2019 Engaged Scholarship Consortium

October 8-9, 2019 - Denver, Colorado

Workshop Session - *What does it mean to be an Engaged Institution? Learnings from the Carnegie Reclassification Process*

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY.

AUBURN UNIVERSITY OUTREACH

Oregon State University

Three Universities, Three Different Processes for Applying

Getting Organized

KSU

The Provost tasked the Center for Engagement and Community Development (CECD) as project leader.
The Provost convened a 25 person Carnegie Task Force to assist CECD.
Task force included representatives from each of K-State 9 colleges, 3 campuses, and engagement centers.
Task force was convened in May, 2018 and met monthly until the application was submitted in April, 2019.

AU

The Office of Public Service (OPS) took the project lead at the direction of the VP-University Outreach.
OPS Did not wait for leadership to mandate and declined the provost appointing a representative task force.
Leadership took an "inside-out"approach with OPS at the center and identified two other leading campus authorities on engagement to co-chair as an exec group.
OPS utilized the University Faculty Outreach and Engagement Council as school/college liaison and recruited other "true and faithful" engagement proponents, plus a number of allied community partners.
The exec group convened January 2018 to plan. Two exec members attended Carnegie's national workshop. This core group met quarterly with the Council group, and in monthly planning/research meetings throughout 2018. The execs plus additional staff IT and research support met biweekly from January 2019 until submission in April.

OSU

OSU's reclassification effort initiated from a collaboration among leadership in the Division of Outreach and Engagement and the Office of Undergraduate Education.
A committee of 8 individuals was appointed to lead the effort, two of them being named project leaders.
The committee utilized the Outreach and Engagement Council as college/unit liaison and advisory board.
Committee' planning meetings took place biweekly from Summer 2018 through submission in April 2019.
A project manager was hired part-time to support the effort. The project manager hired a part-time student assistant to support data collection, analysis and project coordination overall.
Organization started with the creation of 1) project timeline, 2) guidelines for data collection and building the narrative, 3) A initial assessment framework and 4) project task tracker sheet (template handouts available).

Carnegie Foundation Elective Community Engagement Classification

Find out more about the Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification here

https://www.brown.edu/swearer/carnegie

@ CONTACT US

David Procter. Ph.D.
Kansas State University.
Professor, Communication Studies.
Director, Center for Engagement and Community Development.
Email: dprocter@ksu.edu
https://www.k-state.edu/cecd/

Ralph Foster, MS.
Auburn University.
Assistant Vice President, University Outreach & Public Service.
Email: fosters@auburn.edu
www.auburn.edu/outreach

Susan Rowe, Ph.D.
Oregon State University.
Precollege Programs.
Former Project Manager for OSU's Carnegie Reclassification.
Email: susan.rowe@oregonstate.edu
https://precollege.oregonstate.edu
https://susanrowe1.wixsite.com/mysite

Lynn Dierking, Ph.D.
Oregon State University
Professor of Free-Choice Science Learning, College of Education
Email: dierkinl@science.oregostate.edu
https://education.oregonstate.edu/people/lynn-dierking

Incorporating Community Voices 🔊

K-State campus input came from the Carnegie Task Force plus 50 face-to-face interviews with faculty and staff involved in engagement efforts (partnerships, coordinating centers, etc.)
Community input came primarily from five focus groups of community engagement stakeholders. Two focus groups on main campus in Manhattan and one on Olathe and Salina campuses.
Online zoom focus groups were conducted with a group of K-State's international partners.

KSU

AU campus input came from the O&E Council group and from a comprehensive survey of more than 100 engaged faculty, staff and community partners. Direct interviews with leads in key centers and divisional heads coordinating engagement efforts provided critical Carnegie's engagement data.
Community input came primarily from comprehensive surveys. Data on community impact was gained from a group of 15 "exemplar" community partners recruited for an intensive workshop forum. Selection followed recommendations and assessment of which partnerships best fit the Carnegie definition through interviews and questionnaires. The group was representative of a broad spectrum of campus organizations and provided feedback on partnerships, reciprocity, and impact. Dozens of phone consults were conducted with various campus and civic officials on queries specific to sections of the application. More than 240 individuals from on and off campus contributed to the report.

AU

OSU campus input came from the reclassification committee, the O&E Council, and the Dean's Council. Critical Carnegie data was collected through a comprehensive online survey sent to all colleges and units, via interviews with key program leaders and unit/division heads, through annual Dean reports to the provost, the O&E Division annual reports, and from logs from *Digital Measures* faculty reporting system. Community direct input came primarily through the inaugural *Social Impact Lab*, an event organized by OSU in partnership with United Ways as a forum for network and exchange with community partners about reciprocity, impact, challenges and recommendations for engaged work. Indirect input was collected through 63 exemplary partnerships recommended by engagement champions and related data on its institutional and community impact. More than 200 individuals on campus and about 104 individuals off campus (from 55 external organizations) contributed to the reclassification report.

OSU

✏️ Writing the Report

KSU

The vast majority of the Carnegie report was written by the director of K-State's Center for Engagement and Community Development (CECD) and a .25 research assistant. Other staff from CECD also assisted. Additionally, very few sections were farmed out to "experts" in particular areas of the report. The CECD director and the research assistant probably wrote 85% of the Carnegie document. Once the document was written, it was reviewed and edited by multiple CECD staff.

AU

The Carnegie report was written by the 3 person exec team, with data presentation prepared by select staff. The OPS assistant vice president wrote 50% of the narrative(comprising the institutional support sections), with the other execs writing 25% each on the faculty engagement and curricular engagement sections. The exec group co-edited the partner and closing reflective sections. Writing in earnest was conducted from January through March 2019. The team employed an editorial subcommittee. Once the document was completed, the team and select readers made final proofing reviews, and composed an index (not required).

OSU

The Carnegie report's writing task initiated with the Reclassification Committee via targeted written assignments according to "expertise". As substantial focused efforts, the committee participated in 3 all day writing retreats between January and May 2019. However, most of the writing was championed by the project manager, the student assistant and project leader. The complete final draft was reviewed by the VP for Outreach and Engagement and copy edited by selected readers and professional copy editors from OSU's Extension and Experiment Station Communications.