

To: Chancellor Wolf Yeigh
From: David Allen, Chair, Community Engagement Task Force
Re: Community Engagement Task Force Report
CC: Members of committee, Susan Jeffords

Thank you for the opportunity to engage in discussion and to make recommendations with respect to the future of community engagement as a signature value of the University of Washington Bothell.

In 2013 the University of Washington Bothell formally adopted a community engagement mission statement:

Community Engagement Mission Statement

As a *regionally accountable* public university, the University of Washington Bothell is committed to *building and sustaining institutional and community partnerships* designed to enhance *student success and the well-being and prosperity* of the North Puget Sound and Washington State. Through a wide and varied network, our diverse students, faculty, staff, and administrative leadership focus on the goal of increasing the capacity of our region to identify and address local, national, and global challenges.

As part of our commitment to achieving this goal, UW Bothell recognizes the definition of community engagement developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:

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 and reciprocity*.

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare an educated, engaged citizenry; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

This report—charged by Chancellor Yeigh—provides a road map for the next phase of making this mission a reality.

We divide our report into 7 sections: 1) Summary of Recommendations; 2) The Values and Purposes of Community Engagement; 3) Alignment with UW Bothell's Strategic Priorities; 4) Integration into UW Bothell's Structure and Processes; 5) Institutional

Metrics Requirements; 6) Community Engagement Professional Networks; 7) Alignment with Other UW Initiatives.

1) Summary of Recommendations

For reasons described below, we recommend the following 8 steps be taken to advance and realize University of Washington Bothell's long-standing commitment to community engagement and institutional diversity.

- 1) Carnegie Classification: Pursue the Carnegie Classification as an end and a means of developing our community engagement infrastructure in a way that aligns with best practices. This recommendation requires that the campus charge a team/working group to implement, focusing largely on campus systems/priorities/etc. This will also require some further interaction with leadership at other Carnegie campuses.
- 2) Director of Community Engagement: Hire a Director for Community Engagement (Professional Staff position) who reports to the Director of Integrated Learning (Claire Fraczek) (see below) with close collaboration among Community Engagement and the offices of Diversity, Advancement, and Research. This arrangement maintains the campus-wide mission of community engagement while recognizing that its central engine lies within Academic Affairs as one of the 3 C's that constitute our strategy for creating a distinctive student experience at UWB.
- 3) Community Engagement Council: Re-establish and re-charge the campus' Community Engagement Council as a parallel and complementary body to the campus's Diversity Council. The Council would report to the Chancellor and include key internal and external stakeholders. Its central liaison will be the Director of Community Engagement. The Council will establish policies, priorities and oversee quality assurance and help maintain a campus-community dialogue around the build out of community engagement.
- 4) Make Engagement and Diversity Inseparable: Build processes that ensure deep collaboration between diversity and community engagement efforts on campus beyond the Director roles and those of the Councils. Ensure that other groups, such as the one developing an international strategy, are in regular conversation with the Community Engagement and Diversity groups to maximize synergies.
- 5) Count What Matters: Establish metrics that will inform data collection with respect to community engagement and diversity programs, and that are aligned with

overarching campus strategies. This recommendation will require learning from other institutions that have particular strengths in measurement to avoid re-inventing the wheel. We have been advised to look at Seattle University, UNC Greensboro, and Cal State San Marcos. This task, shaped by the Carnegie requirements, will require additional resourcing (see below), but is work we should be doing regardless.

- 6) Build a Trans/Regional Network: Consult with a diverse set of community partners and organizations at all appropriate stages in this process, both to improve the process and to build a network of campus advocates.
- 7) Promotion and Tenure. Work with CCPTFA and the VCAA to articulate criteria and evidence for promotion and tenure related to CE faculty activities, in alignment with Chapter 24 and School criteria.
- 8) Advancement. Deepen work with Advancement to build a case for external support for community engagement, including the possibility of funding to host Imagining America and/or launch a robust center on campus. Note: Community engagement is currently central to each School's case for support.

2) The Values and Purposes of Community Engagement

For UW Bothell, the development of a robust infrastructure for community engagement (CE), including the pursuit of the Carnegie Foundation's elective classification as a regionally accountable institution, are both ends and means. CE is an end because the campus, as a public institution, has a mission that commits it to being an anchor institution, one that plays an integral role in the prosperity, sustainability, and equity of the region. This commitment includes the many global connections that shape our region. Our participation in our community and its global connections makes us who we are.

CE is also a means to achieve our core mission and to practice our deepest values. One of UW Bothell's most notable accomplishments, although an incomplete and ongoing one, has been our work to create a campus that upholds diversity, equity, accessibility, and inclusivity. As the Holland/Furco report on engagement at UWB stated: "Research shows that students who are first generation, underrepresented, commuting and working are among those students who place the greatest value on community-based learning experiences." Many of our high impact learning opportunities are birthed and sustained through engagement.

The success of first-generation students and students of color on campus is inseparable from an emphasis on community engagement. Generous and inclusive relationships on campus are sustained through deep partnerships off campus (and the reverse). The families and communities of our students need to trust that our campus environment will nurture and develop students who attend UW Bothell, and that we are invested in supporting the well-being and prosperity of the communities from which most of our undergraduate and graduate students come and to which they will return. This commitment is also instrumental to our ability to recruit and retain a diverse faculty and staff, many of whom have been attracted to us because of our commitment to diversity and engagement.

A Catalyst for Innovation

UW Bothell already has a well-deserved reputation for moving creativity to action. A continual exchange of people and ideas between campus and community is essential to sustaining innovative practices. Students, faculty members, and staff benefit from the wisdom and expertise of community members participating on our campus and from working with businesses, industries, and organizations throughout our region. These partnerships foster forms of learning, research, and scholarship that develop in dialogue with spheres of practice outside of the university, and make a difference there.

The prosperity and flourishing of UW Bothell and the communities within which we are nested are inseparable. CE enables and is focused on creating mutually beneficial partnerships with individuals, organizations, businesses and industries. In practice, these relationships are sometimes transactional -- exchanging student labor for professional mentorship. Ideally, they are more than that. These relationships can develop mutual, long-term commitments and support even when no immediate benefit is visible. As an anchor institution in the region, this is the goal we seek to attain.

3) Alignment with UW Bothell's Strategic Priorities

In 2008, our campus developed the 21st Century Campus Initiative, outlined as seven prioritized areas to which our campus remains strategically focused. These priorities include: Growth, Resourcefulness, Diversity, Student-Centered, Community, Innovation, and Sustainability. Each of these themes inform and all are critical to our success in realizing the three highlighted by the UW Bothell Chancellor: Diversity, Achievement, and Growth that is Sustainable. In this context, it is important to emphasize that our diverse students, staff, and faculty come from diverse communities of which we are a part.

Community engagement is both a value within the 21st Century Campus Initiative and a methodology central to its realization. Along with complementary values and commitments identified by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (cross-disciplinarity and connected learning), community engagement provides a methodology that will enable us to foster the success of our students, faculty, and staff. This ongoing commitment to community engagement as one of the “3 Cs” dedicates us to focusing on developing regional partnerships that expand the impact of our work in four ways:

- 1) *Intellectually*, through community-engaged and applied research/creative practice and scholarship;
- 2) *Curricularly*, through internships, co-ops, project-based learning alliances, and community-engaged learning and research relationships with local businesses, industries and organizations;
- 3) *Fiscally*, through advancement activities, including grants and contracts, focused on our role as an anchor institution in the region;
- 4) *Politically*, through persuasive narratives about our status as a regionally accountable public institution and our responsibility to leverage our resources in ways that contribute to the sustainable and equitable prosperity of the region.

As a focal point for the global mission for the entire campus, CE engages all dimensions of our work, from research and teaching to external relations to supply chains. From a process perspective, all UW Bothell activities should be guided by a commitment to sustainable, equitable, and mutually-beneficial forms of CE as a core value.

4) Integration into UW Bothell’s Structure and Processes

Moving from generalities to specifics, the question is how to realize this mission-based commitment to community engagement and diversity. Over the past decade, CE has provided a point of convergence for a broad range of students, faculty, and staff interests. Looking forward, it must become more deeply integrated into all our campus priorities, including diversity, research, and community and governmental relations.

Diversity

One of UW Bothell’s most notable accomplishments, although an incomplete and ongoing one, has been our creation of a campus committed to realizing the values of diversity, equity, accessibility, and inclusivity. We see diversity as integral to CE -- i.e. a true commitment to CE requires thoughtful attention to the diverse communities we serve or aim to serve, both internal and external to our campus. This means not only adding more groups to a list of stakeholders and constituents we acknowledge. Communicating and building relationships with diverse communities necessitates a

mindful recognition of alternative epistemological, pedagogical, leadership, and organizing frameworks. Moreover, it calls for us to be conscious of the language and discourses we use to represent ourselves, making clear that we are being transparent while appreciating the ways in which our messages will be/are received by members of diverse communities. To deepen the integration between these campus values and structures which are currently represented institutionally (via the Chancellor's Office), and the operationalization of these values via CE methods (located within Academic Affairs), we emphasize the importance of a close working relationship with between the Director of Diversity and a Director of Community Engagement.

Community and Governmental Relations

These two offices, and their staff, are both engaged in the community and must be intimately involved with community engagement. The work of Advancement and External Relations is to build relationships on behalf of the institution that support the entirety of UW Bothell's academic programs, initiatives as well as students, faculty, and staff. This work is most commonly dedicated to building brand awareness, growing alumni engagement, and stimulating economic and political support to the betterment of UW Bothell. There are many moments in which the two offices and their work are congruent and mutually reinforcing. So, for example, by mapping CE activity across legislative districts, we can gain political support. And businesses that benefit from CE can both directly contribute to UWB and advocate for us legislatively. Both of these examples imply robust CE activities and support for our capacity to map and measure.

The link between CE and Advancement is highlighted in *Institutionalizing Community Engagement in Higher Education: The First Wave of Carnegie Classified Institutions*: "Increasingly engagement has become-part of the identity of institutions, and the engagement brand has been leveraged to increase public support for these campuses. In particular, engagement as an institutional brand has been advanced to cultivate legislative support for higher education (Blanton, 2007). In addition, studies have shown a link between institutional commitment to outreach and engagement and increases in levels of state appropriations for research universities (Weerts and Ronca, 2006). Simply put, across all campus missions, engagement provides a platform to cultivate diverse revenue streams from private and public sources."

As a result, the need for deep coordination and collaboration are necessary. Therefore we suggest developing processes to closely link any offices engaged in advancement and community relations (these are currently being expanded and reconfigured). These processes would develop and sustain institutional alignment regarding prioritized learning and advancement initiatives, strategic partnerships, and tracking processes in a proposed Customer Relations Management database (outlined further below).

Academic Affairs

Within Academic Affairs, CE sits alongside Cross Disciplinary and Connected Learning as one of the 3 Cs. As such, it constitutes the core academic strategy for integrative teaching, learning, and research/creative practice. While it is possible to think of the three separately, the synthesis of all three marks UWB as a distinctive learning environment. This environment serves as a foundation for integrative learning outcomes—key skills and dispositions for 21st century leadership and career success—and we propose a focused organizational design within AA to support this integrative mission.

Consequently, we are recommending formation of an Office of Integrative Learning run by our current Director of Integrated Learning (DIL). A Director of Community Engagement would report to the DIL (see below). The Director of Integrative Learning would be charged with helping all units within Academic Affairs engage the 3Cs, including the campus coordination of partnership development and alignment of strategic initiatives, and would sit as a voting member on the Academic Learning Council, along with the Director of CE and I² as non-voting members. The primary responsibility of the DIL would include building mechanisms for cross-unit collaborations between faculty and staff *across* these units, around the mission of 3Cs integration. Research, the Student Success Center, Global Initiatives, Admissions Outreach, Orientation and Transition Programs and Career Services would all have extensive collaborative relationships to the Office that support fulfilling these commitments. This Office would also serve to bridge successful I² initiatives from an innovation incubation unit into the operational fabric of existing units within AA, especially the Schools. There is a particularly apt alignment here: while structure is important, the key to success is well-crafted *processes* and *communication* which are central dimensions of Integrative Learning.

The Director of Community Engagement would be responsible creating and sustaining active collaboration with all the central offices (e.g. Research, Diversity, Advancement), supporting the Council for Community Engagement, leading the process of pursuing Carnegie classification, overseeing CBLR operations, and coordinating strategic partnership development for UWB in collaboration with the DIL.

5) Institutional Metrics Requirements

UW Bothell has made significant gains related to institutional research in recent years and the success of Community Engagement hinges on transparency of metrics so both internal and external stakeholders can see and assess our collaborations. For several

years, there has been a recognition that while we claim to be (and are) engaged with our communities, these claims are not well documented even descriptively, much less in terms of their impacts and values. We recommend using the Carnegie Classification as a road map to identify the areas we need to measure in order to articulate outcomes. A particular emphasis requiring attention is the alignment of the Community Engagement, Diversity, and Integrative Learning campus agendas. We recommend creating specific measurements that capture the integration of these three efforts.¹

Campus-Wide Customer Relations Management System

Beyond assessment and measurement data, we recommend collecting customer relations data in order to increase our institutional ability to work with multiple external stakeholders. A data management system would enable us to stay organized internally by tracking and making visible the many partnerships that exist with external constituents. The CRM system would be used by multiple units (Advancement, Career, CBLR, Diversity, Alumni Engagement, Research, etc.).

There is an abundance of valuable community activities carried out by UW Bothell students, faculty, and staff. We need to catalogue and recognize that work while retaining a more precise definition for assessing community engagement that meets the Carnegie criterion of “mutually beneficial.” This criterion is important not only for measurement, but also enabling people to understand how their “community work” maps onto and supports community engagement goals. John Saltmarsh, in a phone conversation with the CE Task Force, made it clear that not all external relations work will be nor needs to be defined as community-engaged, but that we should have clear campus definitions in order to define the nuances for different types of community work.

Peer Institutions

As we move forward with metrics, it will be useful to consult comparable institutions that have met the Carnegie classification. The Task Force initiated this work, but it will require more development and considerable follow up. Among the institutions we identified are public institutions (of the same approximate size as UW Bothell) that achieved the Carnegie Community Engaged Classification in 2015, listed as follows: Worcester State University, Massachusetts (Est. 1874, 5,563 undergrads, 787

¹ Here are a few provisional examples of suggestions for metrics that might be appropriate for UW Bothell, but are not identified in the Carnegie process: a) Research joint grants/contracts with community entities as an ‘in-flow’ measure of investment in us- not only an outcome; 2) Degree of interdisciplinary integration in community engaged projects; 3) Alumni involvement as community engagement, as site mentors/supervisors or their own engagement work with the institution; 4) Regular needs/strengths assessment from partners (sampling key stakeholders); 5) One fairly urgent task will be to identify and prioritize metrics, a process that will require considerable discussion within campus and with our partners.

postgrads); Georgia College and State University (Est. 1889, 5,690 undergrads, 964 postgrads); California State University San Marcos (Est. 1990, 10,276 students). We recommend that UW Bothell seek consultation from these above schools, in addition to University of North Carolina at Greensboro (a leader and host institution in CE data management). We are not viewing these institutions as aspirational at the campus level but as having particular expertise and success in CE that we may benefit from.

Feasibility and Sustainability

Building out CE is no small undertaking and will need to be considered in the context of other campus commitments and priorities. To assist in this process, the Task Force created a metrics sub-group (headed by Kara Adams) to develop a provisional picture of what will be required. In order to (re)organize pre-existing data systems, set up new data tracking systems, institutionalize systems, and aggregate assessment data related to community engagement, we will require:

1. Dedicated staff time. This might include all or some of Community Engagement staff, Institutional Research staff, and leave time for a faculty member. This could be built into new work descriptions, or use existing staff time.
2. Infrastructure cost of software system(s)

Resource
Staff/Faculty Time
Two students workers (one graduate, one undergraduate)
Software
· Customer Relations Management system
· Community Engagement tracking system

6) Community Engagement Professional Networks

As a campus, we have existing and emerging opportunities to learn from and provide leadership in networks focused on various forms of community engagement. These networks include:

- AACU

- LEAP initiative, in particular, its findings about how high impact teaching practices such as community-engaged learning foster the retention and success of first generation students and students of color, to be led by Academic Affairs. (Note: Washington recently became a LEAP state through the advocacy of the Washington Consortium for the Liberal Arts, to which UW Bothell belongs.)
- Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life
 - Focus on practices of engagement across the cultural disciplines and, in particular, its research on the necessity of linking diversity and engagement on campuses that seek to foster the full participation of all. (Note: UW Bothell is member of the IA consortium and the Dean of IAS, Bruce Burgett, chairs its National Advisory Board.)
- Washington Campus Compact
 - Supports higher educational institutions in advancing community engagement through professional development and training for faculty and staff, participation in grant programs, advocacy to grant and policy-makers, research/assessment tools, and networking opportunities. WACC serves the role of connecting UW Bothell to state wide conversations on community engagement. (Note: The campus's Office of CBLR is a leader in this organization.)
- AASCU (American Democracy Project)
 - Multi-campus initiative focused on public higher education's role in preparing the next generation of informed, engaged citizens for our democracy.

We are not necessarily recommending continuing any of the above nor is the list in any way comprehensive. One responsibility of the Office of Integrated Learning would be to *prioritize*, leverage and expand these resources and to make the strategic linkages among them more visible. Much of that work will be led, in turn, by the new CE Director.²

² Examples of other networks with which we might develop partnerships include:

- Community Campus Partnerships for Health
 - Leverages the knowledge, wisdom and experience in communities and in academic institutions to solve pressing health, social, environmental and economic challenges.
- Engagement Scholarship Consortium
 - Build strong university-community partnerships anchored in the rigor of scholarship, and designed to help build community capacity.
- The Talloires Network
 - International association of institutions committed to strengthening the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education.

7) Alignment with Other UW Initiatives

As a campus, we have the opportunity to learn from and provide leadership in initiatives across the UW.³ In terms of the Carnegie CE Classification, each campus of the UW would need to apply individually, and each campus would have specific purposes and processes for community engagement that will be distinct from the other. Yet there are also benefits of coordinating across the campuses in more intentional and strategic ways:

- Shared geography
 - If we choose a regional approach to our community engagement strategy, then it is important to our local community that we are coordinated with UW Tacoma and UW Seattle.
- Benefits to the community
 - We hear from community partners that they appreciate when UW Seattle and UW Bothell are coordinated in their CBLR course-based work. This is especially true for partners that geographically serve the north King County region.
- Shared resources
 - There is potential for negotiating our association fees with different professional networks if all three campuses are members
 - Currently, we use a software called EXPO to track and support Community-Based Learning and Research courses. This software was created out of the Carlson Center for Leadership & Public Service at UW Seattle, and we were able to buy it from them to use five years ago. This saved us from investing in staff time and resources to recreate a similar tool. EXPO assists UW Seattle and UW Bothell to track and communicate about organizations in which we overlap.

Summary

The Community Engagement Task Force believes that aggressively and strategically developing our community engagement capacities in the ways we describe above will significantly advance our achievement of the 21st Century Campus Initiative, deepen our mutual affiliations with the diverse region in which we are located, strengthen our own internal community and improve campus climate, help to recruit and retain diverse

³ Examples of existing UW-wide initiatives where UW Bothell faculty and staff provide leadership include UW Urban (where IAS faculty member Christian Anderson serves on the steering committee); the UW graduate Certificate in Public Scholarship (a joint program of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, Graduate School, and the Simpson Center for the Humanities, co-directed by IAS dean Bruce Burgett and Director of Graduate Programs Miriam Bartha).

students, faculty, and staff; and create a distinctive environment for learning, research, and creative practice at UW Bothell. If done properly, this effort will position us as a national model for how to go about (re)building a university in and for the 21st century.