

University Senate Research Committee Meeting  
2 May 2018  
1:00 PM  
156 CL

In Attendance: C. Brown, K. Fike, M. Goodhart, G. Huber, J. Russell, R. Rutenbar, D. Salcido, P. Smolinski, M. Spring, C. Stillman, T. Songer, M. Williams

P. Smolinski stated that if there were not any comments on the Minutes of the April meeting, they would stand as posted. No comments were forthcoming.

In a request for any new information, G. Huber stated that the proposed changes to the Common Rule have been postponed until January 2019.

Community Based Research (CBR)

Prior to the meeting, M. Goodhart circulated a document with some comments and recommendations for CBR (Appendix A).

M. Goodhart noted that CBR differs from community engagement.

R. Rutenbar stated that some CBR may fall under the purview of Lina Dostilio in Community and Governmental Relations Office. He noted that the University has some community based centers which may offer the opportunity for research in those locations, and the personnel at these centers can offer advice to faculty who are interested in CBR.

M. Spring stated that some CBR may not be site based or conducted at the specific sites of the centers and there need at the University for a “point person” for CBR.

G. Huber noted that Jean Barone would be the contact person for IRB related issues in CBR. He stated that Clinical and Translational Science Institute (CTSI) and Community Research Advisory Board (CRAB) are involved in health related CBR.

M. Spring stated that it would be beneficial to hire a graduate student to catalog and evaluate the University’s efforts in CBR.

J. Russell stated that that School of Education has experience in research practice and partnerships, research ideas and community problems and in the brokering of CBR.

M. Spring stated there would be a benefit to the University in showing neighborhood contributions from community based research.

R. Rutenbar said that the University needs better outward communications of its contributions in CBR and a new Vice-Chancellor for Strategic Communications has been hired.

G. Huber stated that the needs of community based research seem to fall into two categories: process aspects and a programmatic aspects.

M. Williams and C. Brown stated that some people in a community may be leery of “research”, however, once they understand the purpose and mission, they come to embrace it.

M. Goodhart stated that CBR is advancing and that the University must progress to be on the leading edge. He suggested forums for strategic planning and the benchmarking of models and best practices.

M. Spring reiterated the suggestion to hire a graduate student to benchmark CMB efforts in other universities.

R. Rutenbar said that there is a program on social entrepreneurship in the Business School that is involved with the ethics and regulation which could have application in CBR.

M. Spring said that School of Information Science is also involved in CBR.

M. Goodhart suggested starting a task force on CBR with representatives from the different Schools, to discuss needs, institutional support, etc.

R. Rutenbar indicated that this seemed like a sensible way to proceed.

M. Spring stated that it may be beneficial for the Senior Vice Chancellor for Research to make a brief statement to the University Senate Faculty Assembly regarding the developments and efforts in the area of community based research. He added that a contact person for faculty interested in this should be designated.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Minutes submitted by Patrick Smolinski.

## APPENDIX A-Recommendations for Community Based Research

### **Community-based research at Pitt: an overview and agenda for the University Senate Research Committee**

Michael Goodhart (with many, many thanks to Lina Dostilio).

#### **Background**

Interest in community-based research (CBR), community-based participatory research (CBPR), or community-engaged research (CEnR) is growing at Pitt. This interest is reflected in the **Plan for Pitt**, specifically, in Goals 2 and 3:

- ***Goal 2: Engage in Research of Impact:*** We aspire to be a university that advances the frontiers of knowledge and makes a positive impact on the world through collaborative and multidisciplinary approaches to research that focus on areas of great societal need.
  - Identify and engage in strategic research opportunities where we can have significant impact on society
- ***Goal 3: Strengthen Communities:*** We aspire to be a university that strengthens our communities—from the Pitt community, to our region and the world around us—by expanding engagements, supporting collaborations, and embracing a global perspective.
  - Foster a culture of civic engagement, seeking to increase societal impact

Efforts are already underway to promote Pitt’s profile and capacity in this area. One such effort is the creation of **Community Engagement Centers** (announced [here](#), described further [here](#)). This committee has met with Lina Dostilio, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Community Engagement Centers, about her work and its relevance for research.

Another effort is Pitt’s decision to seek the [Carnegie Community Engagement Classification](#). This classification is based on “evidence-based documentation of institutional practice to be used in a process of self-assessment and quality improvement.” Several questions in the application are directly relevant to capacity and support for CBR (see Appendix 1).

Some resources in support of CBR already exist at Pitt, including the [Clinical + Translational Science Institute](#)’s Community PARTners program, which provides an integral link between University-based clinical and translational investigators and the community through organizations like the Urban League of Greater Pittsburgh and The New Pittsburgh Courier. These relationships enhance collaborative research, foster public trust, and ultimately promote better health. Community PARTners helps researchers develop studies that address the complex health questions about which community partners are most concerned. Community PARTners provides training, as well as funding for research development and partnered data collection. For community organizations,

Community PARTners can assist with providing evidence-based research interventions and practices and connect organizations to academic research or promote health research awareness and education.”

The GSPH also houses the [Community Research Advisory Board](#) (CRAB) within its Center for Health Equity. CRAB “was established in 2001 to advise researchers on how best to engage under-represented populations in research, and to foster collaboration among those populations and researchers interested in addressing health disparities. The Board includes community members, service providers, and academics with a shared interest in research being responsive to community needs and being conducted in a culturally appropriate and ethical manner. Over 90 researchers have presented research proposals or funded research projects to the CRAB seeking guidance on:

- development of proposals and study design
- minority recruitment
- design and content of recruitment materials
- how to address bad research experiences with minority populations
- how best to inform underrepresented populations about their research
- developing a systematic recruitment strategy
- identifying community organizations for partnered research.”

Both of these institutions reside within and are geared toward the health sciences.

Another resource at Pitt is an informal network of scholars and staff, the Academically-Based Community Engagement Working Group, which meets regularly to exchange information and promote community engagement at Pitt. The Working Group hosts what has become an annual Idea Exchange event on campus (on the most recent event, see <https://www.pittwire.pitt.edu/news/idea-exchange-drives>; a summary report of an earlier faculty-senate support event can be found [here](#).)

### **Additional community engagement capacities**

Even though these initiatives are good examples of support for CBR, more support is required. Pitt has no centralized support system for CBR and the faculty engaged or interested in this work are often left to navigate figure it out for themselves, with the result that many potentially valuable and significant projects may never get off the ground. Additional institutional support will be needed for Pitt to meet its strategic goals related to community engagement and to CBR in particular. The question relevant for this committee is: what kind of additional capacities and support are needed to encourage, foster, and promote CBR at Pitt?

Institutions that prioritize CBR and community engagement more broadly provide a variety of resources for faculty/PIs, staff, and students, often through the creation of dedicated resource centers. (See Appendix 2, a memo summarizing the findings of a Community Research ad-hoc group.) The questions on the Carnegie Classification application provide some guidance respecting the types of resources necessary: **professional development support, institutional-level policies for faculty promotion**

(and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that **specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods; other rewards for community engagement as one form of research or creative activity; and specific guidance for researchers regarding human subjects protections for community-engaged research provided by the institution's IRB.**

In a November 2017 strategic planning memo to senior leadership at the University, Assistant Vice Chancellor Dostilio and Vice Chancellor for Community and Governmental Relations Paul Supowitz wrote:

The development of community-engaged research... is significantly different from other forms of inquiry and research that do not involve community partners or audiences. See the [University of Utah's report on research and their neighborhood-based center](#). Typically, resource centers are developed that provide guidance on:

- Developing CEnR agendas,
- How to navigate partnered research such as Research-Practice Partnerships,
- Community ethics procedures (complementary to, but distinct from, human subjects ethics),
- Access to urban issue data sets,
- Incentive/pilot funding for projects that because of their hyperlocal focus would not be appropriate for external funding sources until instrumentation is validated and research questions are refined,
- Templates for data sharing agreements and templates for memoranda of understanding related to intellectual property and partner roles.
- Relatedly, and of particular importance to the CEC initiative, is the need to provide PIs with support and collaborative partners who can help to translate research findings for lay audiences, facilitate the integration of research findings and practice improvement, and facilitate the integration of research findings and policy development.

These suggestions were echoed in the 2015 summary report of the University Senate, which specifically noted that: "Faculty strongly support creating a centralized office for academically-based community engagement. This was recognized as important for cutting across the University's "silos of practice" to provide a clear hub for support and outreach and builds on the University's strategic pillar of "Foundational Infrastructure." That report also recommended that the University "Create clear guidance for faculty about how academically-based community engagement is understood by the central administration for promotion & tenure decisions." (This concern has been partially addressed within the Provost's area, through instructions to Deans to review and revise tenure and promotion criteria to recognize contributions made by faculty engaged in "collaborative, multidisciplinary, and translational research" intended to have broader social impact.)

### **Points for further discussion**

I would respectfully submit the following points for our committee discussion:

- What kind of process might help Pitt to assess its institutional needs in the area of CBR and to begin addressing those needs?
  - Office of research task force?
  - High-profile campus forums (similar to strategic planning effort)?
  - Benchmarking with leading institutions?
- IRB – human subjects ethics is distinct from community ethics. At other institutions, IRB participates in or facilitates PI awareness of community ethics of CBR.
  - See, e.g. this research ethics training available through CTSI: <http://www.ctsi.pitt.edu/research-community-cpret.html>
- Good practice in CBR involves compensating community partners for their time and participation in research. What can Pitt do to facilitate and streamline this kind of compensation?
- What sorts of professional development should Pitt provide in relation to CBR, and how should it be organized and promoted?
- What can Pitt’s Office of Research do to identify, highlight, and facilitate applications for grants supporting CBR?
- What can senior leadership do to ensure that CBR is recognized as legitimate scholarship essential to realizing the University’s strategic plan?
  - Explicit tenure and promotion language?
  - Seed grants to support small or highly local CBR projects, which often require extensive preliminary trust-building work for which it is difficult to obtain external support?
- Should CBR and other community engagement resources be housed in a single office or center?
  - Expanded CRAB for Pitt faculty/PIs?
  - Appropriate support for other forms of community engagement?
  - Pros and cons of housing these together?

## Appendix 1: The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

“The Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement is an elective classification, meaning that it is based on voluntary participation by institutions. The elective classification involves data collection and documentation of important aspects of institutional mission, identity and commitments, and requires substantial effort invested by participating institutions. It is an institutional classification; it is not for systems of multiple campuses or for part of an individual campus.”

“The classification is not an award. It is an evidence-based documentation of institutional practice to be used in a process of self-assessment and quality improvement. The documentation is reviewed to determine whether the institution qualifies for recognition as a community engaged institution.”

“The Community Engagement Classification takes place on a five-year cycle. The next opportunity for institutions to apply for classification will be during the 2020 cycle (which will open in 2018). In addition to the Elective Community Engagement Classification, the Carnegie Foundation also provides its all-inclusive classifications based on secondary analysis of existing national data. Information on the all-inclusive classifications can be found at <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/>.”

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

“The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.”

[The following questions on the application are relevant to research:

1. Does the institution provide **professional development support** for faculty in any employment status (tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty) and/or staff who engage with community? If Yes: Describe professional development support for faculty in any employment status and/or staff engaged with community. [An explicit expectation of this question is that there is professional development support for community-engaged research.] Check all that apply and indicate if these supports are available to tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, part time, and/or professional staff
  - a. Facilitation of partnerships
  - b. Planning/design stipends
  - c. Program grants
  - d. Research conference or travel support
2. Are there **institutional-level policies for faculty promotion** (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that

- uses community-engaged approaches and methods? If there are separate policies for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty, please describe them as well.  No  Yes NOTE: Characteristics of scholarship within research and creative activities include the following: applying the literature and theoretical frameworks in a discipline or disciplines; posing questions; and conducting systematic inquiry that is made public; providing data and results that can be reviewed by the appropriate knowledge community, and can be built upon by others to advance the field.
3. **Is community engagement rewarded as one form of research or creative activity (see notation above)?** Include tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty if there are policies that apply to these appointments.  No  Yes Please cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document):
  4. Are there examples of faculty scholarship and/or professional activities of staff associated with the scholarship of engagement (i.e., focused on community impact and with community partners) and community engagement activities (technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy reports, publications, other scholarly artifacts, etc.)?  No  Yes. Provide a minimum of five examples of scholarship from as many different disciplines as possible:
  5. Does the campus **institutional review board (IRB)** or some part of the community engagement infrastructure provide **specific guidance for researchers regarding human subjects protections for community-engaged research?**  No  Yes Please describe and provide examples:
  6. Is community engagement connected to [campus efforts that support federally funded grants for Broader Impacts of Research](#) activities of faculty and students?  No  Yes Please describe and provide examples:



## **Appendix 2: Pitt Community Engagement – Research Ad-hoc Team**

**Members:** Steve Albert, Willa Doswell, Audrey Murrell, and John Wallace

**Charge:** Draft a proposal for how research would be facilitated through the community engagement centers

### **Some existing models reviewed:**

1. Yale University – outlines principles, guidelines, ethical responsibilities, strategies and framework; includes explicit statement about ethics, diversity and shared benefits
2. University of Utah – outlines university’s role, requirements (e.g., IRB), principles, mutual benefits. Also includes a list of resources for faculty (e.g., potential journal outlets)
3. University of Connecticut – includes guidelines, statement on the importance of relevance, emphasis on communication with community stakeholders, ethics conduct. Outlines expectations for capacity-building, resource-sharing and sustainability of projects.
4. University of Minnesota – provides a checklist for faculty that identifies key criteria for conducting research (e.g., relevance, engaged community partner, action focused, public dissemination plan, meets IRB guidelines)

**Summary:** Most models include overall principles, statements on mutual benefits, university’s role, importance of relevance, ethical contact and need for ongoing community engagement

**Task Force Recommendations:** Produce a set of guidelines and process for research within the CEC targeting Pitt faculty as the primary audience that includes the following:

1. Core Principles – emphasis on the importance of balancing “rigor” and “relevance” as key criterion for research within the CEC. Stress core principles that should be part of research project such as research consistent with CEC purpose, mutual benefit to both scholarship and community, and adherence to ethical standards of research
2. Criteria and Guidelines – utilize a revised version of the checklist from Minnesota’s UROC that is adapted for Pitt-specific use. Includes requirements such as Pitt IRB approval and that the primary researcher to go thru an orientation with the CEC Director on the center, current projects and background on the targeted community (e.g., Homewood)
3. Review Process – develop a research review board that looks at proposal research projects, provides feedback and suggestions for proposals submitted by faculty (*discussion whether this is all faculty or faculty and community members together was not resolved*); appoint a Faculty Research Chair that works to convene and oversee this group and also serves as a resource for faculty research collaborations
4. Resources – suggest we offer seed grants to encourage faculty to engage in this type of work or to support work under development until larger funding can be secured
5. Other Issues – suggest ongoing oversight and coordination be done by the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Center Director and Faculty Research Chair to help form collaborations, avoid redundancies and limit overutilization from the research within the CECs