

Community Engagement 101

Orientation to CE Task Force
April 25, 2016

1

CE 101 Objective

- Prepare CE Task Force members to make informed decisions
- Provide a common foundation for all members

- Understanding of CE at Loyola
- Cover the nuts and bolts of CE awards

2

Role of CE Task Force

- Leadership
 - Prioritize improvements areas
 - Strategize improvement tactics
 - Identify program/partnership candidates to highlight
- Accountability
 - Set improvement benchmarks
 - Support benchmark achievement

3

QUIZ

Who is currently doing community engagement at Loyola?

- a) Students
- b) Faculty
- c) Staff
- d) All of the above

6

What does CE look like?

Students Curricular and beyond

- Service learning, internships, practica
- LUCAP and service clubs

Faculty Research, Teaching & Service

- Research intended to improve public good
- Service learning
- Provision of technical expertise to community

Staff Centers and advisors

- Directors and staff of centers provide measurable benefits for the community
- Advisors guide students and faculty on increasing impact with community engagement

7

What does CE look like?

Where Non-university communities

- Local
- National
- Global

Who Community-building orgs

- Non-profits
- Government agencies
- Local, small businesses

What Measurable community benefit

- On-going partnerships with primary objective to improve the community

8

Value of CE to Loyola - Internal

- Mission
 - Forming men and women with and for others
 - Social justice promotion
- Strategic Plan
 - Experiential learning
 - New Orleans connection
 - Jesuit identity
 - Preparing for career and a life of service

9

Value of CE to Loyola - External

- Ranking
 - Top 30 in USN&WR Service Learning category *twice* since category was created
- Elite peer group
 - Only 361 universities are Carnegie CE classified
 - Highly distinguished crowd
- Protection from critiques
 - Preparing students for the “real world”
 - Ivory tower elitism

10

Carnegie's CE Definition Pt. 1

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



11

Unpacking Carnegie's CE Definition

| Term | Translation/Notes |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Collaboration | Both parties know they participating in a collaboration |
| Larger Communities | Anywhere on earth, includes people as well as environment |
| Mutually beneficial | The community has to substantively benefit |
| Exchange knowledge and resources | Skills and time of faculty, staff, students, human resources, infrastructure, funds, expertise, connections (enthusiasm is great but not adequate alone) |
| Partnership | Power dynamics are acknowledged, trust is cultivated between partners, agencies can say no |
| Reciprocity | Combining our strengths with theirs for shared use and/or shared successes |

12

Carnegie's CE Definition Pt. 2

The purpose of community engagement is the **partnership**

of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the **public and private sectors** to

1. enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity
2. enhance curriculum, teaching and learning
3. prepare educated, engaged citizens
4. strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility
5. address critical societal issues
6. contribute to the public good



13

Who: CE Partner Agencies

- Contribute to quality of life, enhance social conditions, resist or dismantle systemic oppression
- Serve a population with a demonstrable need
- Share their connections to community and intimate knowledge of need
 - Help our efforts make a much greater impact

14

QUIZ

If it happens off campus, it's community engagement.

- a) True
- b) False

15

QUIZ

If it doesn't meaningfully, measurably benefit the community, it's not community engagement.

- a) True
- b) False

16

QUIZ

Loyola was recognized by Carnegie with the Community Engagement Classification in 2010.

- a) True
- b) False

17

QUIZ

Some people on this CE Task Force share no responsibility for Loyola receiving CE awards.

- a) True
- b) False

18

Breakdown

CE ACCOLADES

19

CE Accolades Overview

| Accolade | AKA |
|---|-----------------------|
| Carnegie Community Engagement Classification | Carnegie |
| President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll | Honor Roll |
| Community Based Federal Work Study | CBFWS |
| Additional Reports | |
| American Jesuit Colleges & Universities Common Dataset | Common Dataset |
| Community Engagement Key Performance Indicators | CE KPIs |

20

CE Accolades Overview

| Accolade | Accolade's Objective |
|-----------------------|--|
| Carnegie | 10-year rounds, increase in CE institutionalization, improvement in CE quality |
| Honor Roll | Annual increase in closed loop assessment, compile nationwide data about student volunteering |
| Common Dataset | Annually compare AJCU institutions' performance with one another |
| CE KPIs | Annually communicate meaningful Loyola CE info and trends with administrators |
| CBFWS | Annually demonstrate we met the Dept of Ed requirement that 7% of ALL FWS funds directly benefit the community, not just the university |

21

QUIZ

Which of the following are penalties for failure to meet the FWS 7% community service requirement

- a) Restricted access to FWS funds in future
- b) Pay back the FWS funds we already spent
- c) Both
- d) Neither

22

QUIZ

Internships with eligible community partners could theoretically count toward the FWS 7% requirement if approved in advance.

- a) True
- b) False

23

CE Accolade Applications Combined

94 items

| Topics | # | Aspects | # |
|----------------------|----|-------------------------------|----|
| Institutionalization | 24 | Policies | 23 |
| Faculty matters | 18 | Practices | 36 |
| Students | 15 | Quantities | 28 |
| Curriculum | 7 | Results | 7 |
| Partnerships | 6 | | |
| Federal Work Study | 6 | | |
| CE Programs | 4 | | |
| Tracking | 4 | (What we did) | |
| Assessment | 10 | (What difference did it make) | |

24

Challenges for Application Strength

- Can we get the info?
- How favorable is our answer?

25

Challenges for Application Strength

| Can we get the info? | # 2014-15 |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Reliably | 47 |
| Inconsistently | 39 |
| Rarely | 8 |

26

2014-15 Issue Topics Getting the Info

| Topics | Rarely | Inconsistently | Reliably |
|----------------------|--------|----------------|----------|
| Assessment | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| CE programs | | 3 | 1 |
| Curriculum | | 1 | 6 |
| Faculty matters | 3 | 11 | 4 |
| Federal Work Study | | | 6 |
| Institutionalization | 1 | 12 | 11 |
| Partnerships | 2 | | 4 |
| Students | | 8 | 7 |
| Tracking | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Finding: More Institutionalization and Faculty Matters items are hard to access than other topics 27

Challenges for Application Strength

| How favorable is the answer? | # 2014-15 |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| Favorable | 38 |
| At risk | 27 |
| Unfavorable | 29 |

28

2014-15 Issue Topics Answer Strength

| Topics | Unfavorable | At risk | Strong |
|----------------------|-------------|---------|--------|
| Assessment | 5 | | 5 |
| CE programs | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Curriculum | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Faculty matters | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| Federal Work Study | | 5 | 1 |
| Institutionalization | 8 | 10 | 6 |
| Partnerships | 2 | | 4 |
| Students | 1 | | 14 |
| Tracking | | 2 | 2 |

Finding: More Institutionalization and Faculty Matters items have negative answers than other topics 29

Examples

- Institutionalization
 - Do we include CE in our strategic plan?
 - Do students earn transcript notations for CE?
- Faculty Matters
 - Is community engaged scholarship a factor in our promotion and tenure criteria?
 - Do we train CRTC members to distinguish high quality from low quality CE scholarship?

30

QUIZ

The “At Risk” category indicates

- a) The item is currently a problem
- b) The item is currently in good standing, but its future is in question
- c) The item currently appears on the applications, but it might be removed in the future

31

QUIZ

A partnership is eligible for highlighting in an application if it has existed for at least 5 years.

- a) True
- b) False

32

**Other Key Concerns:
Highlighted Programs and Partnerships**

- Honor Roll
 - 3 exemplary programs – annually
- Carnegie
 - 15 exemplary partnerships by 2019
- CE programs/partnerships must meet minimum criteria to be eligible for highlighting

33

**Other Key Concerns:
Highlighted Programs and Partnerships**

Currently Eligible (5)

- Collaborative Research on Chagas Disease
- Greater New Orleans Criminal Justice Partnership
- Ignacio Volunteers
- Jesuit Social Research Institute
- Service Learning

Closed (6)

- Common Good Network
- Hispanic Computer Literacy Project
- Policy Research Shop
- Shrockin' (Sheetrocking)
- Teaching American History Summer Institutes
- Thelonius Monk Institute

34

Other Key Concerns: Highlighted Programs and Partnerships

| Currently At-Risk (7) |
|---|
| CBFWS |
| Greater New Orleans Literacy Initiative |
| Immigration Law Clinic |
| LIM Extension Program |
| Small Business Development Center |
| LUCAP |
| PRIEMMANS |

35



Specifics of the

CARNEGIE APPLICATION

36

Carnegie Application Timeline

37

QUIZ

Some CE programs' success are self-evident, so they don't need to assess

a) True
b) False

38

QUIZ

The depth of the highlighted partnerships is more important than the breadth

a) True
b) False

39

QUIZ

We will retain our CE classification in 2020 because we have so many CE activities around campus

a) True
b) False

40

Carnegie Standards

| Essentials | Irrelevant |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Institutionalized CE:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly claim CE as priority • Adequately resource CE • Tie CE to employment expectations • Breadth of CE approaches across the university • Depth of CE partnerships and ongoing projects • Closed CE assessment loops | <p><u>Non-institutionalized CE:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anything CE we don't systematically assess • Lists of Loyola CE activities • One-time or spontaneous service • Volunteering by Loyola members that isn't Loyola-endorsed |

41

Carnegie Application Process

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>2010 Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scavenger hunt for CE • 5 whirlwind months • Describe CE programs • Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Grunt work – Hard workers and CE fans | <p>2020 Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CE only counts in plain sight • 3 methodical years • Detail post-2010 improvements • Task force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strategizing – University decision-makers |
|---|---|

42

Objectives

CE TASK FORCE

43

Role of OCELTS

- Back office support, data compiling
- Monitor and report benchmark progress 2xAY
- Brief CETF on accolade applications revisions
- Maintain CE Task Force intranet
- Collect and provide internal data on request
- Strengthen CE program/partnerships' eligibility for highlighting

44

Role of CE Task Force

- Leadership
 - Prioritize improvements areas
 - Strategize improvement tactics
 - Identify candidates to highlight
- Accountability
 - Set improvement benchmarks
 - Support benchmark achievement

45

QUIZ

Every VP and every dean is requested to enroll at least 1 CE program/partnership for highlighting

- a) True
- b) False

46

QUIZ

Only CE programs/partnerships that complete the workshop are eligible to be highlighted

- a) True
- b) False

47

QUIZ

Anyone can enroll a CE program/partnership for the workshop

- a) True
- b) False

48