**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
2. Introduce FCR new member: Brandi Cossairt
3. Review minutes from October 10, 2019
4. Presentation on community engaged scholarship – Jen Davison
5. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on transparency in animal research
6. Discussion on salary cap and overages for NIH grants
7. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on promotion of transparency and openness in research
8. Good of the order
9. Adjourn

---

1. **Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. **Introduce FCR new member: Brandi Cossairt**

Marwick, the chair, introduced Professor Brandi Cossairt. She is an Associate Professor in the Chemistry and has funding from The National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Department of Energy (DOE).

3. **Review minutes from October 10, 2019**

The minutes from October 10, 2019 were approved as written.

4. **Presentation on community engaged scholarship – Jen Davison**

Jen Davison, Program Director of Urban at UW, shared an overview of Community Engaged Scholarship, a classification from The Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching (Exhibits 1 & 2).

A member asked if there was anything in the application around open source data. Davison responded Carnegie was prescriptive in the methods, but the assessment did not specify around open source data. Another member asked if activities of the Center for Human Rights (e.g. ending capital punishment in the Washington state) would be considered as a community engaged activity. Another member asked if Davison could expand on challenges around decentralization at the University. Davison responded that promotion and tenure criteria varies across units and tracking that down was challenging. She further responded that variation is not bad, and the working team found that the University was engaged in many types of community engaged activities. Davison also commented that the self-assessment illuminated how the University could speak publicly (to the broader Seattle community and WA state legislature) about how faculty and staff are working for the public good.
The chair asked if the Carnegie application could be used to define promotion, tenure and merit criteria for the University. Davison responded that FCR will want to make the definition and criteria more generic. Members noted that the School of Medicine and College of Engineering do not currently have community engaged scholarship criteria for merit; however, there are community engaged activities happening within these units.

Members can send additional questions to Davison. Sara Kover and the chair will review the University’s application and begin to think about general merit criteria.

5. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on transparency in animal research

The chair shared a draft Class C resolution on transparency in animal research. The members discussed the draft and offered additions and edits. Lidstrom also requested that the council notify the Office of Animal Welfare before publicizing. Another member recommended that the council consult the Office of Animal Welfare for faculty participation on the “faculty led committee” described in the resolution. Members also wanted an update from the AAALAC report. Lidstrom responded that the University received the report and the findings were very supportive/positive regarding animal welfare.

The chair will revise the document based on the members’ comments, meet the Office of Animal Welfare, and circulate before the next meeting.

6. Discussion on salary cap and overages for NIH grants

The chair shared initial notes regarding current NIH policy that caps salaries (for degree granting institutions) and requires any overages are charged to the respective submitting unit. Lidstrom noted that there cannot be a central policy due to variation across units; however, there could be a policy at the level of deans.

The chair will revise the document and circulate. Lidstrom will share recommendations with advisory groups and deans.

7. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on promotion of transparency and openness in research

The chair shared a draft Class C resolution on promotion of transparency and openness in research. The members discussed the draft and offered additions and edits.

A member asked the chair to consult with the biomedical research integrity group before publicizing.

The chair will seek additional feedback and revise the document.

8. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.
Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst

Present: Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Ben Marwick (chair), Chuck Frevert, Sara Kover, Brandi Cossairt, Mike Averkiou
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Stewart Tolnay, Larry Pierce
President’s designee: Mary Lidstrom
Guests: Sue Camber, Jen Davison

Absent: Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Michael Rosenfeld, Nicole Gibran, Gillian Marshall, Francis Kim, Donald Chi
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: JoAnn Taricani, Jennifer Muilenburg

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – Carnegie and community engaged scholarship FCR.pptx
Exhibit 2 – Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Executive Summary.pdf
The Carnegie self-assessment and community-engaged scholarship

Jen Davison
Program Director, Urban@UW; Associate Director for Students, Applied Research Consortium
Co-chair, UW-Seattle’s Carnegie Working Group
Road map

• What is “Carnegie”
• UW context
• How does Carnegie **define** community engagement
• How does Carnegie **assess** community-engaged scholarship
• How does Carnegie look at **recognition** of community-engaged scholarship
• UW merit criteria
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

• “aims to build a field around the use of improvement science and networked improvement communities to solve longstanding inequities in educational outcomes.”

• Classifies institutions: e.g., UW as a doctoral institution of very high research activity
The Carnegie Foundation
Elective Community Engagement Classification

• “The elective classification ... is intended to assist in a process of institutional change to improve the educational effectiveness of the campus through the institutionalization of community engagement.
• The classification framework represents best practices in the field and encourages continuous improvement through periodic re-classification.”
Undertaking the assessment at UW

• 2015: most recent classifications came out
• 2015: Community Engagement Steering Committee formed
• 2016-2017: readiness assessment
• Fall 2017 through spring 2019: self-assessment for the classification
  • January 2018: President charged Carnegie Working Group
  • April 2019: self-assessment submitted
Undertaking the assessment at UW

• Complete the self assessment AND make recommendations
• ~3 dozen member working group spanning all roles, all colleges and schools, and most administrative units
• Focus was on the process
• Representative over comprehensive
The Carnegie definition of community engagement drove all analysis

- Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial creation and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

- The purpose of community engagement is the partnership (of knowledge and resources) between colleges and universities and the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

- Community engagement describes activities that are undertaken with community members. In reciprocal partnerships, there are collaborative community-campus definitions of problems, solutions, and measures of success. Community engagement requires processes in which academics recognize, respect, and value the knowledge, perspectives, and resources of community partners and that are designed to serve a public purpose, building the capacity of individuals, groups, and organizations involved to understand and collaboratively address issues of public concern.

- Community engagement is shaped by relationships between those in the institution and those outside the institution that are grounded in the qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes. Such relationships are by their very nature trans-disciplinary (knowledge transcending the disciplines and the college or university) and asset-based (where the strengths, skills, and knowledges of those in the community are validated and legitimized). Community engagement assists campuses in fulfilling their civic purpose through socially useful knowledge creation and dissemination, and through the cultivation of democratic values, skills, and habits -democratic practice.
How does Carnegie define community-engaged scholarship?

- “the partnership (of knowledge and resources) between colleges and universities and the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity”
How does Carnegie **assess** community-engaged scholarship?

- **III.C: Professional Activity and Scholarship (pp 59-62)**
  - Staff scholarly outputs
  - Faculty scholarly outputs on the **pedagogy** of community engagement, the **scholarship** of community engagement, AND/OR community-engaged scholarship

- **III.E.2: Partnerships (pp 81-116)**

- **III.D: How community engagement is addressed through IRB processes and Broader Impacts processes (pp 65-66)**
How does Carnegie assess the recognition (support) of community engagement?

• Most directly: II.G: Faculty and Staff [Support] (pp 25-35)
  • Hiring criteria
  • Professional development support
  • Merit criteria
## II.G.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>tenured tenure track</th>
<th>full-time non-tenure track</th>
<th>part time</th>
<th>professional staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/design stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for student transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility for institutional awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of community engagement in evaluation criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation on campus councils or committees related to community engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, conference, or travel support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1. If Yes to “Other”: Please describe other support or services:
Assessment of merit criteria:

• III.C.4-9 (pp. 28-35)
  • Institutional-scale policies
    • Research
    • Teaching
    • Service
  • Unit-level policies
  • Work in progress
UW merit criteria: (pp. 28-35)

• Institutionally: no

• Across 16 degree-granting Colleges and Schools, as well as UW Libraries:
  • 75%, with a wide variation in language
  • Most aligned with Carnegie definition:
    • School of Social Work
    • School of Nursing
    • Department of Landscape Architecture*

• Work in progress: yes
How does Carnegie assess the recognition (support) of community engagement?

• Also, indirectly:
  • II.A: Institutional Identity and Culture
  • II.C: Institutional Communication
  • II.E: Infrastructure and Finance (including fundraising)
  • II.F: Institutional Tracking, Monitoring and Assessment
    • II.F.4.2: Systematic mechanisms that measure the impacts of community engagement on faculty activities, AND what those impacts are
  • III.D.1: how Diversity and Inclusion efforts relate to community engagement
Questions?

• Recommendations from Carnegie to the CESC
• What CESC is doing next
• Other efforts on campus
In spring 2017 the UW in Seattle committed to apply for the Carnegie Foundation’s 2020 elective Community-Engaged Campus classification. This effort, also undertaken separately by UW Bothell and UW Tacoma, has embraced both the wide-ranging community-engaged work happening across campus and the critical opportunity of a systematic assessment of policies, practices and partnerships to examine and address areas of strength and opportunities for improvement, in support of the UW’s vision to “be the world’s greatest public university, as measured by impact.”

The Carnegie Working Group for the UW in Seattle kicked off in February 2018, charged by President Cauce to:

- Uncover and share activities related to community engagement across campus;
- Advise on assessment, evaluation, and narrative development required by the application;
- Advocate for the self-assessment process within individual units and beyond; and
- Develop strategies and recommendations to build on community engagement on campus.

To leverage the self-assessment process toward achieving these objectives, Working Group members were selected by deans and directors from each of the colleges, schools and primary central units. The Working Group met monthly to gather and assess data, discuss patterns and gaps, and identify areas of excellence and room for growth. In addition, Working Group co-chairs hosted three “community coffees,” inviting community partners to share their perspectives of the benefits and challenges in engaging with the UW in Seattle. Working Group co-chairs also met regularly UW Bothell and UW Tacoma Carnegie self-assessment leaders, to share information and insights on campus-based and institution-wide community engagement. Key learnings from these efforts informed both the assessment and the recommendations. Finally, the Community Engagement Steering Committee (CESC) was re-charged in June 2018 with goals that align with and build on the Carnegie Working Group’s charge. Working Group co-chairs joined CESC conversations and shared progress and insights throughout the 2018-19 academic year.

Given the depth and breadth of community engagement across campus, the Working Group focused on understanding the UW in Seattle’s community engagement through representative, rather than comprehensive, identification of efforts. Even with this focus, over 600 current examples of community engagement (as defined by the Carnegie Foundation) were documented, dozens of which are represented in the assessment. Examples span all units, engage across multiple spatial scales, and involve faculty, staff, students and community partners in a variety of models.
Patterns and examples within this rich, collaborative ecosystem include:

- Partnerships with underserved populations and American Indian/Alaska Native communities, such as the Indigenous Wellness Research Institute that supports the inherent rights of Indigenous peoples to health and wellness as it practices and develops leading-edge community-based participatory research;
- Longstanding and reciprocal research-practice collaborations shaping policy and decision-making on climate, health, income, housing, and more;
- Robust citizen science such as the Coastal Observation and Seabird Survey Team, a place-based, rigorous program advancing science literacy and collective agency in marine resource management from California to the Chukchi Sea;
- Dedicated partnerships to prepare students and to address challenges in the education system, including Unite:Ed, which supports youth, and especially children of color, by expanding their opportunities to learn;
- Community-based design, planning and building, from Livable City Year to other long-standing efforts in Seattle's Chinatown-International District and communities across the globe;
- Community-engaged health research, learning and service, from the Community-Oriented Public Health Practice degree program to the projects fostered by the Population Health Initiative that employ community-driven research to advance the health of people around the world;
- Place-based commitments such as Othello-UW Commons, a learning and collaboration space for faculty, staff, students and community partners that embraces the UW's commitment to learning from and with local communities.

The assessment for the Carnegie Community-Engaged Campus classification made plain the UW in Seattle is a community-engaged institution through its commitments to student success, faculty proactivity, and institutional investment in and accountability to societal challenges. It foregrounded the campus' dedication to equity through engagement, and highlighted areas of growth for the campus, including tracking and assessment as well as faculty and student development pathways.

The Working Group continues through June 2019 as we share the assessment with campus and community partners, provide data to the CESC and other campus entities, and further develop recommendations for the CESC to build on regarding improving meaningful and reciprocal community engagement across the campus. We are inspired by efforts at the UW in Seattle and are excited to have enabled, for the first time, a systemic view of the outcomes, supports and hindrances to such efforts. We look forward to seeing the assessment operationalized to further uphold the UW's vision for equity and impact.