The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy

Volume 4
Issue 3 *Summer 2016*

Article 11

July 2016

Achieving Teaching, Scholarship, and Service through Community Engagement

Carole K. Ivey
Virginia Commonwealth University - USA, civey@vcu.edu

Jodi L. Teitelman
Virginia Commonwealth University - USA, jteitel@vcu.edu

Kelli W. Gary
Virginia Commonwealth University - USA, williamsjonk@vcu.edu

Dianne F. Simons
Virginia Commonwealth University - USA, dfsimons@vcu.edu

Jayne T. Shepherd
Virginia Commonwealth University - USA, jshepherd@vcu.edu

Albert E. Copolillo
Virginia Commonwealth University - USA, aecopoli@vcu.edu

Recommended Citation

Ivey, C. K., Teitelman, J. L., Gary, K. W., Simons, D. F., Shepherd, J. T., & Copolillo, A. E. (2016). Achieving Teaching, Scholarship, and Service through Community Engagement. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy, 4*(3). https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1267

Achieving Teaching, Scholarship, and Service through Community Engagement

Abstract

Occupational therapy faculty currently face enormous challenges in meeting teaching load expectations, while also under pressure to participate in scholarly projects and to make administrative and service contributions. Community engagement projects may provide opportunities for faculty to effectively and efficiently meet the goals in each of these areas while imparting benefits to students and community partners as well. Faculty at the Department of Occupational Therapy (OT) at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) embraced this idea as consistent with the university's mission and strategic plan, and recognized its benefits in assisting faculty to meet workload demands. Four community partnerships reflecting the range and diversity of populations currently involved are highlighted: the Children's Museum of Richmond, Rebuilding Together-Richmond, the William Nelson Bland Literacy Center, and Gateway Homes of Richmond. The developmental process and resulting benefits are described for each of these partnerships, and the paper concludes with lessons learned from these collaborative efforts. From these examples, it appears important to be proactive about developing community partnerships and realistic about the challenges of collaboration, but also to be aware of the role community engagement plays in creatively blending the potentially conflicting demands on faculty time.

Keywords

Community engagement, scholarship, service, teaching

Cover Page Footnote

The Seymour Living Lab training and support was supported by a stipend received from the National Living Laboratory, using funding from the National Science Foundation under Award Number 1113648. The CMoR Learning program and the William Nelson Bland Literacy Center were supported by Community Engagement grants from the Virginia Commonwealth University's Division of Community Engagement.

Credentials Display

Carole K. Ivey, PhD, OTR/L; Jodi L. Teitelman, PhD; Kelli W. Gary, PhD, MPH, OTR/L; Dianne F. Simons, PhD, OTR/L, FAOTA; Jayne T. Shepherd, MS, OTR/L, FAOTA; Albert E. Copolillo, PhD, OTR/L, FAOTA

DOI: 10.15453/2168-6408.1267

Faculty are consistently faced with the challenge of performing three work functions—teaching, scholarship, and service—and performing them at a level of excellence. The 2013-2014 Higher Education Research Institute survey reported that faculty are expected to spend more time teaching than in the past, with greater expectations for teaching excellence and the use of new pedagogical approaches, such as teaching online courses and shifting to learner-centered teaching (Eagan et al., 2014). These expectations are compounded by greater demands for scholarship, which includes increasing publications, grant funding, and data collection. Faculty are also confronted with such responsibilities as clinical practice; student mentorship and academic advising; and engagement in service to the department, school, university, and community (Eagan et al., 2014; Mamiseishvili, 2012). Given these various competing pressures, it is important for faculty members to find ways to balance their energy and the time they dedicate to teaching, scholarship, and service. This balance is especially challenging when faculty face pressures to teach, but scholarship is more highly rewarded than teaching (Eagan et al., 2014).

Differing viewpoints exist about whether these three work functions are complementary or competitive; however, early evidence suggested "research, teaching, and service were separate dimensions of faculty work that competed for faculty members' time and commitment" (Mamiseishvili, 2012, p. 79). Faculty are looking for alternative ways to perform these competing roles and responsibilities while also providing high-quality teaching. Community engagement is one way to meet this challenge because of its focus on and incorporation of knowledge discovery, student learning, and scholarship-driven service (Boyer, 1990; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010; Williams & Sparks, 2011).

Community Engagement

Community engagement is built on the foundation established by Boyer's call for universities to meet the social needs of the community and to extend the meaning of scholarly work (Boyer, 1990). The academic community has responded to this call through efforts to deepen university-community relationships and transform them from of "being in" the community to "being members of" the community (McNall, Reed, Brown, & Allen, 2009; Shannon & Wang, 2010). This is apparent in the current emphasis on community engagement in university mission statements (Aldrich & Marterella, 2014), and aligns with the concept that community engagement is perceived as essential and integral to the purpose of an educational institution.

The Carnegie Foundation, which uses evidence-based documentation of institutional practice for classification, defines community engagement as "the 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" (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, n.d.). Hallmarks of community engagement include responsiveness to the community, respect for community partnership

involvement, accessibility of expertise, full integration of engagement in the academic mission, and interdisciplinary coordination and collaboration (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012). The institutional push for community engagement has fueled new forms of scholarship, such as "engaged scholarship" and the "scholarship of engagement," both of which incorporate teaching, research, and service as integrated scholarship components of community involvement and include higher scholarship through reflection, presentation, and publication (McNall et al., 2009, p. 318). As such, universities accept a broader view of scholarship, which is in line with Boyer's original call.

Many faculty report benefits to community engagement, most notably the ability to integrate teaching, scholarship, and service in one partnership rather than managing the multiple responsibilities separately. Faculty note that community-engaged research, scholarship, and teaching reinvigorates them, sparking new ideas for scholarship and teaching (Curry-Stevens, 2011; Williams & Sparks, 2011). Through community-engaged projects, faculty are often able to expand their research, as their work with community partners frequently leads to new questions and scholarship areas (Williams & Sparks, 2011). Community-engaged work also enhances their teaching pedagogy by building "engaged, responsive and efficacy-enhancing experiences for students" (Curry-Stevens, 2011, p. 21). For example, Curry-Stevens reported how community-engaged work helped in the presentation of case studies from real-life experiences and modeled the work to students, including demonstrating such work-related realities as making mistakes and learning from them. More important, faculty reported direct benefits to their scholarly endeavors, including publication in peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed and invited presentations, book chapters, and policy publication (Schindler, 2014; Williams & Sparks, 2011).

Occupational therapy educators recognize the value of community engagement activities through collaborative programs with Head Start, community mental health, assisted living, homeless shelters, vocational sheltered workshops, and supported education and employment programs, as well as those targeting specific challenges, such as childhood obesity (Kramer et al., 2007; Peck, Furze, Black, Flecky, & Nebel, 2010; Schindler, 2014). Outcomes have been primarily collected on student benefits, such as increasing their comfort level for entering unfamiliar communities; perceived competency in social and cultural influences; and improved knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Kramer et al., 2007; Peck et al., 2010). Community benefits, such as improvements in health behaviors, health consequences, self-efficacy, and social support have been demonstrated (O'Mara-Eves et al., 2015). While there has been limited focus on faculty benefits, Schindler (2014) reported faculty "productively addressed teaching, service and scholarship by embedding this service programme in courses and through documenting outcomes in presentations and publications" (p. 78).

Community Engagement at Virginia Commonwealth University

At Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU), community engagement is specified as one

of three themes in its current strategic plan, Quest for Distinction (VCU, 2015). Therefore, community engagement is fully embedded in VCU's mission and supported through the Division of Community Engagement, which mobilizes university-community partnerships in areas of teaching and learning, outreach, and research. The Division of Community Engagement offers grants to encourage community-engaged research. Because of its strong emphasis on and integration of community engagement, VCU is one of only 54 universities to be designated by the Carnegie Foundation as "Community Engaged" with "Very High Research Activity" (The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d.). Commensurate with its strategic plan, university promotion and tenure guidelines specifically recognize community-engaged activities in each area of scholarship, teaching, and service, and require ratings of *excellent* or *very good* in the areas of scholarship and teaching for promotion.

Following VCU's university-wide mission, the School of Allied Health Professions' Department of Occupational Therapy (OT) also strongly focuses on community engagement. One of the six goals in the Department of OT Strategic Plan is devoted to implementation of coordinated community engagement activities to build ongoing, sustainable collaborations with local, state, national, and international communities. Due to the department's concerted focus on this goal, four OT faculty received community engagement grants from VCU's Division of Community Engagement between 2010 and 2014. Service has been a long-standing tradition in the department. Currently, in each year of enrollment in the OT program, the students engage in over 109 hr of service built into the curriculum, resulting in developmental evaluation reports to parents, the design and production of about 70 adaptive projects for community partners, 19 therapeutic groups or services to area community partners, and one legislative advocacy project. Because of ongoing partnerships with the community and in response to their needs, we have further enhanced and developed these service-learning opportunities into community-engaged activities through the integration of teaching, research, reflection, publishing, and dissemination. Examples representing the breadth and diversity of these partnerships across the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service include work with the Children's Museum of Richmond, Rebuilding Together-Richmond, the William Nelson Bland Literacy Center, and Gateway Homes of Richmond.

Scholarship: Linking Research Practicum with Community Partnerships

In the spring semesters, the Department of OT offers students the opportunity to engage in community-based research as part of their required faculty-directed research practicum. A longstanding feature of the department's curriculum, these practica require a strong level of faculty involvement at every step of the process. The faculty ensure that the students are trained in human subjects' protection and in the administration of any assessments or procedures they are using. Through a contract, the students outline what steps they need to complete prior to the

end of the semester. The faculty meet regularly with the students throughout the semester, ensuring that the students follow institutional review board (IRB) procedures for participant recruitment, data collection, and confidentiality. The faculty also guide the students in their data analyses, coach them for presenting their practicum findings, and encourage them to consider more widespread dissemination of their experiences through publications or presentations. Many of these projects continue each year and are ongoing at the community sites. All four of the projects described below use the research practicum to help collect data while working in real environments (see Appendix A).

Children's Museum of Richmond

The Department of OT began collaborating with the Children's Museum of Richmond (CMoR) in 2012 on two main projects: the Seymour Living Lab and the CMoR Learning project. Both projects intertwine the OT department's dedication to excellence in instruction and promotion of scholarly activities with the museum's mission to create innovative learning experiences for all children.

In response to CMoR's interest in starting a Living Laboratory® at the museum, VCU and CMoR worked collaboratively to develop the Seymour Living Lab. The Seymour Living Lab is an educational on-site research lab at CMoR. Following the principles of the Living Laboratory® model (Corriveau et al., 2015), research occurs in plain view of the public so that all visitors may talk with the researchers and learn about the study. In addition, the researchers and museum educators regularly communicate and collaborate on research.

Since the spring of 2014, the Seymour Living Lab has conducted research on praxis using two OT faculty, six research assistants, and 22 OT students. The OT students' involvement in the lab has been through their two required research courses. While meeting the teaching objectives of the courses, the faculty have engaged the students in hands-on learning experiences that allow the students to participate in many aspects of the research process. Because of their active involvement in an actual research study, course feedback from the students indicated that this hands-on research experience was "an exciting project" and a "wonderful research experience." While contributing to teaching, the Living Lab has advanced the scholarship agenda of the involved faculty through the collection of research data, support from the National Living Laboratory®, and funding from the National Science Foundation. Researchers spent 63 hr over the course of three semesters on site, resulting in the recruitment of 147 research participants. Further, the research resulted in scholarly output for students, faculty, and the community partner through conference posters and presentations to national audiences, including two collaborative presentations by the museum educator and university faculty to their respective professional organizations (see Appendix B).

The CMoR Learning project started in the summer of 2012 with the goal of enhancing the social and learning experiences at CMoR for children with disabilities and their families. CMoR worked to meet the needs of this population, but knew that they could further improve their efforts in this area and approached VCU for assistance. With

funding by the VCU Division of Community Engagement, the university and museum worked together to assess the museum, identify areas of need, and adapt these areas to minimize physical and learning barriers. This original partnership opened doors for the involvement of other OT faculty and enhanced teaching evaluations as well as scholarship and service opportunities for all of the participating faculty. While helping to meet the stated needs of the museum, the faculty received high marks on course evaluations for meeting course objectives related to community integration, environmental assessment, and adaptation through the hands-on learning that linked evidence-based research to practice. These learning activities remain sustainable in two OT courses and have resulted in over 34 adapted projects to promote access, participation, and learning at the museum for children with disabilities (see Appendix A).

Through this collaboration, the CMoR also identified a need to educate and engage parents in their children's development and learning, which aligned perfectly with the OT coursework on learning about and promoting child development. This resulted in the development of brochures on developmental skills with related activities to promote skill development and "exhibit buddy" cards to help museum visitors and volunteers understand the educational opportunities of the exhibits and how to adapt the exhibits for children with different learning needs. The faculty incorporated these into course assignments, scheduled class visits at the museum to align with course topics, and pulled in real-life examples from the experiences at the museum. The students' responses on faculty course feedback positively spoke to the teaching excellence regarding the "opportunities to apply the material in real situations" and use of a variety of teaching methods.

The museum, the faculty, and the students all benefitted from this collaboration. Affiliating with the university resulted in CMoR being recognized as one of the top 10 most inclusive museums from the Association of Children's Museums. The faculty presented at three state and national conferences and published one journal article on this project (Ivey, Shepherd, & Pearce, 2014). The students' responses were overwhelmingly positive, with the students commenting on final course evaluations that these projects "really brought the subject into the real world," aligning with the VCU motto "Make it Real." For the faculty members, this carefully constructed community relationship with CMoR promotes greater efficiency, recognition, and advancement while integrating scholarship with teaching and service.

Rebuilding Together-Richmond

Rebuilding Together-Richmond (RT-R), VA, is the local affiliate of a national non-profit organization, started in 1973, which uses volunteers to assess and modify homes in low-income neighborhoods. Nationally, just under half of Rebuilding Together clients are older adults, and 10% are veterans (Rebuilding Together, 2014). The local program focuses on an annual intensive day of service where 1000 volunteers assist with home safety assessment, followed by the delivery of adaptive equipment and minor and major home repairs and modifications made at no cost to the

homeowners. According to RT-R's mission, the long-range intent is to bring positive change to individual lives and communities by promoting safety and wellness. In this spirit of community revitalization, RT-R has improved 1,108 homes in the Richmond metropolitan area since its inception in 1993 (Rebuilding Together, 2014).

The VCU OT department has a long-standing relationship with RT-R that involves components of teaching and service during the annual assessment days. The department has partnered with RT-R primarily through its student OT association, providing student and faculty volunteers, and, as of 2013, faculty have assigned student involvement in RT-R as part of the coursework. More recently, the OT department became involved in collaborative research with RT-R to pilot-test the use of an assessment for potentially standardizing measurement of home modifications outcomes.

For tenured faculty members, the need to combine community service with scholarship is essential. By linking an ongoing community project with research and classroom assignments (see Appendix A), faculty are efficiently combining teaching, service, and scholarship. Last year, a new layer of collaboration became evident. A former alumna and current postprofessional OT doctorate student and RT-R board member collaborated with two full-time faculty members to pilot-test a measure of performance of everyday activities in the home. This assessment, the In-Home Occupational Performance Measure (I-HOPE) (Stark, Somerville, & Morris, 2010), has been used in Rebuilding Together programs elsewhere, but not by the Richmond affiliate.

For the 2015 research practicum, a team of five master's level students pretested the activity card sort component of the I-HOPE in 10 homes. Their findings were presented at the state's OT conference in the fall of 2015 and at a regional gerontology conference in the spring of 2016 (see Appendix B). In the spring of 2016, five more students added the I-HOPE's in-home observational component to their pilot testing and collected data in 10 new homes. Because RT-R staff collected follow-up data on the first 10 homes assessed, the students will also be conducting a pre-posttest analysis of this data. It is anticipated that the students, faculty, and RT-R staff will continue working together to collect and analyze subsequent waves of pre-posttest data and refine the I-HOPE's administration process so that eventually it will be used as a standardized approach to assessing the effectiveness of home modifications.

The increasing scope and depth of the collaboration allows students and faculty to experience the interface of evidence-based practice, excellence in instruction, and community-based scholarship and service provision in an integrative way. The most recent scholarly dimension of the partnership further deepened an existing strong relationship, with RT-R staff seeking faculty and student input at increasingly frequent levels and at earlier points in their ongoing program development.

The participating faculty clearly derive benefits from this collaborative project. RT-R offers the much sought after commodity of an

appropriate venue for experiential learning to offer students. It requires the faculty to keep their own research skills and knowledge sharp, and enhances their ability to integrate their competencies into teaching. As the collaboration deepens and more data is collected, it increases opportunities for publications and professional presentations. Most significantly, on a humanistic level, and because it involves the faculty's face-to-face contact with community participants, this collaboration meets the need for connection with others outside of the academic environment and offers a welcomed sense of having a positive impact on others. This sense of working cohesively as a team to accomplish a shared vision of improving quality of life for primarily low income, older adult homeowners reflects the ultimate aims and objectives of community engagement.

William Nelson Bland Literacy Center

The William Nelson Bland Literacy Center (WNBLC) is an after-school literacy program for elementary school children in Petersburg, VA. The program is designed to enhance Standards of Learning test scores, a Virginia student assessment that establishes expectations for learning and achievement. The project was built through a preexisting research collaboration between VCU and Virginia State University's (VSU) Department of Teaching and Learning. Through this existing relationship, VCU and VSU partnered with the 1021 Halifax Street Corporation, a nonprofit organization, to collectively develop, pilot, and evaluate a curriculum for the after-school literacy program while providing teaching and learning experiences to VCU OT and VSU education students.

A VCU Division of Community Engagement grant was written and obtained, allowing the purchase of seven iPads with apps for the program. Through partnering with another OT faculty member, this site was used as an after-school community learning project in a pediatric course, in which the OT students provided 24 third, fourth, and fifth grade students from two Petersburg, VA elementary schools with a curriculum-based, after-school learning environment. As part of the pediatric course, the faculty created the assignment for after-school programming, reviewed the plans and family activity ideas with the OT students, made suggestions related to collaboration and material development, and graded the assignments, aligning the teaching objectives of this course with this community engagement project. The OT students were expected to demonstrate how to use apps on the iPads and combine fun activities and movement in each lesson while collaborating with the education students and helping with homework. Further, the faculty participated in all planning meetings at the site, helped obtain parent permission for participating in the group, shared literacy information with the students, observed the groups and reflected on what worked or didn't work, and gave feedback to the college students while helping to maintain discipline with the elementary school students. In the next semester, these same OT students had their research practicum at WNBLC and collected and analyzed WNBLC program pilot data for its first year of operation. They presented

their results at the Virginia Occupational Therapy Association annual conference (see Appendix B) and to the WNBLC board.

This program benefited two community partners—1021 Halifax Street Corporation and VSU—by assisting them to initiate an after-school program. The three-fold partnership remains strong in its third year. The pilot data collected in the first year was instrumental in obtaining funding from a Petersburg foundation for its second year of operation. Although one of the main objectives of the initial grant was to involve OT students in the collection of pilot data during its first year only, WNBLC and VSU students continued to benefit greatly from VCU's engagement by watching how the OT students approached "lessons" with a variety of multisensory activities and the use of iPads. They provided the site with their lessons and materials so they could replicate some of the lessons from the first year. After WNBLC received additional funding, they were prepared to add more VSU education students to this project who were more prepared to advance WNBLC's mission in elementary education strategies. WNBLC is about to complete its third year independent from resources of the first year with other community partners in the Petersburg area assisting with funding and operation.

VCU OT faculty continue to take part in evaluation and fundraising, and received special acknowledgement at events attended by Petersburg's mayor and Delegate to the Virginia General Assembly. Community partners in Petersburg appreciated learning more about OT and the unique skills it contributes to children's learning and development. It was understood by all entities involved that VCU OT's involvement was temporary to help initiate this project. However, a strong partnership was formed and this has set the stage for VCU's continued teaching and research collaboration with this community.

Gateway Homes of Richmond

The Department of OT has had a relationship with Gateway Homes of Richmond for more than twenty years. Gateway is a nonprofit organization that provides a transitional, community-based residential treatment program for individuals with serious mental illness who are striving for independence. Their program offers graded levels of support ranging from supervised living, to supported on-site apartments, to community living programs that help Gateway meet their vision to make recovery a reality for people with mental illness. Gateway is one of four community partners for the second psychosocial course. The psychosocial course is a university-designated service learning course and a Level I fieldwork course that requires students to plan, implement, and evaluate eight weeks of evidence-based group intervention in community-based mental health settings.

Two groups of six students are scheduled at each facility one afternoon a week. The students have all of their assigned readings in the first six weeks of the course to prepare them for designing their overall group plan along with eight session plans. A protocol for the plans is given to the students and each section is linked to a grading rubric. These plans require the students to script out and mentally rehearse the session; thoughtfully plan

support materials; and incorporate theory, evidence-based practice, creativity, and leadership. Reflection prior to the session, peer review, instructor feedback, and fieldwork seminars are instructional methods that are thoughtfully incorporated into the course to promote student reflection and learning. Over the course of the last 6 years, the group and session plans designed for Gateway clients have been refined to target areas of instruction related to routines, organization of tasks, nutrition, budgeting, grocery shopping, meal preparation, exercise, medication management, and self-regulation that support recovery.

Five years ago, recognizing that two of the courses that were taught in the spring semester (Psychosocial II and Research Practicum) included the same group of second year students, a deliberate effort was launched to synchronize the requirements for these two courses, which allowed greater efficiency for the students and for the faculty instructor (see Appendix A). Gateway was contacted in 2011 about partnering to conduct a pilot study to examine whether iPod Touch technology would be useful in helping their clients manage daily routines. Following IRB and board approval, the OT students provided the design and implementation of the instruction in the use of the devices as part of their Psychosocial II course while they conducted the study as part of their Research Practicum course. The students were highly engaged in program development and evaluation and witnessed the collaboration between practice and generating evidence.

This 3-year study resulted in two national presentations by the supervising faculty member, two presentations by students at state conferences, and three national or state poster presentations (see Appendix B). The supervising faculty member has successfully used this partnership with the community to meet the requirements for annual review in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. By integrating the three areas, more time could be allocated to the partnership, which has increasingly strengthened the bond between the faculty member and, by association, the university and the community partner. The collaboration has resulted in the generation of a grant that funded the hiring of an occupational therapist for the first time at this facility, and a graduate of the program who had conducted his research at the facility filled the position.

By creatively coordinating the use of the students' class time between the intervention course and the research course, teaching, scholarship, and service were successfully combined, thus providing the students and the faculty with stimulating, real-life generation of knowledge. Another benefit repeated frequently in the students' final reflection papers is the increase in comfort interacting with and helping a population of individuals with mental illness, as most students have had no prior experience working with this population. More so than a class-based lecture, this experience challenged their preconceptions of individuals with mental illness and opened their eyes to the benefits of assistive technology in promoting occupational engagement with this population. The ongoing Gateway partnership allows every stakeholder–the clients, the Gateway staff and administration, the

OT students, and the faculty instructor—to benefit in countless ways.

Discussion

All of these community-engaged partnerships resulted in an advancement in teaching, scholarship, and service for the faculty involved. The community engagement activities are embedded across the curriculum, resulting in the application of core concepts for the students and use of learner-centered techniques by faculty. The students' feedback on teaching evaluations, one way for faculty to measure teaching effectiveness, is very positive in terms of these activities. The students said they liked the use of a variety of teaching strategies and the application to real-world experiences these projects bring to the curriculum. When paired with research, the students reported seeing the value of community-engaged scholarship, even reporting enthusiasm about research. In addition to improving their teaching, the faculty benefitted by successfully disseminating the results of their community-engaged work in peer-reviewed journals, as well as at state, regional, and national conferences. While service is inherent in a faculty position, the community-engaged collaborations resulted in meaningful partnerships that allowed the needs of the community to appear and be addressed but with the added benefits to faculty meeting their scholarship, teaching, and service demands.

Lessons Learned: Key Concepts for Studying and Implementing Community Engagement

Strong community partnerships do not just happen. Partnerships require an investment of time to develop trust and a true, working collaboration. Faculty need to calculate the time involved carefully and realistically and consider whether participation is viable. At VCU, an urban university, this time usually occurs outside of typical OT department office hours, since it is challenging for community partners to leave their work setting during the workday. This results in the faculty experiencing more time away from teaching and scholarship, unless travel to the community is fully built into the official workload. Faculty and community partners need to proactively develop a comprehensive and honest conceptualization of the partnership, outlining clear expectations, goals, roles, and a mutual understanding of the structure, budget, and operation. Further, faculty and community partners need to discuss the potential mutual benefits for them. These assumptions are not implicit; a full understanding of the partnership, including mutual benefits, needs to be stated explicitly to promote understanding and shared commitment.

Community engagement partnerships need careful selection. For maximum use of time, the scope of any community engagement project should extend across teaching, scholarship, and service, and align with university, school, and department priorities. This ensures that the faculty meet their workload demands and the requirements of the community partnership. Faculty must carefully and rigorously evaluate all potential community opportunities. Questions to ask include: Does this align with our university priorities? Does this support our department strategic plan? How does this relate to our curriculum? Will this fit into our teaching schedule? What research or

scholarship opportunities exist with this community partnership? Does this align with our research? What are the opportunities for sustainability? How can we work efficiently and combine service or teaching with research and scholarship?

Processes to sustain the community partnership need to be identified and addressed. At VCU, community engagement is fully integrated into the mission, strategic plan, and overall philosophy of the university, and as such we have mechanisms for supporting the development of community-engaged partnerships. Projects are often elicited from a community need, and VCU faculty discuss these ideas to determine the interest and expertise of other faculty members. As such, it can be easy to develop these partnerships, but they are sustained by careful consideration and planning. By using natural environments or ongoing projects suggested by the community and linking them to relevant coursework (e.g., intervention, activities, research, fieldwork), there is time to develop and nurture these partnerships to develop and maintain trust. In addition, by linking the community projects to coursework, some aspects of a sustainable workforce can be addressed. Collaborative evaluation with the community partners of what is working, what needs to be adjusted, or what new ideas or goals may be erupting is essential. This allows for ongoing reassessment and changes in scope, which can promote sustainability. However, it is also important to understand that community partnerships may be time limited due to multiple factors, such as the employment of the partners, funding sources, current research or priorities, and the expertise of the partners.

Practicing skills or research in real-life environments is invigorating to students, faculty, and clinicians alike. While this article focused on faculty achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service through community engagement, the benefits to the community partner and the students are also important aspects to consider. Careful planning and development of a strong relationship make community engagement a "win-win" for all.

References

Aldrich, R., & Marterella, A. (2014). Community-engaged research: A path for occupational science in the changing university landscape. *Journal of Occupational Science*, *21*(2), 210-225. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2012.714077

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Corriveau, K. H., Kipling, R., Ronfard, S., Biarnes, M. C., Jeye, B. M., & Harris, P. L. (2015). Living laboratory®: A mutual professional development model for museum-based research partnerships. In D. Sobel & J. Jipson (Eds.), *Cognitive development in museum settings: Relating research and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Curry-Stevens, A. (2011). Research for change: Transforming policy, scholarship, and the classroom through engaged research with communities of color. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, *1*, 11-29. Retrieved from http://jpshe.missouristate.edu/assets/missouricompact/2011-2_CurryStevens.pdf

Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Lozano, J. B., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., & Hurtado, S. (2014). Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2013–2014 HERI Faculty Survey. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S. T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *16*(3), 7-27. Retrieved from http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/view/861/575

Ivey, C. K., Shepherd, J., & Pearce, L. (2014). Snapshots of occupational therapy education, promotion, and research: Learning for all at Richmond's children's museum. *OT Practice*, *19*, 14-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.7138/otp.2014.195f1#sthash.BZlpAkxB.dpuf

Kramer, P., Ideishi, R. I., Kearney, P. J., Cohen, M. E., Ames, J. O., Shea, G. B., . . . Blumberg, P. (2007). Achieving curricular themes through learner-centered teaching. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, *21*(1-2), 185-198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/J003v21n01_14

Mamiseishvili, K. (2012). Thriving in academia: Understanding and managing the complexities of faculty work. *Perspectives on Issues in Higher Education*, *15*(2), 77-84. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/ihe15.2.77

McNall, M., Reed, C. S., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2009). Brokering community-university engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, *33*(5), 317-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-008-9086-8

New England Resource Center for Higher Education. (n.d.). Carnegie community engagement classification. Retrieved from www.nerche.org

O'Mara-Eves, A., Brunton, G., Oliver, S., Kavanagh, J., Jamal, F., & Thomas, J. (2015). The effectiveness of community engagement in public health interventions for disadvantaged groups: A meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(129), 1-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1352-y

Peck, K., Furze, J., Black, L., Flecky, K., & Nebel, A. (2010). Interprofessional collaboration and social responsibility: Utilizing community engagement to assess faculty and student perception. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, *5*(8), 205-221.

Rebuilding Together. (2014). Yesterday and today: Building toward our future/2013 state of the network. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Schindler, V. P. (2014). Community engagement: Outcomes for occupational therapy students, faculty and clients. *Occupational Therapy International*, *21*(2), 71-80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/oti.1364

Shannon, J., & Wang, T. R. (2010). A model for university-community engagement: Continuing education's role as convener. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *58*(2), 108-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07377361003661499

Stark, S. L., Somerville, E. K., & Morris, J. C. (2010). In-Home Occupational Performance Evaluation (I-HOPE). *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *64*(4), 580-589. http://dx.doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2010.08065

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (n.d.). *About carnegie classification*. Retrieved from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/

Virginia Commonwealth University. (2015). *VCU strategic plan: Quest for distinction*. Retrieved from http://www.quest.vcu.edu/

Weerts, D. J., & Sandmann, L. R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *81*(6), 632-657. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40929570

Williams, P. H., & Sparks, J. (2011). Collaborative inquiry at a children's museum: Benefits for student learning, museum outcomes, and faculty scholarship. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, *1*, 31-46. Retrieved from http://jpshe.missouristate.edu/assets/missouricompact/2011-3_WilliamsSparks.pdf

Appendix A

Community Projects and Relationship to Scholarship, Teaching, and Service

Project	Scholarship	Teaching			Service
		Courses	Faculty	Assignments	
Children's Museum of Richmond	Seymour Living Lab Praxis study Universal design for learning assessment of museum exhibits IRB, data collection, and analysis	• Pediatrics I • Research Practicum • Activities III	4	Fieldtrip on natural learning environments Development and exhibit brochures Adaptive projects Adaptive project fair Course evaluation	Research at museum Assessment of exhibits Adaptive projects – including development of and instructions for making and use. (Over the past 4 years, students spent over 1000 hr developing and making adaptive projects, such as an adapted art easel, art supplies, books, stories, instruments, sensory calming tools, and communication boards.) Participation in other museum activities (e.g., Special Nights for Special Needs; Sensitive Santa)
Rebuilding Together-Richmond	In-Home Occupational Performance Evaluation	• Adults I • Research Practicum	2	Attend RT-R assessment day Reflection on RT-R Reflection on aging in place Course evaluation	Evaluation of homes and needs of residents Manpower for assessment day/delivery day SOTA involvement Recommendations
William Nelson Bland Literacy Program	Evaluation research study of after-school literacy project IRB, data collection,	• Pediatrics II • Activities III • Research Practicum	2	Weekly session plans related to apps and hands-on activities	6 weeks of after-school literacy programming with hands-on activities

	and analysis			Self-assessment Reflection on collaboration Course evaluation	Pre-post assessment to evaluate after-school literacy curriculum and satisfaction Literacy board Development of iPad instructions
Gateway Homes	3-year study of iPod Touch technology with clients with severe mental illness IRB, data collection, and analysis	• Psychosocial fieldwork • Research practicum	2	16 group instructional plans (2/week X 8 weeks) supporting client recovery and app use yearly Fieldwork seminar Self assessment Course evaluation	Training for clients related to technology and apps Complete step-by-step visual and written instructions for staff to support client continued app use

Appendix B

Conference Presentations of Community Engagement Activities

Year	Scope	Title and Conference
2012	National	*Use of iPod Touch Assistive Technology for Clients with ACLS-5 Scores of 4.0-5.8.* Allen Cognitive Network 9th Symposium
	State	*iPod Touch Technology: Gateway to Independence for Clients with Mental Illness*. Virginia Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
2013	State	*Museum Access for Children! Using Universal Design for Learning Principles to Promote Community Engagement*. Virginia Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
		The Use of iPod Touch Technology for Cognitive Assistance with Daily Living for

		Clients with Major Mental Illness. Virginia Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
2014	National	*Addressing the Education Gap with Community-Academic Partnerships*. National Institute on Minority Health & Health Disparities Grantees' Conference
		Museum Access for Children! Using Universal Design for Learning Principles To Promote Community Engagement. American Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
		Exploring iPod Touch Applications for Clients With Mental Illness: Refining Measurement and Intervention Methods. American Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
		IPOD Technology with Clients with Mental Illness: 3 years of Research. Allen Cognitive Network 10th Symposium
	State	*Exploring iPod Touch Applications for Clients With Mental Illness: Refining Measurement and Intervention Methods.* Virginia Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
		Involvement of Occupational Therapy in the Development of an After-School Literacy Program for Low-Income Minority Youth. Virginia Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
2015	National	*The Living Laboratory® Model: Building University and Museum Collaborations for Research*. American Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
		National Living Laboratory Workshop. Association of Children's Museum Annual Conference
	Regional	*The Living Laboratory® Model: Building University and Museum Collaborations for Research*.

		Living Laboratory Regional Symposium
		Access for all Children! Adapting an Art Studio to Promote Community Engagement. VSA Intersections: Arts and Special Education Conference
	State	*Pilot-Testing the In-Home Occupational Performance Evaluation (I-HOPE) to Assess Functional Abilities of Community-Dwelling Older Adults*. Virginia Occupational Therapy Association Annual Conference
2016	Regional	*Using the In-Home Occupational Performance Evaluation (I-HOPE) to Recommend Home Modifications for Older Adults and their Family Caregivers*. Annual Meeting of the Southern Gerontological Society