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INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

The SF State strategic planning process of 2018 set forth numerous goals and objectives for various divisions and institutes across campus. The Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) has wide-ranging roles to play in the university strategic plan as well as the academic master plan. According to the SF State Strategic Plan, as part of the Courage core value, ICCE must catalogue and maintain a list of SF State outreach programs so community-based scholars can coordinate and complement one another. In meeting objectives 3 & 4, ICCE was also tasked to develop a survey for faculty to learn about community scholarship being conducted.

In spring 2019, ICCE developed and implemented a campus-wide Faculty Survey about Community Engaged Research and Scholarship (CERS). This survey also included general questions about faculty research efforts and needs, regardless of their involvement with “engaged research” specifically.

A separate literature review on CERS was completed and summarized to help inform the survey content. Additionally, ten other university reports and surveys were reviewed for consideration of content ideas while developing questions applicable to SF State. With approval from the administration to send a Qualtrics link to all faculty, the survey was distributed to all faculty campus-wide.

Faculty were asked to complete an online survey to support ICCE in serving them better and helping fulfill the university mission. We informed faculty that participating in this survey would contribute to helping ICCE more accurately reflect faculty engaged scholarship here at SF State. At the heart of every great strategy is the data to back it up! Faculty were informed that we used the term Community Engaged Research and/or Scholarship (CERS) to address community-defined needs, constraints, and purposes of any given community of interest.

Important to note this type of survey has never been completed at SF State before. While the survey was lengthy and response rate low, valuable information was still gathered. This included eight sections consisting of 58 questions ranging from research experiences and university support to scholarly activity, funding, challenges, and RTP. SF State Strategic Marketing & Communications reports over 1,800 T/TT faculty and lecturers. For this survey, a total of 115 “Recorded Responses” were noted. However, many respondents only answered some of the items in the survey, leading to low responses of between 45-69 people, on average, actually responding to each question. Regardless of the small sample size, it was determined that relevant inferences could be drawn from the survey responses. Analyses included frequencies and descriptive statistics to produce summary measures for all variables and were accompanied with graphs and charts. In the report that follows, questions that precede each graph or figure are exactly as they are stated on the survey. The full survey is available in Appendix B.
**SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS**

An introduction and link to a Qualtrics survey was distributed to all faculty from the Office of the Provost (see Appendix B). According to the “SF State Facts” (see Strategic Marketing & Communications), as of fall 2018, there are 1,812 T/TT faculty (n=779) and lecturers (n=1,033). Since the overall response rate was low (n=115 recorded responses with 69 completes) readers should, therefore, keep in mind this sample is not robust enough (small “n”) to make any broad generalizations that may be observed. Nonetheless, valuable inferences have been obtained from the responses provided.

All findings are assembled in this report and a variety of recommendations are provided for consideration (see page 38). The following eight core sections were developed (nine including demographics as the last aspect).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research experience</th>
<th>Theoretical underpinnings</th>
<th>Publications/conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>Community partners</td>
<td>Challenges/barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review, Tenure, Promotion</td>
<td>Funding sources</td>
<td>Demographics (see p. 34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-thirds of the faculty who responded to this survey (64%) indicated they believe, at least somewhat, that their work is considered Community Engaged Research (CERS) and the majority (81%) agreed they generally have the skills and knowledge necessary to collaborate with the community to complete their research.

The following key points are provided from the overall results:

- Faculty tend to agree that CERS is “encouraged” across the university and their departments yet many disagree that it is “concretely supported” in their specific departments.
- The majority of respondents agree in some capacity (i.e., ‘somewhat’ or ‘strongly’) that community engagement is a core part of SF State mission. While half of all respondents believe the University RTP committee (UTPC) supports engaged research/scholarship nearly 30% disagreed UTPC supports this work.
- Many faculty were generally dissatisfied with and/or unaware of the current CERS opportunities in their field.
- Some faculty indicated a lack of knowledge regarding “CEETL” and associated resources.
- Research that is not community-based research/scholarship informs teaching more than community-based research.
- Faculty were frustrated with lack of support for embedding community-based research in their teaching.
- Majority of respondents expressed that too much of their time is allocated to administrative duties and too little of their time is dedicated to research and scholarship.
Over half of respondents were unsure about whether their department has additional RTP guidelines related to CERS.

The majority of the faculty completing this survey have presented their CERS at one or more conferences during the past 2 years.

Most common publication type that faculty submitted their CERS to was conference proceedings. The second most common type of publication submitted was to their discipline’s refereed/peer-reviewed journals followed by non-peer reviewed White papers.

Primary partners/constituents for CERS are non-profits and underserved communities.

Faculty who receive funding for CERS get it from a variety of both on and off-campus organizations/agencies.

Half of the faculty respondents do not receive funding for CERS from campus related entities listed in the survey, whereas others, 16%, indicated they do, however, they receive funding from ORSP. On the other hand, when asked about external funding, nearly 40% of respondents indicated their CERS funding is supported from a Governmental agency.

Faculty were asked about the most significant barriers faced in participating in CERS, in general, included these top 3:
  o Emphasis on research and research publication
  o Lack of recognition for CE-SL research/scholarship
  o Limited means to document engagement in department reporting

For those conducting CERS, the greatest barriers to “implementing CERS in the classroom and/or community”?
  o Handling logistics
  o Lacking the time to document research
  o Lack of funding to conduct CERS
  o Finding CERS experiences appropriate for students
  o Risk management/liability issues & concerns

Demographics – No crosstabs were completed for this project so this detail merely provides information for who filled out the survey.

  o 73% of the respondents were Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and 27% included both full & part-time adjuncts/lecturers. The average number of years that respondents have worked at SF State was 13 and respondents from all six colleges were represented in this report.

  o The majority of faculty completing the survey were White (Non-Hispanic) at 61%. Second = Latino(a)/Hispanic (16%), followed by Asian/Asian American (10%). Four percent of the faculty who filled this out were African American.

  o The majority of respondents were also female (64.6%). Correspondingly, 31.3% were male, and 4.2% chose not to identify their gender. None of the respondents identified as transgender or non-binary.
RESULTS & FINDINGS

SEC 1: RESEARCH EXPERIENCES & OPINIONS

To what extent do you feel your work relates to Community Engaged Research/Scholarship (CERS) at SF State?

"I believe my work is considered CERS"

Not At All 28%
Neutral 8%
Somewhat 15%
Moderate Amount 19%
A Great Deal 30%

"I have appropriate skills/knowledge to collaborate with members of the larger community in my research"

Not At All 10%
Neutral 9%
Somewhat 9%
Moderate Amount 27%
A Great Deal 45%

"My department supports community engagement type research"

Not At All 5%
Neutral 7%
Somewhat 20%
Moderate Amount 26%
A Great Deal 42%

"My college supports community engaged research"

Not At All 2%
Neutral 6%
Somewhat 24%
A Great Deal 36%
Moderate Amount 32%
Summary: Sixty-seven participants responded to each sub-section of this question. Most of the faculty who responded (64%) indicated they believe at least somewhat that their work is considered Community Engaged Research (CERS). Similarly, the majority (81%) agreed at least somewhat that they have the skills and knowledge necessary to collaborate with the community in their research. The majority of faculty responding also agreed at least somewhat that their department (88%) and their college (92%) supports community engaged research. Despite providing an explanation on the survey instructions, a few comments imply some confusion regarding the meaning of CERS and how they interpreted level of ‘support’:

- I’m not exactly sure what CERS is...it would be helpful if you could define what exactly constitutes Community Engaged research/scholarship.
- Is CERS about getting college professors and students to do market research for private companies who sell products? I am totally against that unless there is legitimate educational outcome.
- I’m not sure what is meant by the college and department supporting engaged research. If it is research funding, research assistants, lab space, or something else.

Comments also specified distinction between CERS at SFSU and in other organizations:

- My daytime work is deeply involved with community-based organizations, and I write White Papers for that work environment, but not for my department at SFSU.
- I work at a philanthropic foundation during the day and teach one night class.

Note: All open-ended comments for this question can be found in Appendix A.

**In your opinion, what constitutes the creation of CERS?** (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty participate in dissemination of research beyond academic audiences</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members co-participate in dissemination of research</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions co-created by community</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members gain tangible benefits through a product</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members co-participate in interpretation of results</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes non-academic decision-makers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic members gain scholarly product/benefit</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column label “#” indicates the number of faculty who selected this response option

Summary: Answers regarding what constitutes the creation of CERS were fairly evenly distributed among the responses. The most popular answer (n=60) was the following:

“Faculty participate in dissemination of research beyond academic audiences.”
To what extent do you believe CERS is valued by these stakeholders?

Summary: Out of 69 respondents, the most common answers regarding the extent to which CERS is valued by stakeholders were “Yes, to an Extent,” and “I’m not sure.” This can infer that interested parties could/should do more to communicate to faculty that CERS is valued.

One faculty member echoed this sentiment with the following comment: “I believe that CERS could be valued by undergraduates, community leaders, and community members in my field if my college (CoSE) sponsored it to a greater extent.”
Let us know how you feel about the following statements to the best of your knowledge:

"Community Engagement is a core part of the SF State mission"

- Strongly Agree: 35%
- Agree: 30%
- Somewhat Agree: 12%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 12%
- Somewhat Disagree: 5%
- Disagree: 5%
- Strongly Disagree: 1%

"Community organizations served by my department are receptive to collaboration"

- Strongly Agree: 21%
- Agree: 32%
- Somewhat Agree: 21%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 19%
- Somewhat Disagree: 5%
- Disagree: 7%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

"University RTP committee supports CERS"

- Strongly Agree: 9%
- Agree: 16%
- Somewhat Agree: 16%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23%
- Somewhat Disagree: 16%
- Disagree: 7%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

For two of these items, the majority of respondents agree in some capacity that community engagement is a core part of SF State mission (77%) and half believe the URTP supports CERS (50%).
Summary: This item sought a rating for level of agreement about four statements regarding perceptions and support of CERS (n=66 people responded to this item). The majority of faculty who responded to this question (77%) agreed that Community Engagement is a core part of the SF State mission. Slightly over half (55%) also agreed that community organizers served by their departments are receptive to collaboration. About 50% of faculty agreed at least somewhat that the University RTP committee supports CERS, but 25% were unsure and 27% disagreed. However, only 33% of respondents agreed that indicators are used in their department to measure and celebrate success of CERS. Correspondingly, 18% neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, and 49% disagreed at least somewhat. This finding indicates that both the University RTP committee and individual departments on campus could do more to encourage and value CERS. The following comments reflected this view:

- The Univ. RTP committee needs to make a stronger statement in support of CERS!
- In 2014 when I had completed the Cultural Humility video through engaged scholarship, I was told that it did not count as research. Very discouraging!
- It seems more difficult for RTP & dept. indicators to capture the value of CERS
- I received the Jefferson Award and my own Dept downplayed this in their committee letter for promotion rather than celebrating it. I’ve seen first-hand on UTPC that decisions on promotion are based primarily on professional achievement and teaching, and service activities are expected but are not recognized or valued in the same way as teaching and professional achievement. I truly believe that this must change and the only way to do so is through revisions or Dept RTP policies that clarify what types of service qualify, and by changing the culture on campus to SHOW that service is valued.
**SEC 2: INSTITUTIONAL/UNIVERSITY SUPPORT**

Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements regarding your perception of university and department support relating to CERS:

"Faculty involvement in CERS is encouraged across the university"

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement about faculty involvement in CERS across the university.]

- Strongly Agree: n=3
- Agree: n=7
- Somewhat Agree: n=9
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: n=14
- Somewhat Disagree: n=4
- Disagree: n=6
- Strongly Disagree: n=3

"My CERS is encouraged in my department"

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement about CERS encouragement in the department.]

- Strongly Agree: n=8
- Agree: n=9
- Somewhat Agree: n=8
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: n=7
- Somewhat Disagree: n=4
- Disagree: n=6
- Strongly Disagree: n=3
Summary: This graph above, along with the two on the previous page, consist of participant ratings for their level of agreement with three statements regarding university and department support of CERS. Nineteen respondents (out of 46 replying to this item) agreed their involvement in CERS is encouraged across the university (41%), and twenty-five noted agreement about this in their departments (57%). However, faculty generally disagreed that CERS is concretely supported in their departments (n=24; 55%). Faculty comments reflected these sentiments as well as the need for increased financial support for CERS:

- Encouraged and financially supported are two different things. The university encourages working in the community, but money is highly competitive and if it isn’t “sexy” no research is funded.
- Lecturers are not encouraged to do research; they are encouraged to carry the course load of the university for unequal pay and poor working conditions -- although our Union does fight to make things better.
- My CERS is not in alignment with the primary values of my college and department to promote curiosity, and advance knowledge. Consequently research that is in alignment with these “ivory tower” values is celebrated and valued with monetary support and honors, but my CERS (and that of others in my college) is not.
- Let’s be honest here - there’s little funding for CERS in the science fields and I have not received funds from the Dept or College for CERS-related equipment, supplies, or student assistants. The only caveats here are SF BUILD which HAS provided strong support for our lead monitoring work in East Oakland, and our Dept Chair who has provided funds to procure supplies to test VOCs in Bayview Hunters Point air samples
- The perception of my research by some colleagues is that it’s less rigorous while some other colleagues value the contribution.
- Where is the money from the university?
- Everything at SFSU is encouraged. But what good is that? Pay people! Stop taking advantage of those on campus who want to help. Recognize what they are doing, and support them both financially and otherwise. SFSU is located in SF, one of the most expensive cities on earth, and the admin acts like we live in Omaha Nebraska and we can all just donate our time, while they take in salaries that are over 200K.

* * * * * * * * *

Indicate your satisfaction with the following CERS opportunities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERS opportunities provided by CEETL to support my coursework</th>
<th>Faculty development opportunities to enhance CERS provided within my college</th>
<th>Opportunities to collaborate with other faculty across departments campuswide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39% (n=16)</td>
<td>50% (n=21)</td>
<td>45% (n=20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Survey participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with three different CERS opportunities. Out of 44 respondents on this item, the most frequent response selected for each of these questions was “Not Satisfied” (39%, 50%, and 45%, respectively). However, most participants overall (between 50% and 61%) said they were at least “Somewhat Satisfied” with each type of opportunity. Faculty comments that reflected dissatisfaction with the current CERS opportunities and suggestions for improvement are as follows:

- Are we surprised that I am only 1 of 18 faculty in my dept doing CERS type work? Right there is a metric which tells you that faculty invest their time and efforts pursuing the more typical basic/applied R&D grant funds through NIH and NSF.
- I have made efforts to do this on my own. 10 years back ICCE brought a few of us together to do a CERS project, I think there should be more such opportunities to connect junior faculty.
- Online instructors and adjunct instructors both have limited collaboration opportunities to connect at SF State. I recommend creating a Google group for
both groups, with discussion categories that include CERS. CEETL is offering its first online workshop, which gives me hope. Perhaps they’ll include a CERS-related workshop next!

Other comments reflected a general lack of knowledge about CEETL and CERS opportunities:

- What is CEETL?
- I don’t know of these particular opportunities.
- As a full-time lecturer, I am unaware of any support of the kind mentioned in these questions.

**What level of support do you currently have to use community-based research in your teaching?**

![Graph showing level of support](image)

**Summary:** Faculty were asked to rate the level of support they have to incorporate community-based research in their teaching from seven different entities as shown above. Very few respondents reported having *major support* for community-based research in the settings mentioned in the graph above. More respondents reported having *minor support* from stakeholders, but this varied based on the setting. The setting with the highest levels of overall support (major and minor combined) was “Creating connections/networking on campus” at 64%. The second-highest level of overall support was “Exposure to best teaching practices regarding CERS” (62%). The setting with the highest levels of *major support* was “Creating connections/networking in the community” (24%). An average of 43% of respondents reported getting *no support* from
these stakeholders/settings. Comments from faculty reflected frustration with this lack of support (see next page):

- My work is frequently acknowledged within the department and occasionally written up by the communications people at the college and university levels. But I am not otherwise supported or rewarded in any significant way.
- Most of the support I have through intra and inter institutional connections is for community-engaged research not related to teaching.
- I also know for a fact that few analytical chemistry professors across the U.S. do this type of CERS

ICCE was mentioned by several respondents as a stakeholder that consistently supports CERS:

- ICCE is the only entity I currently know where to seek support, but am not sure what support is available. I will have to check the ICCE website!
- Currently my only major support has come from ICCE!

**Sec 3: Review, Tenure, & Promotion (RTP)**

In your current position, approximately how much of your time is spent allocated on the following:
Summary: This question asked participants to rate how much of their time is typically allocated to five work-related tasks (Admin, clinical, research/scholarship, teaching, service). The majority of respondents expressed that too much of their time (ranging from slightly too much to far too much) is allocated to Administrative duties (70%). Only 8 faculty responded to the question regarding time spent on Clinical work, presumably because not every field requires clinical work. Those who did respond, however, tended to agree that an appropriate amount of their time is allocated to Clinical work.

Conversely, 63% of faculty felt that too little of their time is dedicated to research and scholarship. Regarding teaching, respondents were divided such that slightly less than half (46%) felt that too much time is spent teaching, whereas the remaining 52% felt that an appropriate amount of time is spent teaching. Similarly, 56% of faculty felt that too much time is spent on service, while 40% believe that the amount spent on service is suitable.

How familiar are you with University Tenure & Promotion Committee (UTPC) guidelines (sec. 1.8) outlining criteria of CERS and its relevance to teaching connected with community? (e.g., effective teaching is demonstrated by a variety of factors, including scholarly research and creative activities)

Summary: Survey participants responding to this question (n=47) were asked to rate how familiar they are with UTPC guidelines regarding CERS. Slightly over half (51%) of respondents indicated that they were at least “somewhat familiar” with UTPC criteria related to CERS, and nearly half (49%) indicated they were “not familiar” with the criteria.
In addition to criteria noted in UTPC, are there additional RTP guidelines put forth by your department that affect how CERS should be documented and considered for your RTP?

Summary: Forty-nine participants responded to the item inquiring if their departments have additional RTP guidelines regarding CERS. Slightly over half (53%) of respondents were unsure of whether their department has additional RTP guidelines related to CERS, and 27% said their department does not have additional RTP criteria related to CERS.

Conversely, 20% respondents indicated that their departments do have additional RTP guidelines for CERS. Comments indicated that faculty would appreciate CERS being a part of their department RTP guidelines:

- Every department across campus should have some sort of CERS included in their RTP guidelines
- This would be helpful!
- Our dept, currently in the process of revising our RTP guidelines, and our chair has allowed me to provide significant input into this document and particularly the service portion, which is being rewritten to reflect the expectations for service.
On a scale of 1-10 (1=none, 10=the most), slide the bar to show how much your research (broadly) informs your teaching?

Summary: On average, the 44 respondents for this question indicated that their non-community research/scholarship informs their teaching more so than their community-based research/scholarship. Comments exhibited a variety of reasons for these responses:

- I teach a broad array of courses, so it really depends on which courses I'm teaching. Some are more related to my research than others.

- SFSU students clearly recognize the connections between the subject matter and monitoring toxic pollutants in environmental samples and consumer products.

- Since I teach online, my research at SF State and within the Bay Area directly informs my own teaching.

- Most of my work focuses on the cultural histories of the Bay Area and California. Almost everything I write is connected to my teaching in that sense.

- It's not in demand in my field

- I am lecturer that does not do much research
What university and/or dept. guidelines or criteria would be helpful for you (in general)?

Summary: Faculty indicated a variety of recommendations for improving university and/or department guidelines. Many comments indicated that policy clarification and making the importance of engaged research and service learning more prominent would be helpful:

- A standard, detailed policy on what factors a department considers when hiring or re-hiring lecturers
- It should be more explicit how to account for CERS in RTP criteria
- Recognition of CSL teaching and research in RTP teaching and research criteria explicitly so junior faculty can be mentored and incentivized
- Making service an equal partner to teaching and PAG in tenure/promotion decisions
- Encouragement and expectations of peer-reviewed publications and grants
- More flexible approaches to community service learning, based on disciplinary differences

Another comment reflected that assistance with planning would be useful:

- Semester long planning, goal-setting, lesson organization to meet specific learning objectives, effective grading strategies, time management skills, creating engaging and relevant classroom activities, multiple types of assessments to utilize with college students, ah, too many to mention,

One comment, on the other hand, suggested that more guidelines would NOT be beneficial:

- I don’t want any more guidelines, especially not from the University level. I am sick of the “top down” approach
Have you incorporated CERS content (e.g., literature, subject matter experts) into any of your courses and/or into your own scholarship to enhance your Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)?

Summary: Of the 42 respondents to this question, almost half of the faculty responding (48%) noted they have incorporated CERS content into their courses in order to enhance their WPAF.

Correspondingly, 49% recorded incorporating CERS content into their own research/scholarship for the same purpose. Of those who had not yet incorporated CERS content, 29% expressed interest in doing so for their courses in the future, and 34% showed interest in doing so for their own research/scholarship.

The remaining 24% of faculty indicated that they have not incorporated CERS into their courses and also do not intend to. Similarly, only 17% indicated having no interest in incorporating CERS into their research/scholarship.
Summary: Survey participants were asked to provide an approximate number of years incorporating CERS into their courses and how many courses have actually achieved their goal related to CERS. Of the 23 people who responded to this question, over half of the faculty (57%) who incorporate community-based research into their courses indicated that they have been doing so for 6+ years. Others (43%) have been doing so between 1-5 years.

Additionally, most faculty (60%) who incorporate community-based research into their courses specified that they have done so in approximately 1-2 of their courses, while the remaining 40% have done so in 3 or more of their courses.

Correspondingly, 61% of those using CERS in their courses do so using CERS from the literature in 1-2 of their courses. The remaining 39% incorporate CERS from the literature in 3 or more of their courses.
How often have you incorporated CERS into the following RTP/WPAF materials (if applicable):

Research (e.g., publications, grants, conferences)

- Often: 25%
- Sometimes: 24%
- Never: 51%

Service (e.g., training, committees)

- Often: 27%
- Sometimes: 24%
- Never: 49%

Teaching (e.g., service-learning, guest speakers, student participation in projects)

- Often: 24%
- Sometimes: 29%
- Never: 47%

Summary: Faculty responded with similar rates regarding how frequently they incorporate CERS into their RTP/WPAF materials in the areas of Research, Service, and Teaching (n=51 respondents to this item).

For each of the sub-sections noted above, the majority of respondents indicated “never” while approximately ¼ stated they do this “often” with between 24-29% noting “sometimes”.

In the last academic year (AY18-19), what types of publications have you submitted to from your CERS? (Check all that apply)

Summary: The most common type of publication respondents submitted to during AY18-19 from their CERS were for conference proceedings (25%).

The second most common type of publication submitted to was disciplinary refereed/peer-reviewed journals (23%), and the third most common was non-peer reviewed papers (19%).

Other publications submitted to during this time included books or book chapters (10%), general technical reports (8%), engagement-focused peer-reviewed journals (8%), and “Other” (6%). (48 respondents answered this question).
Have you presented your CERS at one or more conferences during the past 2 years?

**Summary**: First, of all n=30 respondents to this question, 63% of faculty revealed they had presented their CERS at one or more conferences during the past 2 years.

Second, 30% said they had not, and 7% said they had not done so in the past 2 years but will plan to in the future.
Please indicate the extent you agree or disagree with the following theory/concept-related statements. My community engaged research/scholarship________

Summary: This question asked survey participants to indicate their agreement with four statements regarding theory and concept about CERS. Out of 25 respondents to this item, the majority (71%) “somewhat or strongly” agreed their community engaged research/scholarship contributes to development and/or expansion of theories in their field. Similarly, 60% of respondents agreed in some capacity that their community engaged research & scholarship contributes to development of community engagement theories, broadly.

Furthermore, more than 2/3 (68%) of faculty responding agreed that CERS used in the classroom contributes to the development of theories that can further support service-learning for their students.

Slightly over half (52%) of respondents also agreed that their CERS contributes to development of theories regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning, broadly.
**Section 5: Community Partnerships**

Indicate approximately how often you engage in collaborative research with at least one community partner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (2-3 times/year)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally (1-2 times/year)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely (Every 2-3 years)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Learning about how often faculty engage in collaborative research with at least one community partner was also of great interest. Of the n=31 respondents who answered this question, nearly 35% of faculty responding exhibited that they engage in collaborative research with at least one community partner “frequently”, and 29% demonstrated that they engage in collaborative research “occasionally”.

Of all respondents, 19% of faculty disclosed that they “rarely” engage in collaborative research, and 16% revealed that they “never” engage in collaborative research with a community partner.
What are the primary partners/constituents for your CERS?
(Check all that apply)

Summary: The top two primary partners for faculty CERS were as follows: The majority (35%) of faculty noted working with nonprofit organizations as a primary partner and 28% said they worked with “underserved/under-resourced communities.”

14% of faculty also reported working with education institutions, 12% reported working with government agencies or elected officials, 4% reported working with business groups, 4% reported working with alumni, and 4% reported working with medical professionals.

Several faculty provided more detail about their sample partnerships:

- I arrange for students in my classes and research group to do free testing of pesticides on Native American artifacts (10 case studies to date, most for CA tribes on a gratis basis), lead in East Oakland residences (&gt300 samples analyzed between 2017-2019), and VOCs in Bayview Hunters Point air samples (3 case studies to date).
- Giving talks at Museums - Not sure what category this should be in
- Bay Area Book Festival, California Studies Association, California Historical Society, American Studies Institute, etc.
What are the community issues/topic areas addressed by your CERS? (Check all that apply)

NOTE: The table results are reflected in the same alphabetical order that each issue/topic was provided in the survey. The highest/top 5 are highlighted in yellow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Topic</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, natural resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals (e.g. domestic or wildlife)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis response and assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and/or dating violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and/or literacy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family asset building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care, wellness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/refugee assistance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated youth and/or adults</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, sports, and fitness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and performing arts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce &amp; leadership development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: A variety of issues were identified by respondents in an open-ended question (listed above in alphabetical order for ease of finding topic areas versus based on results). As noted, the top 5 are highlighted in yellow. Results of this survey show the top 3 community issues most commonly addressed in faculty CERS is education and/or literacy (8.7%), followed by cultural awareness and health care/wellness (both 12%). The two community issues addressed the least are agriculture/natural resources both at less than 1% of survey respondents.
Sec 6: Funding

Does your CERS receive funding as part of an officially-sponsored project of any of the following campus-based entities?
(Check all that apply)

- Department
- College/School
- Center/Institute/Program
- University, ORSP
- No Funding
- Other

Summary: Half (50%) of all respondents indicated they do not receive funding from any of the SF State entities listed above for their CERS.

16% of faculty indicated they receive funding from University ORSP, and 13% receive funding from another entity. Furthermore, 9% receive funding from a Center, Institute, or Program, and 6% receive funding from their department and/or their College/School for their CERS.
Is your CERS supported with funding (fully or in part) by an officially-sponsored project from any of the following outside/external entities? (Check all that apply)

Summary: This question asked respondents which outside/external entities they receive funding from for their CERS. Nearly 40 percent of respondents indicated their CERS is supported with funding from a Governmental agency. 22% of faculty reported they receive funding for their CERS from a non-profit organization, and 18% receive funding from a foundation or other philanthropic organization.

17% reported receiving funding for their CERS from an external entity not listed (“Other”), and 4% receive funding from a private business. Examples of external funding sources specified included:

- Funds for VOC testing of Bayview Hunters Point air samples provided via Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt District through a nonprofit (Rafiki Wellness)
- Fulbright
SEC 7: CHALLENGES, BARRIERS, & OPPORTUNITIES

What are the greatest challenges to implementing your CERS in the classroom and/or community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not a Barrier</th>
<th>Minor Barrier</th>
<th>Major Barrier</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading/assessing student learning in my classroom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying options for alternative student assignments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and/or maintaining community partnerships</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing paperwork and agreements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling logistics (e.g., scheduling, transportation, budget)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding appropriate CERS experiences appropriate for students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking time to document my research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding to conduct CERS (e.g., grants, contracts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition/acknowledgement for CERS (e.g., dept., college)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative campus attitudes toward CERS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management/liability issues &amp; concerns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please indicate:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column label “#” indicates the number of faculty who selected this response option.

Summary: This question received between 2-28 respondents answering each sub-section of this question. High percentages for responses identified as a “Major Barrier” and a “Minor Barrier” in this chart are in red, bolded text. High percentages for responses identified as “Not a Barrier” are in green, bolded text.

The top two greatest challenges to implementing CERS in the classroom/community most often identified by faculty as a “Major Barrier” were “Lack of funding to conduct CERS” (72%), and “Lacking time to document my research” (65%). A close third is “Handling logistics” (46%). The challenges most often identified as a “Minor Barrier” were “Handling logistics” (50%), “Completing paperwork and agreements” (48%), “Finding appropriate CERS experiences appropriate for students” (42%), and “Risk management/liability issues & concerns” (42%).

The challenges that were most often recognized as “Not a Barrier” to implementing CERS in the classroom/community were “Negative campus attitudes towards CERS” (77%), “Grading/assessing student learning in my classroom” (68%), and “Identifying options for alternative student assignments” (52%).

Note: Responses for “Other” were not included in this analysis, since only 2 faculty selected this option and did not provide an explanation for their answer choices.
What types of information and/or support would help further your CERS efforts? (Check all that apply)

Summary: Of the types of information and/or support listed, “Paid administrative support/student assistant” was the most commonly identified (n=18). “Logistical support” (n=13) and “Basic written information about CERS” (n=13) were also frequently selected by faculty as types of support that would help further their CERS efforts. Additionally, faculty indicated that “Grant writing support” (n=12) and “Access to community contacts including ways to understand local needs” (n=9) would be helpful for their CERS efforts. Other forms of support identified included “Individual, 1-on-1 meeting about CERS” (n=8), “Access to community contacts” (n=8), and “Other” (n=2). Only three (n=3) faculty indicated that they did not need any further support for their CERS (“Nothing, I have what I need). One faculty member suggested that “planning and brainstorming ideas on how/ help making it happen” would also be helpful in implementing their CERS. Several lecturers also noted lack of access to information regarding CERS and support for their CERS:

- As a lecturer, I receive practically no information about or funding for my research, CERS or no.
- The last time I applied for research funding that would support my current book project for the University of California Press, the dean noted that I wasn’t eligible for that support because I was a lecturer.

Generally, these findings suggest that varied forms of support for CERS could be improved in many areas at the university.
In your opinion, what are the most significant barriers facing faculty participation (in general) in CERS? (Check all that apply)

**Summary:** The most significant barrier to CERS identified by the faculty was “Emphasis on research and research publication” (n=14). Other top barriers worthy of noting included “Lack of recognition for CE-SL research/scholarship” (n=11), and “Limited means to document engagement in department reporting” (n=7), and “Restrictive policies with ORSP” (n=6). Only a few faculty responding indicated the other options as significant barriers to faculty participation in CERS (n=5). No faculty members specified that “CERS is actively discouraged.” Other barriers to CERS identified by the faculty in their comments included lack of funding and other resources:

- Lack of guidance for my specific discipline which is not immediately obviously a CERS field (Classics)
- Resources to support additional time it takes to incorporate CE in teaching
- Funding
- No time to develop new program of research
- My sense is that most of the funding goes to tenure/tenure track faculty. As such, it makes little sense to apply to (or even investigate) support for my research, whether or not it’s for CERS.
- Note ORSP wanted to charge my small $4000 grant from a CA tribe their usual 50+% indirect costs - tell me again how SFSU values community service. The former head of ORSP wanted their cut here and refused to use an off campus rate.
SEC 8: DEMOGRAPHICS

Which of the following best describes your position?

Summary: Of the 48 respondents who answered this question, tenure/tenure track faculty reflected nearly three-fourths of all respondents (73%). The largest group represented were Full Professors (29%). The second largest group represented were Associate Professors (23%), and the third largest group represented were Assistant Professors (21%).

The other positions represented were Part-time Adjunct/Lecturers (15%) and Full-time Adjunct/Lecturers (12%).
Summary: The largest racial/ethnic group represented in this sample is White, Non-Latino (61%). The second largest group represented were Latino(a)/Hispanic/Latinx (16%), followed by Asian/Asian American (10%) as the third largest racial group.

The other groups represented were Black/African American (4%), Middle Eastern (2%), and “Other” (2%).

Apparently 6% of respondents preferred not to disclose their race/ethnicity. None of the respondents in this sample identified as Native American/Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.
Please tell us how you identify:

![Gender Identification Chart]

**Summary:** This question asked participants to share their gender based on “male, female, non-binary, or transgender”. They could also select “prefer not to answer” or “other”). The majority of participants in this survey identified as female (65%). Slightly less than one third (31%) identified as male, and a small minority (4.2%) preferred not to answer. None of the respondents in this sample identified as non-binary or transgender. (There were 48 respondents to this item).

**College Affiliation & Years Employed at SF State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Years Employed at SF State (Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCOE</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoSE</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Several&quot; / Misc.</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSS</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Average:</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Regarding the number of years respondents have been employed at SF State and the college they are a part of the average number of years for each college are reported in the table above. Out of 41 respondents to this item, the Graduate College of Education had the highest reported with an average of 27 years employed at SF State. The lowest reported average was in CHSS, with 6.5 years employed at SF State. The overall average number of years of respondents employed at SF State, across all colleges, was 13 years.
Please share any final comments about your community engaged research/scholarship activities:

Summary: Faculty provided a variety of comments regarding community engaged research and scholarship. Several comments indicated the university should broaden its tenets to include the essential aspects of CERS as well as requests to balance requirements with more of a focus on service and teaching as core values of SF State.

- I have not included CERS in my WPAF because I became a full professor prior to engaging in this type of scholarship. In fact, I think one of the reasons I sailed through the RTP process is because I conformed to the traditional values of promoting curiosity and advancing knowledge that are held by faculty members in my department and college. I think that these values need to be broadened to include advancing social justice through CERS.

- I have been the only person in my Dept to offer a CSL course, and do CBPR. Until it is explicitly recognized in RTP, there will be reticence from junior faculty to engage in these methods. I started after I got tenure and my promotion was based on my traditional research and teaching and all my cbpr activities were counted as service, which was such a shame. I do get very high evaluations as a result of the time I put into teaching a CSL class which is an indirect upside of using these methods.

- The College of Science and Engineering (and dare I say some of our past Provosts) has a long history of focusing primarily on professional achievement and growth in tenure and promotion decisions. You may have a different opinion here but I have experienced this PERSONALLY in my promotion decisions as well as in 2 years of service on UTPC. Stop the bean counting for papers - a candidate is more than just the sum total of their publications. Stop hiring Deans like a former COSE Dean who would repeatedly say "We're going to hire the best of the best - research superstars" - this is not who we are at SFSU. Teaching should be our first and most important priority, but sadly its not in COSE for promotion decisions and I've seen marginal teachers get little or no scrutiny because they had large grants or published frequently. Similarly, our administration EXPECTS service but provides little or no rewards or recognition of this. Frankly, I'm TIRED of always being asked to do more - not just teaching a full load, not just conducting research, but many service duties as well. To give some examples, I serve as an undergrad advisor and meet and advise hundreds of students per year. I serve as Dept RTP chair which is a huge amount of work with NO compensation (annual tenure track reviews, temp faculty evaluations, PTRs, chair elections/reviews - this is a year around task). I serve as defacto instrument repair person for major instrumentation in our Dept, writing proposals to get instruments, arranging for service or repairing them myself. The fact that I have ANY time or energy left for community engaged research amazes me as I look back on my career here. And I am being completely honest when I tell you that I LOVE my job but I'm tired of the 50+ hour weeks - week after week - year after
year. It's not healthy and I'm tired of always having to step up and being asked to do more. Hence, I am planning to retire ASAP - there's a more sane job out there waiting for me which will provide better compensation, fewer hours, and fewer ulcers. I feel that I have given some of the best years of my life to SFSU and it's time for me to move on. And as I leave, I truly feel sorry for the younger faculty who are subjected to incredibly stringent criteria for promotion, while our administrators who set the rules and provide oversight seem to escape the same level of scrutiny. Good luck SFSU - you're going to need it.

Another comment indicated interest in expanding civic engagement:

- When I taught graduate courses, I would line up projects for students to perform services for community organizations as they learned how in my course. I'd like to at least try a civic engagement activity in my undergrad course, but it's a large course (2 or more sections combined, with 50 students per section) so it would have to be manageable.

One individual reflected that community engaged scholarship and research is a core component of their work at SF State:

- This is a huge part of my personal and professional life at SF State!

**Recommendations**

- SF State and ICCE could do a better job of explaining to faculty the meaning and importance of CERS across disciplines.

- Increase efforts to communicate that CERS is a valued component of faculty work and contributions.

- Encourage university level and dept. RTP committee(s) to show better support for CERS as a valid scholarship approach.

- Individual departments can do more to measure and celebrate the success of CERS among their faculty.

- Ensure that UTPC clearly communicates the significance of CERS to faculty as a value of SF State as a whole.

- Improving university and/or department RTP guidelines to include CERS. Results show policy clarification is needed making the importance of engaged research and community-based service learning scholarship more prominent.
• Establish the importance of engaged research and make service learning more prominent across campus.

• Support and promote more funding opportunities for CERS

• ICCE can increase the amount of small grant opportunities and how many are distributed; ORSP could discuss and consider awarding grants to faculty explicitly for CERS as well.

• Explore ways to address other barriers for faculty to implement CERS including logistics and risk management.

• Connect junior faculty with the opportunity to work on a CERS project together.

• The greatest forms of support that surfaced for CERS can be highlighted as follows:
  
  o Paid administrative support/student assistant(s)
  o Logistical support (e.g., getting through IRB)
  o Basic written information about CERS circulated across departments
  o Grant writing support
  o Increase visibility of CERS as a value across SF State
  o Provide additional funds from SF State sources for CERS across disciplines
  o Ensure CERS is part of department RTP guidelines (see page 18 for university and department suggestions)
APPENDIX A: OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

To what extent do you feel your work relates to Community Engaged Research & Scholarship (CERS) at SF State – Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am Cherie Safapou and I contribute to my society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work at a philanthropic foundation during the day and teach one night class. My daytime work is deeply involved with community-based organizations, and I write white papers for that work environment, but not for my department at SFSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure what is meant by the college and department supporting engaged research. If it is research funding, research assistants, lab space, or something else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is CERS about getting college professors and students to do market research for private companies who sell products? I am totally against that unless there is legitimate educational outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not exactly sure what CERS is…it would be helpful if you could define what exactly constitutes Community Engaged research/scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college generally does not support CERS, but there are particular faculty members that engage in this important work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been engaged in community-based research for the past 6 years. Responded &quot;moderate amount&quot; because some of my research is community-engaged, but not all is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a part-time lecturer faculty member in education, but I have a doctorate and conduct research. Right now I am working with Bay Area community colleges to research equity in online courses, but I'm not sure if this counts as CERS. My department and college do not include me in meetings (or most emails) so I have no way of knowing if they support or encourage my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've never thought about this at a college level. :)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERS is key to my overall work at SFSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am the only faculty who does community led research in my department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While I think community collaborations should be valued and part of today's undergraduate/graduate education, I fear that the resources are not there to support this. Yes, lots is said about it and lots of people talk as if they support it, however, as with many other issues at SFSU, if faculty are simply expected to take on more activities, that take up more time, this will largely end up being conducted by a few. And those few will be unfairly used (taken advantage off) by the university, college and departments! It is not up to individual faculty members to make these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
initiatives work. It is a joint effort, and faculty need support, including ONGOING financial support. Unfortunately, I suspect any support that will be given, will be only to START the initiative, and will basically be taken away in no time. The culture at SFSU is to take advantage of faculty and lectures, all "in the name of helping the students" (and I want to help our students!!!), but this type of talk is just a way to guilt faculty into doing it (this only works on those who are already doing a lot (no on the free riders who are busy running businesses and doing consulting on the side, and never even serving on university committees!). I don't have enough fingers to count how many times I have heard administrators say "we are not at SFSU for the money, people join to make a difference". Yet those same administrators never complain about salaries. Wonder why that is! So, unless you compensate people for their work, don't expect these initiatives to really take off and make a difference. People have bills to pay, they are not here to donate their time. As far as the benefits to students. I do think there is a benefit if it is a real experience for the students. I am concerned that students may just be used as free labor by some organizations!

Please share any final comments about your community engaged research and scholarship activities:

I have not included CERS in my WPAF because I became a full professor prior to engaging in this type of scholarship. In fact, I think one of the reasons I sailed through the RTP process is because I conformed to the traditional values of promoting curiosity and advancing knowledge that are held by faculty members in my department and college. I think that these values need to be broadened to include advancing social justice through CERS.

The College of Science and Engineering (and dare I say some of our past Provosts) has a long history of focusing primarily on professional achievement and growth in tenure and promotion decisions. You may have a different opinion here but I have experienced this PERSONALLY in my promotion decisions as well as in 2 years of service on UTPC. Stop the bean counting for papers - a candidate is more than just the sum total of their publications. Stop hiring Deans like a former COSE Dean who would repeatedly say "We're going to hire the best of the best - research superstars" - this is not who we are at SFSU. Teaching should be our first and most important priority, but sadly it's not in COSE for promotion decisions and I've seen marginal teachers get little or no scrutiny because they had large grants or published frequently. Similarly, our administration EXPECTS service but provides little or no rewards or recognition of this. Frankly, I'm TIRED of always being asked to do more - not just teaching a full load, not just conducting research, but many service duties as well. To give some examples, I serve as an undergrad advisor and meet and advise hundreds of students per year. I serve as Dept RTP chair which is a huge amount of work with NO compensation (annual tenure track reviews, temp faculty evaluations, PTRs, chair elections/reviews - this is a year around task). I serve as defacto instrument repair person for major instrumentation in our Dept, writing proposals to get instruments, arranging for service or repairing them myself. The fact that I have ANY time or energy left for community engaged research amazes me as I look back on my career
here. And I am being completely honest when I tell you that I LOVE my job but I'm tired of the 50+ hour weeks - week after week - year after year. It's not healthy and I'm tired of always having to step up and being asked to do more. Hence, I am planning to retire ASAP - there's a more sane job out there waiting for me which will provide better compensation, fewer hours, and fewer ulcers. I feel that I have given some of the best years of my life to SFSU and it's time for me to move on. And as I leave, I truly feel sorry for the younger faculty who are subjected to incredibly stringent criteria for promotion, while our administrators who set the rules and provide oversight seem to escape the same level of scrutiny. Good luck SFSU - you're going to need it.

When I taught graduate courses, I would line up projects for students to perform services for community organizations as they learned how in my course. I'd like to at least try a civic engagement activity in my undergrad course, but it's a large course (2 or more sections combined, with 50 students per section) so it would have to be manageable.

The concept of "community engaged research" should have been more clearly defined. My research has implications for public policy and important personal choices, but is fundamentally basic research. It does not involve participants from the local community and so most questions seemed irrelevant to what I do.

This is a huge part of my personal and professional life at SF State!

I have been the only person in my Dept to offer a CSL course, and do CBPR. Until it is explicitly recognized in RTP, there will be reticence from junior faculty to engage in these methods. I started after I got tenure and my promotion was based on my traditional research and teaching and all my cbpr activities were counted as service, which was such a shame. I do get very high evaluations as a result of the time I put into teaching a CSL class which is an indirect upside of using these methods.
NOTE: The survey that follows is extracted directly from Qualtrics
**Introduction**

_Introduction._

Dear Colleagues:

The Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) is conducting a Faculty Survey about community engaged research and scholarship. According to the SF State Strategic Plan COURAGE core value, ICCE must catalogue and maintain a list of SF State outreach programs so community-based scholars can coordinate and complement one another. Whether you believe you are involved in “engaged research” or not, this survey also includes general questions about your current efforts and needs. Please complete this brief survey to support ICCE in serving you better and helping fulfill the university mission. By participating in this survey you will help us more accurately reflect faculty engaged scholarship here at SF State. At the heart of every great strategy is the data to back it up!

**Note:** We are using the term Community Engaged Research and/or Scholarship (CERS) to address community-defined needs, constraints, and purposes of any given community. For more information: Dr. Nina Roberts, ICCE Faculty Director, nroberts@sfsu.edu, x8-6271.

---

**Research Experiences/Opinions**

Q1.1. To what extent do you feel your work relates to Community Engaged Research/Scholarship (CERS) at SF State:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe my work is considered CERS</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
<th>I Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have appropriate skills/knowledge to collaborate with members of the larger community in my research efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department supports community engagement type research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college supports community engaged research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.1a. Comments:

Q1.2. In your opinion, what constitutes the creation of CERS (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Community members gain tangible benefits through a product
- [ ] Includes non-academic decision-makers
- [ ] Faculty participate in dissemination of research beyond academic audiences
- [ ] Community members co-participate in dissemination of research
- [ ] Research questions co-created by community
- [ ] Academic members gain scholarly product/benefit
- [ ] Community members co-participate in interpretation of results
- [ ] Other:


Q1.2a. Comments:


Q1.3. To what extent do you believe CERS is valued by these stakeholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutely Not</th>
<th>No, Not Really</th>
<th>Yes, to an Extent</th>
<th>Absolutely Yes</th>
<th>I'm Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My College, School or Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Department Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty peers (any)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus marketing &amp; communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus development &amp; fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students (broadly, in your experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students in my department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members/residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.4. Let us know how you feel about the following statements to the best of your knowledge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement is a core part of the SF State mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations served by my department are receptive to collaborating in CERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My CERS is communicated by SF State (university, college, dept., etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award programs/forums exist to recognize engaged scholars and their work on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University RTP committee supports CERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators are used in my department to measure, refine, &amp; celebrate successes of CERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.4a. Comments:


Institutional/University Support

Q2.1. Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements regarding your perception of university and department support relating to CERS.
Faculty involvement in CERS is encouraged across the university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My CERS is **encouraged** in my **department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My CERS is concretely **supported** in my **department**

(e.g., release time, funding, student assistant, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2.1a. Comments:**


**Q2.2. Indicate your satisfaction with the following CERS opportunities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERS opportunities provided by CEETL to support my coursework</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty development opportunities to enhance CERS provided within my college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities to collaborate with other faculty across departments campuswide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2.2a. Comments:**


**Q2.3. What level of support do you currently have to use community-based research in your teaching?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creating connections/networking on <strong>campus</strong></th>
<th>No Support</th>
<th>Minor Support</th>
<th>Major Support</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creating connections/networking in the **community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Support</th>
<th>Minor Support</th>
<th>Major Support</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer mentoring for CERS opportunities in my classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Support</th>
<th>Minor Support</th>
<th>Major Support</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exposure to best teaching practices regarding CERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Support</th>
<th>Minor Support</th>
<th>Major Support</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presence of a coordinating body/office on campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Support</th>
<th>Minor Support</th>
<th>Major Support</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognition of my CERS by my department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Support</th>
<th>Minor Support</th>
<th>Major Support</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support from professional association(s) of which I am a member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Support</th>
<th>Minor Support</th>
<th>Major Support</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2.3a. Comments:**


**Review, Tenure, & Promotion (RTP)**
Q3.1.
In your current position, approximately how much of your time is spent allocated on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Far too much</th>
<th>Moderately too much</th>
<th>Slightly too much</th>
<th>Neither too much nor too little</th>
<th>Slightly too little</th>
<th>Moderately too little</th>
<th>Far too little</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (broadly)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.2.
How familiar are you with University Tenure & Promotion Committee (UTPC) guidelines (sec. 1.8) outlining criteria of CERS and its relevance to teaching connected with community? (i.e., effective teaching is demonstrated by a variety of factors, including scholarly research and creative activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>Not Familiar</th>
<th>Somewhat Familiar</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Very Familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.3.
In addition to criteria noted in UTPC, are there additional RTP guidelines put forth by your department that affect how CERS should be documented and considered for your RTP?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not Sure

Q3.3a. Comments:

Q3.4.
On a scale of 1-10 (1=none, 10=the most), slide the bar to show how much your research (broadly) informs your teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.4a. Comments:

- Non-community research/scholarship
- Community-based research/scholarship
Q3.5. What university and/or dept. guidelines or criteria would be helpful for you (in general)?

Q3.6. Have you incorporated CERS content (e.g. literature, subject matter experts) into any of your courses and/or into your own scholarship to enhance your Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, but I'm interested</th>
<th>No, and I don't intend to</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Research/Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.7. CERS and background of your courses:

Approximately how many years have you been incorporating community-based research into your courses?

How many of your courses have incorporated community-based research? (e.g. students engage in field work)

How many of your courses include CERS from the literature, including your own articles, etc. (e.g., assigned readings)

Q3.7a. Comments:

Q3.8. How often have you incorporated CERS into the following RTP/WPAF materials (if applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research (e.g., publications, grants, conferences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (e.g., training, committees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (e.g., service-learning, guest speakers, student participation in projects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics

DEMOGRAPHICS
Thank you for participating in this survey! Last, knowing the background of our faculty/lecturers is important to us. Please take 1 more minute to tell us a little about yourself.

Q9.1. Which of the following best describes your position?

- Full Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Full-time Adjunct/Lecturer
- Part-time Adjunct/Lecturer
Q9.2. Race/Ethnicity (Check all that apply)
- Asian/Asian American
- Black/African American
- Latino(a)/Hispanic/Latinx
- Middle Eastern
- Native American/Alaskan Native
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- White, Non-Latino
- Prefer not to answer
- Other

Q9.3. Please tell us how you identify
- Male
- Female
- Nonbinary
- Transgender
- Prefer to self-describe (please indicate)
- Prefer not to answer

Q9.4. SF State Background Information
- College
- Department
- Years Employed at SF State

Q9.5. Please share any final comments about your community engaged research/scholarship activities:

Publications/Conf

Publications/Conferences

Q4.1. In the last academic year (AY18-19), what types of publications have you submitted to from your CERS (Check all that apply)
- Disciplinary refereed/peer-reviewed journal article(s)
Q4.2. Have you presented your CERS at one or more conferences during the past 2 years?
- Yes
- No
- No, but I will in the future
- No and I have no intention

Q4.2a. Comments:

Theoretical Underpinnings

Q5.1. Please indicate the extent you agree or disagree with the following theory/concept-related statements. My community engaged research/scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>I Am Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contributes to development and/or expansion of theories in my field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to development of community engagement theories, broadly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my classroom contributes to development of theories that can further support service-learning for my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to development of theories regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning, broadly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5.1a. Comments:

Partners/Community Partners Data

Community Partnerships
Q6.1. Indicate approximately how often you engage in collaborative research with at least one community partner:

- Frequently (2-3 times/year)
- Occasionally (1-2 times/year)
- Rarely (Every 2-3 years)
- Never

Q6.1a. Comments:

Q6.2. What are the primary partners/constituents for your CERS? (Check all that apply)

- Alumni
- Business groups (e.g., tech, finance, retail, hospitality)
- Nonprofit organizations
- Education institutions (e.g., public, private, K-12, college)
- Government agencies, elected officials
- Medical professionals
- Underserved/underresourced communities (e.g., low income, people w/ disabilities, some racial groups, etc.)
- Other, please indicate:

Q6.2a. Please list other types of partners or share additional comments:

Q6.3. What are the community issues/topic areas addressed by your CERS? (Check all that apply)

- Addiction
- Agriculture, natural resources
- Animals (e.g. domestic or wildlife)
- Crisis response and assistance
- Cultural awareness
- Disabilities
- Domestic and/or dating violence
- Economic development
- Education and/or literacy
- Environmental issues
- Family asset building
- Health care, wellness
- Homelessness
- Immigration/refugee assistance
- Incarcerated youth and/or adults
- Low-income assistance
- Media/Communications
- Mental health
- Recreation, sports, and fitness
- Science & technology
- Senior citizens
- Urban planning
- Visual and performing arts
- Workforce & leadership development
- Youth development (e.g., asset building, vulnerable youth, special needs, leadership development, media)

Q6.3a. Comments and/or other community issues not listed above:


Q7.1. Does your CERS receive funding as part of an officially-sponsored project of any of the following campus-based entities? (Check all that apply)

- Department
- College/School
- Center/Institute/Program
- University, ORSP
- No Funding
- Other, please indicate:

Q7.1a. Comments:

Q7.2. Is your CERS supported with funding (fully or in part) by an officially-sponsored project from any of the following outside/external entities? (Check all that apply)

- Foundation or other philanthropic organization
- Governmental agency (e.g., city, county, state, federal)
- Non-profit organization
- Private business
- Other, please indicate:

Q7.2a. Comments:

Opportunities/Challenges/Barriers

Challenges, Barriers & Opportunities

Q8.1. What are the greatest challenges to implementing your CERS in the classroom and/or community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Not a Barrier</th>
<th>Minor Barrier</th>
<th>Major Barrier</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading/assessing student learning in my classroom</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying options for alternative student assignments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8.2. What types of information and/or support would help further your CERS efforts? (Check all that apply)

- Access to community contacts including ways to understand local needs
- Basic written information about CERS (i.e., examples of projects, best practices)
- Grant writing support
- Information session about CERS (e.g., resources/How-to's, funding, publication options, converting engaged teaching/CSL course into research/scholarship opportunity)
- Individual, 1-on-1 meeting about CERS
- Logistical support (e.g., transportation, supplies, etc.)
- Paid administrative support/student assistant
- Nothing, I have what I need
- Other, please indicate:

Q8.2a. Comments:

Q8.3. In your opinion, what are the most significant barriers facing faculty participation (in general) in CERS? (Check all that apply)

- CERS is actively discouraged
- Emphasis on research and research publication
- Lack of recognition for CE-SL research/scholarship
- Limited means to document engagement in department reporting
- My department does not consider community engagement as contributing to scholarship
- No designation for CERS on grant applications, etc.
- Restrictive policies with ORSP
- Restrictions on use of external revenue generated (e.g., IDC amounts and uses)
- Not interested
- Other, please indicate:

Q8.3a. Comments: