



UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO • AUGUST 2026

Community-Integrated Program Handbook

Bailey Liverman

This product was made possible by the NSF Idaho EPSCoR Program and by the National Science Foundation under award number OIA-2242769.



IDAHO
NSF EPSCoR
ADVANCING GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY IN STEM



University of Idaho



MOSS

Table of Contents

I. Acknowledgements.....	3
II. Why This Handbook Exists.....	5
III. Foundational Principles.....	7
IV. Experience-Based Lessons: What It Actually Takes.....	8
V. Political & Institutional Navigation.....	10
VI. Continuing Education, Academic Credit, and Recognition.....	13
VII. Risk, Liability & Youth Programming.....	15
VIII. Indigenous Data Sovereignty.....	18
IX. Institutional Infrastructure & Technology.....	21
X. Equitable Evaluation Structures.....	23
XI. Governance & Sustainability.....	27
XII. Institutional Realities.....	31
XIII. Practical Checklists.....	34
XIV. Encouraging CIP Development.....	38
XV. Case Study Example: Native Youth Leadership Summit.....	43

I. Acknowledgements

This handbook was developed through a process of conversations, listening sessions, and the shared experience of designing and implementing a Community-Integrated Program (CIP) course. Rather than emerging from a single perspective, it reflects the collective knowledge, questions, challenges, and insights of graduate student collaborators, faculty mentors, community partners, and university staff who generously shared their experiences.

The project began with a simple list of ideas, barriers, and recommendations gathered from conversations with those who had navigated the process of developing community-engaged courses. As additional perspectives were incorporated, that list evolved into a more comprehensive resource that documents both the practical steps of creating a CIP and the relational work required to build meaningful partnerships. Throughout this process, each conversation added fresh context, revealed overlooked challenges, and highlighted strategies that had been successful in different institutional and community settings.

This handbook is also informed by firsthand experience implementing a CIP course. Working alongside graduate student collaborators provided opportunities to test ideas, adapt to unexpected challenges, and reflect on what supports or hinders the development of community-engaged education. Those experiences reinforced that successful partnerships are built not only through administrative processes but through trust, reciprocity, flexibility, and a willingness to learn alongside one another.

I extend my sincere gratitude to the many faculty, staff, graduate students, and community partners who generously shared their time, expertise, and honest reflections throughout this project. Your willingness to discuss both successes and challenges shaped this handbook into a resource grounded in real experiences rather than idealized practices.

I offer my deepest thanks to Dr. Karla Eitel, whose mentorship, encouragement, and commitment to community-engaged scholarship made this project possible. Her guidance throughout the development and implementation of the Community-Integrated Program, thoughtful feedback, and unwavering support challenged me to think critically about the role of partnerships, reciprocity, and place-based learning in higher education. Her leadership and dedication to meaningful collaboration have had a lasting influence on both this handbook and my own growth as an educator and researcher.

I am also grateful to the I-CREWS team for fostering an environment where collaborative, community-engaged research could flourish. Working alongside dedicated researchers, educators, and community partners demonstrated the value of approaching complex challenges through relationship-building and shared learning.

Special thanks to River Newe, the Pandion Institute, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, and the Wéetespeme Stewardship Program for their partnership, generosity, and willingness to share their knowledge and experiences. Their perspectives reinforced that effective community engagement begins with listening, respect, reciprocity, and long-term relationships. The examples, insights, and lessons

learned through these collaborations have shaped not only this handbook but also my understanding of ethical and meaningful community-engaged education.

Finally, I am grateful to everyone who contributed their perspectives, stories, and lessons learned throughout this journey. This handbook is a reflection of many voices and many relationships. It is my hope that it honors those contributions and serves as a practical resource for educators, students, administrators, and community partners seeking to build collaborative, place-based, and community-engaged learning experiences that are rooted in mutual respect and shared purpose.

II. Why This Handbook Exists

Community-engaged courses do not fit neatly inside traditional academic systems. At Idaho institutions of higher education, these courses stretch institutional boundaries and require deliberate practices to protect partners, learners, and institutions themselves. They differ from standard coursework in these key ways:

- **Cross funding and curriculum structures**
 - Community-engaged work often draws on multiple funding streams (internal course budgets, grants, community partner funds, philanthropic gifts) and may not adhere to a single department's budget lines or reporting categories.
 - Courses may need flexible credit models (variable contact hours, co-curricular credits, micro-credentials) and approval pathways across curriculum committees.
- **Involve multiple institutions**
 - Projects can span K–12 districts, local nonprofits, tribal governments, health systems, and other colleges/universities, creating overlapping expectations and accountability requirements.
 - Cooperative agreements and memoranda of understanding (MOUs) are common but must be crafted to respect each partner's policies and capacities.
- **Include community knowledge holders as instructors**
 - Community experts and elders contribute essential content, mentorship, and assessment but are often outside academic HR/payroll structures and faculty governance.
 - Fair compensation, intellectual credit, and recognition practices must be established, so community teachers are treated as professionals, not volunteers.
- **Challenge inequitable pricing and access systems**
 - Community-engaged courses may require travel, materials, or technology costs that create barriers for students and community partners unless deliberately mitigated.
 - Traditional tuition and fee models can disincentivize participation by community partners and learners who are not interested in earning a degree.
- **Raise data sovereignty and liability questions**
 - Projects may collect community data (personal, cultural, environmental) that raise privacy, ownership, and Indigenous data sovereignty concerns distinct from classroom data policies.
 - Risk management policies (insurance, liability, student supervision) may be required to be negotiated with campus legal/risk offices and with partners.
- **Disrupt institutional norms**
 - Community-engaged pedagogy shifts assessment, timelines, ownership, and power dynamics in ways that can be unfamiliar to tenure, promotion, and accreditation processes.

Because of these realities, this handbook exists to:

- **Share institutional knowledge**
 - Provide practical knowledge, case studies, and guidance so practitioners don't reinvent processes that are already tested.
- **Reduce harm and avoid political pitfalls**
 - Offer strategies for ethical engagement, cultural humility, and navigating local politics, so projects do not exploit, misrepresent, or endanger communities and participants.
- **Support equitable, shared governance**
 - Help universities and practitioners craft policies that include community partners in decision-making and ensure credit, compensation, and voice are distributed equitably.
- **Help people work within the constraints of the system while changing it**
 - Provide tools to operate effectively under current institutional rules (contracts, payroll, curricular approvals) while suggesting pathways to policy change that institutionalize community engagement.

III. Foundational Principles

These principles should guide design, implementation, assessment, and institutionalization of community-engaged courses throughout Idaho institutions. They are concise, actionable, and adaptable across diverse contexts (urban, rural, tribal).

1. Community-First Commitment

- **Co-create from the start:** projects originate from community-identified needs and priorities.
- Invest in existing community efforts before creating new programs.
- Honor diverse modes of participation. People contribute in different ways and at different levels.
- Provide meaningful recognition beyond academic credit (stipends, public acknowledgement, co-authorship, and community support).

2. Equitable Leadership (Not Equal—Equitable)

- Allocate roles based on expertise and context, not on identical task distribution.
- Clarify responsibilities early (e.g., who designs syllabus and assessment; who ensures a city, tribe, or organization receives agreed deliverables).
- Recognize and document specific contributions and expertise.
- Share syllabus drafts, timelines, and decision points with partners at the earliest feasible stages.

3. Strategically Work Within the System

- **Map constraints:** distinguish legal or non-negotiable rules from policies that have flexibility or discretionary application
- Use institutional policies where they help and tactically navigate or reform those that harm community goals.
- **Acknowledge institutional racism and structural barriers:** plan intentional relationship-building, culturally responsive practices, and political navigation to mitigate harm.

IV. Experience-Based Lessons: What It Actually Takes

1. How Relationships Develop

- **Time and consistency:** durable partnerships require long-term investment. This often means years, not a single semester.
- **Start early:** hold preliminary conversations with partners well before courses launch to align goals and timelines
- **Trust before paperwork:** prioritize building mutual trust and understanding; formal agreements should codify, not create, the relationship.
- **Respect local rhythms:** honor seasonal, cultural, and governance calendars (harvests, council cycles, ceremonies, budgeting periods).
- **Be transparent about constraints:** clearly communicate institutional limits (funding cycles, liability rules, academic calendars) and listen to partner constraints.
- **Multi-level relationship building:** maintain connections with community organizations, institutional units (departments, offices of community engagement), and administrators who enforce policies.
- **Advance notice:** inform partners and institutional stakeholders of objectives, timelines, and roles early and repeatedly.

2. Setting It Up: What Worked

- **Beginning with a vision:** articulate the ideal learning and community outcomes before translating to institutional forms.
- **Find allies:** identify a sympathetic administrator or leader who can advocate, troubleshoot, and anticipate institutional questions.
- **Consult systems experts early:** involve offices and individuals that “know the system” (research administration, grant offices, purchasing, continuing education, tribal liaisons) at project outset.
- **Anticipate institutional questions:** use allies to surface likely compliance, budgetary, and scheduling issues so you can design around them.
- **Iterate:** expect revisions as you learn institutional constraints; own errors, correct quickly, and document fixes.
- **Practice humility:** admit when you don’t know something, ask for help, and use that openness to keep relationships and institutional doors open.

3. Support needed to create realistic timelines, budgets, and partnership agreements.

- Clear process maps distinguishing continuing education/noncredit offerings from for-credit courses (approval pathways, tuition/fee structures, enrollment rules).

- Transparent, streamlined payment pathways for honoraria, stipends, and contracted work that accommodate nonemployee community instructors and consultants.
- **Simplified onboarding for speakers and vendors:** shortened paperwork, expedited fingerprinting/background checks when appropriate, and clear timelines.
- Institutional assistance for cross-institution contracting and MOUs that respect partner capacities (tribal, nonprofit, municipal).
- Technology access and training for elders and community instructors (devices, low-barrier accounts, privacy guidance).
- Clear course-management access protocols (Canvas or LMS provisioning for community partners, guest accounts, data access limits).
- Dedicated staff capacity (community liaison, project manager) and funds to cover travel, childcare, materials, and translation so participation is accessible.
- Legal and risk guidance tailored to community contexts (data sovereignty, FERPA/HIPAA intersections, liability mitigation).

V. Political & Institutional Navigation

OVERVIEW: CIPs routinely break institutional norms (curriculum pathways, program expectations, continuing education units, and payment structures). Effective navigation requires mapping the project, asking targeted questions early, involving the right offices, and designing flexible funding/payment structures that respect community capacities (including tribal governance and tech access).

1. Map the project (what/how/who)

- **Clarify the nature of the activity:** grant-funded project, for-credit course, CE offering, noncredit workshop, or hybrid.
- **Determine ownership and approval pathways:** Which department, college, or office “owns” the program? Which committees or approvers must sign off?
- **Identify stakeholders:** community partner leadership, campus PI/lead, department chair, registrar, finance/purchasing, human resources, sponsored programs, risk/legal, tribal liaisons.
- Create a simple diagram or table showing responsibilities, approvals, timelines, and decision points.

2. Ask the right questions before you commit

- Is this for credit, CE/noncredit, or neither? (affects curriculum approvals, tuition, enrollment, etc.)
- Who holds liability and insurance for participants, activities, and locations?
- Who pays whom, by what mechanism, and when?
- Where is the money coming from (institutional funds, grants, partners, philanthropy)?
- Is compensation a contract, consultant, fee, stipend, honorarium, temp hire, or subaward?
- Who is the PI or academic lead for compliance and reporting?
- Are minors or youth involved? (possible need for background checks, parental consent)
- Are graduate students involved? (TA rules, labor agreements)
- Is an IRB or other research review required? (data collection, human subjects, tribal review)
- What documentation (W-9, IRS forms, CV/resume, vendor forms) will be required for community co-instructors?
- Are there accessibility, translation, or cultural protocols to follow?

Consequences of not asking these questions:

- Honoraria may not substitute for contracts
- Stipends are not always legal payment for services
- Consulting agreements require scope and deliverables.
- Always verify with finance before promising compensation.

3. Funding and payment pathways

- **Payment options**

- Independent contractor/consulting agreement
- Temp/short-term employment (payroll)
- Honorarium or stipend (limited, often taxable, rules vary)
- Vendor agreement or purchase order
- Subaward to another institution or nonprofit
- Continuing education invoice model

- **Practical tips:**

- Talk to the office that manages payments (accounts payable, payroll, sponsored programs) early; request guidance on acceptable forms of payment for non-employees and community instructors.
- Build in lead times for vendor onboarding, tax documentation, background checks, and purchase orders
- Budget for administrative fees and indirect costs when using grants or subawards
- When cross-institution, decide if funds will flow through one lead institution (with subaward) or through multiple contracts; map fiscal reporting responsibilities.

- **Barriers to anticipate**

- CV/resume requirements that exclude elders or community members with nontraditional experience
- Vendor onboarding systems that require institutional email or multi-factor authentication.
- Payment delays that harm trust. Plan interim honoraria or emergency funds where possible.

4. Tribal funding, governance, and application complexity

- Tribal funding streams may have existing program priorities and require formal proposals, approvals by tribal councils or governance boards, and specific reporting formats
- **Engage tribal liaisons early:** learn application timelines, required documentation, and budgeting conventions.
- Respect tribal procedures and hiring rules. Do not assume tribal funds can be spent under the same rules as federal/state grants.
- Co-design budgets and scopes with tribal partners. Include time for internal tribal review and decision cycles.

5. Technology and access: hidden constraints

- Identify LMS, vendor, and onboarding systems early (Canvas guest accounts, institutional logins, vendor portals).
- Plan alternative access pathways for elders and community partners with limited internet or device access (loaner devices, offline materials, phone-based communication, in-person support).

- Secure IT support or a tech liaison who can provision accounts, train partners, and troubleshoot privacy/access issues.

• 6. Who to consult: quick reference

- | | |
|---|--|
| • Department chair/program director | • Legal/risk management/insurance |
| • Registrar and curriculum committee (for credit) | • IRB/research compliance and tribal research review offices |
| • Continuing education office (for noncredit) | • Tribal liaisons/cultural resources officers |
| • Sponsored programs/grants office | • Campus community engagement or outreach office |
| • Accounts payable/payroll/procurement | • IT and LMS administrators. |
| • Human resources (temp hires) | |

✓ 7. Recommended deliverables before launch

- ☐ One page project map (what, who, timeline)
- ☐ Signed MOUs or scope-of-work with payment and deliverable language
- ☐ Budget worksheet showing funding source and flow
- ☐ Payment checklist (forms required, lead time)
- ☐ Risk checklist addressing liability, minors, background checks, and insurance
- ☐ Tech access plan for community partners.

VI. Continuing Education, Academic Credit, and Recognition

OVERVIEW: Community-engaged courses often include diverse learners (undergraduates, graduates, high school students, community members, professionals) who operate under different rules, have different expectations, and hold different value systems. Clear early decisions about learner type, credentialing, and compensation reduce inequity and confusion.

1. Learner Groups and Implications

- **Undergraduate students**
 - Learning outcomes are tied to degree requirements, credit hours, grade transcripts, and financial aid rules.
 - Curriculum approvals, syllabus policies, and registrar processes apply.
- **Graduate students**
 - May involve research credits, TA/RA rules, advisor oversight, and funding/assistantship implication.
- **High school students**
 - Parental consent, excused-absence policies, dual enrollment rules, and safety/background requirements.
 - Transcript credit or dual credit agreements may need registrar and district sign-off.
- **Community members**
 - Participation may be unpaid, stipend-based, or vendor/consultant arrangements.
 - Typically, outside academic credit systems
 - Require accessible scheduling and recognition aligned with community priorities.
- **Professionals seeking CE**
 - Require continuing education credit, certificates, CEU tracking, and fee structures separate from tuition.
 - Often subject to different approval pathways and pricing models.

2. Key differences to plan for

- **Learning outcomes and assessments:** Align these to the credential offered (credit, CEU, certificate, etc.)
- **Governing rules:** Curriculum committee, registrar, CE office, HR, financial aid, and research compliance all may have policies that apply differently.
- **Pricing and funding:** Tuition, CE fees, grant funds, partner sponsorships, or free participation models shift who pays and how.

- **Transcript and credential implications:** Credit appears on transcripts; CEUs and certificates may not.

3. Equity questions to consider

- ? Are learners paying different amounts for essentially the same experience? If so, why? Is that equitable?
- ? How is “value” defined for each participant (degree progress, professional credentialing, community benefit)?
- ? Do recognition mechanisms meet participant goals and community priorities?

4. Recognition options (choose based on learner needs and institutional rules)

- Academic credit (for-credit courses, on transcript)
- Continuing education credits or CEUs (professional development)
- Certificate of participation or completion (skills-based recognition)
- Professional development letters for employers or licensing bodies
- Co-authorship, public acknowledgment, or community certificates for community contributors
- Excused absence or dual-enrollment documentation for high-school students

5. Practical steps

- Consult CE leads, registrar, and curriculum committees in project planning to confirm feasible credentialing paths
- Map learning outcomes to the chosen recognition type before finalizing syllabus and assessment
- Budget for fees, stipends, or waived tuition as an equity measure when needed
- Draft clear syllabus language explaining what type of recognition is meaningful and appropriate.

CLOSING NOTE

Credit is not inherently more valuable than other forms of recognition. Choose recognition that aligns with participant goals, community priorities, and institutional constraints. Document these choices early.

VII. Risk, Liability & Youth Programming

PURPOSE: Identify required approvals, responsibilities, and operational safeguards for off-campus and youth-involved community-engaged courses.

1. Core approvals and paperwork

- Travel authorization (departmental and institutional travel policies; out-of-state/overnight approvals)
- Vehicle use authorization (driver eligibility, vehicle type, mileage, university/insured vehicle vs. personal vehicle).
- Liability waivers / participant agreements (age-appropriate; legal review required).
- Background checks (type: criminal, sex-offender, fingerprinting; frequency and vendor per HR policy).
- Emergency protocols and contact lists (onsite lead, campus emergency, partner emergency contacts, nearest medical facilities).
- Insurance review (verify coverage for location, activity type, and volunteers; add riders if needed).
- Medical consent and health info (parental consent for minors; allergy/medication plans; HIPAA considerations).

2. Compliance and privacy

- FERPA implications for minors and enrolled students; HIPAA if health data is collected.
- IRB/research review if any evaluation or data collection involves human subjects.
- Mandatory reporting and Title IX obligations when working with youth.
- Tribal protocols and sovereign jurisdiction. Follow tribal policies for permissions, background checks, and on-site authority.

3. Roles, authority, and “who is in charge”. Determine lead responsibility by:

- **Location:** on tribal land, tribal authority generally supersedes; at partner site, site host often manages onsite safety.
- **Who hires/supervises participants:** the organization that employs/engages the people typically holds operational responsibility.
- **Who controls activity design and supervision:** faculty/staff leading instruction retain supervisory duty for students.
- Document assignment of lead and secondary contacts in MOU or scope-of-work.

4. Special considerations for graduate students and youth

- **Graduate students acting as instructors:** confirm payroll/appointment status, supervisor oversight, and required trainings.
- Youth participation may require parental/guardian consent, chaperone ratios, youth protection trainings, dual-enrollment paperwork for high schoolers.
- Summer programs may overlap with K–12 or community camps—coordinate calendars, staffing, and housing policies; ensure background checks meet both institutional and partner standards.

5. Operational safeguards and best practices

- **Pre-trip checklist:** approvals, waivers, vehicle/driver verification, emergency plan, insurance confirmation, health forms, equipment/supplies, communication plan.
- **Onsite safety:** role IDs/badges, sign-in/out logs, buddy systems, clear behavioral expectations, incident reporting forms.
- **Training:** youth protection, CPR/first aid, cultural competency, de-escalation, boundary-setting for all staff and volunteers.
- **Documentation:** keep records of approvals, waivers, background checks, trainings, incident reports, and insurance for required retention periods.
- **Contingency planning:** weather, closure, medical evacuation, communications blackout, and media inquiries.

6. Incident response and reporting

- **Immediate actions:** ensure safety, provide/stabilize care, notify campus emergency/partner lead, document details.
- **Reporting:** follow campus incident reporting, legal/risk office notification timelines, and tribal reporting requirements as applicable.
- **Follow-up:** debrief with partners, update risk plans, provide support to affected participants, and document corrective actions.

7. Who to consult (early and often)

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| • Risk management / insurance office | • IRB/research compliance |
| • Legal counsel | • Tribal liaison / partner governance |
| • Human resources (background checks, hiring) | • Campus public safety / police |
| • Office of student affairs / dean of students | • Health services and counseling |
| • Registrar (for minors/dual-enrollment implications) | |

✓ 8. Recommended deliverables before any youth or off-campus activity

- ☐ Signed MOU or site agreement assigning lead responsibility
- ☐ Completed travel & vehicle authorizations
- ☐ Background check verifications for staff and volunteers
- ☐ Waivers, consent forms, and emergency contact info for all participants
- ☐ Insurance confirmation and documented risk review
- ☐ Pre-trip training log and checklist
- ☐ Incident reporting template and communications plan

VIII. Indigenous Data Sovereignty

PURPOSE: Ensure community-engaged courses respect tribal authority over knowledge, materials, and data. This is intended to protect cultural integrity, legal rights, and community priorities.

1. Core questions to resolve up-front

- ? Who owns course materials, recordings, photos, and cultural artifacts created or used in the course?
- ? Who owns participant data (surveys, oral histories, ecological data, student reflections)?
- ? Who approves dissemination, archiving, and reuse (presentations, publications, repositories)?
- ? Are Tribal Research Review Boards, cultural resource offices, or tribal councils required for approval?

2. Foundational commitments

- **Tribal authority first:** recognize tribal sovereignty over research, data, and cultural knowledge within their jurisdiction.
- **Co-ownership and co-governance:** data and materials produced through partnership should be governed jointly, or per tribal preferences.
- **Consent is ongoing:** obtain informed consent that specifies uses, and respect decisions to withdraw or restrict use.
- **Cultural sensitivity:** traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and spiritual/cultural information require special protection. There are often restrictions on sharing.

3. Good stewardship practices (practical steps)

- **Negotiate explicit written data agreements before data collection or material creation. Include:**
 - Definitions (what constitutes “data,” “materials,” “derivatives”).
 - Scope of use (purpose, duration, audience).
 - Access controls (who may view/download/use).
 - Storage, retention, and destruction/return procedures.
 - Publication and dissemination approval processes (joint review and sign-off).
 - Benefit-sharing (how results/resources return to the community).
 - Dispute resolution and amendment procedures.
- **Use case-based permission models:** ask for permissions tied to specific uses (course only; limited presentation; public archive) rather than blanket consent.
- **Respect tribal review processes:** submit proposals to Tribal Research Review Boards or cultural committees as required. Allow time for tribal review cycles.

- **Cite and credit appropriately:** acknowledge tribal knowledge holders, authorship preferences, and community protocols in course materials and publications.
- **Limit data exposure:** anonymize when required, apply embargoes, restrict public repositories, and use secure storage with agreed access logs.
- Default to noncommercial restrictions unless explicitly authorized by the tribe.
- Avoid institutional IP frameworks that override tribal terms. Negotiate adaptations or carveouts when university policies conflict.

4. Operational items to include in MOUs/Data Use Agreements

- Ownership clause (co-ownership, tribal ownership, or defined licenses).
- Approval clause for dissemination and all public-facing materials.
- Data management plan (storage location, encryption, metadata standards, retention period).
- Access and permissions matrix (who can access, for what purpose, and approval workflow).
- Return of materials clause (digital files, artifacts) and procedures for destruction if requested.
- Compensation and recognition for knowledge holders and cultural advisors.
- Timeline for tribal review and decision windows; no-surprises policy for publication.
- Clauses addressing Indigenous legal traditions and governing authority.

5. Who to consult

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Tribal Research Review Boards / Tribal Historic Preservation Offices / cultural offices | • Tribal elders, cultural advisors, and knowledge holders |
| • Tribal liaisons or sovereignty officers on campus | • Institutional offices for data governance, records management, and archives |
| • Legal counsel with tribal law expertise | • IRB / research compliance (to align human-subjects protections with tribal protocols) |

✓ 6. Deliverables before data collection or course launch

- ☐ Signed Data Use Agreement (DUA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifying ownership and approval processes.
- ☐ Data Management Plan aligned with tribal terms.
- ☐ Publication/dissemination approval workflow and timeline.
- ☐ Compensation and recognition plan for knowledge holders.
- ☐ Secure storage provision and access logs.

7. When university IP policies conflict

- Raise conflicts early with legal and sponsored programs; request exceptions, carveouts, or parallel agreements that honor tribal terms.
- Prioritize negotiated tribal agreements; document institutional reasons if unable to comply and escalate via shared governance to seek policy change.

CLOSING GUIDANCE

Treat Indigenous data sovereignty as nonnegotiable governance. Design courses so tribal nations control how their knowledge and data are used, shared, and preserved.

IX. Institutional Infrastructure & Technology

PURPOSE: Ensure technical systems enable participation from community partners, elders, and diverse learners in community-engaged courses.

1. Canvas (LMS) and Access Models

- **Determine the correct interface:** academic LMS (Canvas) for credit courses; CE platforms for noncredit offerings. Each has different enrollment, billing, and transcript behaviors.
- **Guest accounts vs full accounts:** define permissions, data access, and duration for community instructors, partners, and elders.
- **Access duration:** set clear start/end dates and processes for extensions or archival access.

2. Onboarding and Support

- **Streamlined provisioning:** create a low-friction pathway to add community members (minimal forms, temporary IDs, alternative authentication).
- **Tech orientation:** provide short, culturally appropriate trainings (live and recorded) and simple how-tos (login, upload, privacy).
- **Dedicated tech liaison:** assign an IT contact who can provision accounts, troubleshoot, and bridge institutional systems and community needs.

3. Equity and Accessibility Considerations

- **Device and connectivity plans:** loaner devices, hotspot support, offline content packages (USBs, printed materials), and phone-based options for low-bandwidth users.
- **Elder-friendly design:** large text, captioning, minimal clicks, synchronous alternatives, and staff support for account setup.
- **Universal Design:** captioning, transcripts, multilingual resources, and mobile-friendly formats.

4. Data, Privacy, and Permissions

- **Limit data exposure for community partners:** restrict student grades, personal data, and research files as agreed in MOUs/DUAs.
- **Guest content ownership:** clarify who retains course recordings, lecture materials, and discussion archives.
- **Retention and archival:** document retention timelines and processes for transferring or deleting materials at course close.

5. CE vs Academic Platform Tradeoffs

- CE platforms often handle payment, certificates, and noncredit enrollment but may not integrate with LMS or registrar systems.
- **Map workflows:** enrollment → billing → LMS access → transcription/certification and automate where possible.
- If a mix of learners, define parallel access (e.g., credit students in Canvas, community participants in CE portal) and how shared materials are managed.

6. Procurement and Vendor Barriers

- Vendor portals may require institutional emails/MFA—plan alternatives for elders and partners without institutional credentials.
- Request vendor accommodations (guest user roles, simplified onboarding) early in procurement.

✓ 7. Recommended Deliverables and Policies

- ☐ Simple onboarding checklist for community partners (account request, tech orientation, contact list).
- ☐ Access matrix (role → permissions → duration → data access).
- ☐ Low-bandwidth content plan (downloads, printables, phone options).
- ☐ Guest account policy and privacy notice tailored to community users.
- ☐ Tech escalation protocol for course staff and community partners.

• 8. Who to consult

- | | |
|---|--|
| • IT/LMS administrators | • Procurement and vendor management |
| • Continuing Education and Registrar (for CE integration) | • Data governance / privacy office |
| • Accessibility services / disability resources | • Community liaisons and cultural advisors |

CLOSING NOTE

Treat technology planning as part of equity planning. Anticipate barriers, budget for support (devices, hotspots, staff time), and simplify access so community expertise can participate fully.

X. Equitable Evaluation Structures

PURPOSE: Develop assessment practices that honor multiple ways of knowing, prioritize growth over performance, and ensure evaluation supports learning, relationships, and community accountability rather than reinforcing traditional academic hierarchies.

1. Shift from Grading to Feedback

- **Feedback over grades:** Prioritize formative, descriptive feedback that helps learners reflect, improve, and build confidence throughout the learning process rather than relying solely on summative grades.
- **Continuous reflection:** Build regular opportunities for self-reflection, peer dialogue, and instructor conversations so assessment becomes an ongoing part of learning instead of a final judgment.
- **Strength-based evaluation:** Highlight learners' growth, contributions, and emerging competencies rather than focusing primarily on deficits or mistakes.

2. Alternative Assessment Models

- **Narrative feedback:** Replace or supplement letter grades with written feedback describing learner growth, strengths, challenges, and future directions. Narrative evaluations provide richer information and encourage meaningful reflection.
- **Pass/Fail assessment:** Use pass/fail structures where appropriate to reduce competition and encourage intellectual risk-taking, experimentation, and collaboration rather than performance anxiety.
- **Portfolio assessment:** Ask learners to curate evidence of their learning over time through journals, projects, presentations, artwork, field notes, community engagement, multimedia, and reflections. Portfolios demonstrate growth and allow multiple forms of knowledge to be recognized.
- **Co-created rubrics:** Develop assessment criteria collaboratively with students and community partners at the beginning of a course or project. Shared rubric design increases transparency, ownership, and cultural relevance.
- **Community review:** When appropriate, invite community partners, elders, or project collaborators to participate in evaluating community-engaged work, ensuring that community-defined success is represented alongside academic expectations.

3. Reflection and Self-Assessment

- **Structured self-evaluation:** Incorporate learner reflections that ask students to assess their own growth, identify challenges, and set goals for continued learning.
- **Learning journals:** Encourage regular reflective writing documenting how learners' perspectives, relationships, and understanding evolve throughout the course.

- **Process documentation:** Evaluate not only final products but also planning, collaboration, revision, and decision-making throughout a project.

4. Collaborative and Relational Assessment

- **Peer feedback:** Design structured opportunities for students to provide constructive feedback that emphasizes learning, curiosity, and collective improvement rather than competition.
- **Community accountability:** Include assessment of how students build respectful relationships, communicate with community partners, honor agreements, and contribute to shared goals.
- **Relational competencies:** Evaluate skills such as listening, reciprocity, cultural humility, adaptability, collaboration, and ethical engagement alongside disciplinary knowledge.

5. Multiple Ways of Demonstrating Learning

- **Flexible demonstration of knowledge:** Allow students to demonstrate learning through presentations, storytelling, creative work, digital media, oral interviews, community projects, artistic expression, or traditional written assignments.
- **Honor diverse knowledge systems:** Recognize oral traditions, lived experience, Indigenous knowledge, and community expertise as legitimate forms of evidence and learning.
- **Accessibility and flexibility:** Offer multiple assessment formats that accommodate different learning styles, languages, cultural backgrounds, and accessibility needs.

6. Equity Considerations

- **Transparent expectations:** Clearly communicate learning goals, evaluation criteria, timelines, and examples of successful work to reduce hidden academic expectations.
- **Reduce bias in assessment:** Regularly review rubrics and grading practices for cultural bias, language bias, and assumptions about prior educational experience.
- **Opportunities for revision:** Allow learners to revise and resubmit work after receiving feedback, emphasizing that learning is iterative and improvement is expected.
- **Shared power:** Where possible, involve learners in decisions about assessment methods, weighting, and evidence of learning to promote agency and ownership.

7. Community-Engaged Assessment

- **Evaluate reciprocal impact:** Assess not only student learning but also whether community partnerships were respectful, mutually beneficial, and aligned with shared goals.
- **Partner feedback loops:** Provide opportunities for community organizations, elders, and collaborators to offer feedback on both student work and the course partnership itself.
- **Long-term relationship measures:** Consider indicators such as trust-building, sustained collaboration, and community satisfaction alongside traditional academic outcomes.

8. Institutional Considerations

- **Alignment with accreditation:** Ensure alternative assessment models meet institutional and accreditation requirements while preserving flexibility and community-centered values.
- **Faculty support:** Provide professional development on narrative assessment, portfolio evaluation, culturally responsive assessment, and equitable grading practices.
- **Documentation practices:** Develop templates and guidelines for narrative evaluations, portfolios, and community review processes to ensure consistency and transparency.

✓ 9. Recommended Deliverables and Policies

- ☐ Narrative feedback templates for instructors.
- ☐ Portfolio guidelines with reflection prompts and evidence examples.
- ☐ Co-created rubric facilitation guide.
- ☐ Community reviewer orientation and feedback forms.
- ☐ Student self-assessment and peer feedback templates.
- ☐ Assessment equity checklist to review bias and accessibility.
- ☐ Revision and resubmission policy emphasizing learning and growth.
- ☐ Community partnership evaluation form completed by both students and partners.

• 10. Who to Consult

- | | |
|--|--|
| • Teaching and Learning Center or Faculty Development Office | • Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Office |
| • Assessment and Accreditation Office | • Community partners, elders, and cultural advisors |
| • Community engagement or service-learning office | • Students with experience in community-engaged learning |
| • Accessibility and Disability Resources | |

CLOSING NOTE

Assessment should reflect the values of community-engaged learning by emphasizing relationships, reciprocity, growth, and shared responsibility. Equitable evaluation recognizes that learning is not simply an individual achievement to be measured, but a collaborative process of building knowledge, strengthening communities, and developing the capacity to contribute ethically and meaningfully.

XI. Governance & Sustainability

PURPOSE: Establish governance structures and long-term funding models that promote equitable decision-making, shared ownership, and sustained community partnerships beyond a single course or grant cycle.

1. Shared Governance Agreements

- **Joint decision-making:** Develop governance agreements that outline how universities and community partners will share responsibility for planning, implementing, evaluating, and modifying community-engaged courses.
- **Mutual approval for continuation:** Require agreement from both the institution and community partner before a course is offered again, ensuring partnerships remain voluntary, beneficial, and responsive to changing community priorities.
- **Independent continuation:** Clearly define circumstances under which either partner may continue elements of the course independently, including expectations around curriculum use, intellectual property, and attribution.
- **Defined roles and responsibilities:** Document responsibilities for instruction, logistics, communication, student supervision, budgeting, evaluation, and conflict resolution to reduce ambiguity throughout the partnership.
- **Decision-making processes:** Establish transparent procedures for resolving disagreements, making curriculum changes, and adapting partnerships over time through consensus whenever possible.

2. Partnership Agreements and Accountability

- **Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs):** Create written agreements that outline shared goals, timelines, financial commitments, data ownership, evaluation processes, and procedures for ending or renewing partnerships.
- **Annual partnership review:** Conduct regular reviews with all partners to evaluate whether the collaboration remains reciprocal, equitable, and aligned with community priorities. Use these reviews to revise agreements as needed.
- **Relationship continuity:** Develop transition plans for faculty, staff, and community leadership changes to preserve institutional knowledge and maintain long-term relationships.
- **Conflict resolution pathways:** Include culturally appropriate methods for addressing misunderstandings, unmet expectations, and evolving partnership needs before conflicts escalate.

3. Financial Equity

- **Transparent budgeting:** Share complete project budgets with community partners and explain how institutional overhead, instructional costs, and community compensation are determined.

- **Equitable revenue distribution:** Clearly define how tuition, course fees, grants, and other revenues will be allocated among institutional units and community partners.
- **Direct community access to funding:** Whenever possible, provide mechanisms that allow community organizations or Tribal governments to receive funds directly rather than relying solely on reimbursement models.
- **Subawards versus reimbursement:** Prioritize subawards or advance payments when appropriate, recognizing that reimbursement models often create financial barriers for smaller organizations with limited cash flow.
- **Community compensation:** Budget for community instructors, elders, cultural practitioners, and organizational partners as professional collaborators rather than volunteers whenever possible.
- **Equipment and resource sharing:** Develop policies for purchasing, maintaining, and returning equipment funded through the course. Consider models where equipment remains with community partners after project completion when it supports ongoing community capacity.

4. Long-Term Sustainability

- **Move beyond one-time funding:** Design programs with sustainability in mind rather than relying exclusively on short-term grants or pilot funding.
- **Recurring funding strategies:** Identify stable funding mechanisms such as institutional budget commitments, endowments, continuing education revenue, philanthropic support, or multi-year grants.
- **External funding opportunities:** Pursue federal, state, Tribal, foundation, and nonprofit grants that support community-engaged teaching, environmental education, Indigenous partnerships, workforce development, and experiential learning.
- **Diversified funding portfolio:** Reduce dependence on a single funding source by combining institutional support with external grants, donations, sponsorships, and earned revenue where appropriate.
- **Capacity building:** Invest in strengthening community organizations' ability to participate in future partnerships through training, infrastructure, and administrative support.

5. Institutional Commitment

- **Recognize partnership work:** Ensure faculty and staff receive institutional recognition for community-engaged teaching within promotion, tenure, annual evaluation, and workload policies.
- **Dedicated staffing:** Support partnerships through community engagement coordinators, grant managers, and administrative staff who provide continuity beyond individual faculty members.
- **Strategic alignment:** Embed community-engaged education within institutional strategic plans, budgeting priorities, and academic mission statements to strengthen long-term institutional commitment.

6. Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

- **Annual governance review:** Assess governance structures each year to determine whether decision-making remains equitable, transparent, and responsive to all partners.
- **Financial sustainability assessment:** Regularly evaluate funding models to identify risks, funding gaps, and opportunities for long-term stability.
- **Community satisfaction measures:** Include community partner feedback when evaluating both governance processes and financial arrangements.
- **Adaptive management:** Treat governance as an evolving process, updating agreements as partnerships, community priorities, and institutional policies change.

✓ 7. Recommended Deliverables and Policies

- ☐ Shared governance agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
- ☐ Partnership decision-making framework outlining roles, responsibilities, and authority.
- ☐ Transparent budget template with revenue and expense allocations.
- ☐ Community compensation policy and payment schedule.
- ☐ Subaward and reimbursement guidance for community organizations.
- ☐ Equipment ownership and return policy.
- ☐ Annual partnership review process and evaluation template.
- ☐ Multi-year sustainability and funding plan identifying institutional and external funding sources.
- ☐ Leadership transition plan to maintain continuity across personnel changes.

• 8. Who to Consult

- | | |
|--|--|
| • Community engagement office | • Procurement and contracts office |
| • Sponsored programs and grants office | • Advancement and development office |
| • Finance and budget office | • Foundation relations staff |
| • Tribal governments and community organizations | • Faculty leadership and department chairs |
| • General counsel | |

CLOSING NOTE

Sustainable community-engaged education depends on more than successful courses. It requires equitable governance, transparent financial practices, and long-term institutional commitment. By sharing decision-making authority, compensating community expertise fairly, and investing in durable funding models, institutions can build partnerships that remain reciprocal, resilient, and responsive for years to come.

XII. Institutional Realities

PURPOSE: Acknowledge the institutional structures, policies, and cultural dynamics that shape community-engaged education while equipping educators and community partners to navigate barriers through relationship-building and strategic advocacy.

1. Recognizing Institutional Constraints

- **Policy limitations:** Many institutional policies were developed for traditional academic models and may not adequately support community-engaged, Indigenous, or place-based education. Some requirements may be inflexible due to accreditation, legal, financial, or administrative obligations.
- **Inconsistent implementation:** Policies are often interpreted differently across departments or administrative offices. Similar partnerships may receive different guidance depending on institutional knowledge, leadership, or individual decision-makers.
- **Administrative complexity:** Community-engaged courses frequently involve multiple offices, including finance, procurement, legal counsel, risk management, registrar, information technology, and sponsored programs. Each of these offices has distinct priorities and procedures.
- **Competing institutional priorities:** Faculty and community partners may encounter tensions between institutional efficiency, compliance requirements, academic calendars, and the timelines needed for authentic community collaboration.

2. Building Relationships Within Institutions

- **Trust-building matters:** Strong working relationships with institutional staff can be just as important as understanding policies. Trust enables collaboration, problem-solving, and flexibility when unexpected challenges arise.
- **Develop institutional supporters:** Identify faculty, administrators, and staff who understand community-engaged work and can advocate for policy adaptations, navigate institutional processes, and mentor others.
- **Invest in long-term relationships:** Sustainable partnerships develop over years, not semesters. Consistent collaboration with both institutional offices and community organizations reduces barriers, strengthens communication, and creates institutional memory.
- **Shared understanding:** Regular communication between university offices and community partners helps align expectations, clarify responsibilities, and prevent misunderstandings before they become obstacles.

3. Equity and Institutional Change

- **Systems were not built for everyone equally:** Many higher education systems were designed around assumptions that privilege traditional academic structures and institutional authority.

These systems may unintentionally create barriers for Tribal governments, community organizations, elders, and nontraditional learners.

- **Recognize structural inequities:** Administrative requirements, reimbursement processes, credential expectations, and technological systems may disproportionately burden community partners with fewer institutional resources. It is important to recognize where these burdens come into play and work to mitigate them.
- **Move beyond individual accommodations:** Rather than relying solely on exceptions, institutions should examine whether existing policies can be redesigned to better support equitable partnerships for all participants.
- **Center community expertise:** Institutional procedures should recognize community knowledge and lived experience as valuable forms of expertise, rather than requiring communities to conform entirely to university norms.

4. Strategies for Navigating Institutional Systems

- **Patience:** Meaningful institutional change often occurs gradually. Building equitable partnerships requires realistic expectations, flexibility, and a willingness to work through complex administrative processes.
- **Strategic advocacy:** Advocate for policy improvements using evidence from successful partnerships, student outcomes, community feedback, and institutional priorities. Incremental changes can create lasting improvements over time.
- **Documentation:** Maintain clear records of agreements, decisions, successful workflows, challenges, and lessons learned. Documentation reduces confusion, supports continuity during personnel changes, and creates resources for future partnerships.
- **Persistence:** Community-engaged work often requires repeated conversations, iterative problem-solving, and sustained commitment. Long-term persistence helps transform isolated successes into institutional practice.

5. Institutional Learning and Continuous Improvement

- **Reflect on barriers:** After each partnership or course, identify institutional processes that supported or hindered collaboration. Use these reflections to inform future planning and policy recommendations.
- **Share successful models:** Develop case studies, implementation guides, and examples of effective partnerships that can be adapted across departments and institutions.
- **Build institutional memory:** Create centralized resources that document best practices, policy interpretations, templates, and contacts so knowledge is retained beyond individual faculty or staff members.
- **Celebrate progress:** Recognize incremental policy improvements, successful collaborations, and institutional innovations that strengthen community-engaged education and encourage continued investment.

✓ 6. Recommended Deliverables and Policies

- ☐ Institutional barriers and solutions log documenting recurring challenges and successful strategies.
- ☐ Cross-department contact directory identifying key institutional offices and partnership “champions”.
- ☐ Annual review process to identify policy improvements based on faculty and community feedback.
- ☐ Collection of case studies highlighting successful community-engaged courses and partnership models.
- ☐ Documentation standards for agreements, decisions, and institutional processes.
- ☐ Institutional advocacy plan outlining priorities for policy and procedural improvements.

• 7. Who to consult

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Community engagement office | • General counsel |
| • Department and college leadership | • Human resources |
| • Registrar and academic affairs | • Information technology and accessibility services |
| • Sponsored programs and grants office | • Faculty governance bodies |
| • Finance and procurement offices | • Community partners, Tribal governments, and cultural advisors |

CLOSING NOTE

Institutional barriers are often products of systems that evolved without community-engaged partnerships in mind. While not every policy can be changed immediately, sustained relationship-building, thoughtful advocacy, careful documentation, and persistence can gradually reshape institutional practices. Lasting change depends not only on navigating existing systems but also on improving them so future partnerships are more equitable, accessible, and sustainable.

XIII. Practical Checklists

PURPOSE: Provide a practical framework for planning, implementing, and evaluating Community-Integrated Programs (CIPs). These checklists help educators and community partners anticipate institutional requirements, maintain equitable partnerships, and capture lessons learned for continuous improvement.

✓ 1. Before Launching a CIP

- ☐ **Clarify the program vision:** Develop a shared understanding of the course purpose, learning outcomes, community goals, expected benefits, and measures of success. Ensure that all partners agree on the project's objectives through an MOU before implementation begins.
- ☐ **Identify supportive institutional leaders:** Find administrators, department chairs, or program directors who understand the value of community-engaged learning and can help navigate institutional processes or advocate when challenges arise.
- ☐ **Identify a "system expert":** Determine who understands the institution's administrative systems (including procurement, contracting, registrar processes, finance, IT, and risk management) and can guide the partnership through required approvals.
- ☐ **Map the approval pathway:** Document every approval required before launching the course, including curriculum approvals, contracts, technology access, purchasing, risk management, youth protection, and financial authorizations. Establish realistic timelines for each step.
- ☐ **Determine the payment structure:** Decide how community partners, elders, guest instructors, and organizations will be compensated. Clarify payment schedules, invoicing procedures, reimbursement expectations, and funding sources before the course begins.
- ☐ **Determine liability and risk management responsibilities:** Identify which institution or organization is responsible for participant safety, transportation, insurance, emergency procedures, field activities, and legal liability.
- ☐ **Determine data ownership and governance:** Establish agreements regarding ownership, storage, sharing, publication, and future use of course materials, research data, recordings, and community knowledge. Document these decisions in written agreements whenever appropriate.
- ☐ **Confirm course participation and recognition:** Clearly communicate how participation will be recognized for different audiences, including academic credit, continuing education units, certificates, stipends, volunteer hours, or other forms of acknowledgment.
- ☐ **Confirm youth protection protocols (if applicable):** Ensure compliance with institutional and legal requirements for programs involving minors, including background checks, mandatory reporting requirements, supervision ratios, consent forms, transportation policies, and emergency procedures.
- ☐ **Develop communication plans:** Establish regular communication schedules, decision-making processes, primary contacts, and expectations for responding to questions or unexpected challenges.

- **Prepare contingency plans:** Anticipate potential disruptions such as weather, staffing changes, technology failures, funding delays, or scheduling conflicts, and identify alternative approaches before implementation begins.

✓ 2. During CIP Implementation

- **Maintain regular partner check-ins:** Schedule consistent meetings with community partners to review progress, discuss emerging challenges, celebrate successes, and adjust plans collaboratively.
- **Monitor equity of labor:** Regularly assess whether responsibilities remain balanced among faculty, students, administrators, and community partners. Address workload imbalances before they become barriers to partnership.
- **Confirm payments and reimbursements:** Verify that honoraria, stipends, contracts, reimbursements, and invoices are being processed according to agreed timelines to avoid placing unnecessary financial burdens on community partners.
- **Provide ongoing technology support:** Ensure instructors, students, elders, and community participants have access to technical assistance, learning platforms, communication tools, and accessible instructional materials throughout the course.
- **Document lessons learned:** Record decisions, challenges, adaptations, successful practices, and unexpected outcomes throughout implementation. Documentation supports future planning and institutional learning.
- **Determine when adjustments should occur:** Distinguish between changes that can be made immediately during the course and those that require planning before the next offering. Document both types of improvements.
- **Support participant well-being:** Monitor workload, communication, and relationship dynamics among students, faculty, and community partners to ensure the partnership remains respectful, reciprocal, and sustainable.
- **Evaluate progress continuously. Ask throughout the course:**
 - What is working well?
 - What barriers have emerged?
 - Are partnership goals still aligned?
 - Are students achieving the intended learning outcomes?
 - Are community priorities being respected?

✓ 3. After the course

- **Conduct a collaborative evaluation:** Invite faculty, students, community partners, elders, and organizational leaders to reflect on the course together. Evaluate both educational outcomes and the quality of the partnership.

- **Identify needed improvements:** Discuss what should remain the same, what should change, and what new opportunities emerged. Prioritize recommendations for future course offerings.
- **Review governance agreements:** Revisit Memoranda of Understanding, partnership agreements, decision-making structures, and shared responsibilities to determine whether revisions are needed before offering the course again.
- **Evaluate financial sustainability:** Assess whether compensation models, budgeting practices, and funding sources adequately supported equitable participation. Modify financial structures as necessary to improve long-term sustainability.
- **Archive materials and templates:** Preserve course documents, agreements, rubrics, budgets, communication templates, onboarding materials, and implementation guides in an accessible institutional repository to support future instructors and partners.
- **Develop a case study:** Document the course design, partnership structure, challenges, successes, lessons learned, and recommendations. Internal case studies help build institutional knowledge and encourage broader adoption of effective practices.
- **Share institutional knowledge:** Disseminate lessons learned through workshops, faculty learning communities, presentations, internal reports, or resource guides. Share the knowledge you wish had been available when the partnership began.
- **Plan for future collaboration:** Discuss whether the partnership will continue, expand, or evolve into additional projects, research collaborations, or future CIPs.

4. Continuous Reflection Questions

- ? Are community voices meaningfully included in decision-making?
- ? Are responsibilities and benefits shared equitably?
- ? Are institutional processes creating unnecessary barriers?
- ? Is communication timely, transparent, and reciprocal?
- ? Are students meeting both academic and community-centered learning outcomes?
- ? What challenges can be addressed immediately?
- ? What changes require institutional policy or structural improvements?
- ? What practices should become standard for future CIPs?

✓ 5. Recommended Deliverables

- ☐ CIP planning checklist.
- ☐ Partnership implementation timeline with approval milestones.
- ☐ Responsibility MOU identifying institutional and community roles.
- ☐ Communication plan and meeting schedule.
- ☐ Payment tracking and compensation checklist.
- ☐ Risk management and youth protection checklist (when applicable).
- ☐ Mid-course reflection and partnership review template.
- ☐ Post-course evaluation toolkit for students and community partners.
- ☐ Governance review checklist.
- ☐ Financial sustainability review.

• 6. Who to consult

- | | |
|--|--|
| • Community engagement office | • Risk management and legal counsel |
| • Department leadership and academic affairs | • Information technology and accessibility services |
| • Registrar | • Youth protection or compliance office (when applicable) |
| • Finance and procurement offices | • Community organizations, Tribal governments, and cultural advisors |
| • Sponsored programs and grants office | • Faculty who have previously led Community-Integrated Programs |

CLOSING NOTE

Successful CIPs are strengthened through thoughtful planning, continuous communication, and reflective evaluation. While no checklist can anticipate every challenge, documenting processes, revisiting partnerships throughout implementation, and openly sharing lessons learned help transform individual successes into sustainable institutional practice. These checklists are a living resource that evolve alongside community relationships, institutional learning, and the changing needs of both learners and partners.

XIV. Encouraging CIP Development

PURPOSE: Reduce administrative barriers and create institutional support systems that encourage faculty, staff, students, and community partners to develop new Community-Integrated Programs (CIPs). By simplifying processes and providing clear guidance, institutions can increase participation while maintaining equitable and sustainable partnerships.

1. Recognizing Common Barriers

- **Application complexity:** Developing a CIP often requires navigating multiple approval processes across departments and administrative offices. Faculty may be uncertain about where to begin, what approvals are needed, or which office is responsible for which step.
- **Required letters of support:** The CIP funding application requires formal letters from community partners demonstrating commitment to the collaborative effort. These letters are frequently drafted by faculty and circulated among partners for signatures and revisions.
- **Unclear approval pathways:** Community-engaged courses may require approval from curriculum committees, department leadership, registrars, risk management, finance, legal counsel, and community engagement offices. Without a clearly defined process, faculty can become discouraged before implementation begins.
- **Administrative burden:** Budget development, contracts, purchasing, travel approvals, liability documentation, and technology requests occur simultaneously. Managing these tasks alongside course design can significantly increase faculty workload.
- **Limited institutional knowledge:** Many faculty members have never developed a community-engaged course and may lack mentors or institutional examples to guide the process. Likewise, administrative offices may have limited experience supporting nontraditional course models.
- **Fear of uncertainty:** Questions surrounding liability, compensation, data ownership, community expectations, and student assessment may prevent otherwise promising partnerships from moving forward. It is important to push past this to create a successful course.

2. Strategies to encourage CIP development

- **Provide simple templates:** Institutions can reduce administrative barriers by offering standardized templates for partnership agreements, letters of support, memoranda of understanding (MOUs), budgets, assessment plans, and risk management documentation.
- **Offer information sessions:** Workshops and orientation sessions can introduce faculty and community partners to the CIP development process, institutional resources, funding opportunities, and examples of successful partnerships.
- **Develop clear step-by-step guidance:** Rather than expecting faculty to navigate institutional systems independently, provide implementation roadmaps that explain each stage of course development, required approvals, estimated timelines, and responsible offices.

- **Establish mentorship networks:** Pair faculty developing their first CIP with experienced instructors, community engagement professionals, or administrators who have previously navigated similar processes.
- **Centralize resources:** Maintain a shared repository of templates, case studies, frequently asked questions, contact information, policy guidance, and successful implementation examples so knowledge is retained beyond individual faculty members.
- **Normalize iterative development:** Encourage faculty to begin with small pilot projects rather than fully developed programs. Early successes build confidence while allowing institutional processes to evolve alongside the partnership.

3. Navigating common complexities

PAYMENT	RISK
– Compensation for community expertise: Community partners, Elders, and cultural knowledge holders should receive equitable compensation that reflects their instructional contributions rather than relying solely on volunteer participation or honoraria. – Funding pathways: Determine whether payments will occur through contracts, stipends, payroll, grants, or other institutional mechanisms before the course begins. – Budget ownership: Clearly identify which department or institution manages the program budget, reimburses travel expenses, and oversees financial reporting.	– Shared responsibility: Clarify responsibilities for transportation, field supervision, emergency response, participant safety, and insurance coverage before activities begin. – Field protocols: Develop emergency action plans, communication procedures, participant waivers, and culturally appropriate site protections that align with institutional and community expectations. – Early coordination: Consult risk management offices during program planning rather than after course design has been completed.

ACADEMIC CREDIT – Transparent expectations: Clearly define grading responsibilities, workload expectations, attendance requirements, learning outcomes, and assessment methods for all participating institutions. – Flexible participation: Allow opportunities for undergraduate credit, graduate credit, internships, independent studies, or continuing education when appropriate. – Cross-institution coordination: Establish agreements regarding transcript recognition, transfer credit, and academic calendars for multi-institution collaborations.	TECHNOLOGY – Accessible systems: Select technology platforms that are reliable, accessible, and appropriate for all participating organizations, recognizing that community partners may have different technological capacities. – Shared communication: Establish common platforms for scheduling, document sharing, field data collection, and communication while minimizing unnecessary complexity. – Technical support: Identify responsibility for software licensing, equipment management, troubleshooting, and accessibility accommodations.
DATA – Shared stewardship: Establish agreements describing who collects, stores, accesses, analyzes, and publishes data before research or educational activities begin. – Community review: Provide opportunities for community partners and Tribal governments to review findings before dissemination, particularly when culturally significant knowledge or sensitive information is involved. – Long-term management: Develop plans for data storage, archiving, privacy protection, and future access that align with institutional requirements and community expectations.	EQUITY – Shared decision-making: Include community partners as collaborators throughout planning, implementation, assessment, and program evaluation rather than limiting participation to advisory roles. – Reduce participation barriers: Consider transportation, scheduling, accessibility, childcare, compensation, language, and technological access when designing program logistics. – Recognize multiple forms of expertise: Value Indigenous knowledge, lived experience, professional practice, and community leadership alongside traditional academic credentials. – Design for reciprocity: Ensure that community partners receive meaningful benefits, including educational opportunities, resources, recognition, and long-term relationship building in addition to student learning outcomes.

4. Institutional supports for sustainable CIP growth

- **Develop implementation guides:** Add to this handbook, outlining the full CIP development process, common challenges, and recommended practices as the process continues to evolve
- **Maintain example documentation:** Provide completed examples of budgets, partnership agreements, data stewardship plans, governance documents, and course proposals that faculty can adapt. Consider adding this as an appendix to this document.
- **Create interdisciplinary support teams:** Assemble representatives from community engagement, finance, registrar, legal counsel, risk management, and academic affairs who can collaboratively assist new CIP proposals.
- **Evaluate and improve processes:** Regularly review CIP implementation experiences with faculty and community partners to identify recurring administrative barriers and opportunities for institutional improvement.

✓ 5. Recommended deliverables

- ☐ Template library including letters of support, MOUs, budgets, governance agreements, risk management plans, and data stewardship agreements.
- ☐ Faculty orientation workshops introducing CIP development processes and institutional resources.
- ☐ Mentorship network connecting new CIP developers with experienced faculty and community-engaged practitioners.
- ☐ Centralized online resource hub containing templates, contacts, timelines, frequently asked questions, and successful partnership examples.

• 6. Who to consult

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Community engagement office | • General counsel |
| • Department and college leadership | • Information technology and accessibility services |
| • Registrar and academic affairs | • Institutional review boards (when applicable) |
| • Finance and procurement offices | • Tribal governments and cultural advisors |
| • Sponsored programs and grants office | • Community organizations and partner institutions |
| • Risk management | • Experienced community-engaged faculty |

CLOSING NOTE

Encouraging Community-Integrated Program development requires more than reducing paperwork. It requires creating institutional cultures that support innovation, collaboration, and shared responsibility. By simplifying administrative processes, providing practical resources,

building mentorship networks, and demonstrating successful implementation models, institutions can make community-engaged education more accessible while strengthening equitable partnerships that benefit students, faculty, and communities alike.

XV. Case Study Example: Native Youth Leadership Summit

Overview:

The Native Youth Leadership Summit demonstrates how a Community-Integrated Program (CIP) can successfully bring together universities, Tribal communities, educators, and community organizations around a shared educational goal. Developed through a partnership between the University of Idaho, Tribal partners, and the City of McCall, the summit was designed to support Indigenous youth leadership while strengthening relationships between the University of Idaho and Tribal communities.

The program combined land-based learning, cultural knowledge, leadership development, and environmental education. Indigenous community leaders, university faculty, and graduate students all contributed to program design and facilitation, creating a learning environment where community expertise was valued alongside academic knowledge. Rather than positioning the university as the sole provider of education, the summit emphasized reciprocal learning and shared leadership.

Planning required coordination across multiple institutional systems, including grant administration, budgeting, participant registration, transportation, risk management, lodging, and communication with community partners. Graduate students played an important role in organizing logistics, coordinating with partner organizations, and facilitating activities throughout the event. Institutional support from faculty mentors and administrative offices helped navigate these complexities while maintaining flexibility to meet community needs.

The summit also highlighted the importance of shared governance and relationship-building. Community partners participated in shaping program goals, selecting activities, and determining culturally appropriate practices. Decisions were made collaboratively, recognizing that successful partnerships depend on mutual trust, clear communication, and respect for Tribal sovereignty.

Several lessons emerged from the experience. Early planning and consistent communication reduced administrative challenges, while clearly defined roles improved coordination among partners. Flexible funding mechanisms and institutional support were essential for compensating community educators and facilitating participation. Most importantly, investing time in building relationships before focusing on logistics created a stronger foundation for collaboration and future programming.

The Native Youth Leadership Summit illustrates that Community-Integrated Programs are most successful when institutions move beyond transactional partnerships and instead create shared educational experiences that recognize community knowledge, distribute leadership, and build long-term relationships. While the program required significant coordination across multiple organizations and administrative systems, the collaborative model produced educational outcomes that would not have been possible through a traditional university course alone.

Itinerary:

April 17th | FRIDAY

- Tribal youth/official partners arrive to MOSS campus (4pm and on)
- Move-in
- Dinner!
- Welcome ceremony/land acknowledgement/sharing protocols
- campus tour
- teambuilding/orient to place, self, others
 - **Goal:** youth from different groups form an initial connection to this place and to members of the other groups present, as well as members of their own group
 - **Possible Activities:**
 - Tour of MOSS
 - Decorate tree cookies as name tags
 - Helium stick? Chocolate river? Dots Maze? What's the story of your name? What's one teaching from your family that is important to bring to this weekend?
- free time (offer options to go into town?, games/movie in Lake Yurt, night hike?, time on MOSS beach?, or cabin time with group leaders from the partner orgs.)
- Campfire! (s'mores?)

April 18th | SATURDAY

MORNING

- breakfast (on campus) and prep field lunches
- **Art prompt option:** "What does a free-flowing river feel like?"
 - **Intention:** Center relationship before policy
 - Framing language
 - water as a teacher
 - Rivers as beings, not resources
 - Art as a way to express feelings before considering facts
- **Materials available:**
 - natural materials
 - construction paper
 - Glue
 - Markers
 - colored pencils
 - Glitter
 - blank paper OR butcher paper

- paint (NOTE: the paint MOSS has is classroom-grade, washable, not professional oils)
- scissors
- Reflection questions
 - What feelings come up when you see a dammed river vs a free-flowing river?
- **Dialogue:** Water as a teacher
 - **Intention:** understand the varied personal/cultural importance of rivers
 - **Prompts:**
 - How can we learn from rivers?
 - How do rivers shape us?
- **Dam Removal Presentation:** Led by Sammy & Josiah (20-30 minutes)
 - **Content Should Cover:**
 - What dams do (hydropower, irrigation, flood control)
 - Ecological impacts (sediment, fish migration)
 - Economic & political realities
 - What dam removal actually requires (funding, permits, years of planning)
 - Tradeoffs and unintended consequences
 - **Student Task During Presentation:**
 - Give them a notecatcher with 3 columns: Dams Conversation Notecatcher
 - Benefits of dams
 - Harms of dams
 - Questions/uncertainties
- Town hall role-play (~1 hour)
 - **Intention:** civic empathy, systems thinking
 - Students assigned roles in pairs (given role cards with background info included):
 - **Scenario:** An old dam in Hells Canyon is up for review. The community must decide whether to remove, retrofit, or maintain it.
 - **Structure:**
 - 10 min role prep
 - 30–40 min moderated town hall
 - 15 min debrief (step out of roles)
 - How did it feel to represent that perspective?
 - What surprised you?
 - What tensions felt real?
 - Was there a perspective you had never considered before, and did it change your personal opinions on this issue?

- **Panel prep/Advocacy:**

- **Intention:** prepare youth for participation in the panel that follows the film screening, and grow students' confidence in themselves as leaders and change-makers around causes that matter to them
- **Panel Prep:** What is it like to be on a panel? What questions will people likely ask? What does respectful, active participation look like?
 - if needed, provide some sentence stems that could be helpful for the panel that evening (ex: I agree, and want to add that..., ex: From my perspective,...)
- **Youth consider:** If they wanted to see dams replaced, what does it take?
- validate their feelings
- Maintain a space of professional growth
- How to use their voices for change/speak from their lived experiences and cultural and personal perspectives to support a cause

AFTERNOON – FIELD-BASED LEARNING

- Field Lunch
- Paddle Workshop at Zim's
 - **Intention:** spend time connecting with water, improve technical skills
 - **Learning Goals:**
 - Kayak rolls
 - Paddling
 - J stroke, C stroke, etc.
 - **Reflection prompt afterward:** How does being in water change how you think about it?
- **Water Quality Testing:** Little Salmon River
 - Supplies
 - waders
 - 5 gal buckets
 - yogurt cups
 - ice cube trays
 - pH
 - Temperature probes
 - Turbidity tube
 - conductivity
 - Dissolved oxygen
 - Macroinvertebrate sampling
 - Flow rate sensor
 - data tables on handouts
 - info sheets on water quality indicators + watershed maps

- LabQuests
- pencils
- **Discussion:**
 - What does “healthy” mean scientifically?
 - Is ecological health the only measure that matters?
 - How might dam removal affect these indicators?
 - Columbia River watershed map: how does the Little Salmon affect the watershed?

EVENING

- Dinner (on campus)
- film fest
- Tech check at 5pm
- open to the public, Indigenous youth Q&A panel

April 19th | SUNDAY

- Breakfast (on campus), probably pack a field lunch for the road (?)
- Wrap-up or reflection activity
- move-out
- thank yous and goodbyes (closing ceremony)