

I ILLINOIS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

Special Adviser to the Chancellor - on Engagement

Wynne Sandra Korr, Professor

November 30, 2017

Final Report



Source: Valeri Werpetinski

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Goal:.....	3
Introduction:.....	3
Context:.....	4
Recommendations regarding the stated objectives:	5
Objectives:	5
Conclusion:	11
Appendices.....	12
1. Letter from Chancellor Jones to Ad Hoc Advisory Group:	13
2. Individual and Group Meetings	14
3. Potential Members for Community Advisory Council	15
4. Task Force on Civic Commitment for the 21 st Century – Executive Summary.....	16
5. Service Learning Task Force Report -2015 (excerpt).....	18
6. Civic Learning and Civic Pedagogies	20
7. Engagement and Strategic Planning – Discussion Points (source: Staci Provezis)	21

GOAL:

Advancing a culture of engagement that marks our university as an engaged university rather than a university with engagement programs

INTRODUCTION:

To conduct the work as charged, I formed an Ad Hoc group of internal advisers that represented various sectors of our campus (see attached letter from the Chancellor to the group). They met with me as a group twice and as individuals and via email to provide guidance and direction.

I met with groups and individuals to explain the goal of this work and obtain input (see attached list).

I reviewed documents from previous work relevant to this report (see Appendix for list).

I also benefitted from participating in the Big Ten Academic Alliance meeting of campus engagement officers last May.

Given the short time I had for this project I embedded the Goal into all my activities – promoting a culture of engagement and seeking champions to carry that work forward. I focused on several broad themes: (1) promoting a faculty culture that addresses engaged research/scholarship and engaged teaching including mentoring and incentives; (2) promoting the development of place-based engagement strategies within the broad strategic themes of the campus that would guide investment in new initiatives and assessment of their impact; (3) closely related to #2, developing a structure that facilitates communication with external stakeholders.

I also identified key areas that I could not address within the time frame: (1) supporting and strengthening the already strong engagement activities within our cultural assets – e.g. KCPA, KAM, Spurlock, WILL; (2) developing a strategy for student-facing civic engagement especially in coordination with Student Affairs.

In addition to addressing the specific objectives for this work, I provide contextual material. I also include additional material and concerns that emerged from various meetings and discussions I had.

CONTEXT:

In order to provide common ground for meetings and discussions, I typically began with the Carnegie Foundation definition of community engagement:

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*. – *Carnegie Foundation* (2006) (italics added by WK)

I highlighted the values of “mutually beneficial” and “context of partnership” so that it would be clear that Engagement is not something universities impose on their communities but rather a deep commitment to partnership. I also choose to use the term “Engagement” capitalized and without any modifier as I want to be clear that if we are successful in our efforts to build an engaged university, the singular term “Engagement” will bring to mind the public, community, civic, service and other descriptors of this multi-faceted mission that focuses on the commitment to mutually beneficial partnership.

I next highlighted the Chancellor’s vision of an engaged university as he stated in his address at the start of the celebration of the Sesquicentennial:

- Defining the land-grant mission for the 21st century
- Promoting public engagement as an organizing principle for our university
- Offering new and better solutions to critical problems of our society
- Organizing ourselves in ways that put public engagement more clearly as a priority

He further amplified his vision in his November 2, 2017, State of the University Address <https://uofi.illinois.edu/blog/view/5231/573650>:

Inseparable from our investments and innovations around diversity will be our efforts to move from being a university with engagement programs to a Publicly Engaged University. ...We cannot deliver on the land-grant promise of the 21st century if public engagement is not an organizing principle for us as university.

Given this vision, my conversations increasingly included how to embed engagement into both the Strategic Plan – “The Next 150” – and into ‘thinking strategically’ about engaged scholarship and engaged teaching.

Ten years ago, I was a member of a campus Chancellor-appointed Task Force on Civic Commitment for the 21st Century (see Executive Summary in Appendix). While the structures that emerged did not survive, the values and approach we took are still relevant – we hoped to engage in civic commitment:

- that effectively puts our learning and research into the service of a just and prosperous society;
- that builds partnerships with local constituencies that strengthen the community as a living and learning environment;
- that extends beyond the boundaries of the campus and the state of Illinois.

I remain hopeful that our university will be at the forefront of developing and testing new solutions to critical problems in our society, and that our learning and research will be in the service of a just and prosperous society. At the same time, I hope that we can be more focused in our goals and proudly convey the impact of our work.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE STATED OBJECTIVES:

Objectives:

1. *Make recommendations regarding a structure that supports achievement of the goal – identify strengths and concerns of various options;*
 - a. *A position vs a Center for Engagement? Reporting lines? Other structure?*
 - b. *What relationships need to exist to ensure academic legitimacy?*
 - c. *What relationships are needed to promote engagement across multiple domains including academic, student affairs, international, economic development, etc.?*
 - d. *What kind of advisory structures with internal and external stakeholders?*

The two primary options considered were: Situating Engagement in the Provost's office; Situating Engagement in the Chancellor's office with a strong link to the Provost's office. I recommend, based on discussions with the ad hoc advisory committee, that we do both.

As I discussed ways to achieve our goal of an engaged campus with many stakeholders, one of the biggest barriers to achieving our goal related to this theme – the need for a structure that enhances mutually beneficial relationships between the campus and our multiple external communities. This barrier is best addressed by having a position in the Chancellor's office (e.g. Associate Chancellor) that is the nexus for engagement and external relations. This structure would allow the lead person to work closely with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors (Provost, Research, Student Affairs, and Institutional Advancement, and with Associate Chancellors, especially for Diversity and Public Affairs) to set strategy, implement key initiatives, assess impact, and better communicate the impact of our work.

The promotion of a faculty culture of engagement, both engaged research and engaged teaching, is equally challenging and important. We also need a position (Associate Provost) to highlight how our vision of being an engaged university is intimately tied to the academic mission. This position would work with the deans and others in the Provost's office to

embrace, define, and incentivize the commitment to engaged scholarship/research and engaged teaching/service learning. Key Provost Office leaders are already embracing this understanding of engagement. (Based on discussions with Vice and Associate Provosts – Bernhard, Mabokela, Pitts, Santos.)

A Center for Civic Engagement could be considered at a later time. This structure seems to be more common in private universities (e.g. Northwestern) that have not had the long-standing land-grant mission. As the “With Illinois” capital campaign proceeds, fund-raising for civic engagement and a possible Center could be included as a goal.

A Leadership Council for Engagement would provide guidance to these two positions and promote linkages to the various domains of campus. The domains that I drew on in forming my ad hoc internal advisory group could be continued with some others added: deans, student affairs, a research institute, a cultural asset, a member of the Provost’s team concerned with faculty development, someone with a Diversity portfolio. Public Affairs and Advancement representatives should be added. A faculty member with current or recent past Senate leadership should be added. The LCE would provide guidance to the Associate Chancellor and Associate Provost.

Should there be an *external advisory* structure? The need for such structures in order to form mutually beneficial partnerships is critical. Defining the various communities for forming relationships and seeking advice is yet to be done. For example, we will likely want a local community advisory council. How do we relate to other communities in the state and beyond? How do we do so in ways that are sensitive to those communities who historically have felt they had not had access to the university or have been exploited by our research?

The Associate Chancellor would be responsible for convening the external councils whose role would be to advise the Chancellor on strategic direction and to facilitate development of partnerships. (See Appendix with suggestion for types of members for a Community Advisory Council.)

We should also ensure that other external advisory structures include engagement in their purview. For example, as a local group of external business and community leaders is formed with a focus on economic development, they should include a focus on ‘working together for community impact’ (discussed with Laura Frerichs and with her support – see report from Khanna and Frerichs which highlights many dimensions of engagement).

We should also consider the role of alumni in Engagement.

Concerns about this proposed structure are: resources required and possible negative perception of central control. Resources – what are the opportunity costs of not investing in central supports for Engagement? If the central staff can focus on strategy, impact, and support for the culture of an engaged campus, the resources will be justified. **Minimally, we will not be able even to prepare the application for a third designation as a Carnegie Engaged Campus without resources.** Central control – we have to demonstrate that a central office is about strategy, support, and impact, not about control.

2. *Conduct meetings with multiple internal stakeholders to build support, identify opportunities and concerns*

As I noted in the introduction, I met with multiple stakeholders (see Appendix). At all meetings I sought to promote the culture of engagement, support champions of engagement, and listen closely to opportunities and concerns. I emphasized engagement is part of research and teaching. I also emphasized ways to embed engagement into strategic planning and thinking – beginning with our existing grand challenge themes and then developing place-based goals and strategies.

Two of the most common concerns were communication (both within the university and with external communities) and fears of centralization. The concerns regarding communication included lack of knowledge of who is doing what on campus; no clear pathways for communication with external communities – both for them with us and us with them. Providing communications support for this effort will require resources, but again, the cost of not telling this story is much greater than the invest necessary to address the challenge.

1. *Identify key external stakeholders for possible input*

Examples of possible stakeholders include local and state business leaders; state agency leaders especially those that have significant existing relationships with our campus, e.g. agriculture, natural resources, children and family services. Note: I did meet with a key local stakeholder, Sue Grey – CEO of United Way of Champaign County because of the United Way’s attention to identifying needs in our immediate community.

2. *Make recommendations regarding relationship to strategic initiatives; capital campaign; etc.*

Relation to *strategic initiatives* – as I noted in the Introduction, our current strategic plan emphasizes grand challenge initiatives. Both from my knowledge and experience on campus and my meetings with key internal stakeholders, it became clear that the component that needs to be strengthened going forward is place-based strategies within the strategic goals. For example, I met with the leadership and key staff from the Illinois Health Sciences Institute to discussed engaged research. We discussed engaged research methodologies (e.g. Community-based Participatory Research) and place-based strategies.

I also discussed this approach with Staci Provezis from the Provost’s office who is providing leadership during the current round of strategic planning. Dean Kim Kidwell is leading part of the planning discussion related to Engagement. She also was a member of my internal advisor group. (See document re: Engagement landing points for strategic planning discussion.)

Relation to *capital campaign* – the potential impact of building Engagement into the capital campaign, *With Illinois*, is significant and can be understood at several different levels. Promoting our work as an engaged university should be the essence of the meaning of *With Illinois*, e.g. With Illinois, we can impact societal grand challenges; With Illinois, we educate future generations of leaders engaged in their communities. Donors, especially young donors, invest for impact. They will be inspired by our engaged scholarship and teaching that benefits local and global communities. Donors may also wish to invest in specific engagement initiatives/ programs. Examples may range from a Center for Civic Engagement to awards/fellowships for students and faculty who have exemplified engaged scholarship and teaching/learning to engagement fellows in existing institutes and centers, e.g. the new Siebel Center for Design.

3. *Begin better communication/marketing of Engagement – celebrate the strengths of the existing ecosystem (coherent plan to brand and market)*

While we have a rich array of engaged scholarship and teaching and engaged programming, we do not yet have a communication/marketing plan for Engagement, although it could easily be integrated into the overall branding strategy – along the lines suggested above for embedding Engagement into the capital campaign. As I noted above, communication problems were a frequent concern, including lack of knowledge internal to the university and lack of clear pathways for communication with external communities and for them with us. These concerns point to the importance of Engagement leadership addressing the issue of communication. Just having the two proposed positions should help, but a modest investment in creative work (storytelling, design, etc.) would be required. I did meet with the Associate Chancellor for Public Affairs, Robin Kaler, as well as email with her. She supports thinking more strategically regarding how we communicate about our Engagement and impact. She supports Public Affairs participating in, and helping staff, the proposed Engagement Leadership Council.

When I began work on this project, the web pages related to Engagement (engage.illinois.edu and engagement.illinois.edu) had been removed. Discussions with Robin Kaler led to re-instituting the Engagement portal (engage.illinois.edu). Public Affairs is working on a long-term solution for cataloging and displaying a searchable database of Engagement activity. They plan to launch it within the next calendar year – before any additional administration investment to the current system would be required.

One problem with having removed our Engagement page (in addition to the serious one of not having a means of communicating strategically our work and its impact) is that if you search on the word “Engagement” on the Illinois.edu website, the first thing that comes up is the System page on Engagement. We must do better than that.

I did identify some model webpages from peer institutions. These include Spartan Impact at Michigan State (<http://mispertanimapact.msu.edu/>) and the pages at Minnesota <https://engagement.umn.edu/> and <http://engage.umn.edu/>. From the Spartan Impact page you can click on any county in Michigan and get information on activities and impact there. We

have specific programs here that have similar pages like that (e.g. Extension and Prairie Research Institute), but we should have such a page at the campus level.

4. Develop plan for seeking renewed designation as Carnegie Engaged University

Our current designation goes till 2025. While there is no immediate need to work on the next submission, it is vital that a staff person be assigned to attend workshops and/or webinars so that advanced planning can begin in the very near future. The current designation was the result of many hours of careful research, documentation and contextualizing of our Engagement activities. **We cannot assume that maintaining the designation is a given.**

5. Make recommendations regarding resources required to achieve objectives and goal

The most significant resources are associated with staffing, i.e. the Associate Chancellor and Associate Provost, as well as any supportive positions (e.g. part or all of an AP, office support). Resources are needed for the design and maintenance of web pages and to tell the overall story of what it means to be an engaged university. I did have a very preliminary discussion with Vicky Gress regarding what funds this work might require. A more complete assessment of resources needed will have to wait for the future.

6. Continue to seek consultation from peer models (Minnesota; Michigan State) and from key organizations (Campus Compact)

I attended the Big Ten Academic Alliance meeting of Engagement officers in May. I arrived early in order to have consultation from Dr. Andy Furco, the Engagement Officer at Minnesota and a national leader in engaged scholarship and engagement. That meeting was critical to my focus on the need to tie Engagement closely to the core academic mission through promoting engaged research and engaged teaching. Dr. Furco later offered that a graduate student in his class could do an audit of our Engagement work. I felt that would best happen in fall of 2018. I also met Dr. Hiram Fitzgerald, the Engagement Officer at Michigan State, at that meeting. He subsequently was very helpful in providing materials related to how MSU embeds Engagement into research and teaching in the promotion and tenure process. These materials were shared with Vice Provost Bill Bernhard and the outgoing chair of Promotion and Tenure.

I have closely monitored the national and Illinois Campus Compact emails/website for relevant material. We need to remain aware of their initiatives and for opportunities to nominate campus programs/leaders for awards.

7. Begin process of developing criteria for determining investments in new initiatives

In line with the recommendations above regarding embedding Engagement into strategic planning with special attention to place-based strategies, I recommend that criteria for investment be aligned with the strategic directions that emerge in current planning. A general call for Engagement-related proposals is not recommended.

Areas with significant gaps may merit investment – these include service learning and other engaged pedagogies (see below).

8. *Other*

a. *Promoting a faculty culture of engaged scholarship and engaged teaching*

I want to highlight the discussions I had with key members of the Provost's office team (Bernhard and Santos) and the immediate past chair of the campus Promotion and Tenure committee (Ostler). All agreed that promoting a faculty culture that embeds Engagement into scholarship and teaching was important. Our key documents related to Promotion and Tenure for tenure-track faculty and Promotion for specialized faculty would need to be reviewed and updated. Faculty development would need to align with this work. Such a shift will take extensive input and discussion with faculty, deans, and department heads, Senate groups, etc. Best practices from peers can be determined (e.g. the Michigan State documents I shared with Dr. Bernhard). Dr. Bernhard is also following up on the work of the relevant association – Engaged Scholarship.

The importance and difficulty of doing this work underlines the need for a position in the Provost's office to lead this work, to advocate for this shift, and promote a sense of urgency in doing it.

b. *Strengthening resources for service learning*

In 2015, a Provost-appointed task force issued a report on Service Learning (see excerpt in Appendix). I met with Associate Provost Kevin Pitts to discuss engaged teaching and look at this report. We discussed the relationship of service learning to the student learning outcomes and to other initiatives such as the minority cultures requirement. He will take this discussion to his meeting with the undergraduate deans.

I believe it is critical that the Recommendations of the Task Force be implemented. Without this implementation, our vision of an engaged campus with engaged teaching will not be fulfilled. The new position proposed in this report on Engagement could take the lead in this work with the support of the position and resources recommended in the Task Force report.

c. *Strengthening civic learning pedagogies*

The 2012 AAC&U report focused on the role of universities in promoting students' democratic engagement through civic learning (see excerpts from conference presentation I did in Appendix). The report promoted promising pedagogies and civic partnership models. The pedagogies were: Intergroup and deliberative dialogue, service learning, and collective civic problem solving. The latter two pedagogies are addressed in our campus Service Learning Task Force Report. We also have a long history of teaching Intergroup Dialogue through courses supported by the Provost's

office and taught by staff in OIIR. The latter may be scaled up and strengthened by a proposal to move the faculty/staff and courses to the School of Social Work.

Designation as an AshokaU campus was specifically mentioned as a means of enhancing civic partnerships. AshokaU campuses promote students solving social problems through social entrepreneurship. A proposal for AshokaU designation is being developed by the Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership, Social Innovation at Illinois, and the Entrepreneurship Roundtable. That approach also is synergistic with the proposed work of the new Siebel Center for Design.

Another form of civic partnership has emerged since the AAC&U report – Collective Impact. We participate in our local Collective Impact initiative – CU Cradle to Career. However, we have had only limited student involvement -- they have engaged students through the Community Learning Lab.

CONCLUSION:

I am thankful to have had the opportunity to work on the Goal of advancing a culture of civic engagement on our campus.

As I have said throughout my presentations and discussions on this topic – our campus has a long history of engaging with key societal challenges and has a rich array of engaged research, teaching, and programs. With renewed commitment, we can easily become a model for the engaged 21st century land grant university.

APPENDICES

1. Letter from Chancellor Jones to Ad Hoc Advisory Group
2. Individual and Group Meetings
3. Potential Members for Community Advisory Council
4. Task Force on Civic Commitment for the 21st Century 2007 – Executive Summary
5. Service Learning Task Force Report 2015 – Recommendations
6. Civic Learning and Civic Pedagogies
7. Engagement and Strategic Planning – Discussion Points

1. Letter from Chancellor Jones to Ad Hoc Advisory Group:

I have asked Dean Wynne Korr to develop a white paper for me that assists in framing a vision of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign as an engaged university. The paper is to address topics including how we see engagement as part of our research and teaching, structures and resources to support engagement, better communication/marketing of engagement to celebrate the strengths of our engagement ecosystem.

I have asked her to obtain input and advice from internal and external stakeholders. To facilitate her work, I am asking you to meet with her as an ad hoc advisory group of internal stakeholders to build support for this work, identify opportunities and concerns.

I have asked her to convey the final report to me before November 30 when she retires. Unless I hear otherwise, I assume you will assist in this important endeavor.

Dean Korr will be contacting you regarding a meeting schedule.

Thank you for helping.

Robert Jones,
Chancellor

Danita Brown Young, VCSA
Kimberly Kidwell, Dean ACES
James Anderson, Dean of Education
Antoinette Burton, Director, IPRH
Michael Ross, KCPA
Amy Santos, Associate Provost
Assata Zerai, Associate Chancellor

2. Individual and Group Meetings

Research

Peter Schiffer

Institute Directors – IGB, IPRH, NCSA, Prairie Research, IHSI

Follow up with IHSI – with E. Stone and R. Sosnoff

-With N. Cohen and K. Li; E. Stone

Follow up with IPRH – Anke Pinkert and Chris Higgins

Communication

Robin Kaler

George Reese

Engaged Scholarship and Teaching

Bill Bernhard and Teresa Ostler

Amy Santos

Kevin Pitts

Reitu Mabokela

Martin Wolske

Advancement and civic engagement

Susan Lee and advancement officers

Engagement history; Extension

Pradeep Khanna

Sarah Zehr

George Czapar

Economic development

Laura Frerichs

Community engagement – local priorities

Sue Grey – CEO United Way

Senate Executive Committee

Strategic Planning

Staci Provezis

Miscellaneous

Entrepreneurship Roundtable

Relationship with Diversity – N. (Rusty) Barcelo

Relationship with University of Chicago – Derek Douglas and Amar Parikh

Budget and Resources – Vicky Gress

AEL and Social Innovation re AshokaU designation

3. Potential Members for Community Advisory Council

African American Community Advisory Group (Chancellor's advisory committee; members, coincidentally provided input to *Home of their Own*)

Challenge Academy, Rantoul

Champaign Community Coalition

Champaign Community Health Care Consumers

Champaign County Forest Preserve

Chambana Moms

Champaign Park District

Champaign Rotary

CUC2C

CU Fresh Start

CU Neighborhood Champions

First Followers

Interfaith Alliance

Ministerial Alliance

New American Welcome Center (coalition of orgs represented)

Small Business Development Center

United Way/human service providers

Urbana Park District

Urbana Rotary

Youth and family Peer Support Alliance

Other considerations:

Area governmental representatives, e.g. mayors, State Representatives and Senators

4. Task Force on Civic Commitment for the 21st Century – Executive Summary

Date: July 12, 2007

To: Chancellor Richard H. Herman

From: Chancellor's Task Force for Civic Commitment in the 21st Century

Re: Task Force Report and Recommendations

This memo reports the findings and recommendations of your *Task Force on Civic Commitment for the 21st Century*, established in January 2006. It presents a vision that builds on the new campus strategic plan. It outlines the current situation on campus, which is an exciting and pivotal moment in the history of civic engagement. The memo distills our recommendations for mainstreaming civic engagement within the wider ethos of the university, and offers alternatives for building upon that work in coming year.

1. *Vision:*

The senior leadership of UIUC is setting fresh directions for linking public engagement, teaching, and research missions of the university in exciting new ways. These linkages will occur across colleges, from the local to global scales, and in close relationship with diversity goals and core dimensions of an emerging campus culture.

This campus culture is anticipated in the edited volume titled, *No Boundaries* (2004). It will be realized in the early decades of the 21st century by re-affirming, and redesigning, the public land grant mission of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, in part through its strategic plan. That plan articulates *Our Commitment* (2007, 4) as follows:

- We embrace and advance our Land Grant mission by serving the state and the nation through education, research, outreach and economic development
- We foster innovative teaching, research and engagement, demanding and rewarding break-through knowledge creation and learning from our faculty and students.
- Our educational programs promote innovation, cultivate justice, enhance social mobility, and improve the quality of life by responding to local, national and global societal needs...

These commitments and related values in the strategic plan (ibid. 5) will guide civic engagement in ways:

- That effectively puts our learning and research into the service of a just and prosperous society
- That builds partnerships with local constituencies that strengthen the community as a living and learning environment
- That extends beyond the boundaries of the campus and Illinois

As part of its mission this year, the task force sought to map those boundaries and ask, in concrete ways, how they might be extended.

5. Service Learning Task Force Report -2015 (excerpt)

Recommendations

1. Adopt the broad and widely accepted 2002 definition of Service Learning (Community-Based Learning) from the National Commission on Service Learning: **“Service-learning is a teaching and learning approach that integrates community service with academic study to enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities.”** We also recommend adopting the three criteria that Ohio State University uses as they detail the types of experiences that students should have in service learning courses (i.e., activities are designed to meet stated learning objectives, meeting a community-defined need, and include explicit opportunities for student reflection and growth).

This definition should furthermore include additional qualifiers or specific examples important to the Illinois experience. For example, based on our land-grant mission and our global focus, we may wish to emphasize both community-based and international service learning as desirable contexts for service learning. We may wish to distinguish service learning from volunteerism by emphasizing the connection to curriculum, the establishment of clear learning objectives and stated learning outcomes, faculty and/or professional supervision of off-campus work, and the integration of student reflection as a clear element

2. Establish criteria and a process for vetting Service Learning Courses that reflects faculty appraisals of the critical components of service learning at Illinois. The Ohio State and Minnesota Centers provide excellent examples of faculty-supported models. They provide tested criteria, forms and processes that can be adapted to reflect the issues important to our faculty and unique to the Illinois experience. They also offer excellent examples of how the approval of new service learning courses can interface with the Senate Educational Policy Committee to ensure appropriate reviews.
3. In consultation with the Registrar’s office, create a Banner designation for vetted service learning courses so that they can be visible to students at the time of course registration (similar to the “S” and “S+GE” at the Ohio State University).
4. Incentivize Service Learning for faculty and units. This could include an investment similar to the “Discovery Course” program and/or an expansion of course development grants. Review Communication No. 9 to ensure that opportunities are provided to faculty to describe the extensive time and effort they devote to creating and teaching service-learning courses so that this may be recognized.
5. Establish a central office with a tenured faculty Director position at the Associate Provost level that reports to the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education and Innovation. This “Office for Service Learning” should work closely with key functions in the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, Office of Public Engagement, the Office of Student

Affairs, , the Office of the Vice Provost for International Affairs and Global Strategies, the Study Abroad Office, Illinois Extension, and Research Park, where significant service learning course development and instruction is occurring on campus (i.e., LINC, social science units, Spanish & Illinois, Community Learning Lab, etc.). This office will be responsible for: (1) promoting and supporting service learning/community-based learning and international service learning that includes formally recognizing faculty, students and administrators who practice effective service learning; (2) providing training and support for faculty who wish to develop and teach service learning courses as well as for students interested in community-based learning; (3) providing support and best practices for the development and maintenance of relationships with community and international partners, (4) maintaining a directory of service learning courses and (5) establishing a visible “one stop” website for service learning resources and course offerings.

6. We recommend a search for the director’s position begin as soon as possible. To best provide leadership for this new academic initiative, the Director should be a tenured faculty member. We recommend hiring an academic professional Associate Director who can assist with the Center’s programs and staffing. An administrative assistant will also be necessary to support the work of the Director and Associate Director and to staff a Faculty Advisory Committee, which will serve to connect the Office with the academic mission of the colleges and the campus as a whole. Additional personnel may be necessary as the portfolio of the center grows.
7. Funding for the Office should include funds to: (1) seed new service learning courses on a competitive basis; (2) enable community partners to conduct service learning projects that involve Illinois students; (3) conduct annual workshops for faculty to help them design and teach service learning courses; (4) provide modest travel for the director/associate director to attend conferences and visit other service learning centers at aspirational peer institutions; and (5) reward excellence in service learning instruction.
8. A successor committee to this task force should be appointed to continue the planning of an Office of Service Learning and to serve as an advisory group to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Innovation in the 2015-2016 academic year on service learning-related issues. The charge for the committee should emphasize the implementation of the above recommendations

6. Civic Learning and Civic Pedagogies

Source: The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. 2012. *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Background:

- Commissioned by US Dept. of Ed – to lead a national dialogue, make recommendations “about strengthening students’ civic learning and democratic engagement as a core component of college study”
- Report – challenges colleges and universities to prepare students for democratic engagement through civic learning

Key concepts:

- *Civic Literacy* (not ‘civics’): to understand how the political system works, how to influence it, and “to understand the cultural and global contexts in which democracy is both deeply valued and deeply contested” (p.3)
- Literacy obtained via “hands-on, face-to-face engagement” in context of learning different perspectives on problems (p.3); achieved by service learning
- Framework: links knowledge, skills, values, and collective action

Three promising civic pedagogies:

- *Intergroup and deliberative dialogue* – skill: “capacity to deliberate productively and respectfully with others who hold different views” (pp.55-56)
- *Service learning* – integrates service with instruction and reflection; “rooted in respect for community-based knowledge...” (Saltmarsh, 2005, p. 53)
- *Collective civic problem solving* – “...involve students ...in ‘real-world’ learning, where problem solving can be practiced through... internships, practicums, study abroad, and community-based research and projects” (p. 63)

Civic partnerships:

- Generative partnerships – “characterized by mutual efforts to define and build civic prosperity” (p.64)
- Example – AshokaU. – Promoting social entrepreneurship on campuses and to challenge students to “solve social problems at the root-cause and systemic level using innovative, sustainable, scalable, and measurable approaches” (<http://ashokau.org>)

7. Engagement and Strategic Planning – Discussion Points (source: Staci Provezis)

What does Public Engagement mean for a University like Illinois?

1- Societal Impact with a global reach

- Engaged research that can make a difference throughout the world with a specific intention of improving social conditions.
- Students through service learning can build and sustain productive relationships to respond to civic and social challenges at local, national, and global levels, creating positive change in their communities.

2- Lessening Disparities (Education, health, food, etc)

- Engaged research that reaches into communities to better understand how they work, and also to impact change in fundamental ways that lessen disparity.
- Students involved with Public Engagement activities can develop a critical and reflective orientation toward such social and cultural differences as race, indigeneity, gender, class, sexuality, language, and disability.

3- Economic Development of Community (local, rural, urban (Chicago))

- Engaged research can lead to opportunities for building a strong economic foundation.
- Students can learn about how complex, interdependent global systems—natural, environmental, social, cultural, economic, and political—affect and are affected by the local identities and ethical choices of individuals and institutions.

We may also want to think about how do we incentivize this type of work? P&T, awards, etc. How do we say we value it? Incentives, support resources, etc.

Student points come from the Illinois Student Learning Outcomes:

<http://provost.illinois.edu/assessment/learning-outcomes-assessment/assessment-at-illinois/campus-student-learning-outcomes/>.