

24<sup>th</sup> April 2013

## Community Based Learning and Community Based/Service Learning Working Groups

**DRAFT**

### Summary Report from Three Exploratory Sessions with HEI Staff and Community Partners in Galway, Cork and Dublin

#### **Brief**

The Irish Universities Association (IUA), in partnership with the IOTI and DIT, is in the process of setting out the terms of reference and strategic plan for Phase Two of Campus Engage. A steering committee has been created with representatives appointed from 14 Higher Education Institutions in the Republic of Ireland. The broad goal of this new phase of Campus Engage is to create an all-inclusive platform for civic engagement, where the ethos of "the engaged university" is underpinned by a vision articulated within the Hunt Report (2011) and the changing landscape for higher education and research in Ireland.

As identified by a Campus Engage national consultative process in 2012, four Working Groups were proposed in February 2013. These include: Community-based Learning/Service Learning, Community-based Research, Student Engagement and Volunteering. Two convenors were identified to lead each and the first Working Group Meeting was held at the IUA on 7th March 2013. Each pair of convenors were tasked with developing a strategic plan, budget and presentation at the next meeting of the Working Group at the IUA on Thursday April 25<sup>th</sup>2013.

#### **Brief introduction to Community-Based Research (CBR) and Community-Based Learning (CBL) (please note this is not an agreed definition, but a general summary of principles).**

CBR and CBL are generally understood as curriculum-based initiatives in which community organisations and academic staff and students collaboratively design research or project work which students undertake, with support from academic supervisors and community partners, for credit, and for the mutual benefit of all participants. In some instances, CBR can involve

academic staff collaborating with community partners to conduct research to benefit both parties, without students being involved.

CBL and CBR can involve individual students or whole class groups, and varying degrees of contact with community partners, and can be all, or part of, the credits for a module. The main difference between CBR and CBL is that CBL may not have an end-product and is more process-based (such as students tutoring children in a homework club), whereas CBR must have a research output such as a thesis, research report, product design, or research proposal. For CBL these are the learning needs of students and the community as well as supervisors' continuing learning about their discipline. For CBR these overlap with the research interests of academic and research staff in response to societal challenges as well as the research goals of the community organisations. However, what CBL and CBR projects have in common is that they are designed to meet the mutual needs of participants and enhance the HEIs public engagement remit.

### **Three exploratory sessions: Galway, Cork and Dublin**

Following discussion between the Campus Engage CBR and CBL Working Group convenors a decision was taken design a process that was inclusive as possible to take account of the principles outlined in the previous section. We organised three combined CBL and CBR events due to many common traits within these approaches to civic engagement. To facilitate numbers attending these work group sessions, and for geographic reasons, three identical sessions were held, in Galway, Cork and Dublin. The goal of these meetings was to generate broad representation across the HEI and community sectors to promote and develop engagement work with participants across the country, to collect and generate ideas, and to identify volunteers to commit to activities.

1. Galway – Facilitated by Lorraine McIlrath (NUIG)
2. Cork - Facilitated by Kenneth Burns (UCC)
3. Dublin - Facilitated by Pdraig Murphy (DCU) and Sinead McCann (DIT)

All sessions used the same format: a brief generic presentation on the history and future of Campus Engage; new structure and positioning; steering committee and working groups; impact of the Hunt Report and future funding; and an overview of CBL and CBR. The agenda for the rest of the session was as follows: Generate ideas for Campus Engage working groups and work plans until 2015, and promote networking between individuals and groups involved in CBR/CBL: the generation of ideas for CBR/CBL working groups; exploration of CBR/CBL mix in terms of working groups; identifying workshop members who could commit to a working group or set of tasks for at least 1 year.

## **New Working Group Proposal**

Based on discussions with participants with CBL and CBR backgrounds at the three seminars, we are proposing a combined working group with shared resources to foster CBL and CBR across Ireland over the next two years. The bottom-up, inclusive approach that under-pinned the planning of these WG meetings resulted in 60 committed participants attending meetings across three cities to debate how best to further CBL and CBR. In our opinion, the format proposed below could lead to a maximisation of resources, reduce duplication, promote greater participation and would more closely reflect the ethos and principles of civic engagement work.

Rather than keeping two separate CBL and CBR working groups, we propose to integrate the work of these groups, for maximum efficiency and effectiveness. We now have a pool of over 70 interested people - many of them very experienced community and HEI staff - and we propose to coordinate panels to work on the tasks identified below, made up of different combinations of people from this pool who have an expertise in specific tasks.

This work will be overseen by a small co-ordinating panel comprised of the four Working Group co-convenors and a small number of HEI staff and community members who agree to lead key tasks. This will be a tight structure and will reduce travel costs, as we envisage that specific tasks will be managed at a local level. The small panel of convenors/overseers will meet quarterly to coordinate and oversee the work.

To this end, CBL and CBR will be clustered around two thematic areas that have been identified as key to growth and development:

1. HEI Policy, Development and Lobbying
2. Resources and Materials Production

### *Summary Recommendations and Conclusions from the Regional Groups*

- There should be community partner representation on the Campus Engage Steering Committee;
- The CBL and CBR working groups should be merged due to conceptual overlap and the similarity of work tasks identified;
- There is a wide range of interest in this work and members were looking for more creative ways to include more participants, while acknowledging budget limits (28 interested in working groups and up to 70 who could participate in activities in short time-focused periods).

The projected costs and tasks identified in the three regional meetings associated with these two areas are outlined in the following tables:

## Thematic Area 1: HEI Policy, Development and Lobbying

Task	Description	Tim e eline	Cost
1. <b>Tools for incentivisation</b>	Group to work on tools/mechanisms to promote recognition of CBR and CBL (1-2 pagers). For example, recognition of activities in staff promotion processes, academic credits, linking to Resource Allocation Models and KPI's, staff contracts and performance review meetings, audits of HEI and College/School strategic plans, provision of administrative resources to help develop relationships, meet community partners. A key output would be create incentive mechanisms for dedicated CBR/CBL time/work allocation.	Year 1	€2,000
2. <b>Creating stronger links between HEIs and community groups</b>	Identify and disseminate best practices in the area of developing links between HEIs and community groups. Having community partners in the working groups is only the beginning of this. This task is linked to other tasks above.  Working groups could look at the issue of establishing one inter-disciplinary/inter-college "front door" (CBL, CBR, or both) in institutions that community partners could recognise and approach to help find suitable courses and student researchers to work with.	Years 1 and 2	€800
3. <b>Benchmarking</b>	Review and promotion of embedding best practices. Identify existing best practice tools in Ireland and Internationally with pointers for recommendations for the Irish context. Could be a commissioned report.	Year 1	€2,000
4. <b>Mentoring system</b>	Establish a national mentoring system of experienced CBL and CBR participants to provide support and mentoring to HEIs and community partners interested in establishing new initiatives or learning about new developments from other HEI's / community partners.	Year 1	Staff buy out at estimated at €250 per day x 20 meetings = €5,000
5. <b>Internal HEI active promotion</b>	Enhanced lobbying of HEIs for more CBR/CBL/Civic Engagement activities through the networking of individuals / working groups who would lobby and also possibly develop civic engagement lobbying tools. A particular focus of this work would be to find ways to encourage HEIs to create civic engagement offices/officers to promote this work.	Year 1	Travel expenses and meeting costs
6. <b>Statement of principles</b>	A declaration/manifesto was suggested on the engaged campus; it was necessary to formulate an agreement to ensure a range of policy measures are adhered to by policymakers and institutions that would lead to greater engagement and openness from HEIs.	Year 1	Task for national coordinator. Likely to be cost neutral for working group, but should involve wide consultations.
7. <b>Recognition for engaged scholarship and research</b>	Recognition for engaged scholarship and research; academic credits [ <i>dedicated CBR time, turning CBR into scholarly impact</i> ]	Years 1 and 2	Writers retreat to stimulate writing outputs. €1,000  Other aspects of this work relates to lobbying work in 5 above.
8. <b>Updating of survey of civic engagement activities in HEIs</b>	Create version 2 of previous Campus Engage review of activities and draw together new good practice vignettes of CBR and CBL across Irish HEIs. Use of Campus Engage website and Blog to disseminate this task. (commissioned piece of work or PhD Scholarship?)	Years 1 and 2	€4,000

## Thematic Area 2: Resources and Materials Production

Task	Description	Timeline	Cost
<b>Developing tools to support CBR/CBL</b>	<p>Development of CBR / CBL practice and pedagogical tools, and “guidelines” drawing upon existing work of Irish and International partners (eg Living Knowledge Tool Kit, CARL, Talloires Network, GUNi, Campus Compact, Engage Australia etc.).</p> <p>Use of Campus Engage website and Blog to disseminate. One page explanations on CBR and CBL.</p> <p>Case Studies of national examples authored by those embedding the work using a common template.</p> <p>Short video interviews with students, community, academics and enablers to highlight the experience, learning and impact.</p>	Years 1 and 2	€4,000
<b>Database/ resource for mapping/ examples of best practice</b>	<p>To map out clearly existing activities and learn from past experience, as well as good and bad practice.</p> <p>The development of 'rules of engagement' and examples of best practices, as 'how to' for all stakeholders.</p>		Cost neutral for this group = part of national survey if commissioned?
<b>Resources relating to ethics and methods</b>	<p>There are many ethical issues around this change of policies and frameworks that support CBL and CBR work, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• managing expectations on all sides</li> <li>• insurance</li> <li>• child protection policy</li> <li>• Volunteering verses placement</li> <li>• possibility of students getting credits for work they are already involved in inside and outside of curriculum</li> <li>• importance of the use of appropriate language</li> <li>• definition of community</li> <li>• focus to the needs of the community partner and partner models of research</li> </ul>		Shared work with volunteering group?
<b>Training</b>	On-going professional development training for all stakeholders, linked to benchmarking, in the form of modules, or shorter seminars		Role of national co-ordinator, therefore cost neutral for this group?
<b>Creating networking opportunities for those involved in CBR and CBL to meet (conferences, regional meetings, seminars)</b>	Setup of regional networking events. Idea is that these are not prescriptive spaces in terms of outcomes, but could facilitate new networks, exchanges of ideas and recognition of activity. This is one of the most important tasks to be undertaken.	Years 1 and 2	€2,000
<b>Dissemination activities</b>	Use of blogs, Campus Engage website, and social media to find ways to disseminate CBR/CBL activities in Ireland + possibly a database of key units / initiatives / people in CBR/CBL in each institution. In particular, the creative use of media or “hooks” such be considered for dissemination activities	Years 1 and 2	€2,000
<b>Fund research on CBR/CBL</b>	Provide funding calls for CBR / CBL activities to help raise the profile of this area of activity. Those working on this area could seek to lobby the Irish Research Council (IRC) to consider civic engagement type ‘outputs’ in their evaluation of funding calls.	Years 1 and 2	Year 1: 4 x €1,000 Year 2: 4 x €1,000  <i>Total: €8,000</i>

**Budget Summary:**

Thematic Area 1: HEI Policy, Development and Lobbying	€14,800
Thematic Area 2: Resources and Materials Production	€16,000
Co-ordinating panel's travel and meetings costs	€1,000

**Total**    €31,800

**The following participants indicated their interest in being considered for a working group**

Name	Email	Institution
1. Catherine O'Mahony (CBR)	<a href="mailto:catherine.omahony@ucc.ie">catherine.omahony@ucc.ie</a>	CARL / UCC
2. Kenneth Burns (CBR)	<a href="mailto:k.burns@ucc.ie">k.burns@ucc.ie</a>	CARL / UCC
3. Mary Doyle (CBR)	<a href="mailto:mary-dile@hotmail.com">mary-dile@hotmail.com</a>	Irish Foster Care Association (Waterford)
4. Betty Smith (CBR)	<a href="mailto:bettysmith.cork@gmail.com">bettysmith.cork@gmail.com</a>	Bandon Network of Social Groups
5. Carol Byrnes (CBR)	<a href="mailto:merrychristmascarol@gmail.com">merrychristmascarol@gmail.com</a>	Former CBR research student @ CARL
6. Elaine Dennehy (CBR)	<a href="mailto:Elaine.Dennehy@cit.ie">Elaine.Dennehy@cit.ie</a>	Cork Institute of Technology
7. Helena Johnson (CBL)	<a href="mailto:JOHNSONH@itcarlow.ie">JOHNSONH@itcarlow.ie</a>	Institute of Technology Carlow
8. Marian Elders (CBL)	<a href="mailto:M.Elders@ucc.ie">M.Elders@ucc.ie</a>	University College Cork
9. Sinead O'Neill (CBL)	<a href="mailto:Sinead.ONeill@cit.ie">Sinead.ONeill@cit.ie</a>	Cork Institute of Technology
10. Edel Randles (CBR/CBL)	<a href="mailto:edel.randles@staff.ittralee.ie">edel.randles@staff.ittralee.ie</a>	Institute of Technology Tralee
11. Kathy Reilly	<a href="mailto:Kathy.reilly@nuigalway.ie">Kathy.reilly@nuigalway.ie</a>	NUI Galway
12. Maura Farrell	<a href="mailto:Maura.farrell@nuigalway.ie">Maura.farrell@nuigalway.ie</a>	NUI Galway
13. Mary Dempsey	<a href="mailto:Mary.dempsey@nuigalway.ie">Mary.dempsey@nuigalway.ie</a>	NUI Galway
14. Gemma Carney	<a href="mailto:gemma.carney@nuigalway.ie">gemma.carney@nuigalway.ie</a>	NUI Galway
15. Mary Rogan	<a href="mailto:mary.rogan@dit.ie">mary.rogan@dit.ie</a>	DIT
16. Fintan Maher	(Policy and Resources)	Trocaire
17. Sara Bourke	<a href="mailto:sbourke@aontas.com">sbourke@aontas.com</a>	AONTAS
18. Josephine Boland	<a href="mailto:Josephine.boland@nuigalway.ie">Josephine.boland@nuigalway.ie</a>	NUI Galway
19. Rhona Wynn	<a href="mailto:rhonda.wynne@ucd.ie">rhonda.wynne@ucd.ie</a>	UCD
20. Shelia Sugrue	<a href="mailto:Arrow.admin@dit.ie">Arrow.admin@dit.ie</a>	DIT
21. Ann Reynolds	<a href="mailto:ann.reynolds@dkit.ie">ann.reynolds@dkit.ie</a>	DKIT
22. Ailish McArdle	<a href="mailto:ailish.mcardle@dkit.ie">ailish.mcardle@dkit.ie</a>	DKIT
23. Heike Felzmann	<a href="mailto:Heike.felzmann@nuigalway.ie">Heike.felzmann@nuigalway.ie</a>	NUI Galway

---

<b>24. Aobheann McCann</b>		Galway Rape Crisis Centre
<b>25. Brian O Donnachadha</b>	brian.odonnchadha@nuigalway.ie	NUI Galway
<b>26. Seamus Keady</b>	soceidigh@gmail.com	Moycullen Community
<b>27. Des Mulligan</b>	dmulligan@alzheimer.ie	Alzheimer's Society of Ireland
<b>28. Aoife Ní Laoi</b>		Galway Rape Crisis Centre

---

# Appendices

Summary reports from the Galway, Cork and Dublin meetings.



# Campus Engage Phase 2

## NUI Galway Meeting

### 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013

---



#### Community Based Learning and Community Based/Service Learning Working Group

##### **In attendance:**

Kathy Reilly, NUI Galway; Maura Farrell, NUI Galway; Gemma Carney, NUI Galway, Heike Felzmann-Schmitz, NUI Galway; Aoibheann McCann, Galway Rape Crisis Centre; Brian O Donnachadha, NUI Galway; Seamus Keady, Moycullen Community; Des Mulligan, Alzheimer's Society of Ireland; Lorraine McIlrath, (Facilitator) NUI Galway; Mary Bernard, (Note taker) NUI Galway; Aoife Ní Laoi, Galway Rape Crisis Centre; Roisin McGrogan, TCD.

##### **Welcome and Introductions:**

Everyone introduced him or herself and gave their personal/professional rationale for joining the meeting and/or the working groups.

##### **Presentation:**

Lorraine McIlrath delivered a presentation on the history and future of Campus Engage; new structure and positioning; steering committee and working groups; impact of the Hunt Report and future funding; an overview of CBL and CBR was offered and those in attendance gave a flavour of these modes of civic engagement based on their own experiences of teaching and learning, and research.

##### **Main points raised resulting from the presentation:**

- The recession has had a detrimental consequence for the community sector and research needs are the first to be neglected but Campus Engage can play a role in developing awareness both in the community around research partnership and develop capacity within the university to engage in community partnership.
- The majority of community groups have websites and perhaps Campus Engage could lead HEI's into these sites for information or partnership brokerage purposes.
- To create a dichotomy between CBL and CBR might be false since so many work within and integrate both domains. It was agreed that the two working groups should work closely together to develop materials that can affect both approaches. It was decided at the point to steer away from closely defining CBR and CBL as there is a tendency within the academy to get caught up in definitions (definitional anarchy). The community also raised the point that they would lose momentum if the exploration

of definitions were to become a major aspect of the working groups. It was agreed that an all inclusive but general definition could be crafted and agreed upon.

### **Small Group Discussion**

A decision was reached by all gathered not to split CBL and CBR as it represented a false dichotomy and all decided to address both manifestations in three small working groups. Each small group was made up of four individuals with representation from at least one community partner and up to three academic staff. Lorraine McIlrath and Mary Bernard did not join any group so as to not steer or influence any particular thinking.

Following a 35-minute discussion an appointed Rapporteur reported back on the discussions and the following represents action points or ideas for the working groups to address; (these have been categories under a number of broad themes but there are some overlap and points of similarity):

### **Resources**

- Framework to institutionalise civic engagement– a guide for institutions;
- Benchmarking system/s to address and embed best practice;
- Declaration/manifesto or senior management commitment to endorse and sign off on the centrality of civic/community engagement in Ireland;
- Incentive/s – set of incentives for academic staff to engage with community (travel bursaries, professional development, seed funding, national awards etc.);
- Ethics – ethics underpinning community based research (who owns the research etc.) – Heike Felzmann-Schmitz, NUI Galway interested in working on a two page summary of key points to consider;
- Support for community organisations on how best to support students;
- Addressing the student placement dimension of civic engagement with resources to formalise the process – from interview to formal reflection to tri-partite contract/agreement;
- Establish ground rules or rules of engagement (on the broad area of community partnership) aimed at community, students and academics – what to do, how to do it, what not to do etc.;
- Development of toolkits around responsibilities – what is the responsibility of the community, academic and student;
- Methods for honest brokerage and reflection on the experience;
- Short one-page outlines – what is CBR? What is CBL?

### **Showcasing**

- Forum to showcase what people are actually going – both virtual and physical opportunities;
- Civic Engagement Fair – modelled on the very successful national Science and Technology Fairs – all stakeholders to come together and share the work with the broader public.

### **Website**

- Website – interactive and should work as a showcasing platform, means to share and network;
- Campus Engage website to highlight and link to community group websites;
- Facilitation of cross pollinations between different disciplines, research centres, students etc. maybe in the form of a digital depository of short case studies with contact details or link to ‘experts’ in different areas willing to share knowledge through seminars etc.

### **Training**

- Seminars and training should be offered to HEI staff, leaders, students and community on various aspects;
- Address public engagement for research centres and enabling a culture/strategy of sharing research with the broader community/public;
- Peer to peer support for CBL and CBR facilitators – support/guidance/affirmation and sharing;
- Series of seminars or formal modules/courses on specific issues – supporting students etc.
- Development/Training of professional community university liaison personnel – those on the community side appointed to broker/engage with HEIs (might be just a small components of a wider brief).

### **Wrap Up**

All those gathered felt that many valuable ideas had been generated within a two-hour window as to the next steps to deepen and grow civic engagement activities within higher education in Ireland. All reported that they felt energised from the discussion and willing to commit further to the discussion and potential tasks. While the time did not allow for a definitional steps in terms of actual resources etc. to be developed but all were keen to come together with others colleagues undergoing a similar discussion in Dublin (to be held on the 11<sup>th</sup> April) with a view towards all coming together for a full day and actually working on identified jobs that would emanate from both sets of discussions. All were thanked for coming and sharing their experiences and expertise on CBL and CBR and were promised the minutes of the meeting prior to the Easter break.

### **END**

Lorraine McIlrath and Mary Bernard  
26<sup>th</sup> March 2013

## Appendix 2: UCC meeting.

**Working Group Theme:** Combined Community-based research and community-based learning exploratory meeting

### Present:

<b>Kenneth Burns</b>	Community-Academic Research Links	University College Cork
<b>Anna Kingston</b>	Community-Academic Research Links	University College Cork
<b>Carol Byrnes</b>	Former UCC student and CARL researcher '11/12	
<b>Betty Smith</b>	Bandon Network of Social Groups	Community Partner (CARL)
<b>Mary Doyle</b>	Irish Foster Care Association (Waterford)	Community Partner (CARL)
<b>Edel Randles</b>	Institute of Technology Tralee	Coordinator
<b>Helena Johnson</b>	Head of Learner Support & Student Services	Institute of Technology Carlow
<b>Sinead O'Neill</b>	Mature Student Office	Cork Institute of Technology
<b>Elaine Dennehy</b>	Project Coordinator with the Linked Schools Programme	Cork Institute of Technology (Access Service)
<b>Audrey Grace</b>	Accounting Finance and Information Systems	University College Cork
<b>Cliona O'Carroll</b>	Folklore and Ethnology	University College Cork
<b>Mary O'Driscoll</b>	Folklore and Ethnology	University College Cork
<b>Carol Kelleher</b>	Department of Management and Marketing	University College Cork
<b>Jonathon Hall</b>	Programme in Planning and Sustainable Development	University College Cork
<b>Marian Elders</b>	Adult and Continuing Education	University College Cork
<b>Catherine Forde</b>	Youth and Community Work Degree	University College Cork
<b>Christine Chasaide</b>	Adult and Continuing Education	University College Cork

### Apologies:

<b>Ursula Kilkelly</b>	Professor of Law	University College Cork
<b>Eileen Hogan</b>	Masters in Youth Work, Community Arts and Sports Studies	University College Cork
<b>Ian Pickup</b>	Head of the Student Experience	University College Cork
<b>Mary Cronin</b>	Masters in Public Health	University College Cork
<b>Ray O'Connor</b>	Lecturer, Department of Geography / ISS21 Group on Civil Society	University College Cork
<b>Carol Power</b>	Lecturer, Centre for Co-operative Studies / ISS21 Group on Civil Society	University College Cork
<b>Margaret Finch</b>	Institute of Technology Tralee	Academic
<b>Catherine O'Mahony</b>	Community-Academic Research Links	University College Cork

**Agenda:**

1. Information session on Campus Engage (version 2) working groups and work plans until 2015
2. Networking between individuals and groups involved in CBR/CBL
3. Generate ideas for CBR/CBL working groups
4. Explore CBR/CBL mix in terms of working groups
5. Identify workshop members who might be able to commit to 1 year process and sit on a working group

**The following participants indicated their interest in being considered for a working group** (*subject to numbers, national geographic spread and mix of academic/University/IOT and Community Partners*)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Institution</b>
<b>Catherine O'Mahony (CBR)</b>	<a href="mailto:catherine.omahony@ucc.ie">catherine.omahony@ucc.ie</a>	CARL / UCC
<b>Kenneth Burns (CBR)</b>	<a href="mailto:k.burns@ucc.ie">k.burns@ucc.ie</a>	CARL / UCC
<b>Mary Doyle (CBR)</b>	<a href="mailto:mary-dile@hotmail.com">mary-dile@hotmail.com</a>	Irish Foster Care Association (Waterford)
<b>Betty Smith (CBR)</b>	<a href="mailto:betty-smith.cork@gmail.com">betty-smith.cork@gmail.com</a>	Bandon Network of Social Groups
<b>Carol Byrnes (CBR)</b>	<a href="mailto:merrychristmascarol@gmail.com">merrychristmascarol@gmail.com</a>	Former CBR research student @ CARL
<b>Elaine Dennehy (CBR)</b>	<a href="mailto:Elaine.Dennehy@cit.ie">Elaine.Dennehy@cit.ie</a>	Cork Institute of Technology
<b>Helena Johnson (CBL)</b>	<a href="mailto:JOHNSONH@jtcarrow.ie">JOHNSONH@jtcarrow.ie</a>	Institute of Technology Carlow
<b>Marian Elders (CBL)</b>	<a href="mailto:M.Elders@ucc.ie">M.Elders@ucc.ie</a>	University College Cork
<b>Sinead O'Neill (CBL)</b>	<a href="mailto:Sinead.ONeill@cit.ie">Sinead.ONeill@cit.ie</a>	Cork Institute of Technology
<b>Edel Randles (CBR/CBL)</b>	<a href="mailto:edel.randles@staff.ittralee.ie">edel.randles@staff.ittralee.ie</a>	Institute of Technology Tralee

There are two other UCC staff that would sit on the groups if we needed more people.

### Working Group Identified Tasks:

When the groups were asked to explore tasks, many of them were specific to both CBR and CBL which may suggest that current working group delineations may not be the best way to proceed. These tasks are not in an order of priority.

Task	Description	Timeline	Cost
<b>Mentoring system</b>	Setting up a mentoring system/register of experienced people that HEIs / community partners who wished to establish or develop their CBL or CBR initiatives could draw upon for advice.	Year 1	Travel expenses
<b>Lobbying</b>	Enhanced lobbying of HEA/HEIs for more CBR/CBL/Civic Engagement activities through the networking of individuals / working groups who would lobby and also possibly develop civic engagement lobbying tools. A particular focus of this work would be to find ways to encourage HEIs to create civic engagement offices/officers to promote this work.	Year 1	Travel expenses and meeting costs
<b>Updating of survey of civic engagement activities in HEIs</b>	Create version 2 of previous Campus Engage review of activities and draw together new good practice vignettes of CBR and CBL across Irish HEIs. Use of Campus Engage website and Blog to disseminate this task.	Years 1 and 2	?
<b>Exploration of drivers of civic engagement for staff</b>	Group to work on tools/mechanisms such as greater recognition of civic engagement activities in staff promotion processes, asking HEIs/HEA to formally link Resource Allocation Models to civic engagement activities to drive incentives for staff/Schools/Colleges, revision of staff contracts to include civic engagement, add civic engagement activities to staff induction and performance review meetings, audits of HEI and College/School strategic plans for civic engagement, provision of administrative resources to help develop relationships, meet community partners, etc. etc.		
<b>Developing tools to support CBR/CBL</b>	Development of CBR / CBL practice and pedagogical tools, and civic engagement “guidelines” drawing upon existing work of Irish and International partners (for example, Living Knowledge Tool Kit, CARL, etc.). Use of Campus Engage website and Blog to disseminate this task.	Years 1 and 2	
<b>Creating networking opportunities for those involved in CBR and CBL to meet (conferences, regional meetings, seminars)</b>	Setup of working group to support these spaces. Idea is that these are not prescriptive spaces in terms of outcomes, but could facilitate new networks, exchanges of ideas and recognition of activity. This is one of the most important tasks to be undertaken.	Years 1 and 2	Travel costs, room bookings and catering
<b>Creating stronger links with HEIs and community groups</b>	Exploring ways to draw on best practices and to practically work on developing relationships. Having community partners in the working groups is only the beginning of this. This task is linked to other tasks above. Working groups could look at the issue of establishing one inter-disciplinary/inter-college “front door” in institutions that community partners could recognise and approach to help find suitable courses and student researchers to work with.	Years 1 and 2	
<b>Fund research on CBR/CBL</b>	Provide funding calls for CBR / CBL activities to help raise the profile of this area of activity. Those working on this area could seek to lobby the Irish Research Council (IRC) to consider civic engagement type ‘outputs’ in their evaluation of funding calls.	Years 1 and 2	

---

<b>Dissemination activities</b>	Use of blogs, Campus Engage website, and social media to find ways to disseminate CBR/CBL activities in Ireland + possibly a database of key units / initiatives / people in CBR/CBL in each institution. In particular, the creative use of media or “hooks” such be considered for dissemination activities	Years 1 and 2
---------------------------------	---	---------------

---

**Statement of principles**

The participant members, while they felt that the new Campus Engage process can be helpful, it was felt necessary to restate that the values of civic engagement and the significance of local knowledge and relationships, should be the key touchstones in the planning and implementation work of all activities. Top down performance metrics of the success of these activities may not be suitable.

Also, it was strongly expressed that this work is often slow, labour intensive and focused on relationship building and may not have the traditional outputs Higher Education Institutions ‘recognise’. Campus Engage as a process needs to find ways to value these outlooks in its activities.

**Notes by:** Kenneth Burns, CBR Working Group Co-Convenor, Campus Engage

12<sup>th</sup> April 2013

### Appendix 3: Notes from the Dublin meeting:

## Campus Engage CBL/CBR Working Group Meeting, Dublin, April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013

**Attendees:** Padraig Murphy (DCU), Fintan Maher (Trocaire), Ciaran O’Leary (DIT), Antoinette Fennel (CFIT-NCBI), Ailish McArdle (DKIT), Sinead McCann (DIT), Darach Murphy (DIT Phd Student and men’s group), Mary Rogan (DIT), Deirdre Lawless (DIT), Shelia Sugrue (DIT), Lynda Stopford (Wave Change, Social Entrepreneurs Ireland), Sorcha Mulcahy (UCD), Cora Lambert (All Hallows, DCU), Joanna Ozarowska (DCU), Rhonda Wynee (UCD), Ann Everitte Reynolds (DKIT), Josephine Boland (NUIG), Mary McCarthy (Suas), Sara Bourke (AONTAS)

**Apologies:** Catherine Bates

### **Feedback from break-out group sessions**

Through discussion on the idea of merging, and/or separating CBL and CBR sub working groups, the working group proposed the following as a new configuration as a breakdown for sub working group instead of the CBL and CBR proposed breakdown.

1. **Strategic Policy** driven work; Supporting CBL and CBR work at institutional and national levels; lobbying and advocacy.
2. Development of **practical tools**, and **resources**- Supporting CBL and CBR work on the ground.
3. **Media** – This was proposed as a third group, however it was discussed that this work would be best place, and carried out by the steering group.

### **1. Experiences of CBL and CBR that were shared at the meeting include:**

2. Importance of mapping existing activities, and learn from past experience; good and bad practice.
3. Issue of volunteering verses placement; possibility of students getting credits for work they are already involved inside, and outside of curriculum- careful with intentions of the CBL/CBR- not to over incentivise.
4. Importance of identifying clear learning outcomes for students at the beginning of CBL/CBR projects
5. Definition of community, and definition of industry are important.
6. Importance of the use of appropriate language when researching with communities.
7. Negative experience of CBL and CBR ie; focus on academic/institutional need in these kinds of projects; community being exploited, not getting feedback from the project, the project not matching the real-life needs of the community partner.
8. Successful experience of CBL and CBR: Access to the right people at the right time.
9. Enhancing learning for students
10. Acknowledge the time involved in building relationships with community partners



11. Managing expectations on all sides
12. Empowerment: people from the community organisation should be involved right from the beginning of the process.

**Ideas for the focus of the working group(s) could be;**

1. Changing the focus from academic led, to community led projects- bottom up approach, in that civic engagement needs to be community driven
2. Develop institutional and national frameworks to support CBL/CBR work.
3. Develop a national module on CBL or/and CBR for undergraduate and post-graduate
4. The issue of no community partner representative on steering group was highlighted; particularly in the context of CBL and CBR being community led.

**Practical things that the working group could do;**

1. On-going professional development training for all stakeholders
2. Rules of engagement; Ethics, how to engage in meaningful and ethical way; Ethics, insurance, child protection, policies and frameworks that support CBL and CBR work. (Notion of a Pack that would include all of these things)
3. Examples of best practices of CBL/CBR to be disseminated, and access to 'how to do CBL/CBR' for new staff/community partners.
4. Recognition for engaged scholarship and research; inclusive of new skills set, and training for staff.
5. Funding for different community initiatives is available at national levels- sharing resources on where to look for this funding.
6. The idea of how to be engaged campus was discussed, and how to engage with a range of policy that makes the university open to, and for engagement- not letting the university 'off the hook'.
7. Institutional support for academic staff research with community organisation- (to encourage and develop partnership building) and how this is different from students doing research with communities- this could be a task for one of the working groups. Mindful of pressures that community organisations are under; staff, resources, and funding.
8. Do community partners want to be involved in the assessment process?
9. Exploring funding options.
10. Calls for funding that the group could circulate to all involved in the working group
11. Difference between CBL and CBR is important.
12. Lastly, building capacity in community to carry out their own research