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Meeting Objectives

• What “Community Engagement” means & why it matters

• Framing our efforts: Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

• What the 2010 Carnegie reviewers told us

• Our five focus areas: critical areas where we need your help in advance of submitting a successful application to Carnegie

• Group discussion & next steps
Community Engagement
(most widely-used definition in use today)

Community Engagement describes the collaboration between higher education institutions 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.

- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Ernest Boyer, 1990’s
INTEGRATION, APPLIED SCHOLARSHIP

- Engagement: That aspect of teaching that enables learning beyond the campus walls
- Engagement: That aspect of research that makes what we discover useful beyond the academic community

- The Ohio State University
Universities seen as irrelevant: fail to take community context and need into consideration

Universities seen as elitist: fail to acknowledge knowledge, expertise outside of the academy

Collaboration with community expertise to solve problems
In need of a better approach...
Community Engagement, 2013
From “Expert Model” to “Collaborative Model”

- Always COMMUNITY-BASED: takes in the needs and contexts of intended recipient
- Democratization of expertise: shared decision-making, planning, and execution
- Collaboration, trust, respect, joint problem-solving
Engagement: Alignment with Institutional Goals

- **2015 SACS Accreditation Reaffirmation**
  - community/public service, continuing education, & outreach consistent with UT’s mission

- **2012 President’s Strategic Plan: (Goal III)**
  - “[To] Engage every member of the UT community in understanding the land-grant mission, participating in outreach and engagement and communicating the outcomes for economic development and improved quality of life for Tennesseans.

- **VolVision “Top 25” benchmarking initiative**
VolVision “Top 25” Metrics

Retention ● Increase total research ● Increase faculty awards ●

Strategic priorities: diversity ● globalization ● increased resource base (appropriations)

The Evidence:

- Research shows association between community engagement and higher retention rates (faculty and students)
- Research shows association between community engagement and increased public appropriations
- Engaged scholarship expands and adds capacity to the university’s research and teaching functions
- Community Engagement increases campus diversity in many dimensions
- Community Engagement is increasingly taken into account by accreditation agencies (Including SACS)
## Benchmarking UT’s “Top 25”

Community Engagement Classification  

### ASPIRATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
- University of California – Berkley
- University of California – Los Angeles *
- University of Virginia
- University of Michigan – Ann Arbor *
- University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill
- University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign
- University of Wisconsin – Madison *
- University of California – Davis
- University of California – Santa Barbara
- University of Washington – Seattle
- Pennsylvania State University *
- University of Florida
- The Ohio State University *
- University of Maryland – College Park
- University of Pittsburg

### TARGET INSTITUTIONS
- University of Georgia *
- Clemson University *
- Purdue University *
- Texas A&M – College Station
- University of Minnesota *
- Rutgers University *
- Indiana University *
- Michigan State University *

### PEER INSTITUTIONS
- Auburn *
- Iowa State University *
- North Carolina State University – Raleigh *

---

= Now Carrying Classification
Summary:

• 65% (17) of UT’s “Top 25” benchmark institutions currently hold this classification,

• All 3 peer institutions

• 7 of 8 target institutions.

In addition:

• 10 other Tennessee colleges and universities currently hold this classification.
Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

Institutionalization and Alignment of Community Engagement: “Deep & Pervasive”
## 2010 Carnegie Review: GREAT PARTNERSHIPS!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Name</th>
<th>UT Partners</th>
<th>Community Partners</th>
<th>UT impact</th>
<th>Community Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Smart Structures</td>
<td>College of Architecture &amp; Design, College of Arts &amp; Sciences (school of art) ■ UT Extension ■ College of Engineering</td>
<td>Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) ■ Delf University in the Netherlands ■ lighting designer Julie Oksanen (Finland) ■ structural engineer Manfred Grohmann (Germany) ■ local engineer Maurice Mallia ■ Blaine Construction ■ Pocore ■ Multivista ■ Owens Corning</td>
<td>Projects such as The Zero Energy House &amp; The Living Light Solar Decathlon Home: ■ Provide invaluable educational experiences to students, faculty &amp; professionals involved ■ Bring international exposure to UTK. ■ Students and faculty develop global partnerships with structural experts, professional designers, engineers, &amp; many others. ■ Update: UT students and faculty shared winning Solar Decathlon home design with over 1 million at Smithsonian Folk Life Festival 2012 on Mall in Washington D.C.</td>
<td>■ Fast track for new concepts to be transferred to architectural applications. ■ Interdisciplinary team can fulfill challenging tasks for middle sized and large companies in Tennessee ■ UT involvement brings government R&amp;D funding to bear on community needs ■ UT’s solar decathlon home on a state tour to educate people on energy efficient design for our climate. ■ Project designs have been incorporated and used by the local Green Building Council on their own design strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A Partnership from 2010 Carnegie application: Partnerships with providers*
Partnerships with target communities
In this case, SODELA (not UT) determines the partnership’s primary focus areas

From our 2011 C. Peter Magrath Regional Award:

Cultural Events
Advocacy
Collaborative Research
Workshops
Service Learning Courses

UTK
Center for the Study of Youth & Political Violence
TN Teaching & Learning Center
Healthy Transitions
Sport 4 Peace
College of Law
Department of Kinesiology, Recreation, and Sports Studies
Cultural Studies & Educational Foundations
UT Athletics
Department of Public Health

Burundian Community
SODELA:
Solidarity, Development & Light Association 501 (c) 3

Engagement People ✨ Venn Diagrams...
2010 Reviewer Comments

Our Five Focus Areas for Implementation before Submittal in 2014

- Measuring and Assessment
- Mission/Strategic Plan
- Student & Curricular Engagement
- Faculty Rewards
- Centralized Coordination & Alignment
1. Measuring and Assessment

- Community perceptions
- Campus-wide tracking of activity
- Campus-wide assessment of impact
2. Mission & Strategic Plan

- Institutional priority indicated in mission statement
- Defined and planned for in strategic plan
3. - Student & Curricular Engagement

• Making connections with diversity, inclusion, student retention & student success
• Definition/ process to ID service learning* courses
• Collecting student engagement data
• Defined learning outcomes aligned with
• UT goals
• Student transcripts

*Institutions may use other terms, e.g., community-based learning
4. Faculty Rewards

- Search and recruitment policies
- Policies for promotion and tenure
- Work in progress?
5. Centralized Coordination & Alignment

- Campus-wide coordinating structure/office
- Marketing materials
- Community voice included
- Priority of executive leadership
Questions to address at your table:

What is one partnership in which you have been involved – what did the partners do together, and how did the partnership benefit both the community and the university?
Questions to address at your table:

What role might community and campus partners play – time, talents, and treasure – in helping UT address the most important issues facing TN, the nation, the world?
Questions to address at your table:

In the context of our five focal areas,* what ideas or resources can you bring to this process?

1. Measuring and Assessment
2. Mission/Strategic Plan
3. Student & Curricular Engagement
4. Faculty Rewards
5. Centralized Coordination & Alignment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Complete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Carnegie releases announcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>UT Announces intention to apply: writing team begins regular meetings</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 2013</td>
<td>Carnegie Kick-Off Meeting</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2013</td>
<td>“Request for Application” form released</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2013</td>
<td>Deadline: Request for Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 2013</td>
<td>Formal application released</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late summer/Early Fall, 2013</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Meets: Reports &amp; Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2014</td>
<td>Draft complete; Advisory Committee Meets: Draft Review &amp; Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2014</td>
<td>Applications Due/Carnegie Reviewing begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Review Process completed/ campuses notified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>2015 classification results announced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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