Executive Summary of the Community Engagement Task Force Final Report.

The scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers, and to our cities.

Boyer 1996

In the fall of 2009, Provost Ralph Wilcox charged the USF Task Force on Community Engagement (CE) to advance efforts to assure commitment to community engagement throughout USF and to identify policies, strategies, priorities, procedures, structures, and implementation steps needed to institutionalize across the university. Recommendations of the Task Force are aimed at establishing USF as a national model for a university fully engaged with its local, national, and global communities (USF Strategic Plan 2007-2012). For eight months, faculty, students, and staff from across the university engaged in active research, provocative discussions, and challenging analyses of how to make the University of South Florida a more fully engaged university. Following the conclusion of the working committees, the co-chairs (Dee Jeffers from Health, and Harold Keller from Academic Affairs), often working with a small group from the Task Force, wrote this report.

Included in the Task Force’s research was an assessment of USF’s history in community engagement, a history of which the University is justifiably proud. Examples of these successful efforts include the Collaborative for Children, Families and Communities, USF Health, the Faculty Senate Task Force on Community Engagement that resulted in USF being classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Community Engaged and Research Intensive University. The Task Force report built upon the Carnegie Engagement Classification Project, particularly with national research universities, and prior reports by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the Kellogg Foundation. This was supportive of Goal 3 of the USF Strategic Plan 2007-2012 to “expand local and global engagement initiatives to strengthen and sustain healthy communities and to improve the quality of life” through community engaged research and scholarship.

This Task Force report focuses on a Vision for Community Engagement at USF that includes committee reports on Engaged Learning, Engaged Research and Scholarship, Engaged Outreach and Partnerships, and recommendations for the creation of a Center for Engaged Scholarship and Research (CESR).

The Task Force report positions USF to build on its strengths and learn from its experiences as it moves forward with what we all hope will be compelling and innovative programs to put engagement in the center of the university. We recommend that USF create the Center for Engaged Scholarship and Research (CESR) by funding a director and staff to direct and document USF’s grant proposals, courses, internships, community volunteer activities, as well as student and faculty civic engagement locally, regionally, nationally, and globally. Toward that end, we recommend the following activities for CESR and its director:
• Development and use of electronic system for monitoring community engaged grants and projects;
• Development and use of electronic system for coding and tracking community engagement on student transcripts (course related and co-curricular);
• Development and use of electronic system for capturing community engaged curricular effort/products, community engaged research/scholarship effort/products, and community engaged outreach and partnerships effort/products/impact on effort and annual reviews;
• Development and use of periodic community scan of community perceptions of USF community engagement;
• Development and use of annual report (to USF, to community and other constituents) of community engagement;
• Development and use of USF/college/department T&P documents that include community engagement as one pathway to excellence in teaching, research, and service;
• Development and use of internal and external incentives, recognition and rewards for community engagement;
• Development and use of single point of contact (portal, website) for community engagement at USF;
• Development of standards and ethical practices for multiple forms of community engagement;
• Development and use of professional development (training) modules for faculty, community, administrators, T&P committees at all levels on community engagement as part of the T&P process;
• Development and use of professional development (training) modules for faculty, community, administrators, and students on engaged learning, engaged research, and engaged outreach and partnerships;
• Development of technical assistance and resource supports for multiple forms of community engagement;
• Development of impact indices for individual engaged projects and the university as a whole;
• Development of a plan for internal and external communication about USF community engagement;
• Development of a plan for inclusion of community engagement in USF capital campaign and ongoing development;
• Development of a plan of action steps for long-term institutionalization and sustainability of university community engagement;
• Development of a Community Advisory Board.

The report concludes with a list of metrics that can be incorporated into annual evaluations of individuals, departments, and of the entire university as it moves into becoming the engaged university of the future.
The USF Task Force on Community Engagement (CE) was created by the Provost to advance efforts to assure commitment to community engagement throughout USF and to identify policies, strategies, priorities, procedures, structures, and implementation steps needed to institutionalize across the university. Recommendations of the Task Force are aimed at establishing USF as a national model for a university fully engaged with its local, national, and global communities (USF Strategic Plan 2007-2012).

As a metropolitan research I university, USF should serve as a hub in a knowledge-based society in which various communities are involved in all phases of the knowledge process, as opposed to traditional models of universities as dispensers of knowledge in a one-way process. A fully engaged university integrates teaching, research, and service into a delivery approach that involves its constituents and responds to the needs of diverse communities. As such, USF can distinguish itself as an institution in which students become leaders who are prepared to respond effectively to the complex issues of the society they will enter by promoting social responsibility and action (USF Strategic Plan 2007-2012). In this way community engagement directly supports our goal of furthering Student Success.

The CE Task Force recognizes and builds on the history of community engaged scholarship by staff members in multiple centers and faculty members throughout the university. Examples of these successful efforts include the Collaborative for Children, Families and Communities, USF Health, the Faculty Senate Task Force on Community Engagement and resulted in USF being classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Community Engaged and Research Intensive University. The Task Force report builds upon the Carnegie Engagement Classification Project particularly with national research universities, and prior reports by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the Kellogg Foundation. This is consistent with the commitment to Community Engagement that is manifest in Goal 3 of the USF Strategic Plan 2007-2012 to “expand local and global engagement initiatives to strengthen and sustain healthy communities and to improve the quality of life.” Despite these notable accomplishments the Task Force finds that USF lacks the infrastructure necessary for recognition as a national model for a fully engaged university, particularly among peer institutions. In this report the CE Task Force provides a vision for engaged learning, engaged scholarship, and engaged outreach through community partnerships, and makes recommendations for building the necessary infrastructure for realizing that vision.

Community engaged learning, research, and outreach through sustained university-community partnerships results in mutual benefits to both the university and the community. Knowledge acquired through engaged learning and engaged research activities that address local questions is translated into effective practices that are implemented locally, regionally, nationally and globally. In this way the community
contributes significantly to the educational and research missions of USF (Ersing, Jetson, Jones, & Keller, 2007).

The Task Force included faculty and administrators from all academic colleges, including USF Health, professionals and administrators in Student Affairs, central administration and governmental relations, and students. Subcommittees were formed on engaged learning, engaged research and scholarship (including Tenure and Promotion), engaged outreach and partnerships, and infrastructure. Subcommittees reviewed pertinent literature, prior reports, and the commitments and supports for community engagement at peer and aspirational institutions, including AAU universities. Faculty and students in the Advanced Public Relations capstone course in the School of Mass Communications surveyed and interviewed faculty and staff concerning their awareness and attitudes toward community engagement, and particularly service-learning, and their report was reviewed by the task force as well. The subcommittee on engaged outreach and partnerships also conducted focus groups with community members having extensive experiences with engaged faculty and students. The full task force met with Dr. William Plater, previously Provost at Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) and currently with the Carnegie Initiative on University Community Engagement. He reviewed previous documents, including the USF application for Carnegie designation as an engaged university, and subcommittee drafts of reports, and discussed implementation of IUPUI’s commitment to community engagement. The final reports of the engaged learning and engaged outreach subcommittees are available on the Provost’s portal for the CE Task Force, and a preliminary report of the engaged research committee is similarly posted, along with the Faculty Senate report on community engaged research. This final report is the result of deliberations by the subcommittee on infrastructure, integrating information from the other three subcommittees, and input from the full task force membership.

This report is organized around the foci of the three subcommittees, 1) engaged learning, 2) engaged research/scholarship, and 3) engaged outreach and partnerships. Each section provides a brief narrative (with full reports and supporting documents available at the Provost’s portal) and ends with recommendations. A brief section on the proposed model for university community engagement, infrastructure needed, and recommendations for full implementation of the Vision for Community Engagement concludes the narrative portion of the report. This is followed by a set of recommendations for initiation of our commitment in the next two to three years given the current economic conditions and constraints and the lack of any institutional infrastructure supports in place presently. Finally, the report ends with a listing of potential measures for benchmarking community engagement. Such metrics are currently absent from the USF description of strategic priorities and benchmark measures for community engagement.

**Vision for Community Engagement**

**Community Engaged Learning**

The subcommittee focused on the intersection of teaching and community engagement, with an attempt to be as inclusive as possible with multiple forms of curricular and co-
curricular engagement. Examples of curricular engagement include experiential learning required as part of professional programs (e.g., internships, apprenticeships, clinical rotations), experiences as students explore career interests and or develop skills (e.g., shadowing, practicum, class-based consultation projects), performances in and with the community, and those where students translate academic theories and principles into action (e.g., applied research, participatory-based action research). Examples of co-curricular engagement, typically in the form of voluntarism, may be short-term (days-of-service) or longer term (alternative spring break). Other examples of co-curricular experiences are those tied to on-going student groups (e.g., student environmental groups, pre-medical or –nursing groups), those related to philanthropic efforts (e.g., Dance Marathon, Heart Walk), and those focused on the development of engagement/leadership skills (e.g., Civic Engagement Scholars).

Service-learning is a form of community engaged learning that is explicitly connected to academic courses. These are designed to enhance the understanding of course content, planned collaboratively and implemented with a community partner (i.e., reciprocal), and developed to enhance students’ sense of personal responsibility to participate in the public realm to address current pressing social problems (i.e., civic engagement). Meaningful service activities are related to course material through reflection activities such as directed writings, small group discussions, and class presentations. Service activities are not necessarily skill-based as in practica and internships within professional programs.

Research evidence on community engaged learning and service-learning reveals that, if properly implemented, there are benefits consistent with USF strategic priorities to all participants (students, faculty, the institution, and the community). Measurable benefits include positive impacts on discipline-based academic learning, increased social responsibility and citizenship skills (civic engagement), facilitating cultural and racial understanding, direct contributions to career development, increasing retention and graduation rates, increasing faculty satisfaction with the quality of student learning, enhancing university-community relations, enhancing alumni relations due to improved students’ satisfaction with the university, providing useful service and expertise to the community, and enhancing university-community partnerships (e.g., Astin et al, 1999; Axsom & Piland, 1999; Braxton, 2000; Keup, 2005).

While the demonstrated benefits are impressive, it is important to note the caveat “if properly implemented.” Such implementation necessitates that engaged academic courses be immersed in the community, community partners involved in the planning and implementation of experiences, and that course content is directly linked with community experiences via appropriate reflective activities. In successful community engagement programs, faculty members are supported in their community engagement efforts, and students are supported in the integration of multiple experiences (both curricular and co-curricular). Community engaged learning must be included in university and unit-level Tenure and Promotion (T&P) documents relating to criteria for teaching (as done at universities such as Iowa State, Michigan State, Washington). The recommendations identify the kinds of infrastructure supports necessary to institutionalize community engaged learning. See also the posted article by Furco (2002) on a “Self-assessment
rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education.” Such infrastructure supports include:

- the development and nurturing of sustained partnerships with community entities (local and global);
- faculty development and technical assistance opportunities;
- student recruitment and education via the production and dissemination of a catalog of experiential learning courses and activities that will be made readily accessible to students and the community;
- integration of experiential learning in curriculum campus wide;
- established standards and outcomes for engaged learning curriculum development and implementation;
- codification of the full range of curricular and co-curricular engaged learning opportunities;
- a measurement system that easily documents engaged learning, regularly assesses outcomes consistent with strategic priorities, and assesses responsiveness to pressing needs of the community;
- electronic documentation of engaged learning (both curricular and co-curricular) and recording on student transcripts;
- electronic documentation of engaged teaching/learning and automatic downloading onto faculty effort (FAR) and annual reports;
- clear pathways for promotion and tenure based on community engagement accomplishments, with T&P documents at all levels reflecting those pathways;
- professional development for administrators, chairs, and faculty on T&P guidelines and decision-making processes that include community engagement; and
- faculty/student/community rewards, incentives, and recognition for excellence in engaged learning.

It is important to note that many of our state, peer and aspirational universities have extensive infrastructures to support engaged learning on their campuses, including electronic coding of experiential courses (e.g., Florida State, Central Florida) and documentation of outcomes. For example, IUPUI codes each course as to the form of experiential learning (with dropdown menus and definitions). Codes are then transformed electronically onto student transcripts, indicating number of courses and number of service hours performed by each student. Similarly, at Michigan State courses coded as involving community engaged learning result in dropdown menus for faculty completing electronic annual reports, enabling documentation of number of students, number of hours per student, total number of hours, agencies/entities served, types of services provided, etc. Institutional reports of engagement are routinely pulled from these databases.

**Community Engaged Research/Scholarship**

Engaged scholarship consists of scholarly and pedagogical activities that are designed jointly, carried out in collaboration and with potential benefit for groups and organizations in local, regional, national, and global communities related to the university. Such engaged scholarship reflects a range of faculty work in communities from design and discovery to the integration and or interpretation of discovery, to
application with communities (locally and globally). Engaged scholarship is viewed broadly and with rigor. Community engagement can be documented (e.g., Ersing et al, 2007) to:

- Contribute to the definition or resolution of a relevant social problem or issue using state-of-the-art knowledge to facilitate change in organizations or institutions
- Use disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise to help groups/organizations in conceptualizing and solving problems
- Set up intervention programs to prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes for individuals or groups or to optimize positive outcomes
- Contribute to the evaluation of existing practices or programs
- Make substantive contributions to public policy.

Significance of results and peer review are the hallmarks of such scholarship, as with any other form of scholarship. Scholars are responsible for evaluating whether or not they achieve their goals and whether or not this achievement had an important impact on and is used by others. Publications in peer-reviewed journals and professional outlets or presentations at disciplinary or interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of community outreach are examples of valued products.

Various impact indices of quality and significance for engaged research (see the University of Washington Community-Engaged Scholarship toolkit, accessed at http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info) might include:

- Work deemed scholarly, as judged by peer review
- Demonstrable effect not only on a given policy, community, agency or program, but practice is shown to have contributed in some way to advancing the state-of-the-art practice itself
- Documentation that the practice contributions have had important effects on policy, and/or on a community, organization or program
- Evidence that new knowledge, methods, or policies derived from the work have diffused to other communities or agencies
- Evidence that new practice ideas, policies, programs, methods, etc., have been disseminated through publications – refereed journals, technical reports – that are used by organizations and communities to help them assess problems, assure the delivery of services, or develop policies
- Increased engagement in university-community collaborative projects.

Community engaged scholarship and engaged learning must be included in university and unit-level Tenure and Promotion (T&P) documents relating to criteria for research and teaching, respectively. Inclusion in T&P documents only indicates that these forms of research and teaching are valued forms of scholarship and teaching (along with many other forms of research and teaching), and that one can attain tenure and promotion through the conduct of high quality engaged research and teaching. Inclusion of engaged research within T&P documents does not mean that everyone must conduct such research, only that it is one acceptable form of research in the same way as bench research with no immediate application is a valued form of research. Exclusion of engaged research and engaged teaching serves as a significant disincentive to those
faculty who conduct such research and teaching activities. Evaluating community engaged staff in university centers should similarly include criteria for community engagement.

It is important to recognize that engaged research takes many different forms, depending upon the discipline of the researcher. Therefore, each unit needs to articulate those forms of engaged research unique to the discipline(s) represented in the unit. This allows for greater unit-specific application. Language on engaged research and criteria for evaluation needs to be incorporated in T&P documents throughout the university and at multiple levels. While faculty throughout the university conduct engaged research and teaching, faculty development for administrators, department chairs, and faculty is necessary. Similarly infrastructure supports for the conduct of engaged research must be implemented centrally and across campus. For example, sustained partnerships and memorandums of agreement must be implemented, and college level community facilitators will enable engaged learning and research. Our peer and aspirational universities (e.g., Michigan State, Washington, IUPUI) provide mechanisms for electronically documenting grants and contracts that address forms of engaged research and learning, and mechanisms for electronically recording engaged scholarship and teaching on effort reports (AFD/FAR) and annual reports. Documenting grants and contracts directly related to engaged scholarship, given the increasing emphasis of many funding agencies on community engagement, plays a significant role. Michigan State University, for example, has an electronic system that can be easily adapted to record precisely that information and download it onto faculty effort and annual reports, and again enabling automatic institutional reports on community/global engagement based on the resulting databases.

Indirect cost recovery from grants and contracts involving community engagement are often smaller than the desired federal return rates, even when federal grants are attained. The lower indirect cost recovery rates should in no way diminish the importance of our commitment to community engagement and the valuing of engaged learning, research, and outreach. Colleges, units, and individuals should not be discouraged from pursuing community engaged learning and research projects because of the lower indirect cost recovery rates.

Specific recommendations from the Task Force include:

- Clear pathways for promotion and tenure based on community engagement accomplishments, with T&P documents at all levels reflecting those pathways;
- Professional development for administrators, chairs, and faculty on T&P guidelines and decision-making processes that include community engagement;
- College and discipline faculty development and technical assistance on engaged research;
- Systems for assessment, monitoring, and feedback on engaged scholarship at the faculty, department, college, university, levels;
- Systems for assessment, monitoring, and feedback, including impact analyses, relative to the community;
- Electronic documentation of engaged research on grants/contracts, effort reporting, and annual reports;
• Incentives, recognition and rewards for excellence in engaged research; and
• Resources to initiate and bridge engaged research;
• Review and revise policies concerning indirect cost recovery in order to ensure that they do not disadvantage engaged research grants and contracts.

**Engaged Outreach and Partnerships**

“Community engagement describes the 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” (Carnegie definition). Community outreach efforts include a continuum of mutually beneficial involvement and engagement with the community, ranging from one-time efforts (e.g., conducting a workshop, bringing expertise to a problem-solving discussion, providing clinical/medical services, sharing expertise in a community theatre, or conducting a student service day project), time-limited activities (e.g., conducting an evaluation, field placement, alternative spring break service project), to ongoing partnerships that result in mutual capacity building. Ongoing partnerships build capacity, achieve system changes, and or bring about knowledge/practice/policy transfer across locations. Such ongoing partnerships require advance negotiation and mutual agreement on goals, processes, and products that are sustainable long-term. Sustainable partnerships also include shared resources, recognition and resolution of conflicts, and result in mutually beneficial outcomes and mutual capacity enhancement.

Civic engagement includes individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern, and to make a difference in the civic life of our communities. Designed well and with proper implementation that is connected to engaged learning and engaged research, civic engagement activities yield academic benefits and enhance student, staff and faculty productivity and engagement overall. It is critically important that community engaged scholarship, engaged learning, and engaged outreach be included in university and unit-level Tenure and Promotion (T&P) documents relating to criteria for research, teaching, and service, respectively.

Access to information about university resources and assets, as well as to information about community resources and assets is necessary for sustainable engaged partnerships. A single portal of community access to the university and faculty is very important. Involvement of community members is critical at senior leadership levels as well as within the context of specific engaged projects. Our peer and aspirational institutions involve campus media relations in the regular dissemination of information about engaged activities and their value to the community. The benefits of ongoing sustained partnerships and communication with the community in multiple formats, including the media, are obtained in increased donations from external constituents and enhanced capital campaign results. The engaged outreach subcommittee **recommended** that by engaged partnerships at USF will be evidenced by faculty, students, and community partners who are well supported in their efforts through the following measures:

• Central Clearinghouse for community access to faculty and university resources;
• Established standards of excellence with regular assessment and feedback internally as well as to the community;
• An active Community Advisory Board;
• Regular assessment of community partners’ perception of the value of working with USF as well as the barriers present;
• Widely disseminated information about the value USF adds to our communities;
• Clear pathways for promotion and tenure based on community engagement accomplishments, with T&P documents at all levels reflecting those pathways;
• Professional development for administrators, chairs, and faculty on T&P guidelines and decision-making processes that include community engagement; and
• Incentives, recognition and rewards for excellence in engaged outreach and partnerships, for faculty, students, academic units, and community members and entities.

Community Engagement Model and Infrastructure

It is recommended that USF establish a central Office of Community Engagement at a high administrative level, commensurate with its place within its strategic priorities. It is envisioned that each college will have dedicated faculty/staff to support and further the college and university commitment to community engagement. College specific community engagement faculty/staff will work closely with the administrator/staff in the central Office of Community Engagement (see figure below).

The USF Office of Community Engagement (OCE) will be responsible for developing, nurturing, and sustaining the organizational foundation, critical resources, and processes necessary to promote and advance engaged learning, research/scholarship, outreach and partnerships throughout USF. College specific faculty/staff dedicated to community engagement will facilitate implementation of engaged learning, research, and outreach within their respective units, recognizing that not every center, department or faculty will participate. The functions of the OCE pertinent to community engagement include:

• Policy development
• Communications
• Professional development and technical assistance
• Assessment, monitoring, and feedback
• Incentives, recognition and rewards
• Resource development
In addition to the OCE and college-specific dedicated faculty/staff, **recommendations** for internal support include:

- **Information Systems** – assignment of dedicated Information Systems or Technology staff to create and sustain systematic codification of courses, and collection of data for measuring community engagement effort and impact, and to develop and maintain a central website/portal for community engagement and community access.
- **Development** – assignment of dedicated staff support to secure financial and tangible contribution of goods and resources to support community engagement efforts such as a) faculty incentives for engaged scholarship, b) student scholarships and stipends to support engaged learning, and c) recognition events and rewards to faculty, students, and community partners.
- **Financial** – allocation of operating funds to support the day-to-day functions of the office, including special events for recognizing excellence in community engagement.

Currently university community engagement is spread diffusely across campus, dependent upon individual faculty and units committed to engaged learning, research, and or outreach. The Task Force recognizes a critical need for high level executive leadership to guide and advocate for the further development of policies and resources necessary for the advancement of community engagement at USF. At minimum clear expectations regarding community engagements for colleges and the OCE should be clarified and communicated. Priority should be given to funding the office for a minimum of three years, even within the current economic constraints. Specific measureable objectives for each function should be established and assessed annually to determine progress towards the Vision for Community Engagement.
Recommended Staffing in first 2-3 years:

- Director – Full time, existing faculty member with proven expertise in community engagement.
- Program Assistant – Full time administrative assistant to support the Director and coordinate core activities and communication.
- Part-time Graduate Assistant – part time (20 hrs/wk; 0.50 FTE) to assist the Director in all academic activities

Short-term outcomes (in first 2-3 years) through direct work of OCE Staff and with a Community Engagement Leadership Working Group made up of representatives from appropriate entities on campus (i.e., development, university communications and marketing, educational outreach, information systems and various colleges) include the following:

- Development and use of electronic system for monitoring community engaged grants and projects
- Development and use of electronic system for coding and tracking community engagement on student transcripts (course related and co-curricular)
- Development and use of electronic system for capturing community engaged curricular effort/products, community engaged research/scholarship effort/products, and community engaged outreach and partnerships effort/products/impact on effort and annual reviews
- Development and use of periodic community scan of community perceptions of USF community engagement
- Development and use of annual report (to USF, to community and other constituents) of community engagement
- Development and use of USF/college/department T&P documents that include community engagement as one pathway to excellence in teaching, research, and service
- Development and use of internal and external incentives, recognition and rewards for community engagement
- Development and use of single point of contact (portal, website) for community engagement at USF
- Development of standards and ethical practices for multiple forms of community engagement
- Development and use of professional development (training) modules for faculty, community, administrators, T&P committees at all levels on community engagement as part of the T&P process
- Development and use of professional development (training) modules for faculty, community, administrators, and students on engaged learning, engaged research, and engaged outreach and partnerships
- Development of technical assistance and resource supports for multiple forms of community engagement
- Development of impact indices for individual engaged projects and the university as a whole
• Development of a plan for internal and external communication about USF community engagement
• Development of a plan for inclusion of community engagement in USF capital campaign and ongoing development
• Development of a plan of action steps for long-term institutionalization and sustainability of university community engagement
• Development of a Community Advisory Board.

Benchmarking Community Engagement at USF
Community engagement is defined as scholarly and pedagogical activities that are carried out in collaboration with, and with potential benefit for, groups and organizations in the municipality or region that contains the university. This includes a wide variety of research, clinical practica, creative performance, and service-learning projects that involve the unique expertise of faculty, staff, and students. The goal is to establish a constructive reciprocal relationship that defines the role of the university within a larger societal context.

As a major research university located in a major urban area, USF has significant relationships with its surrounding host communities. The neighborhoods, institutions, and people of the local region offer opportunities for citizens and scholars to work together on issues of relevance to the community, the nation, and the world. Collaborative partnerships contribute to the research agenda and training of faculty and students in a wide variety of disciplines, and knowledge gained from these activities should be used to address local needs and problems. In the process, USF will build a more positive image, build on its reputation as a research powerhouse, and establish valuable ties to leaders and activists in diverse sectors of the region it serves.

A workable system for determining what has been done and assessing the impacts of these efforts is indispensable. Community engagement is a multi-faceted enterprise, and USF is an extremely complex institution. Finding appropriate measures of these activities is extremely challenging. Fortunately, many other universities are grappling with this problem. Carnegie, Kellogg, and NASULGC have formulated approaches. The format below reflects their thinking, and that of the task force, about how to conceptualize this task. Note that this framework is an adaptation of benchmarks and outcome indicator categories developed in “Resource Guide and Recommendations for Defining and Benchmarking Engagement (draft),” Committee on Institutional Cooperation in cooperation with NASULGC, November 14, 2005.

1. Evidence of Institutional Commitment to Engagement
This benchmark refers to the existence of administrative structure, reward system, policies, programs, and budgetary allocation supportive of engagement by faculty and students. See also Barbara A. Holland (2004), “Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Engagement,” Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning.

Suggested measures/documentation
1.1. % of total professional (faculty and staff) effort for engagement and outreach, broken down by engaged research, learning, and outreach
1.2. $ allocated to engagement infrastructure and programs, total and disaggregated for individual programs
1.3. $ allocated to faculty and student rewards for excellence in engaged teaching, research, and outreach; description, amount, and criteria for each award
1.4. Description of staffing and lines of communication/authority for engagement programs
1.5. Tenure and promotion documents and practices that address evaluation of engagement, i.e., that include community engagement as one pathway to excellence in teaching, research, and service
1.6. Community engagement is explicitly mentioned in official USF policies and strategic plans
1.7. Community engagement is a central focus of USF’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) in our next SACS accreditation cycle.

2. **Evidence that Institutional Commitment translates to Partnerships and Initiatives**

Is the potential identified in #1 reflected in institutionally supported activities and partnerships productive of measureable results?

_Suggested measures/documentation_

2.1 Number of university-community partnerships; description of each
2.2 Number of university-community partnership projects; illustrative activities conducted by each partnership/project
2.3 Outcome measures for partnership activities/projects
2.4 Descriptive listing of university sponsored community initiatives
2.5 Outcome measures for each initiative
2.6 Number faculty, staff, students participating in each activity/initiative
2.7 Annual/regular assessment by partners of relationship with USF

3. **Evidence of Student Involvement in Engagement and Outreach Activities**

What measures have been taken to involve students at all levels in engaged learning, research and outreach activities? To what extent is engagement infused into the curriculum? What opportunities exist for community service and internships? Note that differentiation of service-learning from experiential/engaged learning is because the Carnegie ratings focus upon service-learning as a premier form of engaged learning.

_Suggested measures/documentation_

3.1 Number of engaged learning opportunities
3.2 Number of engaged learning courses (practica, internships, service-learning)
3.3 Total enrollment (headcount, SCH) in engaged learning courses
3.4 Total hours of service in engaged learning courses
3.5 Number of service-learning courses; total enrollment (headcount, SCH) in service-learning courses; total hours of service in service-learning courses
3.6 Number undergraduate research grants for engaged research; # undergraduate students involved
3.7 Number graduate students involved in engaged research funded by internal grants
3.8 Number undergraduate and graduate students involved in engaged research funded by external grants
3.9 Number of internship programs for undergraduate and graduate students; $ allocated or captured for these experiences
3.10 Incentives, recognition, and rewards available for faculty who include engagement in course curricula
3.11 Number of student volunteer hours provided within the community
3.12 Number of student organizations involved in community service, engaged outreach

4. Evidence that Faculty and Staff are Engaged with Community
What kinds of engaged research, learning, and outreach are done by faculty? What kinds of university, college, and departmental supports are available to promote these activities?

Suggested measures/documentation
4.1 Number of grant proposals that involve community engagement
4.2 Number of grant funded engaged research projects conducted by faculty members
4.3 Number of E&G funded engaged research projects conducted by faculty members
4.4 Dollar amount of professional development funds allocated for engaged research, learning, and outreach
4.5 Number faculty offering engaged learning courses; % effort
4.6 Number faculty offering service-learning courses; % effort
4.7 Number faculty providing undergraduate/graduate engaged research opportunities; % effort
4.8 Number faculty providing engaged outreach; % effort

5. Evidence of Economic Impacts of Engagement, for Institution and Community
What level of federal expenditures and other external funding are generated by engaged research and learning? What economic impacts and value to the larger community are derived from university engaged research, learning, and outreach? What revenues in tuition and fees derive from training and certification for local practitioners and professionals? How does service-learning and engaged learning affect student recruitment, retention, and timely degree completion?

Suggested measures/documentation
5.1 Expenditures for engaged research grants and contracts (federal, state, private)
5.2 Dollars in external grants awarded to faculty and students for engaged research and learning
5.3 Net return in external grants for engaged research awarded to faculty with prior internal seed grants
5.4 Dollars in external grants or other revenue earned by community partners resulting from faculty or student contributions
5.5 Dollars earned in tuition, fees, or other payments from USF engaged outreach programs
5.6 Dollar value of clinical and professional services provided to the community via engaged research, learning, and outreach
5.7 Dollar value of private gifts earmarked for community engaged activities
5.8 Dollar estimate of partner staff time, in-kind contributions and volunteer time
5.9 Extent of improved retention for students enrolled in engaged learning and service-learning courses
5.10 Increases in student enrollment from underserved local communities and underrepresented groups

6. Evidence of Assessing the Impact and Outcomes of Engagement
To what extent are the activities and impacts outlined in the preceding benchmarks incorporated into measurement and accountability systems? What evaluation procedures exist for engaged learning, research, and outreach activities? What kinds of oversight does the institution exercise? Are professional and ethical standards articulated and monitored?

Suggested measures/documentation
6.1 Percentage of total effort assignable to specific social issues and community projects
6.2 Exit surveys of students who have experienced engaged teaching strategies, and engaged learning and research activities
6.3 Track job/career outcomes for students who have had internships and other forms of engaged learning opportunities – do they end up working for the hiring agency/company, or in similar positions?
6.4 Implement evaluation surveys for partners to measure their satisfaction with their experience with university engagement
6.5 Workshops for new faculty interested in community engagement
6.6 Number of faculty recruited for their participation in community engagement
6.7 Addition of engagement data elements to Sponsored Research, FAR (effort) reports, faculty annual reports, course codes, and student transcripts
6.8 Development and monitoring plan for ethical conduct of engaged research and learning
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