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Executive Summary & Recommendations

This report provides a summary of the work completed by McMaster University’s Network for Community-Campus Partnerships (“the Network”) over 2013-2014. Established in September 2013, the Network is the result of a flagship recommendation of the Forward with Integrity (FWI) Community Engagement (CE) Task Force, which identified a need to facilitate the achievement of the university’s CE goals by bringing together CE involved representatives from across the university to move forward with strategic and coordinated action.

Network Priorities 2013-2014

Guided by the objectives articulated by the original CE Task Force, Network members made significant progress on a number of goals this year by:

- **Seeking Community Input:** The Network invited a panel of community representatives to seek community perspectives on what the central priorities for McMaster CE should be. The themes and ideas emerging from this discussion informed the Network’s priorities over the past year. A central goal in the coming year is to formalize regular community input and feedback into the ongoing work of the Network.

- **Creating a Community Engagement Database:** The Network is working towards creating an online clearinghouse of information on CE activities occurring throughout the university in an easily accessible manner. Launching in the fall of 2014, the database will be housed on a McMaster CE website that will serve as a landing page for those both within and beyond the university community who have an interest in community engagement. Established for the first year as a pilot, it will allow searches for campus CE related events, projects, groups and faculty.

- **Establishing Concrete Mechanisms to Recognize CE Activities:** The Network submitted a brief to the Associate Vice President (Faculty) outlining and justifying the urgent need for formal recognition of CE activities by the University. This could be done through Tenure and Promotion (T & P) and Career Progress/Merit (CP/M). The Network also developed guidelines for the creation of President’s Awards in CE for community partners, faculty, staff, and students, which are currently under consideration.

- **Creating a Central Resource:** The Network has advocated for the creation of a central body to serve as a cross-Faculty, interdisciplinary resource to facilitate and coordinate CE activities across the university. This resulted in provisional plans for the Associate Vice President (Faculty) to include Community Engagement in her portfolio and the creation of a Director of Community Engagement position.

- **Developing a Course on CE:** The Network considered how to integrate fundamental concepts of CE into an interdisciplinary campus-wide course. This work also included participating in the development of two graduate level modules about CE scholarship as part of a collaborative effort with several other Ontario universities.

- **Facilitating the introduction of CE activities in both small and large classrooms:** The Network oversaw a research study on the scalability of CE by studying the feasibility of community-engaged learning in larger classes through focus groups with McMaster staff and faculty.

- **Providing Discounted Resources on Campus for CE-related activities:** The Network focused on reducing barriers to hosting CE events on campus, especially reduced parking rates, reasonable catering costs, and access to on- and off-campus spaces.
• **Establishing an Improved Insurance Process**: There were efforts to address inefficient and uncoordinated approaches to insurance for off campus activities that fall outside of a required course.

• **Developing a Relationship with Centre for Continuing Education (CCE)**: It was critical for the Network to explore how CCE might assume a more community-engaged approach that is accessible, flexible, aligns with CE, and incorporates CE-related activities and office space into the new Downtown Centre.

• **Planning CE Events**: The Network contributed to the planning and coordination of events that facilitate information exchange and networking between campus and community representatives. This has been realized in the form of the annual event *Community-Engaged Education: An Idea Exchange*.

• **Participating in Formation of Internal and External CE Networks**: To improve coordination and information sharing, the Network formed two major internal networks over the first year: the Experiential Education Directors/Career Managers and Research Facilitators groups. The Network also collaborated in the creation of a third external network, the Neighbourhood Campus Network, which was formed to connect representatives from the City of Hamilton’s Neighbourhood Action Strategies, Redeemer College, Mohawk College, and McMaster University.

**Enablers**

The tangible outcomes achieved by the Network in the past year were enabled by a number of factors, most importantly:

• **Receptive and Enthusiastic Community Partners**: Listening to and learning from our community partners as the Network works to cultivate a culture of CE at McMaster has been and will continue to be crucial in developing a mutually-beneficial approach to CE.

• **Connection to Senior Leadership**: A robust connection to senior leadership via the Special Assistant to the President and the Project Manager for *Forward With Integrity* was critical in moving Network priorities forward.

• **Opportunity to act as a Consultant on CE**: The Network served as a consultant on a variety of CE-related questions arising across campus. Clearly defining this role going forward will be central in developing a coordinated approach to information-sharing, relationship-building, and partnership development.

**Recommendations Going Forward: Supporting a Community Engagement Culture at McMaster**

The Network has accomplished much in its first eight months. In addition to its continuing work on first year projects, the Network will continue to consider other central objectives articulated by the original Community Engagement Task Force, including:

• **Reaching out to community partners** and groups to improve and develop relationships, clarify processes and define mutually valuable projects

• **Improving the coordination** of internal networks within and between Faculties

• **Establishing appropriate metrics** to track and measure the success of CE

• **Developing a coordinated communications strategy**
• Including community partners as collaborators in event planning with the goal of facilitating a collaborative forum, symposium, or conference on CE

The Network recommends the establishment of an Office of Community Engagement that would support work already underway while also addressing goals not yet acted upon. The primary recommendations to support next steps towards improved integration of CE at McMaster in the coming year include:

• **Forming a Direct Connection to Senior Leadership:** The new Director of Community Engagement should have regular access to senior leadership and the Office of the President in order to facilitate the strategic conversations needed to foster awareness of and support for a coordinate approach to CE. This could be coordinated through the creation of a President’s Advisory Committee on Community Engagement.

• **Securing Faculty Support:** Faculty representatives on the Network are envisioned to serve as liaisons between the Network members and their respective Faculties. Appropriate acknowledgement of time and resources should be provided to adequately serve as a conduit.

• **Acquiring Sustainable Resources:** A budget is being developed to facilitate the ongoing progress of the Network on the CE priorities at the University.

Over 2014-2015 the Network should be supported in their work to ensure enthusiastic support from all levels of the institution for community engaged initiatives on campus. This will involve a focused yet wide-ranging effort to foster a culture of CE, engaging with all areas of campus and with community partners. McMaster must move away from considering CE as a series of programs and projects, and instead integrate CE as an embedded strategy that is connected to all facets of our mission and overarching University agenda.
I. Introduction

1. Evolution of the Network

The Network for Community-Campus Partnerships was established in September 2013. The Network emerged as a flagship recommendation of the FWI Community Engagement (CE) Task Force, which identified a need to bring together CE Champions from different areas of the university to further the CE agenda at McMaster. The idea was reaffirmed in ‘The Emerging Landscape’, the document prepared by the FWI Advisory Group that operationalized the Task Force reports from Forward with Integrity.

The CE Task Force was subsequently reconvened to consider the responsibilities, recommend the areas of campus that should be represented, and to identify a potential structure and priority deliverables for the proposed Network. With this vision in mind, senior leaders (Vice-presidents, Deans, Directors) were approached to identify an appropriate individual from their respective areas to participate in the Network. The name of the Network was revised at this time to capture the preferences expressed by all parties consulted, including community-based partners. The title “Network for Community-Campus Partnerships” was recommended going forward.

The group convened initially in September, with Susan Denburg (Strategic Advisor to the President) in attendance to provide a call to action, emphasizing the need to move forward with coordinated action and tangible goals guided by the principles and definitions that were carefully articulated by the Task Force. The group was asked to consider how it would like to influence the CE agenda at the University, and what it could collectively accomplish as a group.

2. Priorities and Intended Outcomes

As a starting point, the Network reviewed the priority objectives that were articulated by the original CE Task Force, which included:

- overseeing the formation of a database of CE initiatives across the university
- participating in the formation of internal networks within and between Faculties/areas
- establishing appropriate metrics to track and measure the success of CE initiatives
- participating in the coordination of at least one annual event involving community partners and University liaisons
- considering ways to generate awareness about the Network and its mandate through a communications strategy
- developing a common framework and/or step-by-step guide to be used by individuals at the institution with an interest in community engagement
- working collaboratively to determine other appropriate goals and deliverables.

As well, the members of the Network reviewed the guiding principles developed by the FWI Community Engagement Task Force and agreed that these principles would remain central to the work of the Network (see Appendix A - Guiding principles developed by the CE Task Force).
3. Process for Action

With these key objectives in mind, the members of the Network participated in a priority-setting exercise so that a list of deliverables could be established for the first year. Five priorities were determined (for the full list of ideas generated, please see Appendix B – Summary of Priority Setting Exercise):

1. Create concrete mechanisms to recognize CE activities, e.g. Student Portfolio, Faculty T&P + Merit, Staff Performance appraisals

2. Articulate the need for and components of a centralized resource or method to facilitate and coordinate CE activities based on our guiding principles

3. Consider the creation of a “course” that McMaster students would be encouraged to take before participating in community-engaged activities

4. Perform a research study on the scalability of CE within the curriculum in both large and small classes

5. Consider ways to provide discounted resources for those hosting CE activities on campus

While acknowledging that several initiatives would require longer term strategies, the Network was committed to achieving tangible progress in year one. Members self-selected the priorities that were most closely aligned with their individual mandate and expertise and smaller sub-groups were developed to advance the priorities in parallel.

II. Community Input

One of the critical gaps in the current formation of the Network is the contribution of individuals representing diverse areas of the community. This was a deliberate strategy as the Network recognized that there was some initial work to be done internally before others could be engaged. Moreover, it would be difficult to broaden the Network sufficiently to accommodate the diverse communities that should be consulted while still remaining a functional group that is able to deliver on its priorities. In recognition of this gap, the group invited a panel of community representatives to a discussion on what, from a community perspective, the central priorities for McMaster CE should be. For a full summary of the participants and the themes/ideas that emerged, please see Appendix C – Theme and Ideas from Community Partner Discussion. These themes and ideas informed the Network’s priorities for this past year, and will continue to be considered moving forward. In particular, the group is committed to considering ways to remove the burden on community partners who facilitate student learning; pursuing priorities that are shaped by community input (rather than exclusively student/researcher interests); and simplifying the pathways for community to connect into the university.
III. Network Priorities and Recommendations

In addition to the five priorities established by the Network at the beginning of the year, the group identified several other priorities as the year progressed stemming from community partner feedback, discussions with affiliate groups and as unique opportunities presented themselves. The following encompasses all of the priorities attended to by the Network this past year:

1. Community Engagement Database

In its initial meeting, the Network identified the critical need for a central database that would house information on CE activities occurring throughout the university. The database would respond to the challenge posed by the FWI Advisory Group to the university to find ways to improve coordination, collaboration, and communication through better sharing of information.

The database is currently being built on the MacFacts platform and will be hosted on a server in the Computer Services Unit (CSU) in the Faculty of Health Sciences. Its aim is to identify the projects, initiatives and interests of faculty members so that others in the McMaster community and beyond can maintain awareness, identify potential partners or collaborators, and stimulate connections with external partners within the community. The database is intended to consolidate, rather than duplicate, existing sources of this information on campus. At this time, profiles will be restricted to personnel at the university; this was a deliberate choice by the Network, so that the university could first enhance its internal coordination and communication before considering ways to engage more deeply with community partners. External users will have access to the search function on the site, but will be encouraged to contact a knowledge broker (currently the Coordinator of the Network for Community-Campus Partnerships), who will facilitate connections between partners if there is a mutual interest to explore a particular opportunity. The Network will evaluate the necessary capacity needed for this role (and that of database management) over the 2014-2015 academic year.

The database will be integrated into a landing page to help external community members access resources of potential interest, including the database but also information and links for educational opportunities, campus events, information on CE infrastructure at McMaster, how to create connections with McMaster faculty, staff and students, and contact information for the central CE staff. This landing page is intended to provide a user-friendly platform that allows members of the community to better navigate the university’s rich offerings.

2. Concrete Mechanisms to Recognize CE Activities

i. Faculty – Tenure & Promotion/Merit

The sub-group determined that adjusting the Tenure and Promotion/Merit process was a critical first step in promoting CE on campus, as current policies serve to dissuade faculty members from partaking in CE activities\(^1\). The group drafted a briefing note for the AVP (Faculty) outlining the justification for

including CE as part of the T&P/Merit process and has made itself available for further consultation as the discussion progresses.

**ii. Faculty, Staff, Students, Community Partners – President’s Awards for CE**

Along with the FWI Advisory Group, the sub-group has proposed the creation of a series of President’s Awards for CE to recognize and support existing excellence in community-campus initiatives. The Network has recommended that the awards be available to teams of people comprising both campus and community representatives and could include a modest financial contribution to enhance the community-engaged project/initiative. The awards would serve the following purposes:

- Celebrate community partners for their contributions to the university community
- Raise awareness of the wide array of community-university partnerships in existence
- Recognize the efforts required to foster successful community-campus partnerships
- Demonstrate the value that McMaster places on community engaged research, teaching and service/outreach

For a full version of the proposal, please see Appendix D – Proposal for President’s Awards for Community Engagement.

**iii. Staff – Ongoing communication with Human Resources (HR)**

The sub-group was in communication with HR about their work to promote CE amongst staff. Current initiatives include the TMG Day of Service (which the Network recommends be extended to other staff groups) as well as recognition of CE in the Lifetime Achievement award. It is recommended that the Network continue to work in tandem with HR to promote CE amongst staff, given the number of different groups that represent staff on campus.

**iv. Students – Recognition for taking CE courses/partaking in CE activities**

This sub-group convened only once to consider ways to recognize student involvement in CE, including the ideas of “badges”, a CE minor, and the use of the Learning Portfolio. However, the group recognizes that preliminary steps need to be taken (for example, the work being undertaken by the Course sub-group) before this can be further explored.

**3. Development of a Central Resource**

The Central Resource Sub-Group was dedicated to proposing ways to facilitate and coordinate CE activities across the university based on the guiding principles established by the Community Engagement Task Force. The group focused on the creation of a central body that could serve as a cross-Faculty, interdisciplinary resource for faculty, staff and students, as well as a critical connection to members of the broader community. The central body would need to have representation within the governance structure of the university in order to be aware of evolving University priorities and effective in achieving its mandate.

The sub-group originally requested that a high-level academic leadership position be developed to support the CE activities of the university (e.g. VP or AVP). Following a meeting with the President and
Provost, a provisional structure has been put in place that includes the appointment of a CE Director who will report directly into the AVP (Faculty), who has assumed CE into her portfolio. The Network recognizes this as an initial step in establishing a more robust framework to support CE at McMaster. A consultant has been hired to provide administrative and strategic support to the Network. The consultant will aid the Network in considering what further infrastructure will be required to establish McMaster as a leader in CE, and what a more permanent “central resource” should contain and would provide. Further, a proposed budget has been developed to support the Network in accomplishing its goals over the next year.

4. A “course” that McMaster students must take before participating in community-engaged activities

The Course Sub-Group was convened to consider how to integrate fundamental concepts about CE into a course/program at the university, an idea originally proposed in the CE Task Force report. Shortly after convening, the group was asked to participate in the development of a module about CE scholarship that was part of a broader initiative to create professional development modules for graduate students across several universities. The initiative was funded through the Ontario Government’s Productivity and Innovation Fund (PIF).

Since the PIF initiative was time-limited (the group completed its work on the module March 31, 2014), the group dedicated much of the year to the development of two separate (but linked) modules – one focused more broadly on CE (definitions, principles etc.) and the other on CE scholarship. The group considers the modules as resources that could be used more broadly at the university.

Following the completion of the PIF project, the group re-convened to revisit its initial recommendations. The group agreed to return to the original focus of an interdisciplinary campus-wide course on community engagement and discussed various opportunities and ideas around potential next steps, including an environmental scan of related interdisciplinary courses on campus that might serve as models. Based on these discussions the group has approached the McMaster Institute for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (MIIETL) for help in developing ideas and a structure for a course to be developed over 2014-2015.

5. Research Study on the Scalability of CE in the curriculum

This sub-group is interested in studying the feasibility of community engaged learning in larger classes, and recognized that this is currently a gap within the literature on CE. Two students from the MIIETL student scholars program were engaged to conduct a study, which includes focus groups with McMaster staff and faculty. A recommended next step for this project is to expand the study beyond McMaster, to better understand how CE is being facilitated in larger classes in various institutions across Ontario and Canada.
6. Discounted Resources for those hosting CE on campus

i. Parking

The cost of parking was identified as a key barrier to hosting CE events on campus. The sub-group met with representatives from Parking & Security Services, who generously agreed to the following:

- Events that qualify as "community engaged" will be eligible for a reduced parking rate - $9/day and $3/evening
- The Network for Community-Campus Partnerships will be responsible for tracking this in liaison with Parking. Once an event has been recognized by a member of the Network as involving community partners, reduced parking rates will be applied.
- Representatives from Parking & Security Services and the Network will convene in December to review this agreement (for example, how many people have taken advantage of the reduced parking, costs and benefits, whether it is financially sustainable moving forward, and whether the remainder of parking fees might be covered by central administration).

ii. Community Spaces

The sub-group recommends that a number of spaces across campus and in the community be designated as Community Space. Ideally, the community space would have A/V equipment available at low to no cost; would have a unique agreement with Paradise Catering that would allow for discounted food and/or an exemption from the exclusivity agreement; and a straightforward booking system that would favour CE activities. One concern that the Network acknowledges in terms of providing discounted catering for CE events is the effect this could have on Hospitality Services staff. The group is keen to look for affordable options for catering on campus while supporting fair wages for all staff. Potential on-campus locations for the spaces include the Community Room in the new Wilson building and Celebration Hall. Off-campus spaces would include Action Research Commons Hamilton (ARCH) at the Perkins Centre and potentially a designated space within the new Downtown Centre.

7. Improved Insurance Process for students taking part in off-campus activities

The university currently lacks an efficient, coordinated approach ensuring that students are insured when taking part in off-campus activities that are not a part of a required course. Work Education Placement Agreement (WEPA) forms available through the Ministry for Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) are used for academic placements as part of a course mandatory for students to complete their program of study. EOHSS has worked diligently to ensure coverage for placements outside of the MTCU parameters, however, this process remains cumbersome to both academic units and community partners. The Network recommends that senior administration facilitate a conversation with EOHSS, other universities, and MTCU to determine how to bridge these gaps.

8. Relationship with Centre for Continuing Education (CCE)

As the university reconsiders the mandate for the CCE, AVP (Faculty) Susan Searls-Giroux met with the group to discuss how the CCE might assume a more community engaged approach. Following the meeting, the Network proposed the following key recommendations for CCE:
i. Access
Ideally, CCE should provide opportunities for people who might not otherwise be able to afford to take classes, for example, as an extension to the Discovery Program.

ii. Flexibility
Flexibility is an important feature of a re-envisioned CCE—flexibility in terms of budget, administration, relation to other units on campus, and so forth. An important element of flexibility would be flexible arrangements for the kinds of credits and certificates CCE students could receive and transfer into and out of more traditional degree programs. Also, currently faculty members are unable to teach at CCE as part of their course load, and most classes are taught by sessional faculty. CCE should be designed so that it can more easily work with other units on campus rather than be seen as operating in isolation. A shift towards such flexibility would be key to making CCE a “doorway” between McMaster and a diverse range of communities.

iii. Alignment with CE
CCE can serve an important role in the university's CE strategy, and there is a need for established communication lines between those organizing and implementing CE and CCE. Ideally, both units would report into the same area.

iv. Space
Community Space has been identified as a key opportunity with the relocation of CCE. This space could serve a number of different functions, including providing office space for a CE staff as well as classroom/event space for CE activities.

9. CE Events
The Network has remained committed to the original goal of hosting at least one event per year that facilitates information exchange and networking between campus and community representatives. The committee that has organized the annual Community-Engaged Education: An Idea Exchange for the past two years has now been established as the Events sub-group for the Network. This group comprises several representatives from the Network as well as two additional Faculty representatives, who will rotate following a two-year term. The group is currently in the process of planning the third Idea Exchange, with financial support from both the President and Provost.

IV. Connecting the Network: Internally and Externally
The Network recognizes that it can only function effectively if it has the opportunity to liaise with other areas of campus and groups within the community. In order to facilitate communication between different areas, three additional groups have been developed over the past year. A member of the Network sits on each of these groups to provide updates and solicit feedback on Network activities.
1. Neighbourhood-Campus Network

This group evolved as an outcome of the School of Nursing Campus-Community Think Tank hosted in the summer of 2013. The group is a partnership between Neighbourhood Action Strategy neighbourhoods, City of Hamilton, Hamilton Community Foundation and educational institutions (originally McMaster, but Mohawk and Redeemer have recently been invited to participate). The group seeks to better connect educational institutions with Hamilton neighbourhoods to facilitate research, placements, volunteers, informational exchange and resource-sharing.

2. Experiential Education Directors/Career Managers

The Experiential Education Directors/Career Managers group includes a representative from each Faculty who is responsible for coordinating student placements and other experiential opportunities for students, on campus and in the community. This group meets to share information and best practices, as well as to collaborate on shared initiatives to enhance relationships with community partners.

3. Research Facilitators

The Research Facilitators group includes a representative from Graduate Studies as well as an individual in each Faculty who plays the role of Research Facilitator. The role of a research facilitator varies in each Faculty, but most work to support faculty members in developing research proposals and at times, establishing connections between researchers or with community partners. This group has begun to meet bimonthly to facilitate connections between Faculties and the Network, as well as to discuss how to best support community-engaged/based research.

The Network will continue to consider ways to connect more directly with the community, as well as to establish direct ties with other CE related groups on campus (i.e. McMaster-Community Poverty Initiative).
V. Enablers, Challenges and Recommendations for Moving Ahead

1. Enablers

The Network is pleased to report tangible progress across many different areas within the past year. In reviewing what has been accomplished and what remains to be addressed, a number of factors that enabled the work of the Network emerged. Specifically, a connection to senior leadership has been established, community partners that are enthusiastic about engaging with the university have committed to continued engagement; and the development of the opportunity to act as a consultant on important CE matters for the University.

Connection to Senior Leadership

This year, the Network benefitted from a direct connection to senior leadership via the Special Assistant to the President who served as the group’s coordinator, and the Project Manager for Forward With Integrity who reports to the Special Advisor to the President. As many of the Network’s goals involve instigating systematic change, a robust connection to senior leadership will remain critical. The need for CE to be championed at a senior level has been well documented in the literature, including the recent report commissioned by the President’s Office entitled “Community-University Engagement in Canada: Voices from the Field”2. Such leadership is essential in promoting CE as an integral part of the university’s mission.

Receptive and Enthusiastic Community Partners

The university is fortunate to have long-term community partners as well as new organizations and individuals eager to find connections and share resources. The strength of these community relationships was particularly apparent during the FWI campus-community think tank convened by the School of Nursing in 2013, wherein community residents and service providers, faculty, students and staff worked collaboratively to develop a shared vision for engagement, guiding principles and priorities for the coming year. The Network recognizes the critical input and insights community partners provide, and the need to engage community partners meaningfully while being respectful of their time. The Network heard a great deal of feedback from community partners that outlined the many ways the University and partners interacted. The partners supported the Network’s recommendations that there is a need for a centralized resource on campus to support these activities and to provide structure. Some partners identified examples of partnerships that did not meet their needs or expectations. The majority of community organizations/members remain committed to building increasingly mutually beneficial partnerships.

Opportunity to act as a consultant on important CE matters

Despite the Network’s relative newness at the university, the group was consulted on a number of items relating to CE including several FWI projects and the reconsideration of the mandate for the Centre for Continuing Education (CCE). These were seen as key opportunities by the group to promote a university-wide CE vision that respectfufully engages community partners. It will be important to continue to

2 Jackson, Elizabeth. Community-University Engagement in Canada: Voices from the Field., 2014.
enhance the visibility of the Network to ensure the group can steer a community engagement agenda based on the guiding principles.

2. Challenges

In reviewing the key deliverables articulated in the original vision for the Network, the following goals have not yet been clearly addressed:

- Reaching out to community partners and groups to improve and develop relationships, clarify processes and define mutually valuable projects
- participating in the formation of internal networks within and between Faculties/areas
- establishing appropriate metrics to track and measure the success of CE initiatives
- considering ways to generate awareness about the Network and its mandate through a communications strategy
- improving how the Network includes community partners as collaborators in event planning with the goal of facilitating a collaborative forum, symposium, or conference on CE

In addition, it became clear that the Network members were balancing their participation among multiple priorities, which at times resulted in reduced attendance and engagement. As a result, some Network voices representing important areas of campus may not have been heard.

3. Recommendations

While a few of the goals (including the collection of metrics and development of a communications strategy) would be best addressed through the establishment of a central resource, the Network also has the following recommendations for ensuring its own long-term viability:

- The original proposal for the Network envisioned Faculty representatives serving as liaisons/consultants to others interested in CE within their Faculties. In order to enable this, faculty members will need to be given the necessary time and support (as articulated in 'The Emerging Landscape'). This would need to be negotiated between the faculty members and their departments/Faculties, but there should be some consistency across the institution. Support may include training overseen by the CE Director, to ensure that Faculty representatives feel prepared to serve in this role
- Similarly, in order to allow for full participation in the Network, all members should be encouraged to have a conversation with their supervisors to discuss how their area might accommodate the time-consuming nature of this commitment
- It has become apparent to the Network that strategic conversations need to take place between the Network and the seven activity units on campus. The Network recommends that there be open communication between the CE Director and senior management at the University
- It is apparent that resources are required for the Network’s daily operations. A budget is being developed to recognize costs of operating the Network going forward.

---

3 The seven activity units are: DeGroote School of Business, Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Health Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Science, Faculty of Social Science, and the Arts and Science Program.
VI. Conclusion

The Network has had a very productive year, responding with enthusiasm to the call for action stated at the group’s inception. With many tasks accomplished and many more yet to be addressed, the Network recognizes an ongoing need for its existence. However, it has become clear that additional support and resources are required in order to enable the group to accomplish the large-scale systemic change originally sought in the Network’s creation. Ultimately, the Network asserts that the university must continue to move away from considering CE as a series of programs and projects, and instead establish CE as an embedded strategy that is connected to all facets of our mission and of the overarching university agenda.
Appendix A - Guiding principles developed by the CE Task Force

The following principles, originally developed by the Forward With Integrity Community Engagement Task Force, aim to guide the integration of Community Engagement into all Faculties and administrative areas:

• Community engagement will be aligned with all facets of the mission of McMaster University.
• The University will value collaborative endeavours such as research, teaching, service and advocacy activities with community stakeholders.
• McMaster University will value working with the community for mutual benefit, build relationships based on reciprocity, trust and respect, and recognize global interconnectedness.
• The University will respect that there are multiple definitions of “community” and that different disciplines/communities will experience, value and learn about CE differently.
• The University will support, recognize and reward CE among faculty, staff, students, alumni and retirees.
Appendix B – Summary of Priority Setting Exercise

Members of the network were asked to brainstorm ways to enhance and sustain CE initiatives on campus. The following is a full list of the ideas that were proposed, which were then prioritized by the Network to develop year one plans. The items in bold are those that were selected during this prioritization process.

Student Experience:
1. Support from supervisors for those involved in CE or trying to begin –

Recognition:
1. Awards
2. Create a mechanism for reimbursing community stakeholders for all (not just research) participation – recognize community! –
3. Create ways to make interdisciplinary and community partnerships easier to negotiate
4. Create concrete mechanisms to recognize CE activities, e.g. Student Portfolio, Faculty T&P + Merit, Staff Performance appraisals –

Communication
1. Create opportunities for reciprocal dialogue, establish a mechanism to seek input and feedback from community -
2. Facilitate dialogue within and between faculties
3. Write up some key case studies that highlight benefits & challenges of CE → add to the document produced by FWI grant –
4. University-wide Charter of Community Engagement
5. Centralized resourced/method to facilitate/coordinate CE activities based on guiding principles (cross-faculty & interdisciplinary), knowledge brokerage

Education
1. Develop a pool of funds to support the development of CE courses and activities
2. A “course” that McMaster students must take before engaging in communities
3. Provide checklist to instructors to ensure effective use of CE
4. Create a course that recognizes the value of volunteering (with leadership, organization & learning objectives)
5. Establish incentives to support the development of teaching tools on CE Education Development
6. Develop a Minor in CE

Research
1. Plain language summaries
2. Identify/catalogue best practices for CE and disseminate
3. Consider scalability of CE – large classes vs. small classes
4. Student Thesis (UG, Grad) awards and small grants for CE research

Events
1. Annual CE event with local community e.g. poster presentations incorporated into State of the Academy this year
2. Create calendar–grassroots networking opportunities for CE practitioners/participants
3. Discounted resources for those hosting CE on campus
4. Support for attracting/integrating community in academic workshops/conferences
5. Facilitate useful and productive interactions with the community. Address collaboratively the benefit to the community in the planning, promotion and participation
Appendix C – Themes and ideas from Community Partner discussion

The Network sought out community input to inform the proposed direction and priorities for the year. The group invited a panel of community representatives for a discussion around the benefits, challenges and areas of opportunity for community-university engagement.

The following community partners participated in the dialogue:
Chris McLaughlin, Bay Area Restoration Council
Melanie Winterle, Volunteer Hamilton
Don Jaffray, Social Planning & Research Council
Suzanne Brown, City of Hamilton Neighbourhood Development Strategy
Keanin Loomis, Chamber of Commerce

The major themes & ideas that emerged from the discussion are as follows, many of which are represented in the Network’s priorities for the year:

1. The burden to community organizations in providing training for students; many students provide excellent work, not all do
2. We are beginning to form more mutually beneficial relationships with the community, driven by community needs rather than researchers’ interests
3. Many community members/organizations need help understanding the ways in which the university is capable of supporting their work/what university-community partnerships might look like
4. A desire to move the focus (especially amongst students) from volunteerism to a more deeply-rooted sense of engagement
5. The University’s support of the United Way is a very important way in which we give back to community organizations
6. The University has an expansive body of talent and when well placed can be value-added for community organizations (i.e. faculty members who serve on community boards), but it can be difficult for community partners to access the kinds of expertise they are seeking
7. McMaster needs to self organize and create a “bridge” across the 403; similarly community partners need to know what McMaster is seeking from them, and how they might self-organize
8. Tangible ways in which we can benefit our community members include: providing space/telephones/computers; providing staff supports for students doing community-engaged work; managing student expectations around the realities of the work; engaging in ‘possibility thinking’ and not necessarily waiting for funding; integrating faculty research/courses with community needs so there is sustainability beyond the 3-4 month course; joint appointments so that community faculty can influence curriculum
Appendix D – Proposal for President’s Awards for Community Engagement

The following proposal was developed by the Network sub-group dedicated to Concrete Mechanisms to Recognize CE Activities.

Overview

The Network for Community-Campus Partnerships’ Recognition sub-group has been tasked with considering ways to enact Principle 6 as articulated by the FWI Community Engagement Task Force report:

\[ \text{The University will support and reward participation in CE among faculty, staff, students, alumni and retirees.} \]

One of the key recommendations that has arisen from the sub-group is to create a series of President’s Awards for Community Engagement to recognize and support existing excellence in community-campus initiatives. The awards, which would be available to teams of people that must include both campus and community representatives, would include a modest financial contribution to furthering the community-engaged project/initiative. The awards would serve the following purposes:

- Celebrate community partners for their contributions to the University community
- Raise awareness of the wide array of community-university partnerships in existence
- Recognize the efforts required to foster successful community-campus partnerships
- Demonstrate the value McMaster places on community-engaged research, teaching and service/outreach

Why a new set of awards?

In thinking about the creation of these awards, the sub-group examined the awards already available on campus, with special attention to the President’s Awards for Teaching and Learning available to staff and faculty, and the President’s Awards for Outstanding Service, which are exclusively available for staff. The group consulted with Human Resources about their available awards, including future plans for the Lifetime Achievement award.

After considering the gamut of available awards, the sub-group proposes that a new category of President’s Awards is required to:

- Provide special recognition for community partners
- Recognize teams that may include students, staff, faculty and community partners
- Focus exclusively on Community Engagement as the criterion for nomination (as opposed to one of many possible areas of excellence)

Description of the Awards

It is recommended that there be three awards available per year. Nominators must identify which award category their application best aligns with:

1) Community-Engaged Scholarship
2) Community-Engaged Education
3) Community Outreach/Service

There would be up to $5000 available for each award. This amount could be designated between one (1) to three (3) initiatives, depending on the financial needs of the group(s). The intention is that the funds would go towards something of mutual benefit to the recipient team, collectively agreed upon by the group. Some uses of these funds may include:
- Honourarium for community participants/tutors
- Memberships for community-engaged associations, journals
- Course design support
- Travel funds for community partner(s) to accompany academic partner to present at a conference

As with the recent FWI-funded projects, recipients would be required to submit a report outlining their usage of the funds.

Criteria

The definition of Community Engagement used to evaluate submissions will be that of the FWI Community Engagement Task Force (revised, June 2013) subject to interpretation by the Selection Committee:

- valuing the expert knowledge and passion that members of the community (both local and global) have about their communities and issues affecting them
- fostering ongoing collaboration between University and community partners on how to better understand and consider the issues identified as priorities by local and global communities
- performing research, teaching and service with community members and partners for the public good within the local or global community.

Eligibility

The awards would be available for local (southwestern Ontario), provincial, national and international community engagement projects.

The awards committee will aim to award a diverse set of initiatives, in terms of geography, discipline, sector, and so forth.

The award is available for teams with a minimum of one (1) campus representative (staff, student or faculty) and one (1) community representative. Community representatives may be from the public or private sector, as long as the overall initiative meets the definition of Community Engagement, defined above. Initiatives must have been in existence for a minimum of one (1) year.

Nomination

Nominations can be submitted by students, staff, faculty or community partners. Groups would be eligible to self-nominate, however, consent from all parties would need to be obtained as well as support from an Associate Dean in one of the participating faculties.

Selection Committee

The selection committee would be comprised of:
- Three (3) members of the Network for Campus-Community Partnerships
- Two community representatives
- Representatives from student associations (MSU, GSA)