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Goals

Share Motivations

- Why this work?

Establish distinctions between terms, constructs, and concepts

- Reciprocity & Mutual Benefit
- Community Engagement & Public Service

Introduce Collaboratory as a new dataset

- What it collects, what it is/is not
- Model the “reciprocity scale” using collective data from UNCG and IUPUI

Dream of the potential - how can we play with data to answer long-standing questions?

- New research questions
- Introducing different methodologies
Strategic Leadership to Support Scholarly Community Engagement

Move from individual to collective agendas and commitments with communities

Connect and Convene

Tracking and Measuring
The Peril of Conflated Terms

Many terms, many meanings

- 14 terms used by applicants for Carnegie’s elective CE classification (Giles, Ward, Buglione, 2009)

A desire to be precise

- Within an institution, the proliferation of terms can contribute to “scattered” institutional identity and image (Janke & Medlin, 2015)
  - Community engagement as distinct/same as public service/volunteerism
- Diverse terms implies fragmented movement; common articulation advances field (Barker, 2011)

Portraits of Engagement

- What would be lost if we were to remove the institution from its location/world? (J. McGuire, 2012).
- It is not enough to track, measure, support, & report CE activities, but need full portrait
Community Engagement

Per the Carnegie Foundation:

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

We’ve gotten clear about what community engagement is, but what else is there?

As admins, we have to be able to articulate value of Public Service
As researchers, we want to understand when something is CE or not (i.e., PS)
Stakeholders (e.g., students, mentors, CE practitioners) seek greater understanding of CE and PS and their impacts

- may be provided in a uni-directional, often times “expert” or “resource” model in which university resources are extended to serve community individuals, groups, organizations and the public in general
- activities tend to focus on the delivery of expertise, resources, and services to community individuals, groups, organizations, and the public in general
Mutual Benefit

Focuses on **outputs and outcomes**
- partners identify their expectations for what they each get out of the partnership and then negotiate or communicate about those expectations.
- a win-win agreement
- Outcomes – our aims
- Outputs – what we did to support our aimed outcomes
Reciprocity focuses on **Process**

Reciprocity requires a continuous and intentional practice of valuing and drawing on the various forms of knowledge, resources and other assets that each person contributes to the shared activity and outcomes to a degree that the experience is felt by all to be equitable (Janke & Clayton, 2012; Dostilio et al., 2012).

The level and type of involvement will change over time and according to phase, activity, purpose, and members.

Janke, 2013, adapted from Furco, 2009
Tracking

What we need are tools that allow us to ask about these constructs

- Educational mission
- Sorting along a continuum to help with process/outcomes achieved via engagement
- Reasons we track, need to know the level of activity

Collaboratory as a dataset
A Key Characteristic of Reciprocity

- Reciprocity: Partly operationalized through the role(s) that community organization(s) play in engagement and service activities

- For each community organization entered into Collaboratory, the faculty or staff member is asked about the role of that organization in the activity (see image below).

- Articulating an organization’s role provides insights into interactions between community and university stakeholders (process)
Collaboratory as a dataset

Limits on data

- Data self-reported by faculty and staff
  - A proxy delegate (student, admin) often pre-populates data on behalf of faculty and staff, then submits for approval
  - Community organizations not providing data about their role perceptions

- Dataset asks about role of community organization, not role of faculty/staff

- Collaboratory administrators dictate the rollout strategy dependent on institutional resources and needs; data is not (yet) representative

- To date, most activities only include 1 time point. Institutions just now beginning to track how activities change over time (and therefore the evolution of relationships).

- Appropriate methodologies
**Activity**

**Step 1:**
Review the roles that partners may play (handout).

**Step 2:**
For each role, assign a rating for the level of reciprocity:
- 1 = low/thin reciprocity
- 5 = high/thick reciprocity

NORRIS INSERT Poll Everywhere instructions

Janke, 2013, adapted from Furco, 2009
Poll: How reciprocal do you rate “identify areas of need”?

● To respond:
  ○ PollEv.com/kristinnorri653
  ○ OR
  ○ Text KRISTINNORRI to 22333
Discussion + Research Team Reflections

- What types of scenarios came to mind that made it more difficult to assign a rating and why?
- What other type of information would you need in order to assign a rating?
- Do any of the roles not operationalize reciprocity? If so, which ones?
Assessing Reciprocity

Ranking org roles

- Independently ranked by presenters from 1 (low reciprocity) to 5 (high reciprocity)
- Presenters discussed rankings that were more than 1 point apart, revised responses, and then averaged scores

- 1–5 Scale:
  - Low Reciprocity 1.0 – 1.9
  - Medium Reciprocity 2.0 – 3.9
  - High Reciprocity 4.0 – 5.0

- Dependent on context and framing
- Continues to evolve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reciprocity Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide information materials</td>
<td>1 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote event to target populations</td>
<td>1.25 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to target populations</td>
<td>1.25 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate costs and logistics</td>
<td>1.5 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to data</td>
<td>1.5 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the event or activity</td>
<td>1.75 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide volunteer site or space</td>
<td>1.75 Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify areas of need</td>
<td>2 Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funds for the activity</td>
<td>2.25 Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss how to work together</td>
<td>2.5 Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise the activity</td>
<td>2.8 Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in raising funds for the activity</td>
<td>2.75 Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students</td>
<td>3 Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify expected measures, benefits, or outcomes</td>
<td>4.5 High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals</td>
<td>4.5 High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate or provide feedback on students’ work</td>
<td>4.5 High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure the impact of the activity on the community</td>
<td>4.5 High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate or provide feedback on the process or relationship of the partners</td>
<td>4.75 High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-educate students</td>
<td>5 High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-investigator</td>
<td>5 High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “Reciprocity Cone”

By analyzing all the roles partners play in a single activity, we suggest that a level of reciprocity can be assigned to an activity.

**Key Questions:**
- How many “high reciprocity” it must include at least 3 roles that were identified as having “high reciprocity”
- For an activity to have “medium reciprocity,” it must include at least 2 roles that were identified as having “high reciprocity”
- For an activity to have “low reciprocity,” it must include at least 1 role that was identified as having “high reciprocity”
Exploring Our Questions Using The Data
Methodology

- *Q: “What is the organization's role in planning, designing, implementing, or evaluating this Activity?”*

- Published activities from UNCG and IUPUI data
- Both community engagement and public service
- “check all that apply” and for each partner identified in an activity (there are often multiple)
Describing the resulting dataset

- 469 unique activities reported \((594 \text{ prior to cleaning})\)
  - 373 from IUPUI
    - 255 CE | 118 PS
    - 106 T | 155 S
  - 96 from UNCG
    - 86 CE | 10 PS
    - 31 T | 41 S

- 659 unique community organizations
- 3,824 community org roles
## Community Organization Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss how to work together</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify areas of need</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to target populations</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote event to target populations</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-educate students</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide volunteer site or space</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to data</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify expected measures, benefits, or outcomes</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information materials</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate or provide feedback on students’ work</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate or provide feedback on the process or relationship of the partners</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the event or activity</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-investigator</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate costs and logistics</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise the activity</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure the impact of the activity on the community</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funds for the activity</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in raising funds for the activity</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Community Organization Role by Activity Type

- Discuss how to work together: 387
- Identify areas of need: 278
- Provide access to target populations: 273
- Set goals: 194
- Promote event to target populations: 188
- Provide volunteer site or space: 180
- Co-educate students: 170
- Provide access to data: 169
- Provide information materials: 154
- Identify expected measures, benefits, or outcomes: 147
- Evaluate or provide feedback on students' work: 123
- Evaluate or provide feedback on the process or relationship of the partners: 116
- Co-investigator: 116
- Manage the event or activity: 104
- Measure the impact of the activity on the community: 87
- Supervise the activity: 81
- Assist in raising funds for the activity: 77
- Provide funds for the activity: 65
- Supervise students: 52
- Negotiate costs and logistics: 69
Results
### Our Thought Experiment

#### Community Organization Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Reciprocity</th>
<th>Medium Reciprocity</th>
<th>High Reciprocity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss how to work together</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify areas of need</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise the activity</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funds for the activity</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in raising funds for the activity</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to target populations</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote event to target populations</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide volunteer site or space</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to data</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information materials</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the event or activity</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate costs and logistics</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-educate students</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify expected measures, benefits, or outcomes</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate or provide feedback on students' work</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate or provide feedback on the process or relationship of the partners</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-investigator</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure the impact of the activity on the community</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Activities with at least 1 highly reciprocal role:
- 75% of IUPUI activities
- 75% of UNCG activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Activities</th>
<th>Highly Reciprocal</th>
<th>Moderately Reciprocal</th>
<th>Minimally Reciprocal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IUPUI</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCG</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Continue inquiry on reciprocity
- Explore mutual benefit as a construct
- Map mutual benefit and reciprocity onto the concepts of community engagement and public service
The Imperative & Promise of “Big(ger)” Data

- Descriptive
  - Frequencies, distributions, crosstabs, etc.

- Machine Learning
  - Semantic Analysis
    - What is (unsupervised), vs. what should be (supervised)
    - (dis)similarity of terms – CE, PS, R, MB, etc.

- Social Network Analysis
  - Bridges, centrality, density, etc.
To cite Collaboratory as a database:

To cite this presentation:
Janke, E., Medlin, K., Norris, K., Shelton, T. (2019, October). Assessing partnerships for mutuality and reciprocity. Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN.
Questions?
Thank You
Evolution

Stage 1 - the past

- Created 2 surveys - faculty/staff self-identify whether they thought their work was CE or PS based on definitions

Stage 2 - the present

- Currently using a series of y/n binary response questions to try to categorize as CE or PS
- Too limiting

Stage 3 - the future

- Can we measure the level of reciprocity and mutual benefit present in an activity, and determine its categorization as CE or PS more implicitly?
- A more continuum-oriented model - acknowledges process and context, allows for interpretation through multiple data points provided