviewers will be selected as appropriate to, and in accordance with, the conventions of the candidate's discipline(s) and college(s). For example, in the professional schools it is not unusual for some of the outside evaluators to be non-academic professionals and some to be academics in senior ranks of comparable professional schools. For another example, in the liberal arts and sciences it is typical that all or at least a large majority of the outside reviewers are from the senior ranks of academia.

*The University of Memphis* (a campus that has a Carnegie Classification of Research Very High Activity and Community Engagement)

(quoted from the 2012 Faculty Handbook)

Engaged scholarship now subsumes the scholarship of application. It adds to existing knowledge in the process of applying intellectual expertise to collaborative problem-solving with urban, regional, state, national and/or global communities and results in a written work shared with others in the discipline or field of study. Engaged scholarship conceptualizes "community groups" as all those outside of academe and requires shared authority at all stages of the research process from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the research, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer evaluation. Departments should refine the definition as appropriate for their disciplines and incorporate evaluation guidelines in departmental tenure and promotion criteria.

Outreach, or service to the community, primarily involves sharing professional expertise with the wider community and should directly support the goals and mission of the university. Under very rare circumstances, outreach may include non-professionally related activities outside the University. Some departments and disciplines, given the nature of their professional work, will be more involved in outreach than will other departments and disciplines. Community outreach is particularly valuable for an urban university such as the University of Memphis.

## **Recommendations: Tenure and Promotion Policies**

The Working Group recommends that the Provost issue a set of guidelines for the inclusion of community engagement in tenure and promotion, where appropriate. The Provost issued “Suggested Guidelines for Major Faculty Personnel Reviews” in 2011 and these recommended guidelines could be added to that document. Departments would be responsible for applying these guidelines in an appropriate manner to faculty in their unit. The detailed guidelines that we recommend the Provost issue can be found in Appendix A to this report.

The working group recommends that community engagement be incorporated in each of the three categories considered in personnel matters concerning tenure and promotion, that is, scholarship, teaching and service. It should be considered one important way to contribute to the university’s mission in each area, but not as a required practice for all members of the faculty. In other words, one significant way to contribute to scholarship in a field is through community engaged scholarship. It is not unusual for faculty to make contributions to more than one of the areas, even in the same community engagement project, and, in that case, each area of contribution can be considered as part of the review.

In each area of scholarship, teaching and service, faculty will need to provide evidence of quality and impact. Appropriate evaluators should also be invited to assess the quality and impact of the faculty’s work. Each department and college has the responsibility to determine what forms of community engagement are relevant to its fields and how the quality and impact of these forms of engagement can be evaluated. However, in order to evaluate quality and impact, personnel committees may want to request external evaluation letters from community and professional experts, as well as from community engaged scholars, who are capable of making an appropriate assessment.

We recommend that the Provost provide these guidelines to Department Personnel Committees and College Personnel Committees for discussion and implementation. In preparation for the issuing of the guidelines, the working group requests that it make a presentation to the Faculty Council. Finally, the working group recommends that the Provost’s Office offer workshops on evaluating community-engaged scholarship to DPCs and CPCs through the Office of Faculty Development.

## **Findings: Annual Faculty Report**

Beyond reward policies, campuses have additional mechanisms for recognizing community-engaged scholarship. As part of the University of Massachusetts, Boston Union contract, and as the basis for merit increases, faculty across the campus annually report on their activities in teaching, scholarship/research, and service. The campus has recently moved to a uniform, electronic Annual Faculty Report (AFR). After reviewing the content and structure of the University of Massachusetts, Boston’s

current (AFR), the working group has determined that the AFR does not provide sufficient opportunities for faculty members to describe or make more visible the accomplishments of their community engagement and community engaged scholarship. At the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, which has a similar electronic AFR structure, the AFR was revised two years ago specifically to incorporate a place for faculty to report on community engagement in teaching, scholarship, and service. Nationally, Michigan State University has been a pioneer in incorporating community engagement across the faculty roles in the annual reporting structure used by faculty.

### **Recommendations: Annual Faculty Report**

The Working Group recommends that community engagement not only be documented explicitly in each of the AFR's existing categories (Teaching, Scholarship/Research, and Service), but that community engagement (CE) also be referenced in the "Activities Database Main Menu" with the following language: "To gather better data on faculty collaboration with community partners, for the purpose of the AFR, community engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity and enhance curriculum, teaching and learning. It is community engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships in research, teaching, and service addressing a broad range of issues in local, regional, national, and global communities."

The AFR should provide opportunities for faculty to document community engagement activities in teaching, research, and service. Specific recommendations for revisions to the current electronic AFR are included in Appendix B.

### **Findings: Grants and Awards for Community Engaged Scholarship**

#### **Grants**

Community engagement and community engaged scholarship are advanced when faculty receive recognition and resources for conducting it. Currently, the University of Massachusetts, Boston offers a Public Service Grant opportunity for faculty who conduct community-engaged research. This grant is a good example of how the campus can specifically articulate and reward community-engaged scholarship. This grant can also help faculty build the foundation upon which to apply for external funding. The grant is described in this way:

*As a public urban research university, one way, and possibly the best way, to foster outstanding public and community service is through community-based research and engaged scholarship. It is expected that community-based research and engaged scholarship will lead to commonly recognized scholarly outcomes. Publicly engaged scholarship involves collaborative, reciprocal partnerships that couple university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to sharpen and enrich research to increase public knowledge and better inform community service. The purpose of this grant is to build the capacity of the university faculty and other researchers to engage in authentic collaborative research partnerships for public benefit*



*and to provide incentives that foster and stimulate the conduct of community-engaged scholarship and community-based participatory research.*

## **Recommendation**

We recommend continuing this award.

## **Awards**

UMass Boston recognizes faculty excellence each year by celebrating the accomplishments of faculty members who have made exceptional contributions in the three primary areas of faculty responsibility by presenting the Chancellor's Awards for Distinguished Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. The award criteria for teaching includes experimentation with "novel teaching methods," which may include civic or community-engaged teaching strategies. The scholarship award criteria use more traditional language, defining excellence as "evidenced by peer recognition of its import and impact." The service criteria include community as one of the areas where service activities can contribute. While community engagement could be included in any of these awards, it is typically reserved for the service category. Consequently, community engaged scholarship remains unrecognized as a valued form of scholarship.

A growing number of universities have established institutional-level awards that specifically recognize and celebrate faculty members for community engaged scholarship. The following awards represent examples, although this is not a comprehensive survey of all such awards.

Pennsylvania State University: Offers a *Community Engagement and Scholarship Award*, started in 2008, and utilizes a unique model serving as a nominating pipeline for the C. Peter Macgrath/W. K. Kellogg Engagement Award. Up to two faculty are awarded \$1000 by a university committee and based on the description of an engaged institution in the Kellogg Commission's report, *Returning to our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. The recipient(s) are then nominated for the regional engagement award that leads to the national Macgrath Award.

Loyola University, Maryland: Offers a *Faculty Award for Excellence in Engaged Scholarship* to recognize and celebrate "a faculty member's extraordinary contributions to Loyola's students, community partners, and institutional mission through sustained involvement and excellence in one or more types of engaged scholarship." The definition seems to be broad and inclusive of various types of scholarly products, such as curriculum. The award includes public recognition, \$500, and the awardee designates a community partner to receive \$500.

University of Memphis: Offers an Excellence in Engaged Scholarship award annually to a faculty member who has produced scholarship that addresses the concerns and opportunities of urban, regional, state, national, and global communities.

University of Alabama, Center for Community-based Partnerships: Has an annual Awards Luncheon with several awards recognizing "outstanding engagement scholarship" by faculty, staff, students and community partners.

University of Kansas Medical Center: Offers a \$7500 *Faculty Award for Scholarship in Community Engagement* for “excellence in developing, implementing, and sustaining regional engaged scholarship initiatives.”

UNC Charlotte: Offers *Provost’s Faculty Award for Community Engagement* that can be based on public service, student engagement with communities, community-engaged research, or creative scholarship; 2013 was the first year the award was offered.

### **Recommendation**

The Working Group recommends that that a fourth award be added to the annual Chancellor awards, one for community engaged scholarship. Please see Appendix C for award language.

### **An Observation on Alignment and Consistency**

The Working Group’s review of policies and structures related to faculty rewards for community-engaged scholarship reveal a lack of alignment and consistency that creates an institutional environment of uncertainty and confusion. For example, in order to indicate the importance of community-engaged scholarship at the campus, the Public Service Grant commits resources intended to encourage community-engaged research. At the same time, that research cannot be adequately claimed in the Annual Faculty Report, nor is it clear that it falls within the policy guidelines for promotion and tenure or by what criteria it will be evaluated. Further, the kind of research encouraged through the Public Service Grant is not referenced in the provost’s “Suggested Guidelines for Major Faculty Personnel Reviews.” In order to advance community-engaged scholarship, we recommend not only that there are multiple ways that the campus signifies the value of community engaged scholarship, but that the policies, structures, and practices align with each other with consistent criteria.

## **II. Structures Supporting Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts, Boston**

The University of Massachusetts, Boston has a long, mission-driven history of community engagement. The Office of Community Partnerships has identified over four hundred current community partnerships. However, the university does not have a structure that coordinates and facilitates the integration of community engagement across the campus and, in the context of a research university, focuses particularly on promoting community-engaged scholarship.

Community Engagement is currently anchored in three offices at the University. Each has contributed to advancing community engagement at the University and efforts are underway to address more effective integration of these offices. The **Office of Community Partnerships**, which reports directly to the Vice Chancellor for Government Relations and Community Affairs and indirectly, with a dotted reporting line, to the Provost, is focused on quality community partnerships that impact the

community. The **Office of Student Leadership and Community Engagement** reports to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and is focused on student civic leadership development. The **Office for Faculty Development** reports to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and is focused on a wide range of faculty development initiatives, one of which is a time-limited, grant-funded project on faculty development for community engaged teaching, learning, and scholarship.

### **The Office of Community Partnerships**

The Office of Community Partnerships (OCP) seeks to identify, strengthen, and create collaborative community partnerships that advance UMass Boston's mission as a student-centered research university. This effort is aligned with the vision of the university to advance engaged research, teaching, service, and commercialized activities through mutually beneficial and equitable campus-community relationships. This office is helping the University gain a better sense of its partnership activities in order to organize partnership efforts and, per the University's strategic plan, "better tell its story." This office is focused on all types of community-university collaborations and not solely on promoting community-engaged scholarship.

### **The Office of Student Leadership and Community Engagement**

The Office of Student Leadership and Community Engagement exists to empower growth and development in students by engaging them in lifelong learning and self-discovery through community programs that promote social justice and civic leadership. The Office of Student Leadership and Community Engagement offers a variety of leadership training and development opportunities by engaging students with community organizations and partners. The goal is to create effective civic leaders in the classroom, on campus, the community and beyond. Through involvement with the office's programs, students build interpersonal competence and examine humanitarianism as well as civic engagement.

### **Office for Faculty Development**

The Office for Faculty Development at the University of Massachusetts Boston advances the university mission by supporting faculty excellence in research and scholarship, teaching and learning, and service by providing opportunities for professional development at all stages of faculty careers (tenure- and non-tenure-track, from new faculty to emeritus faculty). As one program among many others, the Office for Faculty Development currently offers the grant-funded Civic Engagement Scholars Initiative (CESI). CESI is intended to strengthen the university's ability to cultivate in undergraduates a life-long commitment to civic engagement in their public and professional lives. To achieve this goal, CESI provides faculty and departments opportunities to redesign one or more undergraduate courses to incorporate a civic engagement component for undergraduate students—through community-based participatory research, service-learning, or other means—to address issues of importance to communities and neighborhoods.

## **Findings: Community Engagement Coordinating Infrastructure**

The Working Group examined the internal organization landscape of community engagement at the University of Massachusetts, Boston and found that there are a wide variety of community partnerships tied to scholarship/research, teaching, and service in units across the campus. Indeed, it is clear that community partnerships are pervasive at the campus. It is not clear, however, that the wide range of community partnership activities are coordinated, aligned, or in any way integrated into an institutional whole.

What we heard from faculty who conduct CES is that they typically operate in isolation in their departments and often at a small scale. Some departments and centers are known for CES, but even in these cases, faculty and researchers are working in relatively small silos. Researchers and graduate students have few opportunities to learn from each other – for example, about funding and publishing CES -- and share resources. They lack opportunities to form the kind of cross-disciplinary collaborations that can expand the scale of CES at UMASS Boston, strengthen its quality, and deepen its impact in community well-being and in knowledge production. Collaborations often enhance the possibility for external funding, yet require a facilitating and coordinating structure that is currently absent.

Faculty also reported that they would like more support from the University in integrating teaching and learning with community engagement. There is abundant research indicating that educational practices such as community-based courses and service learning are “high impact practices” that lead to greater student engagement in learning and deeper learning. Research also indicates that high impact practices greatly benefit the retention and academic success of underserved students.<sup>3</sup> While the University currently is involved with hundreds of partnerships, and while the Office of Community Partnership reports that since 2007, nearly sixty percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty are involved with some kind of community partnership activity, the implementation of high impact educational practices at UMB-like courses that include a community-based project -, as measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) indicates need for improvement (see Appendix E). The NSSE results indicate that UMB students are involved in academically-based community engaged activities at a lower rate than our peer institutions. The data indicates that it would benefit UMB to increase its community engaged teaching and learning to improve the retention and success of its students.

The Working Group also studied a number of national models of infrastructure supporting community engagement and community engaged as well as the research literature on community engagement organizational structures at colleges and universities (Appendix F).

---

<sup>3</sup> Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are. *Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*, Association of American Colleges and Universities.

The literature and the results of our research make it clear that, for campuses seeking to institutionalize community engagement as a core commitment of the campus, creating a coordinating infrastructure is essential to advancing and sustaining community engagement. The “Foundational Indicators” of the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification identify such an infrastructure as a core criterion for institutional engagement. The Classification asks for evidence that a campus has “a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement.” The Carnegie Classification’s inclusion of a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure as a foundational indicator of community engagement reflects a preponderance of evidence in the literature that if campuses are to be effective in community engagement, there needs to be some kind of organizational enabling mechanism to facilitate it.

It is clear from all of the material reviewed that there are certain essential characteristics of the organizational structures that support community engagement and community engaged scholarship:

- 1) Organizationally, these structures are located in Academic Affairs because community engagement is positioned fundamentally as core academic work and as faculty work. While community engagement may, depending on the institutional context and cultures of the campus, have strong student affairs and outreach (community service) dimensions, these are complimentary to community engagement as curricular and scholarly commitments. Community engagement is a function of academic affairs because it is producing use-inspired scholarship, pedagogical models, and curricular innovations providing new venues for research, communication, and the creation of actionable knowledge.
- 2) Because community engagement is positioned organizationally as a core academic priority, funding of coordinating infrastructures for community engagement comes from operational funds. The central operation of the infrastructure (staffing, administration, space, overhead) is supported through line items in the operational budget of the campus. Non-operational funds (grants, individual donations, external funding) are an important supplemental component of funding for the coordinating infrastructure, expanding the capacity of the infrastructure, and result from the capacity created by core operational funds. We were unable to identify any organizational models in which the community engagement center was structured in such a way as to be supported entirely by external funding.
- 3) For the coordinating infrastructure to operate effectively, there needs to be adequate staffing that allows for fulfilling the multiple functions of the campus-wide structure. While there is no one single staffing model that represents best practice, it is apparent that a full time director and full time administrative staff are essential. If the director is not a faculty member or does not have faculty credentials, then it is important to have faculty presence as part of the coordinating infrastructure (e.g., faculty release time to assume the role of chair of the office’s standing committee and/or a community engagement scholar).

Part of understanding best practice for coordinating infrastructure for community engagement and community engaged scholarship is to contextualize their emergence and evolution in higher education. During the decade of the 1980s, driven by campus leaders seeking to reclaim the civic mission of higher education (university presidents formed Campus Compact in 1985) and by students seeking opportunities for community service (students formed the Campus Outreach Opportunity League – COOL - in 1984), campus infrastructure to support community engagement began to emerge on campuses. Where it did emerge, it was typically an office or program in student affairs with the aim of fostering student development and leadership.

By the early 1990s, efforts at deeper institutionalization of community engagement shifted attention to the curriculum, to faculty, and to the pedagogical practice of service-learning. Service-learning focused on integrating service with academic study and the infrastructure supporting community engagement took on new roles supporting faculty. With this shift in focus, structures that emerged in the 1990s were increasingly aligned with academic affairs instead of student affairs. For many of the centers that had developed in student affairs, there was a shift in their reporting to academic affairs.

By the late 1990s, and through to the present (2014), community engaged scholarship has emerged as a central feature of engaged campuses, further strengthening the centrality of community engagement to the academic mission of institutions of higher education. The best practice in organizational location of a coordinating infrastructure for community engagement is in academic affairs because community engagement is positioned as part of the core academic work of the campus. The creation of a coordinating infrastructure in academic affairs that supports faculty engagement in teaching, learning, and scholarship and signals that community engagement is an essential component of core academic work is a significant indicator of institutional engagement.

### **Recommendations: Community Engagement Coordinating Infrastructure**

The Working Group recommends that The University of Massachusetts, Boston establish a coordinating infrastructure with the following core features:

- It functions as a support unit for advancing and deepening community-engaged scholarship, teaching and learning, that is already occurring across the campus, while at the same time expanding community engagement
- It is located in Academic Affairs with a reporting line to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
- It is an office that has a core budget provided through ongoing operational funding
- It has a core staff, a Director, Associate Director, and a Faculty member with course release to serve as an Engaged Scholar who would chair a standing committee of faculty members and center directors to oversee the office's work.

The establishment of a funded, staffed, distributed, collaborative, facilitative

infrastructure – an Office of Community Engaged Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning - in Academic Affairs will allow for support for community engagement across the campus to effectively propel many engagement efforts to new levels of achievement and impact. It will function in a way that helps multiple units deepen their engagement and be more intentional in their community engagement. It will help build the capacity of faculty to conduct community engaged scholarship and teaching and assist faculty and units in raising external funds to support these projects. Importantly, it can serve as a convening place to facilitate research collaborations by faculty and students across the campus. There is a lot of community engaged scholarship and community engagement at UMB, but it's not recognized as core academic work. Faculty and researchers do this work on their own or with a few others in a particular department or center and they get very little support for this work as academic work. The purpose of the center is to connect faculty researchers located in diverse departments and centers who are doing CE and CES and provide greater and more strategic support to them.

Further, it will be able to collect data from across the units to be able to demonstrate institutional impact with an emphasis on leveraging university-community partnerships to advance student learning, student success, and student and faculty scholarship. It will function in a way that identifies, recognizes, and makes visible exemplary community engagement practices on campus and publicize them both internally and externally.

What is recommended is a new coordinating unit located in academic affairs that works closely with existing units in order to enhance community engagement as core academic work – in teaching, learning, and scholarship. The new unit has a unique role in advancing community engagement, as do the other units on campus – and thus is not intended to replace any of the existing units or lead to the elimination of existing units. The unique role for the proposed unit is that it will be focused on conceptualizing, piloting, deepening, and expanding community engagement that enhances academic programs and practices. For example, it will work closely with academic units and programs that currently have or can benefit from having community engagement as part of their offerings.

In addition to collaborating with the Office of Community Partnerships, the Office for Faculty Development, and the Office for Student Leadership and Community Engagement, the new coordinating unit in academic affairs can assist the following units with enhancing community engaged teaching, learning, and scholarship:

- Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
- Office of International and Transnational Affairs
- Study Abroad
- The Honors College
- Undergraduate Research
- URBAN- Boston
- Departments in the development of Community Engaged Capstone courses

The new unit can offer programs such as:

- Engaged Scholars Program (Establishing a learning community with faculty focused on CES and developing publications as an outcome.)
- Engaged Partner Program (Establishing a program for developing the capacity of community partners to be more effective co-educators for students involved with community engaged courses.)
- Engaged Department Program (Implementing a program focused on departmental units that want to create an identity as a community engaged department by integrating community engagement across the curriculum in the major.)
- A Graduate Certificate Program in Community Engaged Scholarship open to students across the university (Creating a graduate certificate in community engagement open to all graduate students aimed at building their capacity as community engaged scholars and enhancing their marketability post graduation.)

The unit can provide:

- Facilitation and convening for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary faculty teams to develop CES projects and seek external funding
- The development and sharing of CES resources for faculty
- Developing assessments for civic learning outcomes (addressing a Vision Project goal)
- Workshops and other development opportunities to help faculty with fundraising and publishing community engaged research
- Assistance to centers for funding of community engaged research
- Assistance to ORSP for seeking grants for faculty
- Assistance to the IRB with ethical issues in community-engaged research
- A speakers series focused on improving best practices in community engaged scholarship
- An audit of community engaged scholarship
- Mechanisms for gathering campus-wide data on community engaged scholarship

What is needed is a coordinating infrastructure that advances community engaged scholarship teaching, and learning in alignment with the Office of Community Partnerships in Government Relations and Public Affairs, the Office of Student Leadership and Community Engagement in Student Affairs, and the Office for Faculty Development in Academic Affairs, all of which make important and essential contributions to advancing community engagement and are what collectively contribute to the engagement of the University as a whole. If community engagement as a core academic priority is to be effectively advanced at the University, a coordinating office in Academic Affairs that works collaboratively with and provides support to the existing community engagement offices is essential.



### Summary of Recommendations:

	Recommendation	Timeframe	Funding Commitment
<b>Rewards and Recognition</b>	<p>The Provost issues guidelines for community engaged scholarship in the “Suggested Guidelines for Major Faculty Personnel Reviews” and encourages departments to address how the guidelines would be applied in an appropriate manner to faculty in their departments.</p> <p>The detailed guidelines that we recommend the Provost issue can be found in Appendix A to this report.</p>	Fall 2014	Administrative costs
	<p>Revise the Annual Faculty Report (AFR) to include specific opportunities to document community engagement activities in teaching, research, and service.</p> <p>Specific recommendations for revisions to the current electronic AFR is included in Appendix B.</p> <p>Create a Committee on Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement of the Faculty Council to work with the Faculty Union to implement revisions to the AFR.</p>	Fall 2014	Administrative costs
	<p>Public Service Grant</p> <p>Continue this grant opportunity as is.</p>		No new Resources
	<p>Create Chancellor’s Award for Distinguished Community-Engaged Scholarship.</p> <p>Specific recommendations for description the award are</p>	Fall, 2014	\$3,000 annually

	included in Appendix C.  Establish criteria and solicit nominations for award.		
<b>Coordinating Infrastructure</b>	Hire a Director for an Office of Community Engaged Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	FY 2015	\$25 K for search process
	Undertake planning, design, and coordination with community engaged units across campus	FY 2015	\$50K for planning
	Establish an Office of Community Engagement and community engaged scholarship in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	FY 2016	\$300K annual budget

## **Acknowledgements**

The Working Group would like to express its deep appreciation to Monica C. Garlick and Kathleen Banfield for their assistance in supporting the activities of the Working Group in preparing this report. Monica is PhD candidate in the Department of Public Policy, McCormack Graduate School of Global and Policy Studies, and Kathleen is the Assistant Director of Community Partnerships in the Office of Community Partnerships. Their commitment, insights, organizational skills, and good humor were invaluable contributions for which we are enormously grateful.

### **Working Group Members:**

Mark R. Warren, Department of Public Policy and Public Affairs, McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies (Co-Chair)

John Saltmarsh, Department of Leadership in Education, College of Education and Human Development (Co-Chair)

Patricia Krueger-Henney, Department of Leadership in Education, College of Education and Human Development

Lorna Rivera, Department of Women's and Gender Studies, College of Liberal Arts

Miren Uriarte, College of Public and Community Service (linking to the Ph.D. Program in Transnational, Cultural and Community Studies)

Donna Haig Friedman, Center for Social Policy, McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies

Richard K. Fleming, Exercise and Health Sciences, College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS)

Diana Yadira Salas, PhD Student, McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies

Ex-Officio: Luciano Ramos, Director, Office of Community Partnerships

## **Appendix A: Proposed Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion**

### *Community Engaged Scholarship*

Community engaged research and creative activity results from a partnership between faculty member(s) and community groups or members, broadly conceived. Scholarship is community engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships and addresses public purposes. It also meets the standards of scholarship when it involves inquiry, advances knowledge, and is open to review and critique by relevant scholar and community and professional peers. Scholarship is community engaged when faculty, students, community-based organizations, government agencies, policy makers, and/or other actors work together to identify areas of inquiry, design studies and/or creative activities, implement and evaluate activities that contribute to shared learning and capacity building, disseminate findings and make recommendations or develop initiatives for change. The findings of community-engaged scholarship can be published in academic venues like peer-reviewed journals and university press books. However, this kind of scholarship often produces other kind of products, including but not limited to published reports, exhibits and multimedia forms of presentation, installations, clinical and other service procedures, programs and events, court briefings and legislation.

Excellence in community engaged scholarship requires that the research be of high quality, make significant contributions to building knowledge, and be recognized by a relevant community of peers, just like other forms of scholarship. A variety of evidence for the quality of community-engaged scholarship can be included, including the products listed above. Impact can also be demonstrated through the broad distribution of community engaged scholarship products and evidence of outcomes in terms of changes in policy and practice, legislative action, enhancing community capacity, and contributing to public discourse. Evaluators of quality and impact should be drawn from a relevant and qualified community of experts, which can include scholars, professionals, community members and civic leaders.

Normally, the overall set of evaluators for the review of faculty scholarship would consist mainly of other faculty; but relevant experts uniquely capable of evaluating community engaged scholarship should be included. As is usual in soliciting external evaluators, letters should not be solicited from someone with whom a faculty member has collaborated, including community experts. Instead, personnel committees can ask the faculty member's community partners to submit letters of support, which may document the nature of the community engagement and the contribution it has made, from the partner's point of view.

### *Community Engagement in Teaching*

Community Engaged Teaching can take a number of possible forms, including service learning within campus-based courses, on-site courses, clinical experiences, community-based internships, professional internships, and collaborative courses.

These community learning experiences for students typically occur locally but could also be part of international study abroad or service projects. In addition, community engaged teaching can take the form of instruction to community members or other constituencies. Since community engagement involves a reciprocal partnership between the university and the community, the impact of this teaching should normally include enhanced student learning as well as contribute to community partner objectives. Another potential outcome of community engaged teaching is the preparation of educated and engaged citizens and the enhancement of democratic values and social responsibility among students.

A variety of evidence can be supplied to demonstrate the quality and impact of community engaged teaching, including course syllabi and other instructional material and student evaluations. Community partners and other knowledgeable experts can be asked for letters of support that speak to the faculty member's contribution to community objectives and, if appropriate, to student learning.

### *Community Engagement in Service*

Contributions to service typically include service to the profession, service to the university and its various components (department and college), and service to the community or public. Community engagement should normally be considered as one way of contributing to community or public service. While a faculty member can provide community service via individual action (e.g., publishing an op-ed piece, testifying to a legislative body), engagement implies a reciprocal partnership. In this case, a faculty member's contribution comes through collaborative efforts with other community and civic actors. Impact can include enhancing community capacity, contributing to new public policies and services, creating innovative products and developmental initiatives, and improving the lives of community residents. If appropriate, relevant and knowledgeable experts including community professionals or members can be asked for letters of support that speak to the quality and impact of a faculty member's community engagement efforts.

One general consideration for faculty who practice community engagement in any of the three areas is the time and energy it takes to build partnerships with community actors and develop joint projects. Appropriate credit needs to be awarded to the development of successful partnerships. Principles of successful partnerships include reciprocity, mutual respect, and recognition of expertise on all sides. Community experts can be appropriate evaluators of the quality and impact of faculty's engagement with community partners along these are other appropriate dimensions.

## Appendix B: Annual Faculty Report

The following 12 changes are recommended:

1. **In the Main Menu** of the electronic AFR, there is the text box below:

### Activities Database Main Menu

**Note:**

All fields in the form below are optional. Since this AFR instrument is used by all colleges, some fields will have relevance for certain colleges and not for others. Please fill in information for only those fields that are most relevant to YOUR Teaching, Research, and Service.

ADD THIS TEXT TO THE BOX ABOVE:

To gather better data on faculty collaboration with community partners, for the purpose of the AFR, community engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity and enhance curriculum, teaching and learning. It is community engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships in research, teaching, and service addressing a broad range of issues in local, regional, national, and global communities.

2. **In the Teaching section**, there is a tab for “Scheduled Teaching.”

### Activities Database

#### Scheduled Teaching

RETURN TO MAIN MENU

SAVE AND RETURN

SAVE AND ADD ANOTHER

RETURN (CANCEL)

Term and Year

Course Name

Course Prefix and Course Number

Section Number

Official Enrollment Number

Number of Credit Hours

New course preparation?

New format for existing course?

ADD AS NEXT LINE WITH DROP-DOWN BOX OF YES/NO:

Is this a community engaged course?

**3. In the Scholarship/Research section, the first area is “Artistic and Professional Performances and Exhibits.”**

**Performers/Exhibitors/Lecturers**  
Please either select a person from the drop-down list or enter their name in the input fields.

Performer/Exhibitor/Lecturer						
People at University of Massachusetts Boston	First Name	Middle Name/Initial Name	Last Name	Role	If a student, what is his/her level?	Affiliation
Saltmarsh, John:	John	Saltmarsh				

Add another Performer/Exhibitor/Lecturer: 1 **ADD**

Status

Was this academic or non-academic?

Scope

Was this peer-reviewed/refereed?

Invited or Accepted?

Was this by audition, commission, competition or invitation?

Description (50 Words or Fewer)

ADD THE FOLLOWING TEXT WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:

Does this work/exhibit use community engaged approaches or methods?

**4. In the Scholarship/Research section, the next area for revision is “Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research.”**

## Activities Database

Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research

[RETURN TO MAIN MENU](#)

[SAVE AND RETURN](#)

[SAVE AND ADD ANOTHER](#)

[RETURN \(CANCEL\)](#)

Type

Title

Sponsoring Organization

Awarding Organization Is

Explanation of "Other"

### Investigators

Please either select a person from the drop-down list or enter their name in the input fields.

#### Investigator

People at University of Massachusetts Boston	First Name	Middle Name/Initial Name	Last Name	Role	If a student, what is his/her level?	Affiliation
Saltmarsh, John:	John.	Saltmarsh		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Add another Investigator:  [ADD](#)

Amount

\$

Abstract




ADD TEXT AFTER ABSTRACT WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:

Does this contract, fellowship, grant or sponsored research use community engaged approaches or methods?

5. In the Scholarship/Research section, the next area for revision is "Intellectual Contributions."



Add another Author: 1 ADD

Journal/Publisher/Proceedings Publisher	
City and State of Journal/Publisher	
Country of Journal/Publisher	
Volume	
Issue Number/Edition	
Page Numbers or Number of Pages	
Medium of Publication	
Web Address or DOI Link	http:// <span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 25px; display: inline-block; width: 300px;"></span>
Editor(s)	
Was this peer-reviewed/refereed?	<span style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px 10px; display: inline-block;"> <div style="width: 10px; height: 10px; background: linear-gradient(to bottom, #ccc, #fff); border: 1px solid #0056b3; margin: 0 auto;"></div> </span>
Abstract/Synopsis	

ADD TEXT AFTER ABSTRACT/SYNOPSIS WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:  
 Does this contribution use community engaged approaches or methods?

**6. In the Scholarship/Research section, the next area for revision is “Presentations.”**

1st Presenter/Author						
People at University of Massachusetts Boston	First Name	Middle Name/Initial Name	Last Name	Role	If a student, what is his/her level?	Affiliation
Saltmarsh, John:	John.	Saltmarsh				

Add another Presenter/Author:

Meeting Type

Explanation of "Other"

Academic or Non-Academic?

Scope

Was this peer-reviewed/refereed?

Published in Proceedings?

Published Elsewhere?

Invited or Accepted?

Abstract/Synopsis (30 Words or Fewer)

ADD TEXT AFTER ABSTRACT/SYNOPSIS WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:  
Does this presentation contribute to the understanding of community engagement?

**7. In the Scholarship/Research section, the next area for revision is "Research Currently in Progress."**

### Activities Database

#### Research Currently in Progress

Title

Description

ADD TEXT AFTER ABSTRACT/SYNOPSIS WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:  
Does this contribution use community engaged approaches or methods?

8. In the Service section, the first area is “Department.”

## Activities Database

### Department

RETURN TO MAIN MENU

SAVE AND RETURN

SAVE AND ADD ANOTHER

RETURN (CANCEL)

Service Name

Position/Role

Explanation of "Other"

Were you elected or appointed?

Responsibilities/Brief Description (30 Words or Fewer)



Brief Description of Key Accomplishments



ADD TEXT AFTER BRIEF DESCRIPTION WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:

Does this activity advance community engagement?

9. In the Service section, the second area is “College.”

## Activities Database

College

RETURN TO MAIN MENU

SAVE AND RETURN

SAVE AND ADD ANOTHER

RETURN (CANCEL)

Service Name

Position/Role

Explanation of "Other"

Were you elected or appointed?

Served Ex-Officio?

Responsibilities/Brief Description (30 Words or Fewer)



Brief Description of Key Accomplishments



ADD TEXT AFTER BRIEF DESCRIPTION WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:  
Does this activity advance community engagement?

10. In the Service section, the third area is "University."

## Activities Database

University

RETURN TO MAIN MENU

SAVE AND RETURN

SAVE AND ADD ANOTHER

RETURN (CANCEL)

Service Name

Position/Role

Explanation of "Other"

Were you elected or appointed?

Served Ex-Officio?

Responsibilities/Brief Description (30 Words or Fewer)



Brief Description of Key Accomplishments



ADD TEXT AFTER BRIEF DESCRIPTION WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:  
Does this activity advance community engagement?

11. In the Service section, the fourth area is "Professional."

Activities Database

Professional

RETURN TO MAIN MENU

SAVE AND RETURNSAVE AND ADD ANOTHERRETURN (CANCEL)

Organization/Committee/Club

Position/Role

Explanation of "Other"

Responsibilities/Brief Description (30 Words or Fewer)

Brief Description of Committee's Key Accomplishments

ADD TEXT AFTER BRIEF DESCRIPTION WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:  
Does this activity advance community engagement?

12. In the Service section, the fifth area is "Public."

36

## Activities Database

Public

RETURN TO MAIN MENU

SAVE AND RETURN

SAVE AND ADD ANOTHER

RETURN (CANCEL)

Organization/Committee/Club

Position/Role

Explanation of "Other"

City

State

Country

Were you elected or appointed?

Audience

Served Ex-Officio?

Responsibilities/Brief Description (30 Words or Fewer)



Brief Description of Committee's Key Accomplishments



ADD TEXT AFTER BRIEF DESCRIPTION WITH A DROP-DOWN BOX YES/NO:  
Does this activity advance community engagement?

## **Appendix C: The Chancellor's Award for Community Engaged Scholarship**

The University of Massachusetts Boston is an urban research university that seeks to serve its urban, regional, national, and global communities in a number of ways. Vital to this mission is scholarship that addresses the concerns and opportunities of these communities. Such scholarship (1) involves academic projects that engage faculty members and students in a collaborative and sustained manner with community groups; (2) connects university outreach with community organizational goals; (3) furthers mutual productive relationships between the university and the community; (4) entails shared authority in the research process from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the results, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer review; (5) results in excellence in engaged scholarship through such products as peer-reviewed publications, collaborative reports, documentation of impact, and external funding, and (6) is often integrated with teaching and/or with service activities.

In keeping with this purpose, the University of Massachusetts Boston has established a Chancellor's award to recognize excellence by faculty in community-engaged scholarship.

### **Nomination Criteria**

This award is based on the scholarly or creative work that the candidate has developed in partnership with communities at local, national and/or global levels. The candidate's work must exhibit excellence, as evidenced by recognition of its import and impact both in its contribution to knowledge and to advancing important community goals. The assessment of relevant experts both in the academy and in the community will be considered in the award process. The ability to engage others in his or her community engaged work, e.g., undergraduate and graduate students, will be considered as well.



## **Appendix D: UMB Facilitated Conversations**

On April 10, 2013, Working Group members gathered the views of the UMass Boston research community during “Facilitated Conversations” workshops at the Second Annual Community-Engaged Partnership Symposium. UMass Boston faculty, staff, researchers, and graduate students were invited to share their views about the university’s commitment to community-engaged research.

The Working Group members facilitated six sessions with the following groups: Session 1: Colleges of MGS, CEHD, CAPS, CPCS; Session 2: College of Liberal Arts; Session 3: Early Career Faculty & Researchers; Session; 4: Colleges of CNHS, CM, CSM, SGISD; Session 5: Graduate Students; Session 6: Institutes and Centers.

Participants were asked their views in response to three questions:

- How do you define community-engaged scholarship (CES)?
- How is CES work supported at UMB?
- How do we create an institutional environment to advance CES at UMB?

Participants had much to say in response to these questions. Participants noted the rich history of CES on the campus. They also noted that CES is conducted in many diverse ways. Many stressed that the university values community engagement and supports it in certain ways. However, participants all agreed that CES was not adequately supported on campus.

They offered many suggestions for ways to increase support for CES on campus. The working group compiled these suggestions and integrated many of them into its recommendations in this report. What follows is a selection of comments offered at the facilitated sessions.

### **Support for Faculty and Students Conducting CES**

Participants in the UMB facilitated conversations repeatedly mentioned the need for increased recognition and reward for community-engaged research. Participants discussed their concern about the lack of support that researchers sometimes experience. They offered various suggestions as to how to improve the support for this work at UMB. These suggestions included: recognition of integrated faculty roles, mentoring for new faculty and graduate students conducting this type of research, reviewing the search and hiring processes for faculty, and the need to value CES in tenure and promotion policies.

Participants spoke to the challenges of conducting CES within traditional academic institutions. One participant said, “It is hard to conduct community-engaged scholarship as you have to pursue your own scholarship, and there is not enough time on our hands.” Faculty and graduate students said they should not “feel like they have to choose between [these] scholarships”. Other participants noted that “Time is a struggle” and CES is often process-oriented with longer timelines for work completion.

Graduate students expressed strong interest in CES, but said they need mentorship and training and resources. One participant said that faculty members “devalue” this

kind of research. “If that is how we are taught and trained, then chances are very low that I will continue to do CES.”

Mentorship of junior faculty is key and so is having a culture of and/or “expectation” that one’s scholarship can be community-engaged. For example one participant stated, “working with departments is very important because that’s where languages and values get shaped.” Participants thought it would also be important in the tenure and promotion process, if senior faculty mentored junior tenure track faculty.

Participants suggested that department chairs meet with faculty to discuss tenure and promotion decisions related to community-engaged scholarship. How should CES be evaluated? College Deans should also provide a “framework” for supporting CES among faculty and “raising awareness at all levels” including the Institutional Review Board.

Faculty need advice and support in publishing CES. Some faculty said it was becoming increasingly difficult to publish in “traditional academic spaces”, and that it may be “even harder” to publish community-engaged scholarship.

With regard to tenure and promotion, people said that “there is some real concern among early career faculty around promotion and tenure” and CES. Tenure and promotion is a “source of anxiety for tenure track faculty” because “guidelines are needed [to evaluate CES]”. There was general agreement that CES research is much higher risk, because the academic partner must give up some control – including control of the timeline. This is a very high risk for junior faculty. Someone explained that the challenge of tenure evaluation of a scholar doing community engaged research is that tenure “is based on number of publications and quality of publication. [However CES] takes a really long time to complete research”. Further compounding the issue is the fact that “colleges don’t yet have a way of categorizing CES as research”.

Some participants wanted to make sure that tenure and promotion guidelines for CES would not be used to constrain the kinds of CES faculty could conduct. These concerns were expressed as “guidelines can be a trap” and “a standard can shackle you.”

### **Creating a Stronger Infrastructure across the University**

One participant said, “People don’t know how to find each other.” Some participants suggested developing a “center” or “gestational space” at the university that would foster more collaboration across disciplines, departments, colleges, as well as create opportunities for “finding synergies” and “finding resources”. This would be a space/place that would offer “mechanisms for matchmaking” among faculty and graduate students doing CES and where, “we can have cross-disciplinary conversations”.

Participants detailed the need for increased support and infrastructure in various ways. They cited a lack of resources, support and engagement for partnerships, a lack of space, difficulty in gaining access to campus center by community groups, and the need for a clearinghouse of information with regard to past, present and future

collaboration among community partners and faculty. They argued that the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) needed to be a “two-way relationship” so that there are co-developers of the project. Participants also discussed the need for training IRB members in collaborative research protocols. Faculty also referenced a need for leadership in certain departments to increase support of community-engaged research.

Participants offered further examples of the need for infrastructure support. One person cited the need for “space for faculty and others to explore and evolve into CE research.” Another pointed out that researchers need a longer time period “to build and sustain relationships, which tends to require more funding than in current budgets”. Participants suggested revising the IRB such that it captures the collaborative nature of CES research projects. Many CE scholars reported that they did not feel supported by ORSP. Members said that there needs to be more public discussion about the kinds of resources available for faculty. Perhaps have one person who can manage the logistics of funding collaborative research and ongoing partnerships that develop over years.

Some people suggested other activities to support CES: 1) set aside physical space in the campus center for CES; 2) make the policy that UMB pays for Campus Center space if used for CES; 3) set aside parking spaces on campus for collaborating partners from the community; 4) develop data sets for faculty and community to search for partnerships and ongoing CES; 5) run CES workshops for faculty; 6) publicize access for students to CES projects; and 7) renting space in the city with parking would also be helpful.

The discussion of financial support for CES surfaced in many of the facilitated sessions. Some people had suggestions on ways to overcome the financial gap for CES funding. According to some participants CES could also be a vehicle to connect to alumnae and fundraise. For example, one participant suggested establishing a database of alumni engaged within the community who may be partners and supporters. Another person suggested creating a part-time position that focuses on CES grant possibilities. “Someone should coordinate a list” of these possibilities. It was acknowledged that there is a position in ORSP who works with the Institutes and others to coordinate proposals for funding, including foundation monies.

Some people stated that there was a need for an overall cultural shift to come back to the original mission statement of UMB. In fact, the “Chancellor and Provost are always looking for ways to talk about the importance of community engagement” and the campus should provide them with clear examples.

Some people had suggestions about ways to support CES through cultural changes. One person stressed the importance of sharing information. This person also suggested that within each college, there should be a leader who gives voice to CES, who gets updates on meeting agendas, etc. This idea was supported by attendees, and it was suggested that there be a stipend available for that person(s). Also, the idea of URBAN and URBAN.Boston ought to be widely introduced the UMB faculty.

Many spoke to the need for the university to find ways to strengthen appreciation for CES and embed it in the culture of the departments. From the graduate student perspective, there was agreement that scholarship ought to be a community driven process with the help of academics: one, to meet research needs of community, and then, two, translate it to larger community of scholars. Graduate students have different experiences within different departments as to the level of support they received for CES. One student said all of the faculty in their department would support their community based research projects. Another student had the opposite experience in which some faculty did not consider the community perspective valid.

Community engaged teaching also requires further support from the university. One person talked about supporting faculty who may want to integrate coursework and other steps to promote community engagement. These faculty members may “wish to find synergies” to connect the classroom with community and research opportunities. People discussed service learning as an avenue to community engagement. One person said, “There are steps to take to become fully engaged. Service learning can be a step toward CES relationships”.

## Appendix E: The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

UMass Boston has administered the NSSE in 2002, 2004, 2008, 2011, and is currently in the process of administering it again this year. The administration, analysis and dissemination of the survey is managed by the Office of Institutional Research and Policy Studies (OIRP) with an advisory committee of colleagues from student affairs, student support, the library, athletics and the Provost's Office. The survey targets first year and senior undergraduates and provides benchmark data from other NSSE participants. Data are shared in presentations with campus committees, are made available in reports and are available on the OIRP website.

[http://www.umb.edu/oirp/surveys\\_assessment/nsse](http://www.umb.edu/oirp/surveys_assessment/nsse).

The NSSE question *'In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course?'* is of particular importance to UMass Boston. The percentage responding 'often' or 'very often' has increased for first year students from 2% in 2002 to 9% in 2011 and for senior students from 10% to 14%.

While these increases are encouraging, the 2011 data also show that our students are participating at lower percentages than those of our Carnegie classification, NSSE participant peers. Our Strategic Plan ([http://www.umb.edu/the\\_university/strategicplan](http://www.umb.edu/the_university/strategicplan)) seeks to address this and the University has increased resource allocation to this end, including the development of the offices of Community Partnerships, International and Transnational Affairs, and Faculty Development.

Measurement of the impact of institutional engagement on students' behavior also utilizes NSSE<sup>4</sup> questions shown in the table below showing first year student data in response to the question, *Which of the following ... do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?*

First Year Students Planning to do:	NSSE 2004	NSSE 2008	NSSE 2011
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	59%	70%	73%
Community service or volunteer work	46%	47%	56%
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	33%	31%	41%
Foreign language coursework	39%	36%	45%

---

<sup>4</sup> The question in NSSE 2002 was worded in such a way that it is not comparable with subsequent years.

Study abroad	33%	40%	39%
--------------	-----	-----	-----

Results from first year students show increasing percentages planning to participate in this array of engagement activities. While these figures are lower than those of Carnegie classification peer NSSE participants, they indicate increases.

Responses to the same questions for students who were seniors at the time shown in the table below gives the percentages in response to the question, *Which of the following have you done ... before you graduate from your institution?*

<b>Seniors Having done:</b>	<b>NSSE 2004</b>	<b>NSSE 2008</b>	<b>NSSE 2011</b>
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	31%	36%	36%
Community service or volunteer work	30%	41%	39%
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	12%	17%	16%
Foreign language coursework	37%	43%	42%
Study abroad	6%	7%	11%

The responses from Seniors who report having done the same array of activities, it must be noted, refer to students who began their academic careers before the years in which they participated in NSSE; so their responses refer to an earlier time than the freshmen whose data are reported above.

## Appendix F: References

### Campuses Examined with Revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines:

Michigan State University  
Northern Kentucky University  
Portland State University  
Syracuse University  
University of Memphis  
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

### Literature on Community Engaged Scholarship:

*Academic Review and Engagement at Tulane University, A White Paper for Discussion*, January 2013

Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publically engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 14(4), 5-35.

Gurgevich, E. A., Hyman, D., & Alter, T. R. (2003). Creation of UniSCOPE: A model for rewarding all forms of scholarship. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 7(2), 1-7.

Hyman, D., Gurgevich, E., Alter, T., Ayers, J., Cash, E., Fahnlne, D., ... & Wright, H. (2002). Beyond Boyer: The UniSCOPE model of scholarship for the 21st century. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 7(1&2), 41-65.

Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. K. (2008). Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university.

Stanton, T. K. (2008). New times demand new scholarship Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 3(1), 19-42.

Stanton, T. K. (2012). New times demand new scholarship II: Research universities and civic engagement: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(4), 271-304.

### Literature on Infrastructure for Community Engagement:

Beere, C. A., Votruba, J. C., & Wells, G. W. (2011). *Becoming an engaged campus: A practical guide for institutionalizing public engagement*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hall, B.L, and Berube, L. (n.d.) Towards a New Architecture of Knowledge: The Office of Community-Based Research at the University of Victoria-Based Research at the University of Victoria

Proposal to Establish the “Center for Excellence in Curricular Engagement.”  
February , 2007, North Carolina State University

Toward Fulling the Kentucky Promise: Engaging Students, Engaging Communities, Engaging UK – A Proposal to Establish the Center for Community Engagement in Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship July, 2013. University of Kentucky.

UC Merced’s Resource Center on Community Engaged Scholarship, ReCCES (n.d)

Welch, M., and Saltmarsh, J. (2013) Current Practice and Infrastructures for Campus Centers of Community Engagement, *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Vol. 17.4, December, p. 25-56

UMB Reports:

Civic Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston: Report of the Working Group on Civic Engagement, January 2010

Report of the Faculty Development Committee, June 19, 2009