

Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact

We often talk about how KU works for Kansas. Sometimes it is by educating the next generation of leaders or by making discoveries that improve lives. But sometimes it is simply by rolling up our sleeves and stepping forward to work for the communities we all care about.

–Bernadette Gray-Little, Chancellor

Executive Summary

Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact (ESPI) is an emerging concern at major research institutions throughout the United States. Although community service and outreach have long been a part of the culture of the US higher education system (most explicitly codified in the mission statements of land grant and other public institutions), the desire to leverage the academic/scholarly activities of universities to the greater good of communities that they serve has been more explicitly emphasized in recent years.

A formal definition of ESPI includes the essential elements of academically recognized scholarship (which will differ from one discipline to another) and active collaboration with one or more university stakeholders outside of the university. By stipulating this combination, one differentiates ESPI from “community service” (which involves the community but lacks an explicitly scholarly component) or “research” (which may well have profound long-term impact on the community or the world at large but lacks direct involvement with one or more stakeholder groups). A working definition of ESPI was established to guide the efforts of this committee, but it is clear that many individuals continue to be less comfortable with a formal definition than with examples or with a “I know it when I see it” perspective.

The committee charged with assessing ESPI at KU and making recommendations for future efforts in this area included 26 KU faculty, staff, and students. The work of the committee was pursued by (1) formulating a working definition of ESPI, (2) addressing administrative and faculty issues related to ESPI within KU, and (3) seeking the input of community stakeholders to determine their views of the reality and desirability of KU scholarly work with the public. Besides numerous committee meetings of the subgroups and the committee as a whole, information was gathered by conducting focus groups between committee representatives and KU faculty and staff (five meetings) and with community representatives (four meetings, with two being held in Lawrence and two in Kansas City).

A major finding of the committee is that there is a significant amount of ESPI already taking place at the University of Kansas, although not always designated as such. Thus, good work is being done but its impact is not as great as it might be were the results more broadly disseminated. There are numerous positive outcomes of such dissemination, with one important one being that positive examples would almost certainly inspire more KU faculty and staff to incorporate discipline-appropriate aspects of community engagement in their scholarly portfolios. Any increase in ESPI would be facilitated by the removal of barriers that currently exist such as promotion and tenure standards.

The suggestions of the ESPI committee fall into the following broad, overlapping categories:

1. Increase the visibility of engaged scholarship currently being carried out at the University of Kansas.
2. Increase the impact of the University of Kansas on its stakeholders by facilitating and encouraging engaged scholarship.

Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact Definition

The first step of the process was to craft a working definition of ESPI. This was deemed important because, unlike “teaching” or “research”, ESPI is not part of the everyday vocabulary of a typical university faculty member. This was assigned to a Subcommittee on Definition and pursued early in the process because the definition was necessary to inform the work of the other subcommittees. The most effective definition adopted by the subcommittee which follows included elements of a formal definition, a general statement of importance, and finally statements of ESPI goals, characteristics, and outcomes. This was done because it became clear throughout the entire course of the ESPI committee’s work that many individuals (both faculty and public) are either unfamiliar with ESPI or uncomfortable with definitions of it. Some reasons for this are that ESPI is highly discipline-dependent and that it is not a traditionally emphasized element of many academic missions. Accordingly, we have found that it is often more effective to convey the spirit of ESPI by illustrative examples; in particular, public stakeholders felt that these were more useful than “academic” definitions. To address this, and to begin the process of establishing a baseline of active KU ESPI activities, a website was developed and populated with examples of current ESPI projects (Appendix 1).

Despite any reservations as noted, we considered a working definition (below) to be necessary as a start in formalizing future university policies and actions regarding ESPI.

What is Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact?

Community engagement describes the collaboration between the University of Kansas and the larger community (local, regional, state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange, creation, or enhancement of knowledge and resources. Community engagement can integrate teaching, research, and service.

Engaged scholarship for Public Impact is community engagement with the additional result of contributing to the body of knowledge as demonstrated through dissemination and assessment conducted within an acceptable peer-review process.

Why is It Important?

KU strives for engaged scholarship to enhance quality of life, both in those communities with whom we work as well as those beyond our direct involvement.

Engaged scholarship is supported at the highest levels of the university and employs diverse strategies and approaches. It exists on a continuum of varied strength and intensity of the community–university collaboration. It is rigorous in its conceptualization, execution, and its methods of knowledge dissemination, and consistent with the mission and goals of the University.

Exemplars of engaged scholarship include projects that address high-priority societal challenges associated with energy, sustainability, health, education,

economic and workforce development, and the creation of a just and civil society; artistic, critical, and historical work that contributes to public debates; and experiences in the arts and humanities that add to the richness of life in Kansas and beyond.

ESPI Goals, Characteristics, & Outcomes

ESPI Goal: KU will engage local, state, national, and global communities as partners in scholarly activities that have direct public impact.

ESPI Characteristics:

1. Community-engaged scholarship will be recognized and valued as a legitimate form of scholarly activity.
2. Partnerships will include a wide range of activities, e.g., technology commercialization, advances in K-12 education, service learning experiences, entrepreneurship, etc.
3. The university will facilitate and support community-engaged scholarship.
4. Students will participate fully as partners in the success of the enterprise.
5. Scholarly activities will be facilitated by leveraging current and future outreach activities.

ESPI Outcomes:

1. Recognition, facilitation and support of engaged scholarship
2. Mutually productive partnerships with the community for engaged scholarship
3. Learning and scholarship experiences for students
4. Additional scholarship opportunities using existing community engagement activities

Committee Process

The committee charged with assessing ESPI at KU and making recommendations for future efforts in this area included 26 KU faculty, staff, and students. The work of the committee was pursued by (1) formulating a working definition of ESPI (as described above), (2) addressing administrative and faculty issues related to ESPI within KU, and (3) seeking the input of community stakeholders to determine their views of the reality and desirability of KU scholarly work with the public. The committee's work included the following activities:

- Faculty focus groups to determine the level and types of ESPI being carried out at KU and to determine barriers to such work. Five of these focus group meetings were held.
- Focus groups between committee representatives and with community representatives to establish the present perceived role of KU ESPI in the community and to gather opinions about future ESPI involvement. Four meetings were held, two in Lawrence and two in Kansas City.
- The working group members analyzed the results of the focus groups in terms of thematic emphases (compiled in Appendix 2). This process resulted in the recommendations noted below.

Additional issues related to an important element of ESPI – entrepreneurship – were discussed in the context of the overall Strategic Planning Committee and are included here as well. Specifically, the February 2011 meeting of the steering committee focused on potential actions for organization and support infrastructure issues. Following discussion, the committee provided a number of action items related to entrepreneurship that are summarized in the following section.

Recommendations:

Overview. A major finding of the committee is that there is a significant amount of ESPI already taking place at the University of Kansas, although not always designated as such. Thus, good work is being done but its impact is not as great as it might be were the results more broadly disseminated. There are numerous positive outcomes of such dissemination, with one important one being that positive examples would almost certainly inspire more KU faculty and staff to incorporate discipline-appropriate aspects of community engagement in their scholarly portfolios. Any increase in ESPI would be facilitated by the removal of barriers that currently exist. Pragmatically, the committee recognizes the need for active administrative support of these recommendations and proposes that an appropriate entity be charged with pursuing these initiatives. Finally, entrepreneurship is an important aspect of ESPI that received strong support from the overall steering committee of this strategic planning initiative. The group provided a ranked list of specific actions to enhance entrepreneurship at KU.

Accordingly, the suggestions of the ESPI committee fall into the following broad, overlapping categories:

1. Increase the visibility of engaged scholarship currently being carried out at the University of Kansas.
2. Increase the impact of the University of Kansas on its stakeholders by facilitating and encouraging engaged scholarship.
3. Ensure that ESPI is actively promoted and facilitated through appropriate oversight, such as by establishing a Center for Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact.
4. Promote active entrepreneurship that is consistent with the scholarly mission of the University.

The rationale and some background information relating to each of the recommendations and suggestions for pursuing them are provided below. For specific timelines and metrics, see the Strategic Action Templates (Appendices 3–5).

General Recommendation 1: Increase the visibility of engaged scholarship currently being carried out at the University of Kansas.

A clear finding of the committee is that there is already a great deal of high-quality engaged scholarship being pursued at KU but that it is not always identified as such. In general, the work resulting from such efforts is disseminated through publications and other scholarly work. However, many worthy ESPI activities do not receive public recognition, although exceptions exist (e.g., Studio 804). The impact of ongoing ESPI efforts will be greater when they are appropriately acknowledged and publicized because doing so will:

- help clarify what constitutes ESPI by presenting examples,
- raise the positive view of the University among its stakeholder communities (Lawrence, Kansas, and beyond),
- increase KU's national reputation insofar as ESPI represents an increasingly accepted role of university-based research and scholarship,
- provide greater visibility for KU scholars,
- positively encourage other members of the KU community to consider adding an ESPI component to their work, and
- allow interested members of KU's stakeholder communities to contact and engage KU scholars in projects of mutual interest.

These benefits will be maximized if the university's efforts to disseminate ESPI activities:

- emphasize community involvement in given projects as appropriate,
- emphasize ESPI activities characterized by highly meritorious scholarship,
- broadly represent the range of disciplines that participate in ESPI,
- strictly avoid "ivory tower" overtones by emphasizing KU/community partnerships and adopting a positive tone of inviting community engagement,
- provide as much factual information about university capabilities and opportunities for engagement (and, conversely, be candid about capabilities that do not exist at the university)
- avoid value comparisons between ESPI and more traditional research and scholarship (i.e., there is good and bad ESPI just as there is good and bad traditional scholarship).

The committee recommends the following specific steps to accomplish these goals. We point out here that none of this will take place without tasking and empowering particular individuals/units with the necessary work, thus leading to the key recommendation below for the empowerment of a permanent office or administrator to be responsible for ESPI issues. We also recognize that these are at this point suggestions for some of the approaches that might be taken and that they might well be modified as the broad recommendations made are implemented in the future.

1. **Broadly solicit and otherwise identify examples of ESPI from the KU community.**

The committee has already begun this work in the context of the present Strategic Planning Initiative, but a long-term, sustained effort will be essential to permit the quantitative assessment of ESPI at KU by establishing a central database of relevant activity. This work should take place in two phases:

- *Establishment of baseline for current ESPI.* This will constitute benchmarking for allowing the assessment of changes in ESPI activity level in the future.
- *Ongoing identification of ESPI activities.* Once a baseline is established, positive steps should be taken to ensure that it is kept up to date by adding emerging projects in ESPI and by archiving completed ones.

2. **Establish a web portal/clearinghouse for communication of ESPI activities and opportunities within KU to its stakeholders.** Many community focus group participants remarked that they either did not know about ongoing ESPI activities at KU or that they would not know whom to contact if they had a prospective ESPI project in mind. Both problems would be addressed by the establishment of a vibrant and dynamic web presence for ESPI that would have the following characteristics:

- *Accessibility and simplicity.* Placing a prominent link on the university's home page would both send the positive message that ESPI is valued as well as provide an invitation for interested stakeholders to explore more deeply.
 - *Attractiveness.* Once a person has entered the portal, he or she should be presented with great examples of current ESPI presented in a compelling and accessible way. The specific examples should be regularly rotated.
 - *Utility and responsiveness.* Once inside, interested parties should be able to readily identify contact points for current ESPI activities and easily access a real person who would be able to answer questions or appropriately direct inquiries. Every effort should be made to establish a welcoming tone and to provide appropriate response, even if the appropriate expertise does not exist at KU – we create lasting impressions through how we respond.
 - *Currency.* The portal should be actively curated and updated.
3. **Proactively disseminate stories about KU ESPI in public media.** This already happens through individual efforts but should be actively continued with a particular emphasis on the entire state of Kansas.

General Recommendation 2: Increase the impact of the University of Kansas on its stakeholders by facilitating and encouraging engaged scholarship.

The principles and parameters that the committee has considered in making this recommendation are:

- The first step in maximizing impact of ESPI at KU is to ensure that currently active and successful projects receive appropriate support from the KU administration as well as the appropriate academic units.
- It is understood that ESPI is not necessarily appropriate for all academic disciplines and may take different forms in different fields. Accordingly, the appropriateness of ESPI for a given department or unit should be determined by each unit under existing mechanisms for determining reward criteria.
- It is additionally important to consider the material/financial support available to individuals who engage in these projects as well as possible barriers that exist.
- The most impactful ESPI will be that which attains high standards of scholarly rigor along with real community involvement.
- Growing ESPI at KU would also increase its overall impact on the university and its stakeholders, but only insofar as a high level of quality is maintained.

The specific recommendations of the committee are:

1. **Determine the level of commitment of the University to ESPI.** Structural and administrative changes stand to enhance the level of ESPI at KU but not without a clear and well-rationalized message from university leaders of its importance and desirability.
2. **Comprehensive university review to establish discipline-specific guidelines for ESPI in promotion, tenure, and merit evaluation.** The single most commonly cited barrier keeping faculty from participating in ESPI is concern about how such scholarship will be regarded in critical aspects of individual faculty or staff evaluation. An important way of addressing these concerns will be to establish explicit guidelines for how ESPI will be counted in P&T and other faculty/staff evaluations. Given that these assessments will

greatly depend on the contexts of discipline and units, we recommend that each relevant department and school be asked to consider (1) what sorts of ESPI are viewed as appropriate for a given discipline, (2) what attributes would be viewed as contributing to high-quality ESPI in that discipline, and (3) what parameters would be used to evaluate ESPI in that discipline. To ensure clear communication and fair evaluation, each document should be reviewed and approved according to accepted means for establishing P&T criteria in the University, including all academic levels and with consultation with Faculty Governance.

3. **Consider public recognition for exemplary ESPI efforts in the form of awards.** Awards provide a public way of communicating that the University values specific activities or achievements. For ESPI, this could be accomplished in the context of existing award structures (i.e., the Higuchi or the University Scholarly Achievement Awards) or perhaps by establishing an ESPI-specific honor.

General recommendation 3: Ensure that ESPI is actively promoted and facilitated through appropriate administrative oversight, such as by establishing a Center for Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact.

The specific recommendations of the committee are:

1. **Establish an explicit support structure for KU Engaged Scholarship.** The enhancement of ESPI will require a positive and continuous effort on the part of the University. Depending on the desired level of ESPI activity by KU leadership, this will minimally require one administrative officer for whom tracking and facilitating ESPI is an explicit part of her or his job description. In the event that a more expansive ESPI investment be deemed desirable, a larger administrative presence (such as an ESPI-directed analogue of the Center for Teaching Excellence – see Appendix 5 for such a model) would provide interested faculty and stakeholders with a means of advocating for ESPI. The work of the center could include:
 - Acting as a proponent of ESPI within KU and as a resource for university members seeking to engage in ESPI.
 - Helping to bridge the community and the university by facilitating communication between potential community ESPI partners and appropriate individuals or units within the university.
 - Maintaining a knowledge base of ongoing ESPI within the university.
 - Actively managing the portal and coordinating publicity efforts.

General recommendation 4: Promote active entrepreneurship that is consistent with the scholarly mission of the University.

The following specific recommendations were most highly ranked among those discussed by the steering committee (see Appendix 6 for the detailed list):

1. **Create a culture of intellectual and commercial entrepreneurship across the entire university.** The strong support for this item recognizes the growing acceptance of entrepreneurship as a vital and valued aspect in many scholarly disciplines. Similar to ESPI in general, the establishment of university-wide culture of entrepreneurship will

require consistent messaging from the high levels of university administration and grassroots support by KU scholars.

2. **Enable an interdisciplinary community of engaged entrepreneurs to vet and facilitate ideas and projects related to strategic initiatives.** In many cases, barriers to KU scholarly entrepreneurship arise not from a lack of interest or motivation but from not knowing how to begin such projects and bring them to successful conclusions. One way of overcoming this barrier is to enlist the expertise of accomplished entrepreneurs, both within the University and from appropriate sectors of the community.
3. **Partner with other outside interests to host an innovation fair for students to solve problems, work with partners, and market and publicize those projects to generate student resources.** Although this action item is primarily related to education, it is worth recalling the mutual symbiosis between good teaching and good scholarship. An innovation fair would provide an excellent venue for the promotion and recognition of entrepreneurship at KU.
4. **Minimize obstacles to entrepreneurship, such as conflict of interest regulations and making it easier to get patents.** Like other types of ESPI, entrepreneurship faces challenges in the faculty/staff reward systems. In addition, specific significant barriers to entrepreneurship include the difficulty of managing appropriate relationships with collaborators outside the university as well as the financial and legal issues encountered in protecting intellectual property. It is possible to pursue these aims while respecting traditional academic values, academic freedom, and the educational mission of the university (in particular graduate education), but these are difficult issues that will require substantial university support. Specific actions that have occurred or can be contemplated include the reorganization of the KU Center for Technology Commercialization, Inc., (KUCTC), hiring of a director of innovation and entrepreneurship (Julie Goonewardene, who was recruited from Purdue University), and development of programs to remove barriers for faculty, staff, and students to commercialize ideas

Appendices

1. Examples of ESPI collected on the ESPI website as of March 14, 2011.
2. Summary of focus group themes.
3. Strategic Action Template: Communication
4. Strategic Action Template: Institutional Policies
5. Strategic Action Template: Administrative Structure

Appendix 1

The ESPI work group gathered examples of work by KU researchers who are involved in engaged scholarship. These could be completed or ongoing projects that are consistent with the work group's goal: "KU will engage in local, state, national, and global communities as partners in scholarly activities that have direct public impact". Included below are some examples of engaged scholarship.

SPARK Project – Yo Jackson

Yo Jackson, associate professor of clinical child psychology, directs the NIH-funded SPARK project (Studying Pathways to Adjustment and Resilience in Kids), which examines how youth exposed to child abuse recover and develop positive behavior. KU students work with foster families and local and state agencies to learn about the effects of abuse and what works in the lives of youth in foster care.

NTrainer System - Steve Barlow

Steve Barlow, professor of speech-language-hearing sciences and disorders, studies at-risk premature newborns, who often have difficulty learning how to feed. One result, the NTrainer System technology, enables premature infants to feed naturally before discharge from the neonatal intensive care unit. It is currently being commercialized locally by KC BioMedix of Shawnee.

Impact of the Meatpacking Industry and Immigration - Don Stull

Originally funded by the Ford Foundation, for the past 25 years professor of anthropology Don Stull has studied the impact of the meatpacking industry and immigration. In 2001, he was presented with the key to Garden City and made an honorary citizen in recognition of the value of his work to that community. A new edition of his book Slaughterhouse Blues is forthcoming.

Youth Development in Wyandotte County - Jomella Watson-Thompson

Jomella Watson-Thompson, Assistant Professor of Applied Behavioral Science, has collaborated with Communities in Schools (CIS) of KCK/Wyandotte County to assess and implement strategies to improve social and educational outcomes for youth in Wyandotte County. Dr. Thompson and colleagues at the KU Work Group for Community Health and Development (<http://communityhealth.ku.edu/>) have provided training and technical support to CIS staff and faith-based partners to enhance their capacity. Through this partnership a community assessment and strategic plan was developed to guide community efforts in addressing youth violence and to support youth development in the community. CIS staff co-presented at the conference for

Division 27 of the American Psychological Association, and is co-authoring a manuscript to submit to an academic journal. Also, since 2008, over 250 hours of service-learning with CIS have been supported by undergraduate students to provide applied experience in supporting community health and development projects.

School Superintendents - Rick Ginsberg and Karen Multon

Rick Ginsberg and Karen Multon of the School of Education have been working with school superintendents and principals on issues arising from current economic stresses. The down economy has forced leaders in all education settings to grapple with fewer resources while demands for accountability and performance rise. They have met with principals and superintendents to find out how this was affecting their work and the solutions they came up with. Ginsberg and Multon were also pushed to try to learn how leading in such an atmosphere impacts those in positions of authority, with the goal of identifying ways for leaders to better deal with the difficult emotional strain of leading in difficult budget times. Through surveys and interviews they discovered ways that this “new normal” is affecting leaders in the workplace, and strategies they can use to better cope with the demands they face.

Improvements in P-20 education/Scientific Labor Markets - Donna Ginther

Donna Ginther, professor of economics, has been work with the Kansas City Area Education Research Consortium (KC-AERC): KC-AERC is a partnership between four research universities (the University of Kansas, Kansas State University, the University of Missouri Kansas City, and the University of Missouri Columbia) and 32 school districts in metropolitan Kansas City. The shared goal is to improve P-20 education for all students in the Kansas City metropolitan area by providing powerful tools for data-driven educational policy research, evaluation, and implementation. They are currently engaged in four research projects:

1. the transition from high school to postsecondary education;
2. how algebra is taught in school districts;
3. teacher labor markets; and
4. estimates of school district value-added models.

Ginther’s second project is on diversity in scientific labor markets--her research examines gender and race differences in academic careers in biomedicine. She finds that women leave academic biomedical careers after the postdoc. In addition, under-represented minorities are less likely to graduate from high school and college. Once they have doctorates in biomedicine, they are more likely to receive tenure. She presented this research to the National Academies of Science and testified before Congress on 'Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Science Act of 2008.'

Feedback on Workplace Issues - Leisha Dehart Davis

Leisha Dehart Davis, associate professor of public administration, conducts research in partnership with local governments to conduct employee workplace studies. These partnerships seek three purposes. The first is to provide local government executives with employee feedback on a wide range of workplace issues: bureaucratic rules, organization diversity, proposed city policies, to name just a few. The second purpose is to generate data for scholarly publications and dissertations. The third purpose is to provide undergraduate and graduate students with exposure to research and public organization issues.

As Davis' partners in the research, local government executives identify research topics of interest, weigh in on research design, and support study implementation. In return, Davis presents research results at little to no cost, a bonus in touch economic times for local governments. She has conducted research in seven local government organizations so far and may pick up an eighth this summer. This research thus far has yielded seven journal articles, two dissertation topics, two undergraduate research symposium presentations, and a book in progress.

Kansas Workforce Initiative/Generations Project/Safe and Stable Families - Alice Lieberman

The Kansas Workforce Initiative is led by Alice Lieberman, professor of social welfare. Researchers work with all the private contract child welfare agencies in Kansas. Their role is to assess the organizational climate in each agency, and to develop evidence-based strategies, tailored for each individual agency, that increase recruitment and retention of the best child welfare practitioners (social workers).

Lieberman is working on a second project called The Generations Project. This project, which will soon be up and running, provides education and training to grandparents and adolescent new or expectant parents. They have employed an experimental design to determine the impact of an enhanced Healthy Families model against the traditional model.

Lastly, Lieberman and her colleagues employed an experimental design in their Safe and Stable Families Project, whose target population were parents within 18 months of post-adoption of a child or sibling group. Two models of marital and parenting education were tested. Over the last five years, they have served over 300 families, trained many trainers (ensuring sustainability post-grant period), and will continue to follow up with these parents.

The Tax and Business Climate in Kansas - Raquel Alexander

Raquel Alexander, a tax expert in the School of Business has recently completed a study commissioned by the State of Kansas on the tax and business climate in Kansas and six other states in the region. Her work, which she will present to the Kansas Legislature this spring, will inform law makers about the areas in which the Kansas tax code could be updated to reflect modern business practices and increase fairness in tax code. Her findings have important implications for economic development in the state.

German Settlement Dialects of Kansas - William Keel, Chris Johnson and Gabriele Lunte

For over 30 years the researchers have been documenting and analyzing the German settlement dialects of Kansas. In addition to numerous essays, theses and dissertations, they have published *The Volga Germans of West Central Kansas* (2006). The primary interface with scholars and the public is the website on the German Dialects of Kansas, featuring sound files of Mennonite Low German, Volga German, Bukovina German and Pennsylvania German among others.

Center for Promoting Language and Literacy Readiness - Dale Walker, Steve Warren, Kathryn Bigelow and Jane Atwater

The Center for Promoting Language and Literacy Readiness is a collaborative effort between the University of Kansas and three community-based programs in Kansas serving infants and young children with disabilities. Through a collaborative model, parents and service providers learn to use strategies to promote communication and early literacy.

Classroom Behavior and Asset Scale - Steven W. Lee and Julia Shaftel

Student behavior has a huge impact on learning and academic achievement. Positive behavior and social skills lead to better academic growth, not only for the individual student but for those around her as well. Conversely, disruptive and negative behavior impairs academic progress for the student and the group. Over the past nine years the researchers have been studying quick and efficient ways of assessing behavior problems and assets of students at the classroom level. The instrument, the Classroom Behavior and Asset Scale (CBAS), has been carefully developed and studied with large groups of teachers and students in Kansas.

Appendix 2

Internal Focus Group Outcomes

Ranked by most frequently mentioned to least frequently mentioned. Frequencies of statements made at internal focus groups are reported in black (n). Frequencies of statements made at external focus groups are reported in red (n).

Publicity

- Current examples of engaged scholarship are relatively unknown internally and externally (17) (6)
 - Perception that KU isn't "in the public" as much as KSU (3) (2)
 - No support for faculty to showcase their work (2)

Feedback on the engaged scholarship definition

- The community needs to be involved in the process at the outset of the research (this idea is not explicit in the definition) (20) (5)
 - Collaboration is an important component of the definition (5) (4)
 - Defining communities might be problematic – what aren't appropriate communities (1)
 - Community should be outside of academe (1)
 - KU is not flexible – it is KU's way or not at all (2)
- Everything does not have to be considered engaged scholarship (11) (1)
- Useful to see engaged scholarship displayed on a continuum (7)
 - What isn't engaged scholarship? (3)
 - Explicit examples to differentiate between "engaged scholarship" and "engaged scholarship for public impact" (4) (1)
 - "Engaged scholarship for public impact" does not exist anywhere other than the title
- Is the definition written with a specific end result in mind? (7)
- Engaged scholarship has an implied short-term timeframe (6)
- Is a definition even necessary? (4)
 - Every research project should have an engaged scholarship component (1)
- Term "mutual benefit" is ambiguous – which party defines the benefit (3)
- Can the definition be used to measure engaged scholarship (3)
- Engaged scholarship could be the application of findings of traditional research (i.e. community not involved at the outset) (3)
 - How can we determine if KU should do more or less (1)
- Engaged scholarship does not have to be something "new" (2)

- What if you discover an application to a community during traditional research (2)
- Peer-review could be problematic
 - What about the publication of a best-selling book based on research (1)

Barriers to engaged scholarship

- Promotion and Tenure Process (22)
 - Foreseeable problems in using engaged scholarship in external reviews (12)
 - Engaged scholarship is a high risk for junior faculty (3)
- Perceived disrespect of “applied” scholarship among peers (15) (1)
- Lack of reward structure/incentive system to support engaged scholarship(11) (2)
- Time – junior faculty don’t have time to engage with the community (10)
- Lack of cross-disciplinary opportunities/faculty are isolated from other faculty (8)
- No funding opportunities/lack of resources (7) (1)
- Potential problems with peer-reviews of engaged scholarship (5)
- Disciplines will approach engaged scholarship differently (5)
- Possible negative relationship with community – community could feel “researched on” not “research with” (4) (1)
- Fear of engaged scholarship being “more important” than traditional scholarship (3)
- KU needs to function like one campus (3) (2)
- Concerns with intellectual property (2)
 - KU Faculty are not known for working in the community - no stimulus for faculty to get out into the community (2)
- Faculty are isolated from communities (2) (1)
- No outlets for “nontraditional” publications (2)
- No incentive for “centers” to participate (1)
- No real examples from other institutions (1)

Appendix 3

Strategic Action Template – ESPI

Note: Cells will automatically expand as needed when text is entered.

Strategic Action: Develop and implement a comprehensive communication plan for engaged scholarship

Why (optional): There is a good amount of engaged scholarship at KU currently and this is likely to increase in the future with the new emphasis on this area. This story needs to be told locally, regionally and nationally.

List of Units Responsible/Involved: University Relations; new Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs; Director of the Center for Engaged Scholarship for Public impact

List of Stakeholders Affected: All faculty, staff and students; alumni and KU constituents; elected officials

Comments of Urgent Issues:

Key Activities and Timeline						
Provide broad summaries of the key activities for this strategic action.						
	Contact	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Activity 1: Disseminate information to faculty on the definition and scope of ESPI	Office of the Provost; Center for ESPI	Send information to faculty requesting information for stories on engaged scholarship	Encourage/request that faculty report ongoing engaged scholarship for use by University Relations.	Feed back to the faculty on the effectiveness of the communication strategy.	Feed back to the faculty on the effectiveness of the communication strategy.	
Activity 2: Develop a strategic communication plan for ESPI projects	University Relations	Identify current relevant work and appropriate media outlets. Begin to release stories.	Identify and release stories to expanded media outlets. Work with faculty on telling their stories.	Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the communication strategy and refine as needed.	Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the communication strategy and refine as needed.	
Activity 3: Measure the impact of	University Relations	Survey faculty for satisfaction	Measure changes in faculty	Continue to monitor faculty satisfaction and	Continue to monitor faculty	

increased communication s on faculty.		with current coverage of engaged scholarship .	satisfaction and awareness of increased coverage of engaged scholarship.	awareness.	satisfaction and awareness.	
Activity 4: Measure the impact of increased communication s on the community.	University Relations	Survey local, state and national audiences for awareness of KU's engaged scholarship .	Measure changes in community awareness of engaged scholarship at KU.	Continue to monitor community awareness.		
Activity 5:						
Activity 6:						

Relevant Outcomes: (could be one or all of the items listed on the [ESPI strategic planning website.](#))

▪ Outcome #1:	Recognition, facilitation and support of engaged scholarship
○ Metric 1-a:	Increase in the number of media reports on engaged scholarship
○ Metric 1-b:	Increase in number of faculty reporting their stories to University Relations
○ Metric 1-c:	Increase in faculty satisfaction with public dissemination of their work
▪ Outcome #2	Mutually productive partnerships with the community for engaged scholarship
○ Metric 1-a:	Increased contacts from community members requesting assistance/partnerships
○ Metric 1-b:	Increased awareness by the community of KU's engaged scholarship
○ Metric 1-c:	
▪ Outcome #3:	
○ Metric 1-a:	
○ Metric 1-b:	
○ Metric 1-c:	

Appendix 4

Strategic Action Template – ESPI

Note: Cells will automatically expand as needed when text is entered.

Strategic Action: Review promotion, tenure and merit criteria for equitable evaluation of engaged scholarship

Why (optional): The results of faculty focus groups made it clear that many academic units do not equally value engaged and traditional scholarship even if both are of high quality. Reports suggest that in some units, engaged scholarship is even discouraged and de-valued. The goal of increasing engaged scholarship will not be met unless reward structures are put in place.

List of Units Responsible/Involved: Deans and Department Chairs, Faculty Governance, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Support, Provost Office

List of Stakeholders Affected: All faculty; deans ; department chairs; faculty governance; promotion, tenure and merit committees

Comments of Urgent Issues:

Key Activities and Timeline						
Provide broad summaries of the key activities for this strategic action.						
	Contact	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Activity 1: The definition of ESPI needs to be operationalized	Office of the Provost in consultation with select deans and faculty	Finalize the operational definition and disseminate to campus	Based on the definition, develop an ESPI-specific research award			
Activity 2: The Provost requests a review, and where appropriate, revision of P&T and merit criteria at the departmental and school	Office of the Provost	The Provost Office reviews and approves any changes to P&T and merit criteria. Those not approved will be returned to	Use new criteria in P&T and merit decisions in all units and levels of review (e.g. UCPT)	Monitor the use of the new criteria at all units and levels of review	Review the effectiveness of changes in P&T, merit criteria in increasing the number of ESPI	

levels		units.			projects	
Activity 3: The Provost requests a review of P&T and merit criteria from Faculty Governance	Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Committee (SPPT)	Review policies and procedures of the P&T and merit of units.	Monitor compliance with the changes in P&T, merit policies and procedures re: ESPI			
Activity 4: Measure and analyze changes in the amount of EPSI activity on campus	Director, Center for Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact	Develop and pilot a system to establish a baseline measure of EPSI for benchmarking	Implement baseline/benchmarking system	Measure increases/decreases in EPSI projects	Measure increases/decreases in EPSI projects	
Activity 5:						
Activity 6:						

Relevant Outcomes: (could be one or all of the items listed on the [ESPI strategic planning website.](#))

▪ Outcome #1:	Recognition, facilitation and support of engaged scholarship
○ Metric 1-a:	Number of units that add engaged scholarship to P&T, merit criteria
○ Metric 1-b:	Number of engaged scholarship projects and publications reported in baseline/benchmarking system
○ Metric 1-c:	
▪ Outcome #2	
○ Metric 1-a:	
○ Metric 1-b:	
○ Metric 1-c:	
▪ Outcome #3:	
○ Metric 1-a:	
○ Metric 1-b:	
○ Metric 1-c:	

Appendix 5

Strategic Action Template – ESPI

Note: Cells will automatically expand as needed when text is entered.

Strategic Action: Establish a Center for Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact

Why (optional): A cultural change at KU is needed to emphasize the importance of engaged scholarship. A Center modeled on the Center for Teaching Excellence is needed to support faculty, staff and students in all aspects of engaged learning and to serve as a clearinghouse for faculty/community partnerships.

List of Units Responsible/Involved: Office of the Provost

List of Stakeholders Affected: All faculty, staff and students. Community partners.

Comments of Urgent Issues:

Key Activities and Timeline						
Provide broad summaries of the key activities for this strategic action.						
	Contact	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Activity 1: Initial planning for the CESPI.	Office of the Provost	Investigate models at other universities. Specify the mission of CESPI.				
Activity 2: Establish the CESPI	Office of the Provost	Identify space and resources. Appoint an acting director.	Hire a permanent director and staff.	Grow CESPI if appropriate based on effectiveness.		
Activity 3: Implement a Clearinghouse for university/community partnerships	CEPSI	Acting director begins building community contacts.	A user-friendly portal system for community members to engage with faculty goes live.	Outreach programs to communities across the state to identify community needs for engaged scholarship.	Monitor community satisfaction with ongoing projects and generate additional projects as needed.	

Activity 4: Develop programs for faculty, staff and students to support engaged scholarship	CEPSI	Use survey of current ESPI projects to identify faculty leaders to serve as advisors for program development	Develop and implement a series of workshops for faculty, staff and students on ESPI projects.	Identify external resources to support engaged scholarship; assist faculty in application process.	Develop workshops, etc. as needed.	
Activity 5: Develop and implement a reporting system to						
Activity 6: Measure and analyze changes in the amount of ESPI activity on campus	Director, Center for Engaged Scholarship for Public Impact	Develop and pilot a system to establish a baseline measure of ESPI for benchmarking	Implement baseline/benchmarking system	Measure increases/decreases in ESPI projects	Measure increases/decreases in ESPI projects	

Relevant Outcomes: (could be one or all of the items listed on the [ESPI strategic planning website.](#))

▪ Outcome #1:	Recognition, facilitation and support of engaged scholarship
○ Metric 1-a:	The CESPI is established and staffed.
○ Metric 1-b:	Increase in workshops and other forms of support
○ Metric 1-c:	Increase in faculty, staff, students involved with ESPI
▪ Outcome #2	Mutually productive partnerships with the community for engaged scholarship
○ Metric 1-a:	Increased community contacts via clearinghouse/portal
○ Metric 1-b:	Increase in number of projects with communities
○ Metric 1-c:	Increase in new communities engaged
▪ Outcome #3:	Learning and scholarship experiences for students.
○ Metric 1-a:	Increase in number of students seeking CESPI support
○ Metric 1-b:	Increase in number of students involved in ESPI projects
○ Metric 1-c:	
Outcome #4:	Additional scholarship opportunities using existing community engagement activities
○ Metric 1-a:	Increase in number of service projects converted to research projects
○ Metric 1-b:	
○ Metric 1-c:	

Appendix 6

The following is a list of action items discussed and voted upon at the February 22, 2011 meeting of the overall Strategic Planning Steering Committee. The topic of this meeting was “Resources”.

Ranked Potential Actions for Organizational and Support Infrastructure Issues			
Total Points	Avg Points Allotted	% of Ppl Voting for Action	Action Item
114	4.07	71.4%	Create a culture of intellectual and commercial entrepreneurship across the entire university.
93	3.32	46.4%	Enable an interdisciplinary community of engaged entrepreneurs to vet and facilitate ideas and to strategic initiatives.
82	2.93	46.4%	Partner with other outside interests to host an innovation fair for students to solve problems and market and publicize those projects to generate student resources.
66	2.36	46.4%	Minimize obstacles to entrepreneurship, such as conflict of interest regulations and making it hard to get patents.
48	1.71	28.6%	Create 14 week semester to free up faculty time and leverage intellectual capital.
37	1.32	28.6%	Be more risk taking and form a think tank of innovative thought leaders.
35	1.25	25.0%	Create a portal between campus and industry.
37	1.32	25.0%	Create a curriculum requirement that forces students to think like entrepreneurs.
28	1.00	21.4%	Survey existing entrepreneurial examples across the state and make sure that KU is at the table.
8	0.29	7.1%	Host a symposium and becoming the national leader on strategic planning.

of completed surveys

28