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[indicators?]
Operationalizing Excellence in Community Engagement

[In what arenas ?]
[Select one]
Why Build Capacity for CE?

1- To overcome challenges and thereby enhance excellence (proximate outcomes)

2- To capitalize on challenges and thereby nurture transformation (ultimate outcomes)
   * Individuals
   * Processes / systems (e.g., teaching and learning)
   * Groups
   * Organizations / Institutions
   * Communities
Building Whose Capacity?

1- Students

2- Community members / organizations

3- Faculty / staff

4- Administrators / Institutions

…. the academy, disciplines
Building What Capacities?

1- Collaboration / partnership
2- Learning through reflection on experience
3- Little picture ← → Big picture
4- Self-directedness & other-engaged
5- Dealing with ambiguity
6- Critical thinking
7- Sensitivity to context
8- Integrative conceptualization
9- Openness to growth, including through giving and receiving feedback
10- Intercultural competence
Building Capacity How?

1- Embrace the challenges

2- Scaffold the process

3- Think developmentally

4- Integrate critical reflection and assessment

5- Maintain creative tension between “safe” and “critical” / “support” and “challenge”
Designing community engagement as a “developmental journey”
Designing community engagement as a “shared developmental journey”

Students (ex)

Faculty (ex)

Partners (ex)
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Key elements of community engagement?

Consensus? Contested?
Key elements of community engagement?

Consensus? Contested?
“Community”

In here / out there

~

Geographic

~

Organization type

~

Place or Practice or Purpose

~

Orientation toward the other

~

Relationship
“Engagement”

in ~ on ~ for ~ with

(“with-ness”)
“Partnership”

Placement ~ partnership

Relationship ~ partnership

Campus-Community

~

Students-Faculty-Community

~

SOFAR
“Reciprocity”

“Thin” (mutual benefit)

~

“Thick” (shared power, voice, responsibility, resources, benefits, costs, …)
“Reflection”

“Thin” (describe, look back on, review progress) ~ “Thick” (critical reflection)
“Scholarship”

Basic ~ Applied ~ Engaged

“Just” scholarship

Good ~ Scholarly ~ Scholarship
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

**Good teaching:**
* to engage students
* to foster important forms of student learning

**Scholarly teaching:** good teaching +
* practices of classroom assessment and evidence gathering
* informed not only by the latest ideas in the field but by current ideas about teaching
* peer collaboration and review

**Scholarship of teaching:** scholarly teaching +
* public ("community property")
* open to critique and evaluation
* in a form that others can build on
* involving question-asking, inquiry, and investigation (particularly around issues of student learning)

[Hutchings & Shulman, 1999]
"Resources"

University has ‘em, community doesn’t

~

Range of assets brought by all:
Knowledge / money / prestige / time / skills / past experience / perspective
“Needs”

Community has ‘em, university can fix ‘em

~

Shared challenges in the context of our common life and future
“Teacher” / “Learner” / “Served” / “Investigator” / “Subject”

“co-ness”
“????”
Conceptualizing (and talking about) Community Engagement: The Context and the Stakes

Paradigm Shift
Contemporary Paradigm Shift

Hierarchical Dualism

Web of Life
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional T&amp;L is often ...</th>
<th>Community Engaged Learning is often ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture- and book-based</td>
<td>Reflective experience-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered</td>
<td>Learner-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictable, controlled</td>
<td>Uncertain, messy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical power dynamics</td>
<td>Power-shifted dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>Unfamiliar, outside comfort zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Learning (Vaill, 1996)

Focused on efficiency and on answers
Rule-constrained
Competitive
Being a learner < being someone who has learned
Learning is painful
Learning goals are externally set
Institutional Learning

“While this model is not absolutely useless for the learning challenges we face, it is inadequate by itself, and in many ways it is actually dysfunctional for the learning tasks and opportunities facing us... it tends to disqualify us for the kinds of learning we need to do throughout our lives [given ‘permanent whitewater’].”
Learning as a Way of Being (Vaill, 1996)

Creative
Expressive
Reflective
“Online”
Continuous
Self-directed
Lifelong

“… encouraging them to think of themselves as developing learners, as learning about learning even as they are absorbing subject matter…”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technocratic (1)</th>
<th>Democratic (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit-based</td>
<td>Asset-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“On” or “for”</td>
<td>“With”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction between knowledge producers and knowledge consumers</td>
<td>Co-creation of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentialed expertise</td>
<td>Multiple expertise sources and centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy / traditional power dynamics</td>
<td>“Thick” reciprocity “Co-” roles / “powershift”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Engagement: Elements of Technocratic and Democratic Paradigms

Deficit-based ? Asset-based ?
Hierarchical ? Powershift ?
“On” or “For” ? “With” ?
Technocracy and Professional Development / Professional Practice

Dietetics / Health

Nonprofit / organizational management

Education

Leadership

Community development
Reflection

How technocratic (1) or democratic (10) is your approach to community engagement? Your students’? Your partners’?

Where do you want it to be (on this continuum)?

In what specific ways does your approach to community engagement embody elements of …

the technocratic paradigm?

the democratic paradigm?
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Conducting community engagement often requires and fosters transformative learning. Occurs through processes of examining, questioning, validating, and revising perspectives (Cranton, 2006).

Changing frames of reference by critically reflecting on assumptions and beliefs and consciously making and implementing plans that bring about new ways of defining the world (Mezirow, 2000).

Often occurs in the context of relationships that involve dialogue and action (Cranton, 2006; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Taylor, 2008; Eisen, 2001).

[Jameson, Clayton, & Jaeger, in press]
Conceptual Framework for Conducting Community Engagement

Research + Teaching + Service
Students + Community + Faculty

**Reflection:**
Separate (1) – Integrated (10) Roles
Power hierarchy (1) – Power-shift (10)
Reflection: Pathways into Community Engagement (affect how conduct, tell story, etc.)
Reflection: Design Principles for Community Engagement (1 = low; 10 = high; others?)

“with” not “for”

“co-” roles

asset-based

critical reflection

assessment

capacity building

integration

tie to goals

communication among partners

flexibility and a sense of humor
**Reflection: Competencies Required for and Fostered by Community Engagement**

Students?  
Community?  
Faculty?  
Institution?

*Case Study: BCW’s Capstone Project*  
*Case study: Wake Nature Preserves Partnership (Hess et al)*

*Instrument: EDGES (most / least applicable to various CE activities, most / least confident of yourself, most / least supported at UNCG … critique/add)*
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Reflection: The Counter-Normative Nature of Community Engagement

Students?  Research?
Community?  Teaching?
Faculty?  Service?
Institution?

Story: Shifts re: SL
[Scholarly and] democratic engagement “suggests students, faculty, and community members functioning as co-educators, co-learners, and co-generators of knowledge. Working together in this way means that [all participants] share power and responsibility and communicate as equals across their various roles. It requires open and respectful deliberation as [participants] navigate their way through disagreements to shared commitments. It calls for integrating inquiry with practice and capitalizing on the creative tensions that reside at the core of democracy (e.g., tensions between short-term and long-term, between efficiency and effectiveness, between local and global, and between individual interests and the common good).”

[Jameson, Clayton, & Jaeger, in press]
Reflection: “Co-” Roles in Community Engagement

Students? Responsibilities?
Community? Assets?
Faculty? Capacity Building?
Conditions for Mutual Transformation (in CES)

Vision of a shared developmental journey as possible and desirable

Re-negotiation of traditional power relationships

Relational context

Attention to language

Others?

[Jameson, Clayton, & Jaeger, in press]
EDGES:
Sample institutional mechanism for capacity building
“We are all learners, teachers, and leaders. We just have to give ourselves the opportunity to fill each of these roles. It’s hard. Sometimes the work spins by so quickly, it’s easy to skip this … Without it, however, the challenges build and the successes shrink.’

(Mondloch, community partner, in Stoecker & Tryon, 2009)

And, we would add, without it the engagement process reinforces the technocracy that undermines a truly democratic society and fails to take full advantage of the mutually-transformative potential of participatory partnerships. The stakes are high.”

[Jameson, Clayton, & Jaeger, in press]
Transformation through and for
Scholarly
and
Democratic
Community Engagement