NETWORK OF
COMMUNITY-ENGAGED AND
EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND RESEARCH (CEELR)
AT MCGILL UNIVERSITY

May 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Members of the IES Project Team iii

Executive Summary 4

Introduction 8
Alignment with McGill Strategic Planning Initiatives

Consultation Process 12

Findings 13
Themes
Responses

Recommendations 17
Short-term Recommendations
Longer-term Options

Conclusion 23

Appendices
Appendix A: Best Practices
Appendix B: Best Practices at a Glance: A Selective Summary Canadian and US Universities
Appendix C: Best Practices to Support Possible Models (Consultation Stage)
Appendix D: Potential Models and Survey Questions for Consultation
Appendix E: List of Stakeholders Contacted for IES Consultation
Appendix F: Defining Our Terms

MEMBERS OF IES PROJECT TEAM

Members of the Steering Group

Anna Birnie-Lefcovitch, *Special Projects Officer, Office of the Vice-Principal, Research and International Relations*
Anurag Dhir, *Community Engagement Officer, Social Equity and Diversity Education Office*
Alexis Goulet-Hanssens, *Post-graduate Students' Society*
David Gray-Donald, *Sustainability Coordinator, Students' Society of McGill University*
Darlene Hnatchuk, *Director, Career Planning Service, Student Services*
Evan Henry, *Senator, Macdonald Campus*
Susanna Klassen, *MSE student, School of Environment*
Jana Luker, *Executive Director, Student Services*
Ann Macaulay, *Director, Participatory Research at McGill, Department of Family Medicine*
Marcy Slapcoff, *Educational Developer, Teaching and Learning Services*
Kelly Thompson, *Coordinator of Continued Learning, DESTA Black Youth Network*
Lilith Wyatt, *Sustainability Projects Fund Administrator, Office of Sustainability*
Jaaved Singh, *President, Macdonald Campus Students' Society*

Advisor
Gwendolyn (Wendy) Owens, *former Liaison Officer, Office of the Associate Provost; Senior Advisor, Visual Arts Collection*

Project Manager
Maria Mazzotta, *Sustainability Advisor, Student Services*

Project Consultant and **Report Author**
Joanne Muzak

Project Intern and **Report Co-author**
Kelley Walter

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project began as the Integrated Education for Sustainability (IES) project. As the title of this report suggests, the project has been renamed for its next phase as the **Network of Community-Engaged and Experiential Learning and Research** (CEELR). In this report, we will refer mainly to the IES project, given that the project received funding under that name. We will refer to the CEELR network in discussing future plans and prospects.

Integrated Education for Sustainability (IES) is a partnership of McGill's Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations), Student Services, Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office, Teaching and Learning Services, Office of Sustainability (including leaders of Vision 2020), and the student body.

In December 2012, IES received support from McGill's Sustainability Project Fund to hire a full-time project manager, a part-time consultant, and an intern to support these partners in

- exploring opportunities for **coordinating and expanding applied research** and **experiential learning** at McGill that benefits both the campus and the broader community, and
- **identifying potential structures** for **a university-wide hub** where students, faculty, and staff could access these types of **learning and research**.

Inspired by and building on the momentum of several recent strategic planning initiatives at McGill, including the Administrative Response to the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence, and Community Engagement, Achieving Strategic Academic Priorities (ASAP) 2012-2017, the Strategic Research Plan, and Vision 2020, we conducted consultations with over fifty stakeholders to determine how to best fulfill the goal of creating a McGill hub for applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research, which will provide resources, guidance, and networking opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and community organizations. Supported by best practices research, we put forward three possible models for consultation:

- Model 1: Network of Community-Based and Experiential Learning and Research
- Model 2: McGill Community Engagement Website: Interactive Database
- Model 3: Centre for Experiential Learning and Community-Based Research

Our consultations revealed a consistent enthusiasm around the need for a hub, even among those with concerns regarding the specific execution of this idea. Based on stakeholder feedback and best practices research, and considering the current climate in which universities are being challenged to produce evidence of their economic and social value, we recommend

that, in the short term, McGill pursue building a more formalized Network of Community-Engaged and Experiential Learning and Research (Model 1), which includes the construction of a resource- and information-rich website to increase connectivity and raise the visibility of community engagement at McGill, as well as opportunities for face-to-face connectivity, networking, resource sharing, and knowledge mobilization.

Our **Best Practices** research, which examined Canada's U15 institutions as well as other leading universities and research-intensive, comparator universities in the United States, revealed an incredibly wide array of university-based structures and programming, including centres, offices, organizations, networks, and online tools, that facilitate community engagement and support campus-community relationships across North America. Five key findings from this research informed our proposed models, consultations, and recommendations.

(1) A commitment to the idea of community service is entrenched in American universities' research and pedagogical mandates. Much American engagement programming developed in a context where significant funding was available. This is simply not the situation in Canada. Community engagement as an institutionalized idea and set of pedagogical and research practices at Canadian universities, particularly research-intensive universities, is relatively nascent.

(2) Most research-intensive universities in Canada have some type formal recognition of community engagement as part of their mission. However, most often among the U15 schools, there is no overarching body that aims to brings together the various pedagogies, research methodologies, and co-curricular activities that fit under the rubrics of experiential education and community engagement. Instead, more commonly, there are separate structures for learning and research activities (e.g., Community Service-Learning Program; Office of Community-Based Research).

(3) Smaller, mid-sized universities (e.g., University of Guelph, Simon Fraser) are among the leaders of university-community engagement in Canada. While their student body size and city contexts admittedly vary from McGill and Montreal, McGill can look to these universities for examples of innovative practices in building partnerships, promoting community engagement among students, faculty, and the broader community, and combining engaged pedagogy and research.

(4) At larger research-intensive and smaller universities alike, most organizations started off small, with two or three dedicated full-time staff members who had distinct specializations (most often in experiential education or community partnerships) but could be flexible and play multiple roles as the organization got started. These organizations grew because of (a) stable (but modest, i.e., less than $100,000 annually) financial support, often from a combination of central administration and private funding, and (b) visible support from central administration and often a faculty director and/or champion.

(5) Informal networks without full-time staff of at least one person and a clear reporting structure tend to fade away. The most stable and successful university-community engagement structures, no matter their size or budget, are visibly supported by central administration and have a hard funding for staff position(s).

In addition to the general consensus to pursue building a more formalized Network of Community-Engaged and Experiential Learning and Research (CEELR) (Model 1) in the short term, our consultations revealed four key themes for future consideration (also see Findings):

(1) Stakeholders noted that the models were not exclusive and could exist as part of a sequential or phased approach to creating a community engagement hub.

(2) The discussion of physical space, a key aspect of Model 3, invited significant contradiction. There was consensus, however, around the need for a *gathering space* (physical, perhaps mobile, non-hierarchical, accessible) where researchers, staff, students, and community members could meet and exchange ideas.

(3) The proposed interactive database (Model 2) raised more concerns than support. Most stakeholders saw it as labour- and resource-intensive. However, others championed the usefulness of database as a possible tool – just not the only tool – for increasing accessibility and sharing information about engagement opportunities.

(4) Different stakeholder groups (students, faculty, community organizations, administration) imagined the hub serving their interests differently. The differences in stakeholders' needs must be considered as the project moves forward.

Bearing our best practices and consultation findings in mind, then, we recommend that the project move forward with Model 1, building a network of Community-Engaged and Experiential Learning and Research (CEELR). This model aims to foster McGill's existing network of community-engaged learners and researchers by providing resources, information, and educational and knowledge mobilization opportunities, documenting engaged activities, and maintaining a basic website.

This recommendation meets the call for

- resources and information-gathering;
- coordinated information;
- documentation of engaged-learning and research at McGill;
- better promotion and visibility of community engagement at McGill;
- networking opportunities, increasing connectivity, facilitating partnerships; and
- knowledge mobilization.

This model acknowledges the current financial constraints at McGill and proposes creative short-term strategies for structuring and cultivating the CEELR network without additional significant financial resources. During our consultations, it became clear that several of our stakeholders and partners shared our project's goals closely enough to commit to designating human resources to advancing the project. In the short term, the Steering Group is committed to moving the CEELR network forward by sharing coordination responsibilities between Career Planning Service (CaPS), the Office of Sustainability (OoS), and Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE). We also expect to involve student interns, particularly Applied Student Research and Curriculum interns at the Office of Sustainability, in the network and provide experiential learning opportunities for students as they also help to build and shape CEELR. In the longer term, we envision hiring a full-time network coordinator. Building on our structure of shared coordination and heeding lessons from best practices research, we suggest that the CEELR network coordinator be a cross-appointment.

CEELR's next steps include:

- following up with stakeholders to provide a summary of this report and our findings
- continuing conversations with stakeholders to determine how the network will best meet their needs
- organizing an event to launch the network and provide networking opportunities for stakeholders
- investigating possible avenues of funding to support the development of the CEELR website

This report begins with an **Introduction** to the IES project, including its alignment with current McGill strategic planning initiatives. The next section describes our **Consultation Process**. The third section describes our **Findings**, and the final section presents our **Recommendations**, short-term (immediately actionable) and longer-term options. Summaries of **Best Practices** at American and Canadian comparator universities and other leading institutions in the coordination and advancement of applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research is provided in Appendix A; further best practices are summarized in tables in Appendix B and Appendix C. Our consultation models and survey questions are available in Appendix D, and Appendix E is a list of consulted stakeholders. Appendix F defines some of our terms.

INTRODUCTION

This project began as the Integrated Education for Sustainability (IES) project. As the title of this report suggests, however, the project has been renamed for its next phase as the **Network of Community-Engaged and Experiential Learning and Research** (CEELR). In this report, we will refer mainly to the IES project, given that the project received funding under that name. We will refer to the CEELR network in discussing future plans and prospects.

Integrated Education for Sustainability (IES) is a partnership of McGill's Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations), Student Services, Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office, Teaching and Learning Services, Office of Sustainability (including leaders of Vision 2020), and the student body. The project's Steering Group, which grew over the project's funded Winter 2013 term, reflects this partnership as well as an increasing interest in and commitment to engaged learning and research at McGill.

In December 2012, IES received support from McGill's Sustainability Project Fund to hire a full-time project manager, a part-time consultant, and an intern to support these partners in

- exploring opportunities for coordinating and expanding applied research and experiential learning at McGill that benefits both the campus and the broader community, and

- identifying potential structures for a university-wide hub where students, faculty, and staff could access these types of learning and research.

To us, the word "hub" connotes successful connectivity. Recognizing that applied research and experiential learning are part of university-community engagement at McGill, we use "hub" to refer to an entity that forms an active core for building and sustaining strong connections and reciprocal relationships within and beyond McGill. Our goal is to create a McGill hub for applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research, which will provide resources, guidance, and networking opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and community organizations.

We aim to integrate the three key facets of the university's mission—to be research-intensive and student-centred while providing service to society. IES is also responding to recommendations emerging from a number of campus-wide strategic initiatives, including the Administrative Response to the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence, and Community Engagement, Achieving Strategic Academic Priorities (ASAP) 2012-2017, the Strategic Research Plan, and Vision 2020. All of these initiatives recognize a need for McGill to position itself as a facilitator of campus-community partnerships.

This report fulfills the IES project's three funded deliverables:

(1) The **Best Practices** (Appendix A) section identifies at comparator universities and other leading institutions in the coordination and advancement of applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research (broadly referred to in this report as "community engagement").

(2) The next two sections, **Consultation** and **Findings**, identify the coordination needs and priorities of campus and community stakeholders.

(3) Finally, based on the findings that emerged from the best practices research and our consultations with stakeholders, the report provides **Recommendations** for an appropriate model for McGill.

Alignment With McGill Strategic Planning Initiatives

As noted, the IES project effectively aligns with several recent campus-wide strategic initiatives.

ASAP 2012-2017

- ASAP 2012-2017 identifies sustainability as one of its three "cross-cutting themes," alongside internationalization and innovation. Community engagement is identified in one of the three overarching strategic priorities: "All our actions should ensure … managing existing resources and diversifying and optimizing revenue sources to ensure maximum impact in support of educational programs, research activities, and community engagement."[1] Our consultations have been guided, in large part, by the idea of managing and optimizing existing campus resources related to community-engaged learning and research. Thus, our recommendations also reflect this strategic priority.

Administrative Response to the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence, and Community Engagement

- The IES project was particularly inspired by the Administrative Response to the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence, and Community Engagement (AR-Task Force on DECE), which affirms McGill's Senior Administration's commitment to "engagement with our communities":

> McGill will develop a resource centre that documents, coordinates, facilitates and tracks information about our engagement with communities and serves as a clearinghouse for students, faculty, and staff

[1] Anthony C. Masi, *ASAP 2012-2017: Achieving Strategic Academic Priorities* (McGill University, October 2012), 5.

> who want to find ways that they can become involved in projects outside McGill.[2]

- Although this statement focuses on communities outside of McGill, the emphasis on providing resources and facilitation of partnerships with communities aligns with the IES project's goals as well. This recommendation is also implicitly about supporting diverse forms of community engagement and increasing the recognition of McGill's community engagement activities, goals that the IES project also shares.

Work Group on Service to Québec and Canada, ASAP

- While we are excited by this commitment to develop a resource centre, we have also been guided by the earlier recommendations of the Work Group on Service to Québec and Canada, which, in its Final Report, emphasized, "we do not propose the creation of a central office that would coordinate all service activities at McGill."[3] The Work Group instead proposed

> the creation of a shared space, physical and virtual, where community members can meet with their McGill partners and where all can find guidance and resources for their projects. Information-gathering, coordination, networking, facilitation and recognition are the university's main responsibilities in support of community engagement at this point.[4]

- This recommendation infused our formulation of the hub models that we developed for consultation. The emphasis in our models, including the creation of a centre in Model 3, is on facilitating connections between groups and communicating about opportunities—not on coordinating the service activities themselves. Not surprisingly, the consultation findings largely (although not exclusively) reinforce the Work Group's recommendations that we avoid a centralized office for the coordination of all and create a shared physical and virtual space.

Vision 2020

- There is also a high degree of alignment between the goals being advanced by Vision 2020 and the IES project. Vision 2020's goals of valuing community engagement as a "core element of the McGill student, staff and faculty experience," sustaining "strong, reciprocal relationships with partners in local, regional, and global communities," and having knowledge "flow freely in all directions – within McGill,

[2] Anthony C. Masi, *Administrative Response to the Recommendations of the Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement (DECE)* (McGill University, October 2012), 22.

[3] Raphaël Fischler and Lisa Bornstein on Behalf of the Work Group on Service to Québec and Canada, Work Group on Service to Québec and Canada, Final Report (McGill University, Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement, July 2012), 29.

[4] Ibid.

from McGill to the communities to which we belong and from those communities to McGill," all resonate in the IES project.[5]

Strategic Research Plan (SRP), 2013-2017

- McGill's Strategic Research Plan's core commitments to sustainability, collaboration and partnership, and social engagement also align broadly with the IES project. More specifically, the SRP advances community engagement as a driver of knowledge exchange and translation. It calls for the cultivation of engagement and citizenship activities led by faculty, students, and staff, and to "capitalize on activities undertaken by some of McGill's academic and non-academic structures to facilitate links between researchers and communities."[6] Facilitating the links between researchers and communities, particularly those related to community engagement, has been central to the IES project from the beginning and is reflected in our final recommendations.

In sum, the IES project was designed with the full awareness of McGill's current strategic planning initiatives and in consultation with those leading them. We have proceeded with the hope and expectation that the IES project will be a materialization of McGill's strategic priorities and commitments.

[5] McGill University, Vision 2020, "A Primer: Connectivity and Sustainability at McGill, March 21, 2013.
[6] Office of the Vice-Principal, Research and International Relations, *Strategic Research Plan, 2013-2017* (McGill University, February 2013), 14.

CONSULTATION PROCESS

Working towards our goal of identifying potential structures for a university-wide hub where students, faculty, staff, and community partners can access applied research and experiential learning opportunities, the IES project sought feedback on three potential models of the "hub" through a interviews, meetings, and a brief email survey that was sent to targeted stakeholders.

The three potential models and their four accompanying questions (see **Appendix D**) were developed in consultation with members of the IES Steering Group. The three possible models were:

- Model 1: Network of Community-Based and Experiential Learning and Research
- Model 2: McGill Community Engagement Website: Interactive Database
- Model 3: Centre for Experiential Learning and Community-Based Research

Over the course of the project, an extensive list of potential IES stakeholders was compiled. This list contains around seventy-five examples of McGill faculty, students, staff, and organizations that are involved in experiential learning, applied research, and/or service to the community. SEDE provided additional stakeholders – namely, community organizations who are currently partnered with McGill projects and students. As to not end up with an overwhelming amount of data, the Steering Group decided to contact five stakeholders within each stakeholder category (Students and Student-led Groups; Faculty; Research Centres/Institutes; Administrative Units) for consultation via the email survey. Along the way, other stakeholders were suggested to us, and some approached us. Steering Group members were asked to contact those stakeholders with whom they had an established relationship to better ensure a timely response. We expressed a willingness to meet stakeholders in this email as well. Some stakeholders responded to our survey via email, while others chose to meet with us in person and provide responses verbally.

All responses were aggregated in a single document. Feedback was coded according to stakeholder category for the reference of the Steering Group, but all efforts have been made to assure anonymity in this report. We have used content analysis to summarize the **Findings**, and the data gathered during consultation is reflected in our **Recommendations**.

The IES project also gathered feedback on an earlier iteration of the models during a Vision 2020 event, "Making it Real," in February 2013. This feedback helped us refine the models for the email survey.

The list of stakeholders contacted for IES consultation can be found in **Appendix E**: **List of Stakeholders Contacted for IES Consultation**. Overall, fifty-four stakeholders were contacted. As of May 24, 2013, thirty responded to the email survey or met with the project manager or members of the Steering Group to provide feedback.

FINDINGS

The IES project sought feedback regarding proposed models for "the hub" from administrative staff and centres, research centres and institutions, faculty, students, and community organizations. The project's mission was very well-received, and the stakeholders consulted expressed significant interest in and enthusiasm for addressing community engagement at McGill University. The general consensus was that McGill needs a new approach to community engagement, though there were differences in how this process was envisioned. The data collected from these consultations presented several clear themes concerning structure and purpose. After reviewing these topics and the conflicting views within them, the Steering Group determined how the data could inform our recommendations.

Themes

(1) Models as phases

Stakeholders were asked to choose which of three proposed models would best suit their group's or organization's needs. Generally, individuals chose aspects of various models, or suggested that two of the models could be appropriate. In the data we received there were six statements in favour of Model 1, three for Model 2, and four for Model 3, though it must be noted that most of the comments suggested that the models were not exclusive and could exist as part of a sequential or phased approach to creating a community engagement hub. One commenter drew attention to the fact that Model 1 would be a necessary starting point for any of the other two models, making it the most sensible place to begin. Following this point the hub could evolve to include elements of Models 2 and 3 or take on a different shape as the project gained a better sense of how to serve its stakeholders.

(2) Physical Space

The discussion of physical space, an aspect of Model 3, was an area that invited significant contradiction. Some individuals thought that a centralized office would offer better visibility and organization for community engagement. Such a structure could offer guidelines for creating partnerships and act as the primary contact point for community organizations interested in working with students and/or researchers. Others thought that additional bureaucracy was unnecessary and simply not feasible given the current financial climate of the university. One respondent expressed a concern that housing the project within an existing unit, a possibility suggested by the Steering Group, could risk losing the hub's mandate within the mandate of the larger organization. As is apparent, responses covered a broad spectrum between suggesting that there be no centralized office and/or staff to stating that such a centralized office and/or staff is necessary for standardizing project procedures that lead to lasting and mutually beneficial relationships.

Another aspect of this discussion that arose was an emphasis on a need for a space where researchers, students, staff, and community members could meet and exchange ideas. Stakeholders suggested that the value of face-to-face communication and spontaneous

networking and brainstorming was often not provided by online forums. Without physical space these "water-cooler conversation" benefits would be lost.

(3) Database

The proposed "interactive" database that was the primary focus of Model 2 raised more concerns than support. Several respondents saw a database as a labour- and resource-intensive pursuit that promised little payoff. Other concerns were raised about how the database would be populated, as it would require the participation of both individuals seeking and those offering partnership opportunities. Without support on both ends the database would be unable to stand on its own. Additionally, some stakeholders expressed that their respective groups were successful in matching individuals with projects through more traditional means of departmental networking and interactions. Creating a database could actually compromise the development of skills and creativity in students who might rely on opportunities presented in a database rather than creating their own projects or seeking out researchers and communities on their own. One respondent in particular repeatedly emphasized the need to encourage these general skills in students rather than limiting them to pre-existing options.

(4) Terminology

As anticipated, several respondents raised the question of terminology. Several individuals touched on the use or non-use of the term "sustainability," as this is articulated in the project's mission but is not explicitly used in the goal statement. Some thought that the project should more clearly be linked to sustainability by using the term while others thought it could be limiting.

The meaning of other terms such as "community engagement," "experiential learning." and "basic vs. applied research" prompted additional comments. One respondent discussed at length the risks of using certain terms and the problems associated with defining them.

(5) Goals and Outputs

A final concern amongst stakeholders dealt with the articulation of the project's desired outcomes and intended consequences, as many asked the question, in some form, what does this project do for *me*? This is to be expected for a model that seeks to serve diverse groups, and respondents were not always certain that the hub would adequately serve their research interests or the interests of other groups. Some put forth ideas for how the hub could benefit them, and suggested it could serve as a repository for project information, a toolkit for learning research and engagement skills, a means for matching the most qualified individuals to projects, and/or a communication tool.

(6) Stakeholder Group Differences

An additional theme that emerged from the consultation process was the existence of differences, and in some instances contradictions, between how stakeholder groups imagined the hub serving their interests. For students and student groups, the hub was imagined as a physical space and centralized structure that facilitated communication and acted as a repository of information for engagement and research skills and student opportunities. Community members approached the hub much differently (but not incompatibly with student visions), seeing it as a means to benefit from McGill's academic resources and networks, as well

as a place to connect with other community organizations. Both of these stakeholder groups also expressed the merits of having a centralized administration and standardized process for helping to connect students, faculty, and community partners and supporting these relationships. McGill administrators, however, vocalized concerns over the structure and popularity of a hub. Some felt that the proposed database was very labour-intensive and that, generally, the hub would have limited appeal to students and researchers. Administration also expressed concern about terminology and the costs of creating such a structure. These factors make Model 1 the preferred option for administrators. Finally, the feedback from faculty echoed some of the concerns of administrators, with questions regarding the lack of clarity about the project's intended deliverables and usefulness; though, many faculty members acknowledged the ability of a Hub to connect students with faculty and projects.

Responses

We are grateful for the amount of time and effort our stakeholders have put into responding during consultations, and we hope they will continue to provide feedback as we make our recommendations and move forward with the project. In addition to gaining helpful insight, we have forged valuable alliances with diverse stakeholder groups that are enthusiastic about the project. A few of these stakeholders are eager to participate in the project's next steps and have requested to join the Steering Group. The expertise that McGill can offer is seen as invaluable to community groups while researchers and students see the benefit in being part of a larger network geared towards community engagement. We have considered the above themes carefully, and have sought to respond to them in light of how they will inform our recommendations.

- Given the contradictions present in some of the themes, stakeholder requests for additional clarity, and the current financial and resource limitations, it is most sensible to pursue Model 1 at this time. This model was the most well-received by stakeholders and serves as a necessary starting point for a hub dedicated to community engagement. (See **Recommendations**.)

- We realize that the creation of a database does not guarantee its use. While this is a valid concern, especially for static list-like databases, we have encountered several active engagement databases with significant support from all stakeholder groups. In these practices, students have just as much opportunity to create their own projects as they do to choose from existing opportunities, and communities form lasting and mutually beneficial partnerships with researchers. While it is important to consider how best to promote use of an interactive database, we are aware that the most successful databases are those that have significant participation from stakeholders as they seek to mould it to their needs. At this time, the project will not pursue the creation of a database as we consider the associated difficulties as well as the possibilities for working with exiting database at McGill.

- The IES Project is not the only group at McGill interested in physical space. At this time, a centralized office and staff is not possible, but we are entertaining the possibility of having space(s) where stakeholders could meet. This "gathering space"

can be mobile and multi-use, and we hope to have conversations with other campus groups interested in this subject.

- Stakeholder questions regarding terminology raised questions that are part of much larger debates. We feel that the IES project adequately addressed sustainability in its mission, and including it in the goal statement does not enhance its message as, at present, "sustainability" is a popular term that can encompass both narrow and broad meanings. As for other terms, their definitions and use are part of much larger discussions and debates that the IES Project hopes to be a part of, but does not see as its central purpose. (See "Defining Our Terms" in the **Introduction** of this report.)

- Importantly, every discipline at McGill University requires research, and so we view it as unlikely that there would be a particular discipline that could not benefit from a hub for community engagement. Even for those that see limited opportunities for community engagement, a hub could serve to connect researchers and students, and offer student a forum to propose their own projects. The diversity of possibilities for how different departments and groups can form partnerships became apparent while conducting best practices research.

- It is to be expected that different groups with diverse interests and needs will not engage with the hub in the same way. We realize the necessity of having a sense of these differences in order to devise better strategies for the project as it evolves. The hub's responsibilities will differ depending on the user's needs, and we aim to develop a network with the flexibility to address this variation.

Conclusions

Given concerns about resources and end goals, at this time we are suggesting that the project move forward with Model 1. It is the most suitable as it draws on existing resources and will allow a network of individuals interested in community engagement to continue discussions about how the hub can serve the different, but not necessarily incompatible, needs of its stakeholders. Over time, this model could expand to include a database and a centralized office and/or space to better serve faculty, students, and community groups if it is determined that this is the best course of action for McGill. In addition to facilitating connections, a hub can work towards Vision 2020 goals of connectivity and treating engagement as a unique and beneficial part of learning and research, rather than something in competition with priorities of faculty and students. Model 1 has the potential to grow as we continue to consult with stakeholders and concerns about online presence, databases, and bureaucracy are discussed and addressed. An important part of this growth will be acknowledgement from stakeholders that the hub is something to be shaped by them, not just provided to them. We look forward to continuing these conversations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This section is divided into three main sections: Short-term Recommendations; Longer-Term Options; Next Steps for the Steering Group.

Short-term Recommendations

We recommend pursuing Model 1, building a formalized Network of Community-Engaged and Experiential Learning and Research.[7] This model aims to foster McGill's existing network of community-engaged learners and researchers by providing resources, information, and educational and knowledge mobilization opportunities, documenting engaged activities, and maintaining a basic website.

This recommendation meets the call for

- resources and information-gathering;
- coordinated information;
- documentation of engaged-learning and research at McGill;
- better promotion and visibility of community engagement at McGill;
- networking opportunities, increasing connectivity, facilitating partnerships; and
- knowledge mobilization.

This model acknowledges the current financial constraints at McGill and proposes creative short-term strategies for structuring and cultivating the CEELR network without additional significant financial resources. During our consultations, it became clear that several of our stakeholders and partners shared our project's goals closely enough to commit to designating human resources to advancing the project. While best practices research strongly suggests that such networks require the commitment of at least one full-time coordinator, in the short term, the Steering Group is committed to moving the CEELR network forward by sharing coordination responsibilities between Career Planning Service (CaPS), the Office of Sustainability (OoS), and Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE). (See *Reporting Structure and Resources*.) We also expect to involve student interns, particularly Applied Student Research and Curriculum interns at the Office of Sustainability, in the network and provide experiential learning opportunities for students as they also help to build and shape CEELR.

In the longer term, we envision hiring a full-time network coordinator. Building on our structure of shared coordination and heeding lessons from best practices research, we suggest that the CEELR network coordinator be a cross-appointment. Cross-appointments are increasingly common as a way to share resources and create synergy between units. The Steering Group will revisit this question of hiring a full-time coordinator in the next six months or so as the financial climate dictates.

It is worth emphasizing that our best practices research revealed that the organizations that most closely matched our vision for the McGill CEELR network (University of Alberta's Network

[7] Note the slight name change from the proposed model, from Community-based to Community-Engaged. This decision was made by the Steering Group in the May 13, 2013 meeting.

for Community-Engaged Learning [N-CEL]; University of Maryland's Coalition for Civic Engagement and Leadership) are now defunct. In the case of N-CEL at the U of A, after about three years of small grants that enabled funding for a graduate student to work as a part-time research assistant/coordinator with the network, the network dissolved. This example is cautionary. When N-CEL began, it also launched a website intended to raise the visibility of community-engaged activities, offer resources and information, and facilitate relationships and hosted regular, well-attended workshops and networking events. The steering committee was a group of experienced, enthusiastic leaders from across the university, but without the support of a permanent paid position dedicated to the coordination of the network, N-CEL was ultimately not sustainable.

Possible Outputs (Network)

1. Host an annual gathering of community engagement practitioners that showcases and celebrates the outcomes of community-engaged learning and research at McGill
2. Organize a workshop series that brings students, faculty, and community partners together to examine common issues that arise in university-community partnerships
    - E.g., evaluating experiential education; doing CBR ethically; designing sustainable projects
    - Vary the location (i.e., don't always host on campus)
3. Host bi-monthly small fieldtrips to relevant community partner organizations
    - E.g., Tour the Macdonald Campus Ecological Gardens, have the organizers talk about the project; tour specific landmarks or parts of town connected to CBR, have researchers talk about the impacts of their research
    - Invite everyone, but target audience doesn't need to be everyone.
4. Organize a symposium to explore ways of integrating community engagement in teaching, learning, and research throughout the university
5. Create a brief monthly newsletter to go to all identified potential stakeholders, including community organizations; provide a calendar of relevant events, profile a success story, offer a resource; invite contributions
6. Host a competition (with a prize) to raise awareness, especially among students:
    - E.g., name the network, design a logo, show us your community engagement in a one-minute YouTube video
    - Use the competition to launch the website and use the videos to populate the website
7. Assess whether smaller working groups might be an effective part of the network; would it make sense to have people organize around experiential pedagogies or subject areas, for example?
8. Explore the possibility of connecting with other Montreal universities; explore possible synergies between their organizations and McGill's network
9. Produce an annual report of community engagement at McGill – make it fun and accessible to audiences within and outside of McGill. Have a press release; invite the Montreal press.

Possible Outputs (Website)

1. Links to other relevant McGill databases and resources
2. Definitions of key terms/FAQ section
    - e.g., What do we mean by community engagement? What does experiential learning look like at McGill? What is applied student research? What is community-based research? Where do I look for opportunities to work with community organizations? McGill faculty? McGill students?
3. McGill's official community engagement polices and practices, including any tenure and promotion documentation related to community engagement at McGill
4. Scholarly resources for faculty, students, and community partners
5. Profiles of successful partnerships and engaged learning and research activities (e.g., blog)
6. Calendar of events

Reporting Structure and Resources

The CEELR network will continue to be supported by the Steering Group. Members of the Steering Group – Darlene Hnatchuk, Director, Career Planning Service (CaPS); Lilith Wyatt, Sustainability Projects Fund Administrator, Office of Sustainability (OoS); and Anurag Dhir, Community Engagement Officer, Social Equity and Diversity Education Office (SEDE) – will share coordination and facilitation responsibilities as the network's activities overlap with their current positions.

Additional Required Resources:

1. McGill IT support in setting up website
2. Financial resources for events (catering, space, honoraria)
3. Student intern(s) (one or two) for the entire academic year to populate the website (write copy, build a library for "resources" section, create a "toolkit" for students pursuing experiential education, document examples of successful partnerships via video, blog, map, etc.).

Reporting Structure:

- The Steering Group remains the informal governing body of the CEELR network. There is no formal reporting structure for the CEELR network or the SG.
- Interns will report to a supervisor, who will be a member of the SG, and to the SG.
- Darlene Hnatchuk, CaPS, will serve as the main contact person for CEELR.

Career Placement Service (CaPS) & CEELR

Since 2013, McGill's Career Planning Service (CaPS) has an expanded mandate to promote the importance of experiential learning opportunities for students during their studies at McGill, to further facilitate their transition to the workforce post-graduation. In addition to providing diverse career education and job search programs, events and resources, we aim to lead the integration of career development and experiential education into the McGill student experience by developing and working with a supportive network of McGill faculty and staff, employers and alumni. In particular, we will encourage faculties and schools to embed experiential learning (in its various forms) into the curriculum, where possible.

CaPS brings to the CEELR network:

· a sound understanding of the employability skills required in today's workforce, and career trends for the future;
· a thorough understanding of students' professional and personal development needs;
· a broad overview of employers' needs and priorities, and current EL programs available;
· experience working with an extensive network of internal and external partners who provide students with quality experiences and opportunities;
· and strong sense of the following values: Student Centredness, Collaboration, Inclusivity, and Experience.

The Office of Sustainability (OoS) & CEELR

The Office of Sustainability (OoS) connects, nurtures, and supports students, staff and faculty efforts to build a culture of sustainability at McGill. Sustainability is the process of the McGill community working together toward a shared vision for the future flourishing of people and the planet. This vision is rooted in learning; encompasses research, education, connectivity, operations, and administration & governance; and is driven by the ecological, social, and economic imperatives of our time. The OoS provides a) a shared understanding of the McGill community's sustainability vision, b) the institutional memory & knowledge to advance the vision, c) the network of like-minded people who are working toward the vision, and d) the funding with the mandate to kickstart change toward the vision.

The OoS was founded in part in response to the need to better facilitate and support applied learning and research by students, faculty, and staff on campus sustainability at McGill. This has led to the OoS developing the necessary knowledge, memory, and connections to facilitate and support a wide range of community-engaged and experiential learning and research.

As the CEELR project moves forward, the OoS can offer its general resources (as listed above, available for any sustainability effort), and in particular the time and expertise of Lilith Wyatt, SPF Administrator, and the Education & Research Interns (who currently coordinate and populate the Living Lab database (student research on sustainability at McGill) found at escholarship.mcgill.ca; work with the McGill Food Systems Project, McGill Energy Project, McGill Waste Project; maintain a network of professors active in conducting or supervising CEELR and providing them with resources and support; and developing a wiki and summary briefs on each faculty as resources for student, faculty, and staff interested in engaging with CEELR).

Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) & CEELR

SEDE's Community Engagement department has a mandate to create links and establish needs-based collaborations between the McGill community and those Montreal communities that are identified as under-represented at McGill. These efforts are in line with SEDE's mission of fostering a culture of equity, diversity at McGill while working in solidarity with community partners to overcome barriers of access to McGill. We work with community groups to develop co-curricular projects and programs that address societal needs while leveraging McGill's strengths and resources as a research intensive institution that strives to provide meaningful engaged learning opportunities for its students. Through action and reflection, student volunteers are provided with spaces and activities to critically explore their impact, their assumptions, and their understanding of what it means to be part of a community and world beyond the McGill bubble. As partners in promoting, equity, diversity and justice, the communities we work with also help shape the education that students receive during their time at McGill.

As a member of the CEELR steering group, SEDE's Community Engagement office can provide the following:

· Through our annual face-to-face consultation with Montreal community partners, we can inquire about research opportunities that address their needs and leverage McGill's strengths. Through these inquiries, we can identify common themes and needs, as well as a general understanding of the community members that can best benefit from our research efforts.

· Insight into level of community engagement at McGill based on programming developed at SEDE (e.g., Community Engagement Day, Homework Zone, Community Action Toolkit, etc.)

Longer-Term Options

The stakeholder support and best practices research suggest that we should not disregard Models 2 and 3 entirely but consider, for at least the next one to two years, how the growing network of Model 1 might shape a database and/or an office for community engagement in the longer term. Most stakeholders recognized that the models were sequential, whereby one model evolves into the next, and suggested that Model 1 was a necessary starting point for the creation of a centre (Model 3), as the logical longer-term goal.

Again, four overarching lessons from best practices research are important to keep in mind here as the CEELR network grows and other configurations are envisioned:

1. Without full-time staff (at least one person) dedicated to coordinating and facilitating a network, the network often becomes unsustainable.

2. Centres or offices of community engagement at large Canadian universities almost always begin small, with two or three full-time staff. Often, one staff member has expertise in facilitating relationships with the community, especially non-profit organizations, and another has expertise in experiential education curriculum design, including faculty development and student support. Increasingly, there is a move to hire

a communications coordinator in these types of centres, given that a substantial portion of the network is devoted to information and resource sharing and activity promotion. Budgets for nascent centres or offices do not need to be large; salaries are the biggest expense.

3. Initiatives such as these require the commitment and visible support of central administration.

4. Community engagement needs to be formally recognized as an integral part of the university's mission. A commitment must be visible in support offered to researchers, opportunities for students, consideration of current structures (e.g., tenure), and community relations.

Possible Longer-Term Outputs

1. Dedicated physical space: a gathering space that diverse groups could access, allowing for increased connectivity and resource sharing; the space would be multi-purpose and not necessarily an office.

2. Database: an interactive database that allows anyone – students, staff, faculty, community partners – to access and contribute information about engaged learning and research opportunities at McGill. Ideally, the database would be supported by at least a part-time staff member. Creating the database could be linked to an Information Studies course or another experiential learning opportunity on campus.

3. Centre for Experiential Learning and Community-based Research: Following best practices research, the centre would start small with two or three full-time staff. General configuration of responsibilities: a) Information and Communications; b) Student Support; c) Faculty and Research Support and Development; d) Community Development. The Centre could be a partnership with a research unit, like CURP at U of T, or it could be a small unit housed in the Provost's Office, like the Office of Public Engagement at Memorial.

4. Curriculum development: creation of new ASR-specific courses; creation of interdisciplinary, for-credit "Introduction to Community Engagement" service-learning course.

5. Formalized relationships with research institutes and foundations on campus.

CONCLUSION

Faculty, administration, students, and staff at McGill clearly recognize the importance of community engagement to society and to McGill. We are confident that our recommendations for fostering a formalized network of Community-Engaged and Experiential Learning and Research will support McGill's diverse engagement activities, including research and curricular and co-curricular experiences. The IES project, now the CEELR network, is a direct, concrete response to the various recent strategic planning initiatives at McGill that call for increased connectivity, resource and information sharing, networking, accessibility, facilitation, knowledge mobilization, and recognition of community engagement on campus. Community engagement is most successful when it is recognized as an integral part of the university's mission. The CEELR network concretizes the centrality of community engagement and experiential learning and research to McGill's mission as a student-centred, research-intensive university.

APPENDIX A
Best Practices

Introduction

Identifying best practices at comparator universities and other leading institutions in the coordination and advancement of applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research is a key deliverable of the IES project. The purpose of this best practices research is to support the project's goal in identifying potential structures for a university-wide hub where students, faculty, and staff could access these types of learning and research. This research provides an overview of the wide array of university-based structures and programming, including centres, organizations, and online tools, that facilitate community engagement and support campus-community relationships on campuses across North America. The breadth of initiatives that exist on campuses in the name of community engagement illustrates just how tricky McGill's task of connecting applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research in a single initiative is.

Below, we present two summaries – one focused on The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN) in the United States, and the other on Canadian universities. These summaries admittedly reflect their different authors' approaches to synthesizing their findings, but they also reflect an important difference between the American and Canadian context of university-community partnerships and community engagement on campuses. As Kelley Walter explains in her summary of TRUCEN practices, at many American universities the commitment to engagement began at their inception over a hundred years ago. A commitment to the idea of community service is entrenched in their research and pedagogical mandates. Moreover, much American engagement programming developed in a context where significant government funding was available. This is simply not the situation in Canada. Community engagement as an institutionalized idea and set of pedagogical and research practices at Canadian universities, particularly research-intensive universities, is still in many ways nascent. As recently as March 2013, Margo Fryer, former director of UBC's Learning Exchange and currently senior advisor, Student Learning Initiatives in the Office of the Vice-President at UBC, expressed doubt that "the current community-university engaged activities in Canada constitute a movement." But, she added, "many institutions have made rhetorical commitments that could serve as a rallying point."[8] Acknowledging that McGill already has a solid understanding and feel for community-university engagement and its value, this summary presents some examples and trends for short- and longer-term consideration.

The **Recommendations** section of this report incorporates specific examples of best practices based on this research as well. For further best practices documentation, please also refer to the following Appendices:

Appendix B: Best Practices at a Glance: A Selective Summary Canadian and US Universities
This document (also distributed at the March 27, 2013 Steering Group meeting) demonstrates

[8] Margo Fryer, "Moving the Agenda Forward," *Taking the Plunge* (blog), *University Affairs*, March 5, 2013, http://www.universityaffairs.ca/taking-the-plunge/moving-the-agenda-forward/.

the depth and breadth of university initiatives and structures that fall under the rubrics of experiential and community-based learning and research and community engagement. The table breaks down community engagement best practices into what we see as the component best practices that are important to McGill's consideration of establishing a hub for applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research (e.g., best practices in *governance*, best practices in *teaching & learning*, best practices in *community-university partnerships*, best practices in *community-based research*, best practices in *scholarship of engagement*, best practices in *financial support for community engagement*, best practices in *online tools*).

Appendix C: Best Practices to Support Possible Models (Consultation Stage)
This document (also distributed for the March 27, 2013 Steering Group meeting) provides an overview of best practices that aligned most closely with the three possible models for which we sought feedback during the consultation stage of the IES project. While stakeholders did not receive this document alongside the models during consultation, URLs to the relevant best practices were provided.

Methodology
The primary method of investigation involved Internet research. Most of the information gathered here was drawn from online resources – that is, publicly available information. Key search terms included: community engagement; civic engagement; public engagement; community-based research; community service-learning; experiential learning; experiential education; participatory action research; applied research; community outreach; and community partnerships. Contact was made with a handful of institutions to confirm details and discuss on-the-ground implementation of programs. Both Joanne Muzak and Kelley Walter conducted informal telephone interviews with a few key contacts and had brief email exchanges with others.

Recognizing that McGill's peers are found among the Canadian U15 universities as well as the Association of American Universities, our best practices research began by looking at present and past university programs, centres, organizations, and online tools among Canadian and American research-intensive universities. However, the resources available to many of these universities, particularly in the United States, are beyond what McGill has available in the current fiscal climate. Furthermore, especially in Canada, it is not the research-intensive universities that excel at community engagement. Instead, the leaders in university-community engagement in Canada are smaller universities, who have prioritized, valued, integrated, and rewarded community engagement since their inception. In fact, many smaller and mid-sized universities are distinguishing themselves from comparable universities by integrating community engagement into teaching and research throughout the university (e.g., Simon Fraser University, University of Guelph). Thus, our best practices research also considers initiatives of Canadian universities outside of the U15 group whose work is insightful for McGill.

Best Practices Summary: Canadian Universities

I. Introduction

It would be difficult to find a Canadian university – large or small – that does not make some commitment to community engagement as part of its mission or strategic plan. The visibility and materiality of that commitment, however, vary enormously. The University of British Columbia, for example, names community engagement as one of its three core commitments, alongside student learning and research excellence.[9] As one illustration of that commitment, in 2012-13, over 3,000 students participated in community-based experiential learning (CBEL) opportunities facilitated by the UBC-Community Learning Initiative (CLI).[10] At the University of Guelph, notably not a U15 member but a sizable university with over 19,000 students, 88 per cent of all undergraduate students complete an "extended placement of community engagement" – whether that be in co-op work terms, internships, volunteer work, practica, fieldwork, or community service-learning.[11] Aiming to "re-imagine the role of the university" as a genuine agent of social change, the University of Guelph is currently at the end of an eighteen-month period of community consultations and dialogue to create a vision for the School for Civil Society and Engagement (SCSF).[12] St. Francis Xavier, a significantly smaller university with an undergraduate student body of approximately 4,000, was founded in 1863 on the principles of community outreach, service to society, and social responsibility.[13] StFX's service learning program began in 1996 and is regarded as Canada's pioneer service learning program. Service learning courses are offered in almost every faculty on campus.[14] While Canadian universities generally share a commitment to engagement, their varied contexts have resulted in equally varied practices and approaches to organizing and supporting these practices.

II. Overview of Engagement Practices

Organization, Reporting Structures, and Known Resource Allocation – Themes and Examples

Like their American counterparts, the majority of research-intensive universities in Canada have some type of formally recognized institutional structure – usually a centre or an office – dedicated to the promotion and support of community-engaged learning and research. Also like their American counterparts, the focus of these offices varies. Most often among the U15 universities, there is no overarching body that aims to bring together the various pedagogies, research methodologies, and co-curricular activities that fit under the rubrics of experiential education and community engagement and simultaneously meet the needs of faculty, staff, students, and community partners in the way that the IES project hopes to do. Instead, more commonly, there are separate structures for learning and research activities.

---

[9] UBC, *The UBC Plan*, http://strategicplan.ubc.ca/the-plan/commitments/.
[10] UBC-CLI, "Peer Programs at the University of British Columbia," http://students.ubc.ca/sites/students.ubc.ca.
[11] Tara Fenwick, "Breaking Waves: Rethinking Experiential Learning for Community Engagement," Keynote lecture at the Festival of Teaching, University of Alberta, March 6, 2013; University of Guelph, Educational and Research Development Unit, "Experiential Education," http://www.uoguelph.ca/cera/Curriculum/White20Paper/Experiential20Ed.html.
[12] University of Guelph, School for Civil Society and Engagement, http://schoolforcivilsociety.ca/about-the-sfcs-project/.
[13] St. Francis Xavier, "About StFX – History," http://www.stfx.ca/about/history/.
[14] St. Francis Xavier, "Service Learning – About Us – History of Service Learning at StFX," http://sites.stfx.ca/service_learning/About_Us.

For example, the University of Toronto has a Centre for Community Partnerships (CCP), which, with community organizations, develops partnerships that are "defined, sustainable, and action-oriented for students. These partnerships have a dual aim to build educational and resource capacity within communities of the Greater Toronto Area and Peel Regions and to enhance and broaden student learning."[15] Currently eight years old, the CCP has a staff of five full-time employees, including a non-academic director, a coordinator of academic service-learning and faculty development, a coordinator of co-curricular service-learning and student development, an office coordinator and information officer, and a coordinator of community development. The CCP organizes co-curricular programs like Alternative Reading Week of Service and Academic Service-Learning courses at U of T's three campuses and assists faculty members, particularly within non-professional faculties, create partnerships for their courses. The centre operates with "full autonomy" and is financially supported by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost (Academic Programs) and Student Life Programs and Services; the Provost pays for the academic appointments and activities, and Student Life pays for the appointments and activities related to the co-curricular side of experiential education within the CCP.[16]

U of T also has a Community/University Research Partnerships Unit (CURP). Housed within the Centre for Urban and Community Studies (CUCS), CURP represents U of T's "contribution to applied scholarship on the practical problems and policy issues associated with urban living, particularly poverty, housing, homelessness, social welfare, and social justice issues." CURP's overall goals parallel those currently being pursued through various McGill initiatives, including Vision 2020: CURP aims "(1) to help define socially important and policy-relevant research agendas; (2) to link researchers and identified research needs; (3) to seek research funding sources … (4) to develop new ways to communicate and disseminate research findings."[17] Essentially, CURP is a research unit within an administrative home (CUCS) that is in turn housed within the Faculty of Graduate Studies. The configuration of resource allocation in CUCS is noteworthy: "The University supports the Centre with space and funds for administration only; all research initiatives require external sources of funding. The Centre acts as an administrative home for interdisciplinary research programs. The School of Graduate Studies appoints the Director. A small management committee oversees policy matters and provides advice to the Director. A committee appointed by the School of Graduate Studies reviews the Centre every five years."[18]

CURP's specific research scope and its apparent neglect of undergraduate student experience limits its viability as a model for McGill's IES hub, but the administrative structure – namely, administrative support, physical space, and a small management committee – is a possible model for McGill to consider in the longer term. More broadly, this example demonstrates how

[15] University of Toronto, "Centre for Community Partnerships," http://www.ccp.utoronto.ca/.
[16] Ben Liu, Coordinator, Academic Service-Learning and Faculty Development, telephone interview with Joanne Muzak, March 6, 2013; University of Toronto, "Centre for Community Partnerships," http://www.ccp.utoronto.ca/.
[17] University of Toronto, "Community/University Research Partnerships Unit," http://www.urbancentre.utoronto.ca/curp.html.
[18] University of Toronto, "Centre for Urban and Community Studies," http://www.urbancentre.utoronto.ca/aboutcucs.html.

research-intensive universities in Canada meet their commitments to research excellence, community engagement, and educational experience. It also shows how comparable research-intensive universities organize the various components of what is broadly considered community engagement.

Based on their websites alone, community engagement initiatives at the University of Alberta likewise appear to reinforce the notion that large research-intensive universities in Canada structure engagement according to research focus and separate engaged pedagogy from engaged research. For example, the U of A has a research organization called Community-University Partnerships for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) as well as a Community Engagement Studies program, both of which are housed in the Faculty of Extension, which is largely a cost-recovery faculty. The University also has a Community Service-Learning Program that serves the entire university but is housed in the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies in the Faculty of Arts.[19] Obviously, CSL is a specific engaged pedagogy; therefore, the existence of CSL Program seems to reinforce the notion that engaged pedagogy and engaged research exist in separate university silos at research-intensive universities. However, as the CSL program has grown, so too has the sophistication of service-learning as a form of engagement. In 2010–11, the program developed CSL Partnership Grants, grants that funded two-year partnerships between university instructors and community organizations that engage students across disciplines with a focus on social change or a community-based research.[20] The grants enabled faculty and community organizations to develop experiential learning projects collaboratively; the projects involve multiple CSL courses (the engaged pedagogy component) but the students, faculty, and community organizations are simultaneously engaged in community-based research (the engaged research component).[21]

These types of initiatives that seek to de-silo community engagement at large universities are not always recognizable from websites. Thus, while it is obvious that most research-intensive universities in Canada have specific centres, institutes, and offices devoted to specific types of engaged practices or to specific disciplinary approaches to community-based and applied research, the interconnectedness of engaged practices is less immediately evident. As McGill already recognizes, these types of efforts are often the vision of an individual or a small group of people; and given that these efforts represent a kind of paradigm shift in academic pedagogy

[19] U of A's CSL Program has a staff of eight, including an academic director, manger, program coordinator, two partnership coordinators, evaluation coordinator, administrative assistant, and a Humanities 101 coordinator. The program has been advised since its inception in 2003 by an advisory board comprised of university and community members; as of 2013, there are thirteen board members (www.csl/ualberta.ca). The program has had various main funders, beginning with the McConnell Foundation; more recently, the program has received hard funding from the Faculty of Arts as well as sizable private philanthropic funding.

[20] Alison Taylor, Academic Director, CSL Program, University of Alberta, telephone interview with Joanne Muzak, March 8, 2013; University of Alberta, Community Service Learning, "Partnership Grants Guidelines and Terms," Spring 2013, http://www.csl.ualberta.ca/en/CommunityPartners/~/media/CommunityServiceLearning/Documents/FormsGuidebooksetc/NEWPGGuidelines2013.pdf.

[21] One of the first CSL-funded partnership projects was Project Citizenship, a project focused on enhancing the experiences of citizenship for people with disabilities. With its multifaceted creative strategies, the project is a notable success.

and research, it often takes some time for them to be recognized and validated within the university as well as the broader community.

Smaller Canadian universities, those outside the U15 group, also often have centres and institutes devoted to specific kinds of engaged practices. However, generally, smaller Canadian schools are more likely to also have an office of engagement at the central administration level, with which the centres, institutes, or other units are affiliated. Memorial University's Office of Public Engagement, for instance, is the face of community engagement at Memorial. This new initiative, currently with a staff of just three, is supported by the Office of the President and Vice-Chancellor and works closely with the Harris Centre, which describes itself as "Memorial's hub for public policy and regional development issues."[22] The Harris Centre is also responsible for Yaffle, an innovative database that connects university researchers, students, and community partners and helps them develop projects collaboratively. The Office of Public Engagement provides resources, including a "Public Engagement Toolkit," and raises the profile of community engagement at Memorial by featuring success stories on its website. These may seem like modest activities, but they can be quite effective on a campus of any size. Moreover, the Office of Public Engagement is significant not only because it represents a sustainable, high-level commitment to community-university engagement, but also because its staff are working to facilitate and maintain personal relationships as the foundation for collaborations.[23]

Other universities that are explicitly distinguishing (and marketing) themselves as "engaged" universities are emphasizing a more comprehensive framework for engagement. Simon Fraser University, for example, refers to itself as "Canada's Engaged University." Its *Strategic Vision* is centred on three goals: engaging students; engaging research; engaging communities.[24] It is worth noting as well that Simon Fraser is particularly adept at using multimedia and online tools for promoting its vision; the university's "Engage" website features an interactive "Engagement Map," which invites students, faculty, staff, and partners to "add a story" to the map, as well as an animated video, narrated by the university's president, that unpacks the SFU's strategic vision.[25] The University of Guelph's School for Civil Society and Engagement is similarly imagined as a pan-university initiative, a structure that will facilitate cross-department and cross-faculty collaborations, convene and support local and global partnerships, and offer both undergraduate and graduate programs.[26]

Funding

Funding for the types of structures identified here varies significantly among universities. Most commonly, at least part of the budget for centres, institutions, or programs comes from central

[22] Memorial University, Harris Centre, http://www.mun.ca/harriscentre/; Lisa Charlong, Project Manager, Harris Centre and Jennifer Warburton, Manager of Operations and Strategic Projects, Harris Centre and the Office of Public Engagement, Memorial University, telephone interview with Kelley Walter, March 8, 2013.

[23] Lisa Charlong, Project Manager, Harris Centre and Jennifer Warburton, Manager of Operations and Strategic Projects, Harris Centre and the Office of Public Engagement, Memorial University, telephone interview with Kelley Walter, March 8, 2013.

[24] Simon Fraser University, *Strategic Vision*, http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/engage/StrategicVision.pdf.

[25] SFU, Engagement Map, http://www.sfu.ca/engage/map.html; SFU, "SFU: Canada's Engaged University," http://www.sfu.ca/engage/ and http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=2H_GvkWomuo.

[26] University of Guelph, School for Civil Society and Engagement, "Essential Functions," http://schoolforcivilsociety.ca/events/learnings/.

administration. External grants are common at the beginning of many of these types of initiatives (e.g., J.W. McConnell Family Foundation's CSL grants; Max Bell Foundation grants; individual faculty directors' SSHRC grants, etc.). As we know, universities are increasingly building partnerships with corporations whose mandates include community service. York University is home to the York-TD Community Engagement Centre (CEC), for example.[27] Alumni and philanthropic gifts are also common sources for community engagement initiatives.

Best Practices Summary: The University Civic Engagement Network (American Universities)

I. Introduction

Research universities in the United States have embraced a diversity of approaches to community engagement. Many small colleges and liberal arts universities incorporate some form of engagement into their mission, and the cohesive nature of these institutions results in a unified effort on the part of students and faculty to engage with the surrounding communities. This, however, is not the case for large-scale research institutions that must work to unite numerous schools and departments, expansive administrations, a large student body, and faculty committed to rigorous scholarship. In order to prevent these institutions from lagging behind their smaller counterparts, several of these universities came together in 2005 through Campus Compact, an organization dedicated to supporting and improving community engagement in US universities, to discuss how they might incorporate community engagement and research into their academic programs. By 2008, this group had formalized this commitment and formed The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN). This network, now consisting of 36 members, emphasizes the leadership role research universities can play in adopting community engagement strategies. These universities emphasize three goals:

1. Encourage community-engaged scholarship by identifying its dimensions and demonstrating how it satisfies criteria for rigorous scholarship established by and expected from research universities.
2. Encourage research on different forms of civic engagement and give greater visibility to this growing field of scholarship.
3. Encourage greater commitment to curricular and co-curricular activities that promote students' civic understanding and engagement and scholarly efforts to understand and articulate the outcomes, challenges, and best practices for doing so.[28]

[27] York University, York-TD Community Engagement Centre (CEC), http://cec.info.yorku.ca/. The CEC is a unique structure among Canada's U15 schools. The CEC is a York office located off campus in the Yorkgate Mall. The CEC identifies opportunities for York students to provide services and support to the local community as part of their learning. Like UBC's Learning Exchange, which is also located off-campus and in a downtown neighbourhood, there is more of an emphasis here on increasing learning opportunities for the community.

[28] TRUCEN, "The Mission and Purpose of TRUCEN (The Research University Civic Engagement Network)," *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 16, no. 4 (2012): 11.

In order to better understand the efforts of TRUCEN and how its members can inform a model based on best practices, it is necessary to examine the context in which the institutions operate, including their history of engagement or service, strategic missions and goals, organization and support of operations, and community engagement scholarship. This overview examines universities comparable to McGill in size and research to help inform a model of best practices.

II. Overview of Engagement Practices of TRUCEN Members

Context

For the members of TRUCEN, a commitment to engagement is often based in the context of their creation. Many of these institutions were developed as a result of the US Land Grant system, which was comprised of the Morrill Land Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890. Under these acts states received federal land to sell or develop on the requirement that the proceeds would go toward building and operating a college that emphasized the teaching of agriculture and mechanical arts, subjects that were considered practical for farmers and an increasing working class, in addition to sciences, liberal arts and classical studies.[29] These programs taught applied skills that addressed real-world problems. This original commitment formed a legacy of service to society in many of these universities, which has served as the basis for civic engagement and collaborative research.

Another element that is frequently cited in the missions of TRUCEN universities is citizenship. Often this concept is explained in connection to United States history and notions of democracy, and includes community engagement as essential to creating a responsible citizenry. As part of its mission, Florida State University's Center for Leadership and Social Change articulates that as responsible citizens, individuals engage the world around them "to create a more just and humane society."[30] These discourses have increased the effectiveness of outreach missions, changing them from something seen as optional to something that perceived as being a duty or obligation of a responsible scholar.

Mission and Theme

Each university has articulated a mandate to outreach and engagement. While these vary by institution, they typically include a commitment to having the university's skilled and knowledgeable researchers and students collaborate with the community for mutual benefit. Generally, these statements concerning engagement are written into a university's strategic plan or mission. This is particularly clear in universities with very successful histories of engagement, such as Michigan State University, which includes "advancing outreach, engagement, and economic development activities that are innovative, research-driven, and lead to a better quality of life"[31] as one of three parts of its mission.

---

[29] U.S. Congress, "Morrill Act (1862)." National Archives and Records Administration, http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=33.

[30] Florida State University, "The Center for Leadership and Social Change: Mission, Vision, and Guiding Principles," http://thecenter.fsu.edu/About-Us/Mission-Vision-and-Guiding-Principles.

[31] Michigan State University, *MSU Mission Statement*, http://president.msu.edu/mission/.http://president.msu.edu/mission/.

Organization, Reporting Structures, and Known Resource Allocation
The majority of these institutions have offices dedicated to the advancement of community-engaged research and learning. Depending on the institution, the focus varies between emphasizing service-learning courses, community partnerships, applied research, experiential learning, or some combination thereof. This variety is also seen in where these offices are housed, though they consistently report to a senior member of the administration, often the Office of the Provost. In other instances there is a staff member dedicated to overseeing this type of pursuit, such as at Georgetown University where there is a Lead Associate VP for Community Engagement and Strategic Initiatives or University of Georgia where there is a Vice Provost for Engagement. These offices are also responsible to advisory or steering committees comprised of students, faculty, staff, and community partners. One model for this practice is the Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania. This center, housed in the Office of Government and Community Affairs, is overseen by four advisory boards that represent the community, students, faculty, and national interests.

Importantly, these offices are responsible for a range of tasks, but two particular commitments are standard. The first is offering support to students, staff, and community members interested in engagement, whether it is incorporating it into their research pursuits or finding a university researcher interested in addressing a community's needs. This support could be as simple as providing literature and publications pertaining to how to approach engagement, or more involved such as offering faculty grants to assist with adding engagement to their research or teaching (e.g., grants offered by the Lincoln Filene Center for Community Partnerships at Tufts University), or giving information to students on service-learning courses and engagement opportunities. An important part of this support is an emphasis on faculty and academic development. The second service provided is the facilitation of relationships between community organizations, faculty, students, and staff.

In addition to housing offices dedicated to offering resources and facilitating collaborative partnership, several universities also maintain databases of projects and examples of successful collaborations.

Funding
All of these centers receive funding from their respective universities, showing an administrative commitment to engagement efforts. Still, it is often the case that centers dedicated to engagement, service-learning, or some combination are legacies of certain founders or former administrators of the university, resulting in a large portion of funding coming from endowments. One such case of this is at Stanford University's Hass Center for Public Service, which is served by two positions endowed by the Hass family. In many instances funding is also provided through grants and donations, depending on the institution and the operating size of the office.

Scholarship
The TRUCEN network is committed to rigorous and quality research as a part of engagement. This does not only pertain to the projects that are carried out in collaboration between community and university, but also applies to an increasing body of literature dedicated to the

study of engagement, including best practices, methodologies, theoretical underpinnings, and other topics. One such outlet for this was the creation of the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, a scholarly publication that frequently features TRUCEN members and explores ways to enhance community engaged scholarship while staying committed to a research institution's rigorous scholarship requirements.

Considerations

Research institutions in both the United States and Canada have strengthened their commitments to community engagement in a variety of ways. Their practices offer insight as to what is important to consider when considering engagement at McGill University.

- The efforts of these universities illustrate that an investment in engagement is not done to simply benefit the community, but is carried out for the benefit it also bring the university. Research grounded in service and engagement results in an education that that leaves students and faculty with lasting skills and understanding as they continue their careers. The university must consider how service, engagement, and responsibility enhance academic practices.

- A consistency among the research-intensive universities in the US was a top-down approach, even for offices with humble beginnings. This style seemed to suit the larger, more disconnected nature of research institutions as having offices reporting to senior administrators lent them a level of legitimacy that could be more appealing to faculty. Nevertheless, students were not lost in this activity as many centers were careful to highlight how students could be involved and offered opportunities for students to participate in advisory committees etc.

  Community engagement initiatives at research-intensive universities in Canada, on the other hand, are not generally top-down initiatives. While support for community engagement is most certainly (and necessarily) articulated by senior administration and advanced in strategic planning at Canadian universities, most structures are the vision and effort of individuals or small groups of people, sometimes with modest funding from central administration or external funding, especially at the beginning. Having said that, at most Canadian research-intensive universities, central administration now financially supports centres, institutes, programs at least partially. It is important to add that, like the US offices and centres, centres and programs in Canada also started small. Contacts at U of T and the University of Alberta recalled that in the early days of their programs, they had firm goals and firm institutional commitments, but individuals' roles were often ambiguous and multifaceted.

- Engagement can be implemented at large-scale research universities without losing sight of their goals and purposes. This is especially true as a body of scholarship dedicated to research on engagement grows. In an act further legitimizing engagement practices, the Carnegie Institution has begun offering an optional classification system based on universities that can demonstrate their commitment to community engagement.

Currently, there is no Canadian counterpart to the Carnegie Institution, and it's unlikely that one will emerge. Canadian universities do, however, often look to the Carnegie classifications, but we must consider specific Canadian (and indeed specific provincial and regional) contexts as well.

- It is not enough to have an office dedicated to engagement. It is also not enough to have a website to serve as a face of or a portal to community engagement. In addition to resources, it is necessary to strive to integrate engagement into the very make-up of a university.[32] Various elements of this could include reaching a critical mass of colleagues that would embrace engagement to convince others that it was worthwhile, demonstrating the improved education resulting from engagement, and finding university champions to put forth the cause. A commitment must be visible in support offered to researchers, opportunities for students, consideration of current structures (e.g., tenure), community relations, and university mission. Engagement is most successful when it becomes the norm, not when it remains an exception.

[32] Ira Harkavy and Matthew Hartley, "Integrating a Commitment to the Public Good into the Institutional Fabric," *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16, no. 4 (2012): 17–36. Or, as Margo Fryer reminds us, "authentic community engagement requires a change in the status quo" ("Community Engagement: Why Bother? *Taking the Plunge* (blog), *University Affairs*, October 30, 2012, http://www.universityaffairs.ca/taking-the-plunge/community-engagement-why-bother/).

APPENDIX B
Best Practices At a Glance – A Selective Summary
Canadian and US Universities

The following tables provide an overview of selected best practices in several areas that are important to McGill's consideration of establishing a hub for applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research. The tables also demonstrate the depth and breadth of university initiatives and structures that fall under the rubrics of experiential and community-based learning and research and community engagement.

Content

GOV Best Practices in **GOVERNANCE:** best practices in institutional frameworks and institutional support, including staffing and funding. Also refer to Best Practices in Governance Summary.

T&L Best Practices in **Experiential TEACHING & LEARNING (Curriculum)**: best practices in supporting students' in experiential learning as well as faculty in curriculum design and professional development related to experiential pedagogies (e.g., community service-learning, community-based learning, etc.).

CUP Best Practices in **COMMUNITY–UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS**: best practices in facilitating, fostering, and maintaining mutually beneficial community–university partnerships.

CBR Best Practices in **COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH & Engaged Scholarship**: best practices in supporting and encouraging CBR and engaged scholarship.

SCH Best Practices in **SCHOLARSHIP of Engagement**: best practices in encouraging research and publications related to theory, practice, and evaluation of engagement between universities and community partners in accordance with academic research standards.

$CE Best Practices in **FINANCIAL Support for Community Engagement**: best practices in financially supporting undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and community partners in experiential learning and research opportunities.

WEB Best Practices in **Online (WEB) Tools**: best practices in using online tools (interactive database, maps, videos, etc.) to increase accessibility to community engagement opportunities and facilitate relationships.

Canadian Universities

Institution	**Best Practices**						
	GOV	**T&L**	**CUP**	**CBR**	**SCH**	**$CE**	**WEB**
University of Alberta							
Community–University Partnerships (CUP), Faculty of Extension				CBR			
Community Engagement Studies, Faculty of Extension		T&L					
Community Service-Learning Program, Office of Interdisciplinary Studies		T&L	CUP			$CE	
University of British Columbia							

UBC-Community Learning Initiative (UBC-CLI)		T&L	CUP				
UBC Learning Exchange			CUP				
Concordia University							
Explore Research							
Sustainable Community Partnerships, Living Knowledge Discussion Series			CUP				
University of Guelph							
School for Civil Society and Engagement (in planning stages)	GOV	T&L	CUP	CBR	SCH		
Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship and The Research Shop			CUP	CBR	SCH		
McMaster University							
McMaster Centre for Scholarship in the Public Interest (MCSPI)					SCH		
Humanities Target Learning and Experiential Education Centre (HTLC)		T&L	CUP				
Memorial University							
Office of Public Engagement	GOV		CUP				
Yaffle							WEB
University of Ottawa							
Centre for Global & Community Engagement	GOV						
University of Toronto							
Centre for Community Partnerships	GOV	T&L	CUP				
Community/University Research Partnerships Unit, Centre for Urban & Community Studies			CUP	CBR			
Trent University							
Impact Program		T&L					
Trent Centre for Community-Based Education (independent non-profit org)	GOV		CUP				
Simon Fraser University							
SFU Engage, Engagement Map							WEB
SFU Engagement Peers Program		T&L					
University of Victoria							
Office of Community-Based Research	GOV			CBR			
Pilot CBR Directory							WEB
Western University							
The Student Success Centre	GOV						
Wilfrid Laurier University							
Centre for Community Service-Learning	GOV						
York University							
TD Community Engagement Centre	GOV						

US Universities

Institution	Best Practices						
	GOV	**T&L**	**CUP**	**CBR**	**SCH**	**$CE**	**WEB**
University of California, Berkeley							
Cal Corps Public Service Center	GOV					$CE	
University of Connecticut							
Office of Public Engagement	GOV			CBR		$CE	
Office of Service-Learning		T&L	CUP			$CE	
Executive Committee for Public Engagement	GOV						
The Public Engagement Forum	GOV		CUP				
Cornell University							
Public Service Center		T&L	CUP				
Center for Engaged Learning + Research	GOV	T&L		CBR	SCH	$CE	
Duke University							
DukeEngage		T&L					
Center for Civic Engagement	GOV			CBR			WEB
Service-Learning Program	GOV	T&L					
Florida State University							
Center for Leadership and Social Change	GOV						
Harvard University							
Harvard in the Community: Community Programs				CBR			
Phillips Brooks House Association			CUP				WEB
University of Massachusetts, Amherst							
Office of Civic Engagement and Service Learning	GOV	T&L					
Michigan State University							
Office of the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement	GOV		CUP	CBR	SCH	$CE	
Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement		T&L	CUP			$CE	
University of Minnesota							
Office for Public Engagement	GOV	T&L					
Stanford University							
Haas Center for Public Service	GOV	T&L	CUP	CBR		$CE	
University of South Florida							
Center for Leadership and Civic Engagement			CUP				WEB
Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships	GOV	T&L	CUP			$CE	WEB
University of Texas—Austin							
Division of Diversity and Community Engagement				CBR			
Tufts University							
Jonathan Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service		T&L			SCH	$CE	
Lincoln Filene Center for Community Partnerships			CUP				

APPENDIX C
Best Practices To Support Possible Models (Consultation Stage)

The following best practices examples were distributed to the Steering Group (27 March 2013 meeting). These examples most closely supported the three proposed models used during the email survey consultation.

Model 1: NETWORK OF COMMUNITY-BASED AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND RESEARCH

University of Alberta, Network for Community-Engaged Learning (N-CEL) – now defunct	
Structure (Reporting)	- Advisory Board; Work Groups
Programmatic Emphasis	- Pan-university network of faculty engaged in various forms of community engaged learning and research (CSL, CBR, global citizenship internships, etc.) - Professional development re: partnerships
Known Resource Allocation	- Board and committees; volunteer time - Graduate Student Research Assistantships (2 over 2 years), Faculty of Arts, Teaching & Learning Grants - Some IT support, Faculty of Arts
Innovative	- Pan-university network, no disciplinary boundaries
Supports McGill's Needs	- Cautionary note: Did everything this model calls for (educational workshops, symposia, discussion groups, networking opportunites, list-serv, website, published research findings, etc.) and still disappeared after 3 years because there was no long-term commitment to funding a body to sustain the network

University of Maryland—Coalition for Civic Engagement and Leadership	
Structure (Reporting)	- Steering Committee, subcommittees of faculty, staff, and students -reports jointly to Vice President for Student Affairs and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost -Coalition Partners and Affiliates
Programmatic Emphasis	- promote integration of civic engagement and leadership into education -increase opportunities for engagement, assist faculty and staff with incorporating civic engagement
Known Resource Allocation	- some IT support -committees
What's Innovative?	- offered information about programs across UMD campus, handbooks for engagement -created website with aim of showcasing opportunities for engagement
Supports McGill's Needs	- Another cautionary note: The website created by the Coalition, "Terp Impact," no longer exists and there is no information as to what happened to the Coalition. Other civic engagement opportunities continue to exist at UMD, but there is no centralized website.

Model 2: MCGILL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WEBSITE: INTERACTIVE ONLINE TOOLS

Memorial University—Office of Public Engagement	
Structure (Reporting)	-Executive Director is also responsible for Harris Center which has an advisory board, full-time staff, and reports to the Vice-President (Academic) and Vice-President (Research)
Programmatic Emphasis	-facilitate engagement and support students, faculty, staff, and community partners
Known Resource Allocation	-3 staff members -close partner with Harris Center of Regional Policy and Development -2 staff members located in Harris Center to manage Yaffle database and two part-time staff to maintain the database -significant IT support
Noteworthy	-Yaffle database for finding engagement opportunities and connecting community partners, faculty, students, and staff -using existing infrastructure and projects but facilitating new relationships and institutionalize community engagement through high-level support, students, and champions -cross-appointments with Harris Center
Supports McGill's Needs	-"Start Small." -facilitating public engagement for existing infrastructure and projects -cross-appointments

University of Michigan—Michigan Outreach Directory	
Structure (Reporting)	-maintained by the Office of State Outreach within the Office of the Vice President for Government Relations
Programmatic Emphasis	-offers information about outreach projects and services for surrounding communities
Known Resource Allocation	-housed within administrative units, no specialized staff but falls under directors of community relations and state outreach
Noteworthy	-links to other resources at the college -newsletter "Michigan Impact" that details local impact of university research
Supports McGill's Needs	-little staffing required, simply a searchable directory

Harvard University—Phillips Brooks House Association (Matching Program)	
Structure (Reporting)	-student-run umbrella association for 86 service programs across the institution -Advisory Group of alumni, community leaders, faculty; Student Board of Directors; Board of Trustees
Programmatic Emphasis	-public service and collaboration -leadership and experiential learning -social service and social action
Known Resource Allocation	-full-time staff members (14) -nonprofit public service organization

	-grants, fundraising, institutional support, volunteer time
Noteworthy	-database of opportunities that matches individual based on interest, community, availability, type, and term -umbrella for organization across disciplines
Supports McGill's Needs	-searchable database -"Start small." Association began as an effort to offer logistical and advisory support for service programs across institution.

Model 3: CENTRE FOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH

University of Toronto, Centre for Community Partnerships	
Structure (Reporting)	- Central Academic (Provost); Student Life
Programmatic Emphasis	- Curricular experiential learning; service-learning in courses - Faculty support for building partnerships, designing courses - Community organizations support
Known Resource Allocation	- Staff of 5 - Central Academic supports academic positions in the Centre - Student Life supports positions related to non-curricular experiential activities
What's Innovative?	
Supports McGill's Needs	- Staffing history: started with 2 staff members, one specializing in faculty/curricular support, other in community partnerships - "Start small" applies here; original staffing configuration could be good model for McGill - Double reporting structure maintains academic focus but balances with accountability to student services

Wilfrid Laurier, Laurier's Centre for Community Service-Learning	
Structure (Reporting)	- VP Academic; Office of Teaching Support Services
Programmatic Emphasis	- Community service-learning - Partnership building for curricular experiential learning
Known Resource Allocation	- 5 Staff, +1 at Brantford Campus - VP Academic; Office of Teaching Support Services
What's Innovative?	- Cross appointment: Coordinator, Community Partnerships, Curriculum Integration & Program Development
Supports McGill's Needs	- Cross appointment structure could be useful for McGill - History of centre: started out of Psychology; housing in a specific faculty or centre already known for c-e could be a temporary solution (although not ideal because of disciplinary affiliation)

Cornell University: Center for Engaged Learning + Research	
Structure (Reporting)	-Office of the Provost
Programmatic Emphasis	-use of knowledge for public good -make engagement an integral part of education -promote collaborations and partnerships with community, bi-

	directional flow of information -Service Learning
Known Resource Allocation	-3 staff as well as student ambassadors and program assistants that work across the institution -support from trust funds, Division of Student and Academic Affairs, and Office of the Provost
Noteworthy	-efforts to develop means for evaluating outreach programs
Supports McGill's Needs	-use of part-time students and assistants to work across institution rather than in centralized office which maintains a small staff

APPENDIX D
Potential Models and Survey Questions for Consultation

McGill Integrated Education for Sustainability Project: "The Hub"
Last Modified: 21 March 2013

Our Goal
We aim to create a **McGill hub** for **applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research**, which will provide resources, guidance, and networking opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and community organizations.

A Note about Terminology
We recognize that a range of vocabulary is used to describe these types of learning and research. Where "**community engagement** (c-e)" is used in this document, it refers to "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.). We welcome suggestions as to the most appropriate language to describe these types of learning and research at McGill.

Model 1: NETWORK OF COMMUNITY-BASED AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND RESEARCH
This basic model in our proposal draws on existing McGill resources and should be seen a stepping stone rather than a distinct initiative. The model aims to foster McGill's existing network of community-engaged learners and researchers with the idea that a vibrant and more visible network will build a more cohesive, robust, and sustainable support structure for community engagement at McGill. The network would provide educational and knowledge mobilization opportunities (e.g., annual meetings, workshops, speaker series, symposia, online publications, etc.), which would also increase the visibility of McGill's c-e. The network would also include the maintenance of a basic website that would provide information about c-e opportunities and McGill's official c-e policies and practices, house scholarly resources for faculty, students, community partners, and profile successful partnerships.

REQUIRED RESOURCES	EXISTING MCGILL RESOURCES	BEST PRACTICES
- Some additional financial (catering, space, honoraria) & time investment from current IES Steering Group - IT support in setting up website - Opportunity for student intern(s)		Concordia University's Sustainable Community Partnerships, Living Knowledge Series Community-Based Research & Evaluation Workshop series, University of Alberta Research Impact, "Mobilize This!" (blog), York University

Model 2: **MCGILL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WEBSITE: INTERACTIVE ONLINE TOOLS**
Acknowledging that the majority of Canadian universities have a central online presence—"a face"—of community engagement activities or university-community partnerships somewhere on their web domain, this model proposes the creation of a well-supported website and interactive database with the primary goals of increasing access to c-e opportunities and facilitating research and learning partnerships between faculty, students, and community organizations. The website would include the basics, as outlined in Model 1, but might also include videos, interactive maps, a searchable resources section, links to community partners' websites, etc. The real emphasis here is on the creation of an interactive database to facilitate campus-community partnerships.

REQUIRED RESOURCES	EXISTING MCGILL RESOURCES	BEST PRACTICES
- IT - Database would require source outside McGill to build - Database needs inventory (student research opportunity?) - Full-time staff to maintain database and website		Yaffle, Memorial University SFU Engage, Simon Fraser Explore Research, Concordia University

Model 3: **CENTRE FOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH**
Based on best practices research, this model recognizes that the majority of community engagement centres and offices at comparable Canadian universities started small and thus proposes a small, first-step, central venue for accessing information, resources, and support for applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research at McGill. A "centre" or an "office"—some formally named and recognized structure—conveys a long-term commitment to c-e at McGill and recognition of the contributions of McGill's engaged students, faculty, staff, and partners to the university's mission. It is expected that this model would incorporate elements of Models 1 and 2. Additional staff in this model would directly support faculty, students, and community partners in their c-e activities and champion applied, experiential, and community-based learning and research as important and viable pedagogies and research methodologies.

REQUIRED RESOURCES	EXISTING MCGILL RESOURCES	BEST PRACTICES
- Advisory Board of faculty, staff, students, community members - 2 full-time staff (e.g., Communications/Programming position; Engaged Scholarship position) - Possible cross appointments		Centre for Community Partnerships, University of Toronto Community Service-Learning Program, University of Alberta Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships, University of South Florida

Survey Questions

1. Does the overall goal of this project resonate with you? How could this hub serve your clients/unit/department/organization?
2. How is your unit/department/organization already pursuing the goals of this initiative?
3. Which of the proposed models, aspects, or combinations thereof best fits your unit/department/organization's needs?
4. How would your unit/department/organization like to be connected to this hub?

APPENDIX E
Stakeholders Contacted For Consultation

Last updated: 24 May 2013

Name	Affiliation	Contacted by	Response
Darlene Hnatchuk	Director, CaPS	Maria	Joined Steering Group; submitted feedback via email April 15
Frederic Fovet	Director, OSD	Maria	
Heather Mole	Advisor, OSD	Maria	
Neil Whitehouse	Associate Director, Chaplaincy	Maria	Met with Maria, February 13
Paige Isaac	Coordinator, First Peoples' House	Maria	Responded April 18 asking if she could still provide input. Maria let her know re: living doc and her input welcome
Ian Simmie	Director, Leadership	Maria	Met with Maria, April 12
Mitchell Miller	Student Life Coordinator, Leadership	Maria	Met with Joanne and Kelley, February 27; met with Maria, April 12
Ryan MacDowell	Program Assistant, Leadership	Maria	
Joan Butterworth	Training Facilitator, Leadership	Ian Simmie	Met with Maria, April 12
Jessica Earle-Meadows	Consultant, Leadership	Ian Simmie	
Lou Daoust-Filiatrault, Courtney Quinn, and Noah Margo-Dermer	Coordinators, McGill Food Systems Project	Maria	Submitted via email April 2
Marc-Etienne Brunet	Coordinator, McGill Energy Project	Maria	Submitted via email April 3, Submitting SPF application citing alignment with IES, attended March 27 SG meeting
Isha Berry	RezLifer, contact for Environmental Residence Council	Maria	Forwarded questions and models to ERC, but no members responded
Holly Dressel	Adjunct Faculty, McGill School of Environment, Montreal Food Systems Network, connected to	Maria	Met with Maria, March 26. Willing to act as spokesperson for IES and to connect with community members

	multiple NGOs, rural and indigenous communities		
Victor Chisholm	Undergraduate Research Officer, Faculty of Science	Marcy	Provided extensive feedback on terminology and in response to question one (via emails April 5-12)
Bruce Dobby	Faculty, Dentistry Outreach Program	Marcy	
JP Lumb	Faculty, Chemistry	Marcy	Submitted via email April 15
Anne Turner	Arts Internship Office / Internships Network	Marcy	
Raphael Fischler	Director, School of Urban Planning	Wendy	Submitted via email April 23
Martin Kreiswirth	Associate Provost (Graduate Education) and Dean (Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies)	Wendy	
Robert Couvrette	AVP University Services	Lilith	Provided verbally to Lilith April 9
Barbara Lewis	Special Projects Officer, University Services	Lilith	Submitted via email April 17
Isabelle Pean	Quartier de l'innovation	Lilith	
Steve Maguire	Director, MDIIM - Marcel Desautels Institute for Integrated Management	Lilith	
Ellen McDill	Associate Director, MDIIM - Marcel Desautels Institute for Integrated Management	Lilith	
Anita Nowak	Integrating Director, Social Economy Initiative (MDIIM)	Lilith	
Adam Halpert	Managing Director, MDIIM - Marcel Desautels Institute for Integrated Management	Lilith	
Jim Nicell	Dean of Engineering	Lilith	Submitted via email April 10 and 15
Nico Trocme	Director, Centre for Research on Children and Families	Lilith	
Marilyn Scott	Director, McGill School of Environment	Susanna	Submitted via email April 15

Ian Strachan	Associate Dean (Graduate Education), FAES	Susanna	
CURE	Community University Research Exchange	Susanna	
Leigh Yetter	Associate Director, IPLAI – Institute for the Public Life of Arts and Ideas	Anna	Expressed interest in project and in meeting with Anna to discuss, via email April 30; Met with Anna May 13
Michael Loft	Faculty, Social Work	Anna	Met with Anna and Maria April 15, shared contacts from Kahnawake
Murray Humphries	Faculty, Centre for Indigenous Peoples' Nutrition and Environment	Anna	
Carrie Rentschler	Director, Institute for Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies	Anna	
Ralf St-Clair	Chair, Faculty of Education	Anna	
Morton Mendelson	Deputy Provost, Student Life and Learning	Jana	Submitted via email April 14
	KANATA – interdisciplinary student-published journal focusing on topics relating to Indigenous Peoples of North America	Dave	
	CKUT	Dave	
Jessica Ruglis	Faculty, Human Development & School/Applied Child Psychology Programmes	Anurag	Wants to attend Steering Group meetings
Victor Lam	Mac Campus Undergraduate, OIKOS	Maria	Submitted via email April 18
Michael Farkas	Youth in Motion	Anurag	Submitted via email April 11
David Brown	Faculty, School of Urban Planning	Susanna	Introduced Susanna to Lisa Bornstein
Lisa Bornstein	Faculty, School of Urban Planning	Susanna	Maria arranging meeting with her
Kelly Thompson	Coordinator of Continued Learning DESTA Black Youth Network	Anurag	Submitted via email
Anna Schillgalies	Share the Warmth, Pointe St. Charles	Anurag	Submitted via email April 19 (from Anurag April 24)

Tamara Hart	Tyndale St-Georges	Anurag	Submitted via email April 24
	AIDS Community Care Montreal	Anurag	
	Association Sportive et Communautaire de Centre-Sud	Anurag	
	Pointe-St-Charles Community Clinic	Anurag	
	Commission Scolaire de Montreal	Anurag	
Matthew Albert	Lester B. Pearson School board	Anurag	Submitted via email April 26
Allan Vicaire	Coordinator, Aboriginal Sustainability Project, SEDE	Anurag	Expressed interest in next steps

APPENDIX F
Defining Our Terms

We recognize that a range of vocabulary is used to describe the types of learning and research with which this project is concerned. In fact, attempts to define these terms have generated considerable debate. Moreover, we understand that the discourse of university-community engagement is changing as community engagement becomes increasingly institutionalized within universities. While the IES project team members remain open to discussions of terminology, for the purposes of this document, we use the following definitions.

Community Engagement
Community engagement is "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity."[33]

As the Working Group on Service to Québec and Canada suggests in their Final Report, "proper service to the community [is] engagement with the community." "What drives service to the community … is the desire to benefit society and improve human well-being in a direct manner, rather than in the indirect, albeit essential, manner of teaching or of research. The critical element is the interaction with the community of lay persons."[34]

Experiential Education/Experiential Learning
Most broadly, experiential education is engaged learning in which the learner experiences a visceral connection to the subject matter. Experiential learning combines direct, meaningful experience with guided reflection and analysis.[35] It is the process of making meaning from direct experience. Experiential learning can take place inside or outside the classroom, and may or may not be for credit. Experiential learning can include service-learning, internships, co-op work terms, volunteer work, participation in student groups, etc.

Applied Research/Applied Student Research
In this report, "applied research" refers specifically to "applied student research." Applied student research has been defined as "research that (a) is conducted … with the goal of informing and affecting school, community, and/or global problems and issues and (b) contributes to the positive development of a variety of academic, social, and civic skills [in students]."[36]

Community-based Research (CBR)

---

[33] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Classification Description: Community Engagement Classification*, n.d., http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php.
[34] Raphaël Fischler and Lisa Bornstein on Behalf of the Work Group on Service to Québec and Canada, Work Group on Service to Québec and Canada, Final Report (McGill University, Principal's Task Force on Diversity, Excellence and Community Engagement, July 2012), iii, 2.
[35] Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning, "Experiential Learning," n.d., http://communityservicelearning.ca.
[36] B. Rubin and M. Jones, "Student Action Research: Reaping the Benefits for Students and School Leaders," *NASSP Bulletin* 91 (2007): 363.

Community-Based Research Canada defines community-based research as "creating and mobilizing knowledge for action by communities, civil society, policy makers, and stakeholders in all of the key areas affecting the future social, economic, and environmental sustainability of Canada. It engages communities and their citizens in the creation, design, implementation and use of research to meet their needs."[37]

Sustainability

At the recommendation of the Steering Group, the definition of sustainability has been left open, particularly regarding the goal(s) of the IES project. Generally, we accept and borrow from Vision 2020's broad conceptualization of the term to refer to a "future orientation: working together toward a shared vision for a better future in a manner that integrates social, economic, and environmental dimensions."[38] At this stage, however, we recognize "sustainability" as a process term, and aim to emphasize the values that inform the concept and the outcomes towards which the processes of sustainability can lead, instead of working with concrete definition.[39]

[37] Community-based Research Canada, "Who We Are," n.d., http://communityresearchcanada.ca/who_are_we#cbr.

[38] McGill University, Vision 2020, "A Primer: Connectivity and Sustainability at McGill, March 21, 2013.

[39] The term sustainability is rarely used in names of university-community engagement organizations, while the concept is occasionally broadly incorporated into the organizations' mandates and sometimes only means "able to be maintained." One notable exception to this is Concordia University, which has an initiative called the Sustainable Communities Partnership: "Sustainable Communities Partnership is Concordia's signature for community engagement and social responsibility, housed in the Office of the Vice-President Institutional Relations and Secretary General. As a bridging initiative, its purpose is to support, connect, and promote existing community-university partnerships as well as foster the sustainable development of new partnerships" (http://www.concordia.ca/about/community/). What "sustainable" means here is completely open.