Excellence in Outreach Scholarship

Outreach Scholars Academy

Workshop # 2 - Engaged Scholarship Partnerships and Projects

Audience: Class of 10-15

Duration: 4 1/2 hours

Equipment needed: Projector for PPT presentation, flip chart, markers

Handouts:

- Exercise – The architecture of your project as a scholarly outreach partnership
- NRB Criteria (already have)
- PPT – Outreach Scholarship Partnerships and Projects

Objectives/Outcomes:

- To become more aware of other faculty on campus who are active in quality engaged scholarship;
- To understand the principles of successful community-university partnerships;
- To apply the criteria and standards of quality engaged scholarship to Outreach Scholars’ projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Component</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships are Key</td>
<td>½ hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of Partnership—reciprocity Promise and pitfalls</td>
<td>10-15 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has worked for you?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large group discussion—15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel of campus faculty already successful in engaged scholarship – three or four faculty members from various disciplines to talk about the kinds of partnerships and projects they have worked on.</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Coordinator to recruit faculty members and provide them with an outline of what they should talk about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check In and Warm Up</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Brain storm and put pointers on newsprint Refer back as workshop goes on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Community Engaged University

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Architecture of Your Project as a Scholarly Outreach Partnership</th>
<th>45 minutes</th>
<th>Small Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In three groups of three or four:</td>
<td>10 minutes each/30 minutes</td>
<td>Facilitator to lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Using criteria for quality engaged scholarship, for each criteria,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Assess how your project proposal meets or could meet the criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Exercise – Architecture of Your Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Focus on how to strengthen both the elements of partnership and scholarship.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• NRB criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As a group, identify and share the collective strengths and challenges</td>
<td>15 minutes for synthesis and report out</td>
<td>• Flip charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group report of themes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator or recorder to put check marks next to criteria (already identified) and add new concepts/Themes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAK** | 15 minutes |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach Scholarship Partnerships and Projects</th>
<th>45 minutes</th>
<th>Power Point presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What questions do you have?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PPT presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PPT handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Projection equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Group Work on Outreach Scholarship Project** | 1 hour | Small Group Work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In three groups of three or four:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask and receive assistance on one aspect of your project … What advice makes this more engaged and more scholarly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Instruction sheet Proposal Feedback Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Coaches &amp; Coordinators to fill in; join in small group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary, HOMEWORK</strong></td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources to be most helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Point to Web resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview of next steps - self-organizing mentoring/small group sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*The Architecture of Your Project as a Scholarly Outreach Partnership*

*Outreach Scholars Academy – Workshop II - Partnerships*
Excellence in Outreach Scholarship

Outreach Scholars Academy

Workshop #2 – What is a Mutually Beneficial Partnership?

Objectives/Outcomes:
• To understand the principles of successful community-university partnerships;
• To become more aware of other faculty on campus who are doing quality engaged scholarship;
• To apply the criteria and standards of quality engaged scholarship to outreach scholars’ projects.

Check in and Warm Up
Partnerships are Key!

Homework review
1. Why did the scholar seek a partner(s)?
2. Who were the partners?
3. How did they initiate the partnership?
4. How have they sustained the partnership?
5. How did they manage the partnership?
6. What was the scholarly component of their work with the partner?
7. What was the overall impact of the partnership?
8. What lessons were learned?

Principles of Partnerships Part 1
Why do we do it and how should we think about it?

BREAK

Principles of Partnerships Part II
How we do it?

Enhancing your project as engaged scholarship

Problem solving and parking lot issues

Summary, homework for next session
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PROMISING PRACTICES OF SCHOLARLY OUTREACH PARTNERSHIPS

Review of Homework
45 minutes

1. Divide into your coaching groups of four people plus your coach.

2. Review your homework by each person reporting on their interview, specifically:
   - Why did the scholar seek a partner(s)?
   - Who were the partners?
   - How did they initiate the partnership?
   - How have they sustained the partnership?
   - How did they manage the partnership?
   - What was the scholarly component of their work with the partner?
   - What was the overall impact of the partnership?

3. As a group, identify the five top promising practices of engaged outreach partnerships learned through the interviews.

4. One person reports to the total group on these five promising practices.

************************************************************************

NOTES
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Time: 30 minutes

This protocol is a formalized way to get feedback on a work in progress.

Specifics:

1. **Introduction** (2 minutes) Facilitator briefly introduces the presenter(s) and reminds the listening team to give only the kind of feedback the presenter(s) requests.

2. **Proposal Presentation** (5 minutes) The listening team reads or hears about the presenter’s proposal. No interruptions or questions are allowed, just listening and note taking by the listening team. The presenter(s) may ask for specific feedback (framed feedback) or may leave it open (unframed feedback).

3. **Clarifying Questions** (3 minutes) The listening team may ask clarifying questions, but no discussion is allowed.

4. **Feedback** (10-15 minutes) The listening team discusses the proposal together and with the presenter(s). Feedback is directly related to the kinds of feedback the presenter(s) wanted. There are positive ways to frame feedback.

- ☀️ Warm Feedback -- Positive points associated with the work
- 🌡️ Cool Feedback -- Questions that arise, doubts, gaps in the work
- 🟢 Hard Feedback -- Challenges related to the work

Hard feedback is not used often and only when it is absolutely necessary for the success of the proposal.

5. **Reflection** (2 minutes) The presenter(s) responds to the feedback given by the listening team. Responses should be about changes that might be made, new insights, and clarifications. This response is not an opportunity to defend the work.

Modified from *A Guide to Looking Collaboratively at Student Work*, 1999 by David Allen, Tina Blythe, and Barbara Powell.

---
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Name of Project:

Outreach Scholar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Engaged Outreach Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who are the Partners? What are their roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does each of the partners want/need from this partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will each of the partners contribute?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who represents each partner? Who is the lead contact for each partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can make decisions for each partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the mechanisms for routine communications?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the “deliverables” for this project? Who will deliver them? What approvals are needed?

Who has rights to the data or products from this partnership?

What is the budget for this project?

Who is managing the budget? What are the means for accountability?

What is the timeline for this partnership?

What are the milestones?

What are the opt-out conditions for this?

---

Quality Engaged Scholarship

**Project Goals**

- What are the mission, goals, and purpose of the project, and how do these goals relate to value for public good?

- How does this project “fit” academically and institutionally – within the academic department’s and within the institution’s mission/vision?

- Are the objectives realistic and achievable?
• What are the significant intellectual questions that relate to the discipline and the community?

• What will be the indicators or evidence of success?

**Context of theory, literature, “best practices”**

• What existing scholarship in the discipline relates to this project? How will this project add to the existing literature or scholarship in the discipline?

• What skills and knowledge does each team member bring to the project?

• What makes the project intellectually compelling to each team member?

**Methods**

• What is the rational behind the choice of methods in relation to the issue your project addresses?

• How will you modify the methods during the course of the project should circumstances change?

• How will the community partner be involved?

**Results**

• How will we know if the outcome/impacts have been achieved?

• What evaluation methods are set for the project?

• Who is responsible for evaluation?
What additional area of inquiry might be open as a result of this work?

How will the results add to the existing knowledge (scholarship) in your discipline?

**Communication/Dissemination**

- Who needs to know about the results of this project? How do they want to know it?

- How do you plan to communicate the results of this project?
  - To the community/audience you are working with?
  - To your own discipline – in a scholarly manner?

**Reflective Critique**

- How will the community/audience/partner you are working with be asked for critical input on the project – how it was carried out and how the results are perceived by the community?

- How will you use the critique you receive to direct future projects?

*How can this partnership be enhanced as engaged scholarly outreach?*

*What are particular challenges with this partnership as engaged scholarly outreach?*