

# 5

## Curricular and pedagogical impacts of community-based research: experiences from higher education institutions

*Felix M. Bivens*

### Introduction

Universities no longer monopolize knowledge. Once seen as society's primary institution for preserving, creating and disseminating knowledge, higher education institutions (HEIs) now find themselves in a world in which knowledge is too commercially valuable and omnipresent to be contained within academy walls. The advent of the knowledge economy has seen the proliferation of other organizations, many profit driven, which also understand their *raison d'être* as creating and disseminating new ideas and knowledge. Looking beyond its potential monetary value, postmodern understandings of knowledge equate it directly with cultural and political power (Foucault and Gordon, 1980). Such thinking has led to a (re)recognition of the diversity of epistemological perspectives which exist, of which disciplinary academic and scientific ways of knowing represent only a few in a much more vast and complex taxonomy of knowledges (de Sousa Santos, 2006). These seismic shifts in the place of knowledge in society have not eliminated the need and value of traditional academic approaches for creating and transferring information, but they have exposed the serious limitations of conventional approaches to research and teaching, particularly in regards to pressing social and environmental issues.

Moreover, while the intellectual foundations were shifting beneath HEIs, so were financial supports that have typically kept universities in business. Over the past thirty years, government spending on universities and research has been curtailed drastically. This combination of factors has forced HEIs to adopt a plethora of new structures and processes in order to survive. Of particular importance is that these factors have required HEIs to become more permeable and networked with the wider world. Seeking new forms of revenue, universities have collaborated more with private sector businesses in research and development projects. This marketization of the university has been counterpointed by a smaller, but equally significant, university engagement with people in communities, in the non-profit/voluntary sphere and in civil society more generally. Whereas marketization correlates with the increased monetary value of knowledge, engagement is typically undergirded by an aim of extending epistemologies so that knowledge from within universities can be activated and allied with various forms of knowledge outside of HEIs, for the purpose of creating positive social change, both locally

and globally. Within this particular arena, community-based research (CBR) is proving a particularly powerful process for bringing diverse forms of knowledge together to address difficult problems faced by communities and society.

The Office of Community-Based Research at the University of Victoria in Victoria, Canada, describes CBR as ‘Research that is conducted with and for, not on, members of a community ... Unlike traditional academic research, CBR is collaborative and change oriented and finds its research questions in the needs of communities, which often require information that they have neither the time nor the resources to obtain’ (Dragne, 2007, p. 16).

Strand *et al.* (2003a) point to three distinct dimensions of CBR: (1) collaboration between academics and community members; (2) legitimization of multiple modes of knowing in the creation and dissemination of the knowledge created; and (3) a normative goal of social change.

CBR can be understood as a union of two important traditions within higher education which have sought to make university resources and capacities available for community needs. The first, participatory action research (PAR), has long sought to make the research capabilities of HEIs accessible to marginalized populations and communities. PAR has an extensive history, particularly in universities in the global South. The second tradition is service-learning, a more recent, largely Northern movement which has sought to engage university students in direct action in dealing with community problems. Both of these traditions have remained minority perspectives within HEIs because they challenge conventional roles of university academics and students. For this reason, among others, such practices have had limited impact on curriculum and teaching within the higher education sector as a whole. Because researchers were rarely recognized or rewarded for their PAR with communities, this work was done as an add-on to their regular research activities. Moreover, because such work was considered of questionable academic merit by the higher education establishment, academics were hesitant to fold such endeavours back into the classroom. Similarly, while universities were willing to support service learning as an extra-curricular activity for students, many administrators questioned the educational relevance and revenue-generating potential of such activities. Considered a distraction from serious classroom-based learning, service-learning was often separate from the curriculum and rarely linked intentionally with courses.

CBR, however, makes a more explicit commitment to bring students into the process of working with communities:

In contrast to participatory research, CBR engages students alongside faculty and community members in the course of their academic work. CBR combines classroom learning and skills development with social action in ways that ultimately can empower community groups to address their own needs and shape their own futures. (*Ibid.*)

While this normative aim of embedding students in community research is an important shift in the discourse, to date very little research has been done to understand in what ways such practices of CBR influence curriculum and

teaching at institutions where community research is accepted and prevalent. Like other discourses relating to various modes of engagement by HEIs, literature on the subject of CBR falls into three categories: normative, methodological and community outcomes. Proponents of CBR are eager to explain the value and need for scaling up these activities: they write articles that describe the challenges of carrying out research in dynamic partnerships with community members and groups; and advocates often produce reports of how their work has led to qualitative and quantitative improvements for the community or groups involved in the research collaboration. All of this is important and will contribute to the mainstreaming of CBR at more universities. Nonetheless, there is also an important need to be reflexive and to explore if such CBR practices have led to changes within HEIs themselves. This chapter will seek to fill some of this void by examining the extent to which CBR programmes at four HEIs have impacted the curriculum and pedagogies of the institutions themselves.

The next section will provide a review of these four programmes, supplying some background on the CBR programmes and their evolution, and detailing some areas where the growth of these programmes has had an impact on aspects of the institution's curricula and/or pedagogy. The four programmes to be covered in detail are: the Master's in Participation (MAP) at the UK's Institute of Development Studies (IDS), and the Community University Partnership Programme at the University of Brighton (CUPP), the outreach programme at Sewanee, University of the South (US), and the *Programa de Investigación Interdisciplinario Desarrollo Humano en Chiapas* (Interdisciplinary Research Programme on Human Development in Chiapas) at the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM), Mexico. In addition to the review of these four programmes, there will be some shorter examples of innovative work under way at several other institutions across the world. These organizations (including an NGO as well as HEIs) are partners in the Citizenship Development Research Consortium (CDRC), also based at IDS. Following the review of these programmes, some lessons will be gleaned by looking across these diverse cases and contexts. Finally, some remaining challenges will be explored as well as some potential ways forward in order to meet these difficulties.

## Lessons learned

Looking across the various programmes, institutions and contexts, some commonalities can be found. Important lessons can be discerned on at least three levels: institutionally, curricularly and pedagogically.

Institutionally, student engagement in CBR work is the culmination of many years of advance work by numerous individuals. Although the actual trajectory is of course different in every HEI, CBR within universities generally starts in a piecemeal, stochastic manner, with individuals working singly, with no institutional support and little connection to others in the institution who similarly engaged. In time, some amount of informal organization is achieved between community-based researchers, though their preference may be to work beneath the radar and not draw attention to themselves and this work. By various means,

an institutional opening eventually occurs which leads to a formal recognition of CBR work by the HEI. Such an opening may arise from the arrival of a new university head with a predilection for community engagement, it may be triggered by poor community relations that need to be repaired in a visible, tangible form by the university, or it may come from below with a groundswell of university and community members demanding more support for community-based activities. With this institutional recognition comes a degree of institutional support, often in the form of an office with one or more staff with extensive knowledge and experience of CBR or community development who serve as advocates and resource persons for academics.

Only after such offices have become established and somewhat accepted within the institutional culture do CBR processes seem to begin to feed back into the curriculum of the institution. Although individual academics may have long involved students in their community work, having the contributions of students in such research recognized and credited by the institution comes only after a formalized CBR approach is established and a good track record achieved. This is not only a matter of building advocacy networks in the university but also among community partners; it is arguable that integrating CBR practices into the curriculum actually places higher demands on community partners than on HEIs. By the time a university formally accepts service learning, action research and CBR as legitimate pedagogical approaches, course leaders have generally long since integrated such practices into their teaching, and it is simply a matter of having that extra dimension recognized on students' transcripts.

When this recognition occurs, the volume of students engaging in CBR will increase. Instead of individual students carrying out independent study projects, now entire classes of students will be seeking out organizations and projects to fulfil their required project placements. This is one reason why a stable community engagement office is usually in place before CBR moves into the curriculum, because a large number of community partners are needed to work with students on a mass scale. Lone academics are unlikely to have the sheer number of contacts to link their students, nor the time to help broker these connections, one by one. Thus, CBR offices play a vital supporting role in making connections and facilitating student-led CBR. These offices need to have access to a wide variety of networks to be able to field students regularly, and to ensure that the same community partners are not continually asked to be matched with students. As Stoecker (2008) has pointed out, CBR by students is often of sub-optimal quality, particularly at the undergraduate level and if students are working singly. As such, community groups are likely to continue fielding student researchers only if they are satisfied with the other forms of university engagement the office offers. Strong relationships must be established and maintained with community partners above and beyond these student interactions, wherein working with students is understood as more as a form of capacity development, to increase student awareness of social issues and of the work of the voluntary/community sector more generally.

Just as maintaining a good working relationship with a wide variety of community partners is an important responsibility for a CBR office, so is maintaining

relationships within the HEI itself. In order to mainstream CBR and other engagement approaches in the curriculum, a CBR office must widen its network across the university faculty and lend support to potential allies in the faculty who are considering adopting these practices in their research and teaching. However, this requires a nimble balancing of sharing resources so that the office does not appear to be too cliquish in supporting only the same academics time and time again, but yet not alienating these long-time supporters when attempting to woo new faculty members into CBR projects. Moreover, the office needs to cultivate a strong relationship with the power centre of the university.

Mott (2005) has noted the vulnerability of even well-established CBR programmes. Just as CBR advocates within HEIs need to remain attuned to opportunities within the institution, they also need to stay abreast of threats as well. However, maintaining a high level of visibility appears to reinforce the value of CBR programmes to university managers. Being a good neighbour is often a rhetorical rallying cry for university presidents, and well-documented CBR can give weight to such claims. Further, outside support generated from a strong track record with community groups can provide important leverage against internal institutional threats. Curricular CBR is also significant in such instances because it provides a mechanism through which a university can maintain high levels of connectivity across the community. Through widespread student CBR, the university is perceived as working in many locations at once, as opposed to the much fewer number of projects that CBR office workers can staff themselves or provide funding for academics at any one time. Significant as well in many cases are alumni, who have benefited from their past engagement with CBR programmes, and who can leverage their support towards maintaining and augmenting CBR programmes.

At the curricular level, perhaps the most important contribution of this chapter is simply to demonstrate through several clear case studies that CBR programmes do typically feed back into the curriculum. So much energy has been spent advocating for CBR-based projects on external outcomes from projects in and with communities that the reflexive impacts of CBR on institutions where such programmes are housed have been neglected. However, even this brief overview of several HEIs suggests that CBR programmes do eventually make substantive inroads on curriculum design. As mentioned previously, this does not seem to happen when CBR practices are informal and diffuse. Only when such practices have been recognized and given standing within the institution, by the creation of a staffed office, do such approaches begin to gain pedagogical validity. Further, the office itself serves to hasten this evolution by acting visibly as an advocate for academically integrated CBR and by providing various kinds of resources in support of academics attempting to teach through CBR activities. As such, CBR offices are essential for seeding and maintaining community engagement approaches in the curriculum.

It is important to note, however, a lag time between the institutionalization of CBR through a dedicated office and CBR's penetration of the curriculum. A curricular programme must be founded on strong internal and external networks

which require time to develop. How long it might take CBR to infiltrate the curriculum is heavily dependent on context. In an institution such as Sewanee, which had very low levels of community engagement prior to the establishment of its outreach programme, moving CBR into the curriculum took almost fifteen years. Even at the University of Brighton, which had notably high levels of CBR prior to the establishment of CUPP, the development of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programme took several years. Initial priorities of CUPP involved organizing allies inside the institution and in the community. On the back of these networks, a strong academic dimension has emerged and is continuing to proliferate.

The Case Studies suggest that CBR programmes can shift curricula in rather specific ways. First, teaching through CBR approaches helps to bring together theory, experience and practice, thus making learning more connected. Integrating CBR into a course helps students apply concepts they are exposed to in the classroom. Students in CPD at the University of Brighton experience working inside an organization as they try to make sense of organizational management literature. Rural development students at UAM (Chiapas) work with massively complex human rights and human development approaches by discussing with villagers what these concepts mean to them. The Participation, Power and Social Change (PPSC) team at IDS has a long history of CBR, with partners all over the developing world. However, because of the Empowering Society course, that accumulated experience is now being applied in the city of Brighton where IDS is located. Similarly at Sewanee, an institution which has long held to a traditional liberal arts approach, disciplines as conceptually oriented as anthropology and philosophy departments are finding ways to improve student learning by building relationships with local people in order to engage students with diverse and challenging perspectives on complex issues.

Further, the Sewanee examples also demonstrate how CBR approaches push curricula towards greater interdisciplinarity. It's often said that 'the world has problems but universities have departments'. CBR helps to shift the starting point for curricular learning to real-world issues which cut across entrenched disciplinary lines. Sewanee's work in Haiti has brought together faculty from biology and fine arts, wherein students who participate in the Haiti programme collaborate between courses on CBR projects that utilize knowledge and skills from biology and photography students. This interdisciplinary influence is not just apparent in the fieldwork. As the photography professor from Sewanee notes, his subject matter in the classroom has also become more diverse:

My engagement with students against this backdrop of community service, study abroad, has actually opened up many more avenues of communication with other faculty and other disciplines than ever before for me. My readings in classes are much more about other things than art itself ... Rarely do I assign readings that are studies about other artists. More frequently it's things like an essay on war – I mean right here [on my desk] a random sampling of what we're looking at – 'Access and consent in public photography', 'Seeing and believing', a whole essay about the nature of politics and documentary photography and the reporting of truth, Fyodor

Dostoyevsky's *Notes from the Underground*, and an essay we just finished reading about war, human rights and photography. There are massive and really exciting cross-overs happening with other disciplines and approaches. (Interview, 2009)

Courses such as MAP and the MA in Rural Development are taught collaboratively by teams of academics, all of whom have different disciplinary training and diverse cultural and regional experience. Not only is there an epistemological melding across disciplines in these courses, there is also movement to include perspectives previously excluded from academic discourse. In PRIA's MA and in UAM's MA in Rural Development, practitioners are given a podium in the classroom as adjunct faculty to speak from their hands-on experience in the field. Their experiential knowing is acknowledged to be as valid as academic knowing. The case is similar with the CPD module at Brighton where the majority of the course conveners are experienced professionals from the voluntary sector rather than career academics. Moreover, the courses described in this chapter universally recognize the experience of students as a core form of knowledge which must enter the mix as well.

Finally, CBR approaches tend to make the curriculum more emergent and adaptive. Allowing real-world experiences and processes to enter the learning space greatly reduces the predictability of a course. Community partners may shift the focus of a project to a more pressing issue. Complications may arise which requires different kinds of information and methods. The course conveners must deftly cover core concepts while also helping students address unexpected situations. Moreover, emergence in the classroom is not simply an instrumental response for better problem solving. CBR approaches, rooted in participatory methods, are increasingly moving towards a participatory paradigm which focuses on co-construction and co-creation in all activities. Thus, deep CBR approaches also strive towards participatory curriculum development. This is most clearly expressed in the IDS' MAP programme where time is spent each week determining the future direction of the course, with some parts of the course completely dependent upon students' preference rather than determined in advance by the lecturer. This was also seen in many of the CDRC courses. When teachers empower students to lead entire class meetings, the course would move in unanticipated directions. Such participatory course development requires time – time to deliberate, and time to build a circle of trust in which students are comfortable expressing their goals and feelings, and additional time for preparation on the part of the course leader who must anticipate and prepare for the various directions in which a course might flow.

This takes the discussion to the third level in which the influence of CBR approaches is apparent – the pedagogical. In many ways, once such approaches are integrated into a course, the discussion basically shifts from pedagogical concepts to andragogical ones – adult learning concepts. Engaged teaching does not see students as receivers and consumers of information but as active producers and co-creators of knowledge collaborating with the course facilitator and others outside of the classroom. Thus, students shift from objects of teaching to subjects of learning. This involves a shift in power relations which can be facili-

tated by creating spaces for participatory curriculum development and the kind of emergence discussed in the preceding paragraph. The professor moves away from the marketized logic of delivering a predetermined bundle of information/content. Instead, the aim is to collaborate iteratively with students, to bring them appropriate information which helps to problematize and illuminate the challenges emerging from the action learning and processes occurring outside the classroom. As such, the course leader is not simply problem solving but opening the possibility of multiple responses and ways forward so that students' CBR work is also adaptive and responsive to ongoing developments, rather than a linear, rote methodology and structure. Shifting classroom power relations is also about creating a more democratic space in the classroom. There are multiple aspirations in such a shift: instrumental – bending the class towards greater relevance and immediacy for the students; normative – being congruent with the participatory axiology inherent in CBR; capacity development – helping students to experience and construct inclusive, multi-stakeholder discussions which give voice to all at the table and strive towards consensual resolutions of disagreements. On one hand, this is about modelling these behaviours for students as course leaders, and on the other, about providing them room to facilitate such spaces themselves. There is anticipation of a knock-on effect, that students will pick up these practices and utilize them in their own CBR. Thus the course leader models good facilitation and provides spaces for students to facilitate in the classroom as purview to students then facilitating such inclusive processes in the field – and, it is hoped, even further in their careers, subsequently.

CBR-infused teaching is andragogical because it recognizes values and incorporates the lived experience of the student. As such, students are not empty pails to be filled; they are fires to be stoked. The question is how to meet students where they are and build upon the knowledge they bring. The examples in this chapter suggest one of the best methods for incorporating this embodied knowledge is through reflection and reflective practice. This means a structured, intentional effort, not periodically asking for students' opinions. Indeed, students are so used to one-way transactions of knowledge in most formal education settings that they are reluctant to put their experience forward, considering it an inferior form of knowledge. However, personal experience is the lens through which students will interpret all new information in the course and in the CBR process. Structured reflection helps students to form their own motivations, expectations, biases and assumptions. Rather than filling pages with quotes and citations from literature, students write out their own responses and reactions to concepts and events.

The reflective inherently links to the reflexive. Through reflective journal recording and other methods, students create a personal history of their own changing perspectives and mindsets. It helps them trace changes in their own thinking over time. Reflexive practice in conjunction with CBR also reminds students that social change is partially a personal process and that creating change in the world may require critiquing and changing oneself. Through reflective processes, learners examine their own power and their positionality within hierarchies of organization and culture. Reflexive thinking encourages students to



conceptualize that positionality as malleable, as something that can be changed through new behaviours, ways of being, relating and facilitating. Ultimately, students become more self-aware and cognizant of how they engage with others, personally and professionally.

## Challenges

Although there are many institutional challenges involved in introducing CBR elements into the curriculum, additional issues present themselves in attempting to work with students on CBR projects. Obviously, managing students engaging in one or more outside projects requires additional time and energy from course conveners. Again, one of the values of a CBR office is being able to support, administratively and in other ways, faculty who are attempting to work such processes into their courses. However, even when there is good support for this work, various challenges persist. In reviewing the courses and programmes cited in this chapter, several reoccurring issues are found. Some are practical while others are more complex.

On the practical side, one of the difficulties faced in MAP and with the PRIA diploma is staying in good contact with students. MAP functions well while students are on the IDS campus. However, while students are in fieldwork, contact with supervisors can often be quite intermittent. IDS researchers stay incredibly busy and then the MAP students themselves face the double duty of completing complex PAR projects in the middle of their regular workaday duties. As such, both students and advisers can often become so busy that months may go by without regular contact. Requiring students to submit regular progress reports has proved to be helpful, as is the mid-placement seminar which brings all of the students back to IDS for two weeks. Still, some students have expressed frustration at a feeling of disconnection during this period, not only from conveners and supervisors but from fellow students. Although students are quite energetic in building community while they are on campus, the realities of fieldwork do not leave much time for peer support. Social networking sites have allowed MAP students to facilitate some dialogue, but not consistently.

Similarly, the PRIA diploma, which was entirely distance-learning based, had difficulty maintaining appropriate levels of communication. Some students would disappear from online discussions for weeks at a time. Sometimes, towards the other extreme, virtual student discussions would move so quickly that course facilitators, who might have time to contribute once a day or every other day, would find that the discussions might have digressed. Allowing for a mixture of emergence and control was found to be more difficult in e-discussions than in actual face-to-face dialogues. CUPP's CPD module seemed to have the most success in this area and students felt they able to easily reach their conveners throughout their term of fieldwork. On the whole, however, the CPD placement period of three months is far less than the year of fieldwork involved in IDS's MAP, UAM's MA in Human Development and PRIA's MA in Participatory Development. Creating a good infrastructure for communication and peer support is vital

to programmes involving long, site-based CBR projects.

Another more difficult issue is student resistance to new and unfamiliar pedagogical approaches. Examples of student resistance were found in most CDRC courses where lecturers attempted to create more participatory and democratic teaching spaces. Similarly, some MAP students have difficulty with the reflective practice element of the programme. They are very reluctant to connect the personal and the professional, even in a small group setting. Further, students who have adjusted to a passive, consumeristic approach to education expect to receive information they have paid for and feel cheated by emergent, participatory approaches that may or may not cover a predetermined body of information. Much effort should go into explaining the logic of such pedagogic approaches, making links to the communal epistemological paradigm upon which PAR and CBR are founded. Nonetheless, students can misinterpret such teaching styles as unpreparedness on the part of a professor who does not arrive with lectures notes or a PowerPoint presentation. One approach to combat this perception is to begin a course with a more structured curriculum, and then open up the flow of the course more as time moves along, more of a relationship has been forged and a sense of energy can be detected in certain topic areas. Beginning a term with completely open discussions of what a course's content might be can leave the students feeling off kilter if they are unfamiliar with such an approach. Striking the right balance is more complicated when students are more advanced, however. Many MAP students anticipate a completely emergent process and can be frustrated when too much structure is generated by institutional requirements, such as required attendance, mandated by the directorate of the institution, and not by MAP's course conveners.

Another way to gradually introduce participatory methods into the classroom is to begin with intensive reflective practice exercises. This encourages students to express their course expectations and to articulate their natural perspectives on issues to be explored in the class. Often, even in many of the CDRC courses discussed in this chapter, lecturers front-load their courses with conceptual material and then spend the rest of term debating the implications of these ideas. While this is an essential component of the learning processes, it can 'denaturalize' the students' own tacit perspectives on these issues. Because students have not had the opportunity to intentionally articulate what their own experiences have taught them to believe about certain concepts such as democracy and citizenship, they are immediately saturated with concepts from the literature. Because these views are assumed to be more valid than a student's naive opinion and because students have not formed their own perspectives clearly, their room for manoeuvre and discussion becomes largely confined by the ideas in reading lists. By beginning with more reflective and exploratory work, students can become more aware of their own views and attempt to link those perspectives with certain experiences and influences in their lives – or indeed discover the absence of any experiences to support those views. Having vocalized such a baseline perspective, students then are more empowered to use literature presented in the course to interrogate their own beliefs. The reflective element then leads to a level of reflexivity.

Moreover, professors can use the reflective writing to gauge where a class is starting from. The course readings and overall direction can be adapted to begin with ideas that are comfortable to students because they harmonize with their own experiences. Then, there can be a more gradual exploration of concepts which students may find challenging. Similarly, students can be individually assigned readings which may support or challenge their first reflections. As the course continues, ongoing reflective exercises help the students keep track of how their ideas are evolving as they engage with new ideas. Through such a reflective scaffolding, some of the emergent aspects of participatory curriculum design become more embedded and do not depend only on classroom discussions. Through gathering reflective information, lecturers are able to sense energy and momentum in the group and to anticipate where they are heading next.

Another important challenge is striking the right balance between the needs of students and the needs of community partners. Bringing CBR practices into the curriculum reintroduces this tension at a new level. Potentially, the power differential in terms of social positionality may be somewhat less for a student and an outside participant than for a professional academic and a CBR participant; nonetheless, it remains an important topic for students and partners to reflect on.

Certainly, reflective practice offers a good method for helping students become more self-aware, but as facilitators of such courses and projects, there are additional issues to be considered. Whereas academics taking part in CBR efforts may have a fairly fluid time-frame that can allow the project to develop within the community and move forward at its own pace and in an emergent direction, students are on a much more regimented timescale. Their time for engagement is strictly bounded and will come to an end, likely in advance of the full completion of the project so far as community participants are concerned. So it is important to manage expectations on both sides of the equation – students and community partners. Both need to know the limitations of what is likely to be achieved. Students need to be assured that assessment is not based on the outcome or the completion of a project. Equally, community partners need to be realistic in the scope of the projects where students are the primary researchers. Course facilitators can add incentive for community participation by providing students across multiple terms/semesters to carry out segmented CBR projects over longer time-frames for community groups. Perhaps, in some instances, student projects can serve as preliminary data for creating more robust projects that may involve academics and not simply students.

IDS's PPSC team faced this tension in MAP as well as in its Empowering Society course. When the MAP course came into being, the energy was focused on participatory methods and PAR, as those are the strengths of that team for which they have an international reputation. Nonetheless, it was clear in practice that students attempting to facilitate large-scale action research projects, particularly within their own workplaces, could not move such projects to any level of resolution in a year. To force such projects along would inevitably contradict the nature of the work. Thus there is tension between students' needs and goals and those of the partners in the project, just as there is when academics engage in CBR. This

tension resulted partially in the increased importance of reflective practice in the MAP programme. The core aim of the MA has to move subtly from action inquiry to professional/personal inquiry. Students still spend much of their time building their action research skills, but within the framework of the MA itself, students are assessed more on self-discovery and personal change – impact on self, more so than impact on the community or field site. Creating change in the broader environment is still paramount, but projects initiated under MAP are expected to continue even after the course has completed, allowing them to run their course naturally. In the process, MAP students become more dynamic and self-aware as social change participants.

Even in the one-term (ten-week) Empowering Society course this tension developed. As discussed previously, the module turns around a CBR project locally in the Brighton community. Initially, the course conveners had labelled this project as ‘action enquiry’ in the syllabus. However, as the course went on, students themselves expressed unease with that term, with the connotations and expectations it created. They felt that within a limited ten-week time-frame they could not complete a genuine PAR project. Thus they asked to amend the terminology to simply ‘case study’. This change has not prevented student teams from achieving noteworthy results in their projects in Brighton, but their expectations and their partners’ expectations are managed proactively and made more realistic (Pettit, 2009).

### Ways forward

Bringing CBR approaches into the curriculum is not a simple or straightforward matter. Many of the tensions and ambiguities between academics and community partners in relation to CBR are recreated at the student/community partner level. Moreover, teaching and learning about these practices in a way which builds student capacity for CBR is also immensely challenging and requires pedagogical experimentation, commitment and energy, more so than teaching from a static syllabus. Because participatory, engaged approaches to teaching and learning are difficult to institutionalize and to implement, they remain minority approaches. Certainly, mandating CBR approaches would be a mistake as well. Many academics and students have neither the temperament nor the inclination to carry out cooperative inquiries with community partners; forcing such individuals into CBR projects would exacerbate relations between HEIs and communities. Nonetheless, more academics and students who could contribute significantly to the field of CBR have yet to be exposed to the ideas and practices that compose this paradigm. While many CBR practitioners have worked in the margins of the university feeling that their work is not academic enough, this mindset only inhibits the advance of these approaches throughout institutions and the higher education sector. If the aim is to expand the use of PAR and CBR, then such work must be made visible. Significantly, there are now more academic journals with an explicit focus on community engagement. Such journals allow for the production of peer-reviewed articles which help meet the publishing quotas

required of academics, while simultaneously creating publicity and advocacy for CBR processes more broadly. Academics who can succeed according to standard occupational metrics but also exceed this mould by becoming important contributors to local community life are likely to inspire curious academics who have not yet attempted CBR. CBR practitioners must aim to be institutional change participants as well as social change participants, acting as role models to draw other colleagues into the work as well.

Often, however, it is non-institutional participants which can exert more force on HEIs than those working from the inside. Vocal community partners can be powerful advocates for CBR, exerting pressure on HEIs through news and social media to maintain and support university engagement within the community on important, pressing issues. Similarly, building CBR into the curriculum helps to generate new recruits from among students and subsequently from alumni. At institutions such as Sewanee, which has a long history of engaging students in community work, alumni – former participants of outreach programmes – have played a key role in the expanding scope of engaged approaches to learning and research. They have acted as financial donors, they have been elected to the university's Board of Trustees and they have returned to the university as faculty where they teach in a manner which reflects their commitment to CBR approaches: principles they were often first exposed to through the outreach programme. Increased surveying of current students indicates that outreach programmes and CBR courses are considered by many students to be among their most valuable and transformative undergraduate experiences. Thus, current and former students have played a pivotal role in pushing the university systemically towards greater levels of engagement, particularly at the curricular level.

As such it is crucial that those already working with CBR, at the course level and with individual students, intentionally document and assess their work. Concrete data which indicate heightened student retention, improved learning outcomes and higher levels of student satisfaction will resonate strongly with university managers. Many studies already indicate that engaged approaches to teaching and learning can bring these results, but internal institutional data speak even more loudly. Persistent use of reflective practice with CBR courses is quite effective at generating qualitative data of this sort.

While such snapshot data of student outcomes within a course is important, one of the most important ways forward for CBR involves greater effort towards conducting longitudinal studies. This of course means following students across their whole careers as undergraduate or master's students, but probably more important and more rarely done is finding out what happens to the students once they have completed their programmes. What are their subsequent educational choices? What are their career choices? Even more explicitly, what levels of public and civic engagement do they maintain? How do they engage with institutions where they are employed? Are they active institutional change participants? Are they active community change participants?

All of these questions help to clarify to what extent engaged educational practices encourage students to become active citizens and social change partici-

pants in their lives after university. That is the underlying aim of programmes such as MAP and CPD, but thus far no follow-up data have been collected that indicate the long-term influence of these programmes on students. Undertaking more longitudinal research in this vein helps to improve the quality of these programmes, provides more concrete and convincing evidence of the value of these approaches and illuminates somewhat the complex links between individual change and wider, systemic social change.

## Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to capture briefly the current state of CBR as an approach for teaching and learning in higher education. It has defined broadly what is meant by CBR and then subsequently reviewed four case studies, four HEIs in which CBR approaches have been integrated into particular degree programmes and courses. This has not been an exhaustive review of such programmes. Instead, effort was given to describing the institutional genealogies of these programmes and to detailing the actual structures, methods and pedagogies used in these particular courses. Nor should these examples necessarily be considered 'best practices' or 'state of the art' so far as CBR teaching and learning are concerned; rather, these are programmes with which the author is intimately familiar. That said, most of these programmes have received national and international attention from other HEIs interested in building and improving their own CBR programmes. Perhaps the utility of this chapter, however, is in placing these cases side by side, along with several other examples, so that some commonalities in approach and experience could be found – and indeed some widespread challenges as well. Some particular suggestions have been made in terms of institutional advocacy and classroom pedagogies, as well as some potential ways forward for the field of curricular CBR more generally. Ultimately, it is left to readers themselves to glean some useful insights from these cases which may help them to advance their curricular CBR work in their particular institutional context.