Community Engagement Task Force 2.0
Recommendations Meeting
February 19, 2019
What’s happened so far?
Timeline and deliverables for each dimension

1. SWOT [Nov 2018]
2. Best Practices [Nov 2018]
3. Recommendations [Feb 2019]

- Steering Committee Kick-Off [July 9]
- Invite Dimension Lead participation
- Dimension Lead Kick-Off [Aug 1]

- 1st week of classes: announcement to campus & roadshow
- Kick-off w/Task Force [breakfast Sep 11]
- Working teams established

- SWOT and present (2) Best Practices to CETF 2.0 [Nov 5] & [Nov 29]
- Steering Committee debrief on takeaways, concerns, etc. [12/4]
- Dimension Lead meeting to debrief, consolidate lessons learned, and set expectations for final deliverable [12/10]

- Working groups submit (1) SWOT and present (2) Best Practices to CETF 2.0 [Nov 5] & [Nov 29]
- Working groups present (3) Recommendations to CETF 2.0 (Originally scheduled for 1/31 and then rescheduled due to snow day) [Feb 19]

- Steering Committee synthesizes CETF 2.0 recommendations [Aim: late Feb]
- Provost makes recommendations to ELT & closes loop with CETF 2.0 [Aim: Late Feb/early Mar]

Legend:
- Steering Committee Meeting
- Task Force Meeting
- Task Force = Steering Committee + Dimension Leads

Open forums? Listening sessions? Other ideas on how we can get broader campus input?
- Presentation to Academic Senate, Staff Senate & ULC [Completed by end of Sep]
- Listening Session [Oct 10]
## Requested recommendations

### Recommendations will help:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty, Staff, Students, Community Partners, Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the optimal organizational structure?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centralized (departments), co-located OR Decentralized (departments), co-located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should there be additional staffing in the Office of Community Engagement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should there be dedicated liaisons from colleges and units? (i.e., Communicate liaison, Advancement liaison, Mission office liaison, college-level liaisons, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Based on what you have learned through this process, what would be your recommendation on an organizational structure that would institutionalize Community Engagement at Marquette?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty, Staff, Community Partners, Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What growth model (promotions, tenures, etc.) do we need to do to institutionalize Community Engagement?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should it be a part of P&amp;T for faculty and staff? Why? Or Why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How should faculty/staff be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Based on what you have learned through this process, what would be your recommendation be on updating P&amp;T guidelines with the intention to institutionalize Community Engagement?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students, Community Partners, Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would student outcomes look like? How can we evaluate/assess that they leave Marquette with the characteristics of a Jesuit-educated person?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How should students be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Based on what you have learned through this process, what would be your recommendation on how create and assess student outcomes?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is one thing that Marquette University can do to propel ourselves as a local, national and global leader?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What would be one thing that Marquette should do to propel ourselves as leaders in this space?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current State: Office of Community Engagement

- OCE was founded in 2016
- 2016 & 2017: ~60% through GHR Solutions Initiative grant; ~ 40% from Provost’s Office ($29K)
- 2018: First-time with an operating budget
- Annual Operating Budget ($66K):
  - Annual Community Engagement Symposium: $25K (includes $10K of awards)
  - Research Assistant: $16K
  - Student employment: $6.5
  - Remaining: Conferences (Dan B & co-sponsored faculty), events/sponsorships, office expenses, database management: $18K
- Anticipate coming in on-budget
Vision ...

- Given the many cross-campus conversations, community conversations, and ongoing work for the past 2 years, below is a description of a future state for Community Engagement at Marquette University:
  - Increase partnerships (new and deepen existing)
  - Expand community-engaged research: Attract more scholars doing this work, apply for and receive more community-engaged grants, etc.
  - Create seamless student experience: utilize both co-curricular and curricular opportunities to educate students from charity to justice
  - Strategically fundraise around a community-engaged brand
  - Continue to elevate MU's profile so we attract community-engaged scholars, staff and students
  - Utilize community engagement to elevate and to bring focus to issues of diversity and inclusion
Where do we go?
Recommendations
Dimension Leads & Steering Committee Advisors

Mission
Mission responsiveness, community voice, diversity and inclusion, pursuit of social justice

Kathy Coffey-Guenther
Assoc. VP, Mission & Ministry
Theresa Tobin
Assoc. Dean, Graduate School
Advisors:
Kent Beausoleil, Special Asst. to Faculty & Student Affairs VPs
William Welburn, Executive Director, Diversity & Inclusion
Kimo Ah Yun, Acting Provost
## Mission: Co-Leads & Working Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Coffey-Guenther (Co - Lead)</td>
<td>Assoc. VP, Mission &amp; Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Tobin (Co - Lead)</td>
<td>Assoc. Dean, Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bates-Froiland</td>
<td>Pastor at Redeemer Lutheran Church-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Cheng</td>
<td>Asst. Prof, Social &amp; Cultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Harris</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Social &amp; Cultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Fischer</td>
<td>Assoc. Dir., Campus Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Jeske</td>
<td>Associate Director, Center for Peacemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kiely</td>
<td>Director of the Catholic Leadership Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Longhenry</td>
<td>Director/ Chief Curator, Haggerty Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Meagher</td>
<td>Spiritual Director, Mission &amp; Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Chavoya</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Gillespie</td>
<td>MUSG President; Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Recommendations

Mission

1) What is the optimal organizational structure?
   • Centralized (offices/programs), co-located OR Decentralized (offices/programs), co-located?
   • Should there be additional staffing in the Office of Community Engagement? Why/Why not?
   • Should there be dedicated liaisons from colleges and units? Why/Why not?

- Create a centralized hub that houses and mutually sustains, grows, empowers current community engagement office, service learning, community service, and CURTO and unifies these efforts as arms Marquette’s sustained commitment to mission responsive and reflective pedagogy, research and community partnership.

- Establish and coordinate college/unit community engagement liaisons between these units and central hub. In some places these people exist so their position needs elevated and integrated into collaborative approach. In other colleges/units no such person exists, so need either to revise job descriptions of existing personnel (e.g., 10-15% of an associate dean’s time as CE liaison) OR hire new position. We have to have liaisons who can translate community engagement efforts at local college/unit levels

- Annually rotating community leader to be part of the central hub staff and serve as a liaison between that office and community.

- There may need to be additional staffing OR major restructuring of current efforts/positions to be more coordinated and collaborative and unified
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Recommendations

Mission

2) What growth model (promotions, tenures, etc.) do we need to implement to institutionalize Community Engagement?

- Should it be a part of P&T for faculty? Why/Why not?
- Should it be included in merit considerations for staff? Why/Why not?
- How should faculty/staff be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- Yes, we think mission responsive/reflective community engagement should be built into the tenure and promotion process for faculty. CE is CORE to Jesuit identity and the university mission—community engagement requirement for faculty that can be flexible (1) research/publication, (2) service learning course (3) # of hours of volunteering in MKE (Chris)—build this into tenure and promotion—stronger criteria that faculty should be held too for CE work? It could also be a model in which CE helps a case but lack of CE does not hurt a case. In this model, a person with significant CE would have adjustments to their other requirements (e.g., less requirements for traditional scholarly publication).

- We do not recommend that CE work be included in merit considerations for staff but we do think that paid days for service and/or retreat leave be implemented, and that staff could have paid time to attend CE programs the way that are given paid time to attend mission programming.

- P&T tenure dossier includes a section in which faculty members describe their interpretations of mission and their contributions in this regard to mission reflective community engagement. The office of community engagement could then compile these statements, work with Nick Curtis and Assessment office to develop assessment criteria based on this aggregate view, and submit the recommendation to home departments.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Recommendations

Mission

3) What would student outcomes look like? How can we evaluate/assess that they leave Marquette with the characteristics of a Jesuit-educated person?

- How should students be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- Student to produce a culminating e-portfolio that represents the development of the development of the Jesuit elements of the student’s education—a tangible body of work to assess their growth as Jesuit educated person

- We think students should leave Marquette with deeper understanding of the socio-cultural, political, economic, history of the city of Milwaukee along with required community engagement educational component. We propose a required 0 or 1 credit course that all students take that bridges this historical understanding of Milwaukee with mission framed service, service learning, or community engaged research so that students understand the origins of our cities problems in order be a better partner in solving them.

- We propose to build an expectation (with training and incentive) that faculty are trained in Ignatian pedagogy and use it (with flexibility to adapt). So that faculty and students leave the university with deep understanding of and practice of reflection that leads to action and transformed experience.
Dimension Leads & Steering Committee Advisors

Promotion/tenure, faculty-staff training & development, exec/senior leadership development (related to community engagement), BOT development, research/scholarship, staff promotion, incentives, diversity and inclusion

Faculty and Staff Engagement

Gary Meyer
Senior Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs
Lynn Mellantine, Asst Vice President, HR
Advisors:
Bill Lobb, Dean, Dental School
Janet Krejci, Dean, Nursing School
Jeanne Hossenlopp, VP, Research & Innovation
## Faculty & Staff Engagement: Co-Leads & Working Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Meyer (Co-Lead)</td>
<td>Senior Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Mellantine (Co-Lead)</td>
<td>Asst Vice President, HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiola Keller</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Nicky Santos, S.J.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, College of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Abena</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor and Senior Director of Marquette University Community Dental Clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Edwards</td>
<td>Professor, College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Su</td>
<td>Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syed Ahmed</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Community Engagement, Medical College of WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Burkhart</td>
<td>Engagement Director UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Schram</td>
<td>Director and Special Assistant to Native American Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janelle Romano</td>
<td>Research Assistant (Graduate Student), Office of Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Torruco</td>
<td>Communication and Engagement Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty & Staff Development

1) What is the optimal organizational structure?
   - Centralized (offices/programs), co-located OR Decentralized (offices/programs), co-located?
   - Should there be additional staffing in the Office of Community Engagement? Why/Why not?
   - Should there be dedicated liaisons from colleges and units? Why/Why not?

- A centralized structure, with resourced “liaisons” dispersed throughout other areas including colleges, schools, programs, etc. is recommended. The office of Community Engagement should be sufficiently resourced to help incentivize and support liaisons.

- Recommend adding the following staff positions (1) a full-time associate director; (2) a full-time administrative assistant; (3) a half-time grant writer (co-located in ORSP); (4) a half-time communication specialist (co-located in OMC); (5) student assistants as appropriate.
Faculty & Staff Development

2) What growth model (promotions, tenures, etc.) do we need to implement to institutionalize Community Engagement?

- Should it be a part of P&T for faculty? Why/Why not?
- Should it be included in merit considerations for staff? Why/Why not?
- How should faculty/staff be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- Community engagement should be formally recognized and valued at the university level and incorporated, as appropriate, into the university promotion and tenure guidelines (criteria).
- Community engagement should be incorporated, as appropriate, in annual merit considerations for both faculty and staff.
- The impact of an individual's community engaged efforts should be considered for faculty and staff; how impact is determined will vary.
- As an aspirational goal, identify ways to bring the community’s input into assessing impact.
Faculty & Staff Development

3) What would student outcomes look like? How can we evaluate/assess that they leave Marquette with the characteristics of a Jesuit-educated person?

- How should students be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- Student Outcome: Students will have foundational knowledge of community engagement, rooted in Ignatian Pedagogy, and the capacity to act on it.

This outcome can be realized by creating additional opportunities for community engagement as well as required reflection associated with the engagement.
Dimension Leads & Steering Committee Advisors

Student Engagement

Experiential learning, clinical placements, internships, service learning, student research, student service, federal work study, diversity and inclusion

Mary Janz
Executive Director, Residence Life

Chris Simenz
Clinical Professor/Practicum Coordinator for Exercise Science

Advisor:
Xavier Cole
Vice President, Student Affairs
## Student Engagement: Co-Leads & Working Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Janz (Co - Lead)</td>
<td>Executive Director, Residence Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Simenz (Co-Lead)</td>
<td>Clinical Professor/Practicum Coordinator for Exercise Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Cieslicki</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed de St. Aubin</td>
<td>Associate Professor/Assistant Chair, Psychology Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyanna McLaurin</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Service Learning Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tresca Meiling</td>
<td>Development and Community Engagement Manager, Milwaukee Academy of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence Miller</td>
<td>Director, International Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Walker</td>
<td>Director of Community Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Recommendations

Student Engagement

1) What is the optimal organizational structure?
   - Centralized (offices/programs), co-located OR Decentralized (offices/programs), co-located?
   - Should there be additional staffing in the Office of Community Engagement? Why/Why not?
   - Should there be dedicated liaisons from colleges and units? Why/Why not?

- Centralized Operation
  - Thoughtful co-location
- Additional Staffing
  - Necessary to maintain and build relationships with partners
- Liaisons
  - Follow the OIE model
    - Dean appointed advisory committee
    - Community representation
    - Student representation
    - Some level of authority
Recommendations

**Student Engagement**

2) What growth model (promotions, tenures, etc.) do we need to implement to institutionalize Community Engagement?

- Should it be a part of P&T for faculty? Why/Why not?
- Should it be included in merit considerations for staff? Why/Why not?
- How should faculty/staff be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

### Part of P&T

- Duties, scope and purpose must be clearly defined
- Understanding of time and purpose of relationship
- Consider cultural competence requirement for faculty
- Establish community role in development and assessment of faculty CE
- Must represent true community partnerships not solely data opportunities

### Staff

- Consider cultural competence requirement for staff
- Issue proper HR classification
- Time to account for variable schedules/flexibility that community partnership require
Recommendations

3) What would student outcomes look like? How can we evaluate/assess that they leave Marquette with the characteristics of a Jesuit-educated person?

- How should students be evaluated? How can we get community's evaluation?

- **Eliminate the “help people” philosophy**
  - Pivot to social justice & cultural competence framework
  - Tie to co-curricular with regular contact points within entire college experience

- **Intentional**
  - Engage in difficult conversations early on
  - Focus on building relationships
  - Incentivize deeper support and connections within the community

- **Prepare Students**
  - Devote time and staff to supporting the process
  - Speak of community partners from an asset based perspective
  - Ensure competency training and education
Dimension Leads & Steering Committee Advisors

Profile & Membership
Carnegie classification, awards, marketing, sponsorships, memberships (local, state, national, global), philanthropy/development/funding

Kathleen Waterbury, Director of Brand Marketing, Office of Marketing & Communication
Jaclyn Ness, Managing Director of Development, Corporate, and Foundation Relations, University Advancement
Advisor:
Brian Dorrington, Assistant VP, Advancement Communication
## Community Engagement Team

### Profile & Membership: Co-Leads & Working Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Waterbury (Co - Lead)</td>
<td>Director of Brand Marketing, Office of Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaclyn Ness (Co - Lead)</td>
<td>Managing Director of Development, Corporate, and Foundation Relations, University Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Filmanowicz</td>
<td>Editorial Director, OMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Parsons</td>
<td>MU-WIN Coordinator, Research Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Ng</td>
<td>Student Media Coordinator, OCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie Fenceroy</td>
<td>Senior Program Manager - Education and Scholarships, Greater Milwaukee Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortney McEniry</td>
<td>Director of Community Engagement at Milwaukee Repertory Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Otero</td>
<td>Associate Director of Social Innovation, Research Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Grow</td>
<td>Strategic Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile & Membership

1) What is the optimal organizational structure?
   - Centralized (offices/programs), co-located OR decentralized (offices/programs), co-located?
   - Should there be additional staffing in the Office of Community Engagement? Why/Why not?
   - Should there be dedicated liaisons from colleges and units? Why/Why not?

- Though we recognize that space is at a premium, we recommend that the Office of Community Engagement be centrally located in locations such as Zilber (like the corporate engagement office) or the 707 Building. The current location doesn’t indicate to internal or external audiences that engaging the community is a priority.

- Centralized, co-located and accessible. Our recommendation is for new community engagement roles across the university to report through and/or coordinate with the Office of Community Engagement. Engagement activity across campus specific to offices, colleges and areas would improve operations, communication and effectiveness, and avoid redundancies.

- Staffing should include: A) One operations person to keep communication open and fluid and provide support; B) Three assistant directors, one for each category: research, teaching, and service.

- Establish an Advisory Board of community members, staff and faculty.

- Dedicated liaisons are beneficial to support the flow of communication, but should not be seen as the main vehicle for communicating on behalf of the office.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Recommendations

Profile & Membership

2) What growth model (promotions, tenures, etc.) do we need to implement to institutionalize Community Engagement?

- Should it be a part of P&T for faculty? Why/Why not?
- Should it be included in merit considerations for staff? Why/Why not?
- How should faculty/staff be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- Explore options for how community engagement can be part of P&T for faculty so that it’s embedded in the fabric of the institution. We recommend looking at best practices for merit considerations and how other organizations outside of higher education have implemented similar plans or pay incentives for staff.

- Since we don’t currently evaluate staff in the area of community engagement on performance reviews, we recommend iterative steps. These steps include: 1) Highlight the roles our university leaders have on the boards and or with non-profit organizations. 2) Define what community engagement is and how one can actively participate in it. 3) Include a question on the performance review asking, “In what ways are you contributing to Marquette’s community engagement?” 4) Recommend each department participate in a day of service to help reinforce a culture of community engagement.
Profile & Membership

3) What would student outcomes look like? How can we evaluate/assess that they leave Marquette with the characteristics of a Jesuit-educated person?

- How should students be evaluated? How can we get the community’s evaluation?

- We describe a Jesuit-educated person as someone who embodies social justice, empathy, imagination, reflection, commitment and problem solving.

- We recommend students be surveyed a minimum of three times. This could be connected to the Marquette Core or aligned with additional surveys or assessment tools currently in place. Surveys will help to identify opportunities, blind spots and gaps.

- Engage parents more proactively. Survey parents at the start of their child’s academic career and again at graduation.

- Admissions can include criteria in the application process.
Dimension Leads & Steering Committee Advisors

Partnership management & cultivation

Database, contracts, MOU's, college liaisons, liaisons with other internal teams/offices/departments. [Marquette partners with entities such as non-profit, foundations, government, residents/community members, businesses]

Anne Deahl, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Support Programs & Retention
Kimberly Bohat, Director, Service Learning
Advisor:
Dan Bergen, Executive Director, Office of Community Engagement
## Partnership Management & Cultivation: Co-Leads & Working Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Deahl (Co-Lead)</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost, Academic Support Programs &amp; Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Bohat (Co-Lead)</td>
<td>Director, Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Castro</td>
<td>Program Director, United Community Center (UCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Sparrow</td>
<td>President, Next Door Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheena Carey</td>
<td>Internship Coordinator/Lecturer, College of Comm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Rindfleisch</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Williams</td>
<td>Executive Director, Educational Opportunity Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Keyes</td>
<td>Undergraduate student, works for OCE and previously SLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McGinn</td>
<td>Alum and current Trinity Fellow; Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partnership Management & Cultivation

1) What is the optimal organizational structure?
   • Centralized (offices/programs), co-located OR Decentralized (offices/programs), co-located?
   • Should there be additional staffing in the Office of Community Engagement? Why/Why not?
   • Should there be dedicated liaisons from colleges and units? Why/Why not?

We recommend a centralized OCE with the following staff, at a minimum:

- **Director:** potentially elevate position to Vice President of CE, elevate reporting line
- **Associate Faculty Director for Community Engagement**: who would serve on the P&T committee, assist with new faculty orientation, serve as liaison to OIRA and Assessment, and encourage/mentor other faculty to engage in this work (part-time, course buy out, 3 year rotation)
- **Co-locate and move the reporting lines of Service Learning and Community Service Programs** to CE Director (possibly Trinity, Burke, and CURTO with more discussion)
- **Program Assistant**: full time, manage database, marketing and communication duties
- **Dean Appointed College Liaisons**: serve as consultants, communicate College needs and work, task force style
- **Community Partnership Specialist**: to be the point person for the community, manage requests, attend events
- **We suggest establishment of a formal collaboration between CE and Diversity and Inclusion with consideration of a Social Justice Advocate** which could be a dual report to D and I
- **We also suggest an Assessment Manager** to manage student, faculty, and community impact

Further, the location of the office and physical proximity to the heart of campus is important for community access, student access, collaboration, and communication. For the short term, the 707 Building would serve that goal well
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Recommendations

Partnership Management & Cultivation

2) What growth model (promotions, tenures, etc.) do we need to implement to institutionalize Community Engagement?

- Should it be a part of P&T for faculty? Why/Why not?
- Should it be included in merit considerations for staff? Why/Why not?
- How should faculty/staff be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- We recommend that CE become a part of the P&T process, with the following caveats:
  - We carefully define quality, ethical CE research, teaching, and engagement
  - Faculty who engage in CE may have this be considered as a legitimate aspect of their P&T portfolio - college and dept education needed
  - Faculty who do not choose to engage in CE activities should not be penalized in the P&T process, but perhaps be offered different tracks for consideration
  - Outcomes should be defined at the outset of CE engagement such that they can be readily evaluated by community partners and peers at completion of the engagement. Letters of support from community partners could be considered just as letters of support from academic colleagues are considered now
  - We do not recommend that CE engagement become part of the merit process for staff, as there are many staff positions which do not allow for CE within the position description. We suggest, rather, that the university honor and promote CE by staff where possible, but not privilege those who can engage in this way over those whose roles do not allow for CE. We do encourage the consideration of a “service day” benefit, much like how the “retreat day” benefit works for staff.
Partnership Management & Cultivation

3) What would student outcomes look like? How can we evaluate/assess that they leave Marquette with the characteristics of a Jesuit-educated person?

- How should students be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- We recommend using the existing Service Learning evaluation plan as a template from which we build a formal mechanism to evaluate student participation in CE.

- Write clear learning goals on potential objectives such as:

Students who have participated in meaningful community engagement experiences at Marquette will:

- Develop relationships that demonstrate a sense of cultural competency and cultural empathy
- Articulate an understanding and awareness of social justice,
- Express a commitment to being an active and engaged community member in the future
- Utilize self-reflection to understand their own values, beliefs, and identity as a citizen of the world

- Community Impact Assessment Survey could ask for community to evaluate our students.
- NSEE, Student Survey, focus groups, e-portfolios, alumni survey, core class assessment
- We might consider incorporating CE activities into a badge and transcript
- A long term goal would be to build institutional capacity such that we could require that every undergraduate student enroll in at least a Service Learning/Community Based Learning/CE Research experience locally and/or globally as part of their degree requirements
Dimension Leads & Steering Committee Advisors

Impact/Accessment

Impacts of this work on students, faculty, staff, alumni, community, economics

Carie Hertzberg
Director, MU Burke Scholarship Program

Jen Reid
Director, Student Affairs, Communications

Advisor:
Rana Altenburg
Vice President, Public Affairs
### Community Engagement Team

**Impact/Assessment: Co-Leads & Working Teams**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carie Hertzberg (Co - Lead)</td>
<td>Director, MU Burke Scholarship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Reid (Co - Lead)</td>
<td>Director, Student Affairs, Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Celata</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Grych</td>
<td>Professor, Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Durben</td>
<td>Executive Director, Office of Research &amp; Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura MacBride</td>
<td>Assistant Director, OIRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Swabek</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Trinity Fellows Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Manjee</td>
<td>MUSG Outreach VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren McMahon</td>
<td>Burke Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine Nelson</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant in ORSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Recommendations

Impact/Assessment

1) What is the optimal organizational structure?
   • Centralized (offices/programs), co-located OR Decentralized (offices/programs), co-located?
   • Should there be additional staffing in the Office of Community Engagement? Why/Why not?
   • Should there be dedicated liaisons from colleges and units? Why/Why not?

   - Thoughtful centralization is recommended, especially for programs whose missions/purposes align (Service Learning, Community Service, Burke Scholars, Trinity Fellows). An emphasis on ease of access for students and community members is recommended as well. Centralized models are best practices in community engagement and would alleviate duplication of efforts as well as keep people in communication with each other. Centralization efforts should be mindful of discipline specific efforts and inclusion of faculty voice.

   - Additional staffing for the Office of Community Engagement is recommended including an assistant director and office manager. Staff with expertise/experience in data analysis would be helpful in measuring impact.

   - College liaisons are recommended as a means to keeping everyone in the loop, identifying synergies, creating efficiencies, and reducing duplication of efforts.
Recommendations

Impact/Assessment

2) What growth model (promotions, tenures, etc.) do we need to implement to institutionalize Community Engagement?

- Should it be a part of P&T for faculty? Why/Why not?
- Should it be included in merit considerations for staff? Why/Why not?
- How should faculty/staff be evaluated? How can we get community’s evaluation?

- Consensus among those in the working group and those interviewed as part of this process leans toward incentivizing Community Engagement in some way and making it an option in P&T. Individual departments should carefully consider how to do this as some departments lend themselves more easily toward community engagement. Different milestones may be developed for faculty who declare themselves to be on a community engaged track. And perhaps different requirements and supports are provided in part by the Office of Community Engagement (e.g., writing groups, opportunities to present at national conferences, etc.).

- It would be equally beneficial to incentivize community engagement work for staff. Doing so, in conjunction with incentivizing for faculty, creates a spirit of comradery, shared mission, and feeling valued. It could also create opportunities for staff and faculty to partner in efforts, increasing collaboration and efficiencies and breaking down silos that exist among departments.

- A system of evaluation would have to be developed, perhaps using Carnegie classification components as well as best practices. The first step would be to decide what we mean by impact in terms of community engagement work. Having community partners’ input on measures of impact is crucial.
Impact/Assessment

3) What would student outcomes look like? How can we evaluate/assess that they leave Marquette with the characteristics of a Jesuit-educated person?

- How should students be evaluated? How can we get community's evaluation?

- In terms of outcomes, it is recommended that the university define first what we mean by impact. There are so many types of community engaged activities with many different outcomes. Thus, the definition of impact should be developed with community partners. There are some tools that can assist with this including Carnegie Classification and Marquette’s Co-Curricular Learning Outcomes. The Social Justice domain of these learning outcomes speaks directly to community engagement and what we hope a student will look like when they graduate.

- It would be helpful to have samples of evaluation tools available and share these across departments. It would also help to talk about evaluation more to keep it forefront in people's minds. Maybe Marquette's Director of Assessment could give a presentation on community-engaged strategies. While the Carnegie Classification serves as an evaluation of sorts, perhaps there is a way to gather this information on an annual basis (which would also make the 10-year application much easier to complete).

- Direct and indirect measures should be used. Perhaps the Office of Community Engagement could coordinate tracking of student community engagement occurring through student organizations. A student survey could be developed to run every three years, and questions on the Graduating Senior Survey could be modified to capture students' perceived impact of their community engaged experiences.
Next Steps
Next Steps

• Steering committee will offer insights based on recommendations (format: TBD)
• Acting Provost Ah Yun will present final recommendations to ELT for decision-making (timing: TBD)
• Decisions will be shared with Community Engagement Task Force 2.0
• Convene, on a semesterly basis, to provide updates regarding outcomes/impacts

THANK YOU!
Appendix
People & Structure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff Development</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Janz, Executive Director, Residence Life</td>
<td>Gary Meyer, Senior Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Kathy Coffey-Guenther, Associate Vice President, Office of Mission &amp; Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Simenz, Professor, Clinical Professor/Practicum Coordinator for Exercise Science</td>
<td>Lynn Mellantine, Asst Vice President, HR</td>
<td>Theresa Tobin, Associate Dean, Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor: Xavier Cole, Vice President, Student Affairs</td>
<td>Advisors: Bill Lobb, Dean &amp; Professor, Dental School</td>
<td>Advisors: Kent Beausoleil, Special Assistant to VPs of Faculty &amp; Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Krejci, Dean, Nursing School</td>
<td>William Welburn, Executive Director, Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Hossenlopp, Vice President, Research &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>Kimo Ah Yun, Acting Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact/Assessment</th>
<th>Partnership management &amp; cultivation</th>
<th>Profile &amp; membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carie Hertzberg, Director, MU Burke Scholarship Program</td>
<td>Anne Deahl, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Support Programs &amp; Retention</td>
<td>Kathleen Waterbury, Director of Brand Marketing, Office of Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Reid, Director, Student Affairs, Communications</td>
<td>Kimberly Bohat, Director, Service Learning</td>
<td>Jaclyn Ness, Managing Dir for Development, Corp &amp; Foundation Relations, UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor: Rana Altenburg, Vice President, Public Affairs</td>
<td>Advisor: Dan Bergen, Executive Director, Office of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Advisor: Brian Dorrington, Assistant Vice President, Advancement Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed structure: Community Engagement

- Community Engagement Task Force 2.0
  - Community Engagement Steering Committee*
    - Will serve as an advisor for 1 or more Dimension Lead
  - ULC
  - ELT (President, Provost, EVP)
  - Board of Trustees
Steering Committee Summary
## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Readiness Assessment / SWOT

### STRENGTHS
- Community Engagement is a part of our mission, history and culture
- Our urban location affords it a wealth of opportunities to impact change and work with a multitude of committed community partners
- There is deep interest, commitment and engagement for this work at all levels: President, Administration, BOT, Faculty, Staff, Students
  - It is 1 of the 6 strategic plan themes
- Our brand and reputation can help further establish its leadership in Community Engagement

### WEAKNESSES
- Continued negative perceptions of MU and our intentions based on history
- Fragmented and siloed structures and approach:
  - Lack of clear definition of ‘Community Engagement’
  - Confusing to navigate (internally and externally)
  - Student, Faculty, Staff experiences with CE is disjointed
  - Watered down impact and creates inability to capitalize on institutional resources and gains
  - Lack of coordinated efforts across campus
  - Lack of more centralized tracking
  - Lack of resourcing: staffing & space
  - Lack of diversity and inclusion on campus
  - Lack of time and incentives for more broad faculty engagement
  - Transportation issues

### OPPORTUNITIES
- Community Engagement is distinctly ‘who we are’ as a Catholic, Jesuit University
- Can leverage strong support and commitment provided by leadership, faculty, staff, students, alumni, etc.
- Chance to build stronger, more meaningful relationships with the community
  - MU’s unique and highly specialized academic community allows for innovative research and problem solving that other organizations/companies can’t provide
- Our location and reputation can provide a chance for great impact
- Can increase efforts in diversity and inclusion to advance this work
- Institutional support and commitment to recent new initiatives that can be leveraged: NWSP, President’s Challenge, new Core curriculum, SWIM

### THREATS
- Too reliant on Dr. Lovell and Dr. Bergen
- If CE work is done poorly:
  - Experiences as forced, evangelizing and charity; this reinforces past perceptions that MU has been working to undo
  - Results in lost opportunities for both sides
  - Outcomes are limited to what can be provided by 1 siloed partnership with MU vs. the full-breadth of what MU has to offer
- Lack of CE in P&T
- Current divisive political climate
- Want partnerships to usually create instant results vs. slow, methodical output
- Safety perceptions
- Accreditation standards: CE is not valued the same
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Best Practices

- **Mission:**
  - Mission infusion in the life-cycle of faculty & students
  - AJCU consulting group for mission integration
  - In-depth and ongoing study of community perception and perception mapping
  - Structure and office to support integrated and coordinated work and funding

- **Partnership Management & Cultivation:**
  - **Infrastructure:** Centralized infrastructure with a professional team to operationalize; Community Ambassador Model; Long-term plan for endowed Community Engagement center; CE Advisory Board; Available funds or vehicle fleet for transportation
  - **MOU’s/contracts:** Established guidelines; Include language on mutual benefit and socially just; Provide sustainable deliverables; Possible reimbursement for CBO’s work; Formal guidelines for best practices in Community Based Research
  - **Database/tracking of CE activities:** inventory and consolidation of CE efforts, needs and opportunities; community interface; faculty interface
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Best Practices

- **Ensuring quality partnerships**: required orientation to community-based service or research; plan and protocol to ensure mutual benefit & fit with mission; intentional campus communication plan; strategic & intentional effort to address negative perceptions; intentional and strategic work with other local IHE's (Institutes of Higher Education) to alleviate competition for community partners

- **Impact/Assessment:**
  - Centralized coordinated efforts and dedicated staff with access to technology and resources
  - Culture of assessment is created and sustained
  - Necessary technology is available to support wide assessment and data collection
  - Community asset based approach
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Best Practices

- **Student Engagement:**
  - Common definition of CE
  - One-stop shop for internal and external navigation; easier and more intuitive website
  - Integration of CE into core curriculum, graduation requirement, and impact on tenure
  - Create student outcomes
  - Systematic training for faculty and staff on CE

- **Faculty & Staff Engagement:**
  - Increased integration with Diversity and Inclusion: leverage integrations; hire OMC staff member who has CE and inclusive excellence goals; create Asst/Associate Dean potion in each college
  - Better Faculty & Staff Communication on efforts and opportunities; increase awareness
  - Promotion & Tenure guidelines: create agreed upon definition on CE scholarship, develop assessment metrics, include community partners in assessment of impact
  - Participation Time & Incentives: expend retreat benefit; increase fellowship opportunities; recognize individuals
**Profile & Membership:**

- Survey staff and faculty for commitments, memberships and engagements – create repository of current state
- Interview foundation and business partners to better understand needs and MU’s effectiveness
- Develop funding and fundraising strategy
- Identify national organizations/alliances that fit with mission as possible partners
Mission

4) What is one thing that Marquette University can do to propel ourselves as a local, national and global leader?

- Partner in transforming Milwaukee—how we engage locally is what we will be known for globally. Our community engagement programs can be directly measured on whether they contribute to social justice in our community. For example, Milwaukee as the most segregated city, Marquette could commit to lead a community initiative in racial healing.
Recommendations

4) What is one thing that Marquette University can do to propel ourselves as a local, national and global leader?

- Ensure the Marquette community (faculty, staff, and students) has a foundational knowledge of community engagement, rooted in Ignatian Pedagogy, and the capacity to act on it.

Note: this is seen as a necessary, but not sufficient, condition. Other things that can be done in parallel:
- Agree upon a signature initiative that engages Marquette personnel with “communities.”
- Share stories, locally, nationally, and globally, related to the work and impact we are making.
- Increase network connectedness, locally, nationally, and globally around community engagement.
- Identify ways to increase Marquette’s reputation (e.g., lists of best universities).
Student Engagement

4) What is one thing that Marquette University can do to propel ourselves as a local, national and global leader?

- Commit to cultural competence as a framework for all employees and students
- Act as true partners with shared investments, goals, missions and visions for the greater community
- Ensure the continuation of our Jesuit mission to support at-risk communities
- Own our role in perpetuating systems that foster inequality
Partnership Management & Cultivation

4) What is one thing that Marquette University can do to propel ourselves as a local, national and global leader?

- Incorporate CE into P&T
- Resource the centralized CE office as evidence to both the campus and the community the importance of CE as an institutional priority (Endowment)
- Engage in one university-wide CE project annually or on a five year calendar that ripples out globally and meets community/societal need. The project would offer each MU constituency the opportunity for involvement (teaching, research, and service)- and by doing so we can measure and articulate how we have positively impacted that social justice concern.
- Require a Service Learning/ Community-Based Learning or CE Research experience of every undergraduate (local and/or global)
4) What is one thing that Marquette University can do to propel ourselves as a local, national and global leader?

- Recommendation to make ongoing process of community engagement work transparent, thoughtful and purposeful through on and off campus input, public/web-based dashboard of metrics, goals and impact and ongoing assessment.

- It is our belief that Marquette could become a leader in community engagement by looking at deep, strategic and intentional collaboration with diversity, equity and inclusion offices/initiatives on campus. To ultimately do this work well, we can’t afford to work on diversity/equity and community engagement separately – this includes student impact but just as important, community impact.
Profile & Membership

4) What is one thing that Marquette University can do to propel ourselves as a local, national and global leader?

- We recommend the university dedicate significant resources to marketing. Marquette must tell the stories that may otherwise not be told, and provide clear, consistent messaging. This will create the needed awareness of the work being done with the community across the university, including stories of partnerships and the why behind them matter. There are misperceptions and lingering stereotypes, and it is easy to be caught in the past. But with focused and dedicated resources, the real stories can be shared. This will help will turn the conversation from “me” to “we” and open more doors for fundraising and partnerships.