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I. Introduction

The four-person Program Review Team was comprised of two external professionals, Dr. Barbara Holland and Mr. Vincent Ilustre and two internal professionals, Dr. Betty Farmer and Ms. Kellie Angelo Monteith. This External Review report is informed by the self-study prepared by the Center for Service Learning and on-site discussions with the CSL team and various WCU administrators, faculty, staff, and students held April 11-12, 2013.

In general, throughout the program review process, all participants provided constructive and thoughtful input to the review panel, revealing patterns of experience with the Center’s work and performance, as well as identifying opportunities for change that will be discussed within this report. While the discussions were open and candid, the Review Team notes that, despite valiant efforts of review organizers, almost all the individuals we met were well-experienced users and advocates for CSL. However, through careful questioning of participants the Review Team was able to generate useful observations that illustrated the perspectives of other, less involved people across the campus and community.

The Team began their visit by meeting with Interim Associate Provost, Dr. Mark Lord. Dr. Lord spoke of the reorganization of the Provost office to focus on the importance of further implementation of “high impact learning practices” at WCU. In particular he described the importance of the WCU Vision 2020 Plan and the QEP related to the most recent SACS Accreditation review, and invited the Review Team to provide insights and recommendations that would clarify the potential roles of service learning and other community engagement strategies in the implementation of these institutional plans as a way of creating a specific agenda of work and measurable goals for the CSL.

These themes were further developed in the meeting with Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Dr. Carol Burton, who has oversight for the Center for Service Learning. She reaffirmed the desire to increase all forms of experiential learning for WCU students and the need to have a specific plan and vision for CSL in terms of its vision and capacity to contribute to the fulfillment of Vision 2020 and QEP objectives. After a time of transition and instability at CSL, institutional leaders are keen to expand the centrality of community engagement broadly and service learning and service explicitly, and to shape CSL going forward so that it can be effective in promoting and facilitating that broader level of integrated activity across WCU. She also asked that we provide advice about strategies such as faculty fellows, an advisory board, strategies for documentation and assessment, clarification of the language around service learning and community engagement and the relationship of CSL to other campus units relating to student experience.
All administrators meeting with the Review Team were clear that they aim to develop a more robust and strategically intentional agenda of quality service learning and other forms of community engagement, across academic disciplines, in support of Vision 2020 and QEP goals. They asked the Review Team for guidance in how CSL could be positioned and supported to be an effective resource in support of those developments.

CSL Director, Dr. Lane Perry, shared his vision of the Center as a facilitating unit that aims to establish a culture of community engagement, meaning that service learning and other forms of engagement will become a “personal habit” of WCU students, faculty, and staff working in partnership with community. He also identified three challenges and/or needs to meet that vision.

I. Creating an efficient and systematic way to track and assess the impact of service learning and service outcomes for all programs. Evidence of impact (+/-) is a critical aspect of getting more faculty on board in support of community engagement as important and valuable work.

II. Faculty Involvement - Creating a “culture of engagement” by providing an agenda of professional development and technical support that would encourage the productive involvement of every academic department in service learning and other forms of community engagement.

III. Structuring CSL services, programs and resources so as to ensure the ongoing capacity to institutionalize that culture of engagement.

In a separate meeting, CSL staff members, Assistant Director Jennifer Cooper and Administrative Support Associate Jen Nickel, shared their interests in the review process. Together, they provided the Review Team with an overview of community service and volunteer events held on and off campus. Their emphasis was on the need to identify additional resources for the Center including the need for systematic tracking and assessment systems, better access to transportation, and funding for food, t-shirts and other supplies for community service events. Since their focus has been on the service side of the house, they were less certain about how CSL could better support service learning in the curriculum.

In the meetings with the CSL Director and the staff, information began to emerge regarding the challenges and the workload impact associated with being the locus of responsibility for organizing volunteering sites for students who are required to do community service as punishment for student code violations (More on this point later).

All the remaining Program Review sessions were group meetings with faculty, students and community partners.

The Team met with four students that had direct experience and positive regard for the Center for Service Learning. The Team was disappointed there were not a lot of students in attendance and that there were no participating students in this discussion that did not have experience with the Center. Among those present, the passion for the work the Center does on campus and in the community was evident. The students wanted wider student participation in service
events and service learning, and frustration was voiced towards those students who did not appreciate the work of the Center. They noted the negative impact of the workload impact on CSL regarding the coordination of students doing community service because they were mandated for code violation. During a long discussion of service and service learning, it became clear to the Review Team that even these highly engaged students did not have a clear understanding of the difference between “service” and “service learning.” These were highly self-motivated individuals, each with a long and robust history of volunteer service and student leadership, yet they did not have many ideas about how CSL might foster growth in wider student and faculty involvement in service and service learning.

In the Team’s first meeting with faculty, four faculty members attended, all with direct experience working with CSL. Three of them had been faculty fellows and one worked closely with the Poverty Project. These faculty emphasized the costs and barriers associated with the service learning component. Having had financial support before for their involvement in service learning, they felt that financial support was necessary to ensure faculty participation. When asked for an illustration of the cost factors, the participants mentioned incentives (direct payments or release time), materials/supplies, transportation, and greater assistance with liability and risk management issues.

In response to other Team questions, the faculty described CSL’s potential role in growing service learning and community engaged scholarship as one of enabling the “scholarship of community engagement” such as advice on service learning design and links to QEP, strategies for linking service learning to scholarship, assistance with literature reviews, connections between service learning and co-curricular events, professional development activities (“show up at department meetings”), and preparation for promotion and tenure. They were clear that the CSL involvement in a large agenda of service and volunteer events was distracting resources away from developing and supporting the further growth of service learning and that it contributed to faculty confusion about the difference or relationship between service and service learning. “CSL would be more useful if service and service learning were integrated.” They offered the year-long focus on poverty and the approach of the Honors College as examples of effective blended activities. Interestingly, these faculty members were also eager to see the University media relations and communications staff members give greater visibility to the benefits and outcomes of service learning activities and WCU-community partnerships.

Feeling the need for broader faculty input, the Team requested additional open meeting times for faculty on the second day. In the morning session, all had history with CSL relating to service learning in particular. Although their courses did not have a CSL designation, all believed in an engaged teaching model and have gotten to know the staff at CSL. One faculty member will have a CSL designation in a fall 2013 class and will work with the Center closely including Team teaching with Dr. Perry. Their view of the designation process was that it was not burdensome, but many of their colleagues did not see value in applying for designation. All identified the expertise and enthusiasm of the new Director. They also identified the challenge of resources for travel and lodging when taking students on trips. Their descriptions of their service learning designs suggested use of good principles and practices, and the Team was interested to hear
that at least one of these faculty members was linking the service learning activity to their own research. They complemented the Director of CSL for scholarly expertise and coaching, and the CSL staff for helping create good contacts with community partners. They suggested stronger links between service events and service learning; for example one suggested it would be good to organize an Alternative Break event that is linked to a completed service learning class. “We’re aware of the co-curricular events but they need to be relevant to what we are teaching.” These faculty members agreed with others about the need for resources for transportation, food, lodging, T-shirts and supplies, and greater attention to simple and meaningful liability management procedures.

The Campus/Community Partners session was well-attended by highly experienced and satisfied partners. Participants described positive relationships and partnerships with the Center. The partnerships varied from volunteers for the community table, LEAD House Party, Days of Service, Red Zone, Entrepreneurial class, Special Project “FOCUS”, the Poverty Project, and more. All expressed their desire for continued relationships and more in-depth partnerships with integrated learning component, internship opportunities. Although they’d not heard of the concept before, when the Team inquired about the idea of community partners as “co-educators” the partners were quick to embrace the term as describing their own experience in working with WCU students. The partners were unanimously positive that if they had interacted with CSL, they had found the team “very quick and responsive.” They gave CSL credit for consistently delivering on its promises – examples cited: generating student volunteers for days of service, clean-up events, collecting food or toiletries. When asked by the Review Team, a few partners said they had met with faculty or been a guest lecturer in a class; one was certain they’d been linked to a service learning course. Ideas partners had for improvement included more faculty connections and more service learning connections because this was seen as promoting more consistent involvement of students and longer interactions with particular groups of students.

Here are specific suggestions for and observations about CSL and WCU from the partners attending the session:

• Partners should share in the design of mutually beneficial outcomes in all events – win/win should be the norm; sometimes they feel like “hosts.” “WCU is a friend more than a partner.”

• “WCU physically faces inward by its campus design; it needs to face outward in its programming.”

• Place interns or other students in community partner sites to help organize and facilitate volunteers and service learners.

• Create sequenced relationships between volunteering and service learning.

• Make sure partners know the learning or developmental goal for students.

• More sustained interaction through service learning courses that are regular and predictable.

• Opportunities to partner with faculty on research and students in undergraduate research.
• Create a central, accessible space on campus to build fellowship between campus and community and facilitate planning and interaction with academic departments.
• CSL could facilitate all of the above, including interdisciplinary partnerships.

A third session for faculty attracted a few more voices. These faculty members also valued the service/volunteering agenda of CSL but felt it should be more obviously connected to learning outcomes. They suggested that greater attention to academic service learning could make volunteering more effective by articulating a “cycle of learning in community. Otherwise, volunteering is just busy work.” They expressed a need for more professional development on service learning design for faculty and staff, and hoped that having a more scholarly CSL leader would help make that happen. They also suggested a more intentional plan for service learning and volunteerism that would build from the first year through to graduation. CSL was described as being quick and positively responsive when contacted. Across all constituents, CSL staff members are perceived as having a “yes first” attitude. When asked if the campus recognizes the difference between service and service learning, it was believed it was still a work in progress.

Besides the Program Review Team members, the exit meeting consisted of Dr. Lane Perry, Dr. Carol Burton, Dr. Mark Lord, and David Onder. The Review Team established five major talking points to guide the exit discussion:

- Importance of developing intentional institutional goals for community engagement that will inform further development of the Center for Service Learning in support of WCU’s Vision 2020/QEP
- Confusion regarding language and terminology (within CSL and across the whole university)
- Balance of attention to and relationship of curricular and co-curricular programming
- Lack of tracking or assessment of outcomes or descriptive data
- The alignment of resources with CSL responsibilities to meeting institutional goals

II. Analysis of Program

Through the site visit meetings, analysis of the self-study, and direct observation, it is clear that the mission of CSL is bifurcated between service/volunteer management/delivery and academic service learning development/faculty relations. Both internal WCU goals and external trends in academia make this bifurcation a problem for WCU.

Externally, institutional experience and research on student expectations and outcomes are encouraging colleges and universities to strengthen their agenda of community engagement and involvement in several ways; here are just a few of those trends:

• Creating one or more linked, sequential pathways of student learning and development that integrate curricular and co-curricular experiences. (Note: this is not meant to exclude the offering of a large and diverse agenda of other, general and traditional service and service learning activities that operate independently across the institution.)
• Using these designs to focus on key local/regional issues so that partnerships are sustained and deepened, and positive change actually occurs in communities over time.
• Articulating clear learning and developmental outcomes linked to every service learning or service experience, supported by simple but relevant assessment tools to measure outcomes.
• Linking disciplinary plans for service learning and partnerships into departmental or interdisciplinary research agendas, including undergraduate research opportunities.
• Coordinating different forms of experiential learning that meet diverse student needs across the years, and making this a feature of student recruitment.
• Ensuring formal and informal recognition for faculty, students, community partners, and staff for their roles in implementing engagement activities, courses and research projects.

Internally, WCU has articulated goals in the WCU Vision 2020 and the QEP developed as part of the recent SACS review that will require attention to some of the external trends mentioned above. These plans were described to the Review Team as intended to help WCU “become more unified in our vision for student experiences and community engagement.” Plans are underway to implement a vision for a center or office for experiential education and senior level leadership of active learning strategies. The choice made to hire a new CSL Director with academic credentials and scholarly competencies was described to us as a reflection of the priority given to community engagement as a strategy and as a form of scholarship in the University’s vision and plans. In a decentralized university culture, departments have been asked to create their own plans for how their disciplines will respond to strategic goals articulated in Vision 2020 and the QEP. **GOAL 3.3** of the 2020 plan calls for aligning internal processes and reward systems to foster external engagement. Two initiatives particularly relevant to CSL’s strategic direction are 3.3.1 and 3.3.2:

• **Initiative 3.3.1:** Develop models and strategies to formally recognize and reward faculty and staff participation in educationally-based external engagement.
• **Initiative 3.3.2:** Ensure that all division and departmental personnel processes, including those related to annual faculty evaluation, tenure, promotion, and review, provide faculty and staff the formal opportunity to detail and describe educationally-based external engagement activities.

From our review process, we propose that actions to align CSL with these goals will provide essential infrastructure for WCU to realize its strategic plans. The student experience, engagement with community, the positive impacts of engaged scholarship on teaching and research, all point to a critical role for CSL.

WCU has already embraced the Boyer vision of an integrated view of scholarship; attention to engaged teaching and research could bring that vision to life for more faculty and more
departments. This will require a sustained level of professional development, facilitation, cultivation, and coordination – functions that CSL could be designed to support, perhaps in partnership with related faculty support units. To achieve the goals of 2020 and QEP, the culture of service learning and community engaged scholarship must become an expected part of faculty life and routine. As upper administration reviews departmental plans, there is an opportunity to assess attention to engaged teaching and research, and its connection to academic strategy and to the evaluation and rewards for academic personnel. This will go a long way to changing culture.

The Review process identified a number of key challenges and factors that currently constrain the capacity of WCU to progress service, service learning and community engagement in ways that will benefit overall strategic directions. Recommendations for actions based on these findings from the Review can be found in Section V of this report.

- There is confusion within CSL and across the whole university regarding the difference between service and service learning (purposes, goals, models, outcomes), even among practitioners and advocates. This is partly because of institutional history, but there is considerable need for consistency in all university materials and for deliberate discussions with faculty, staff, community and students to clarify the differences and the potential for complementary connections between these practices. Both WCU and CSL need a branding effort to clarify and capitalize on the engagement/service learning theme.

- This confusion regarding terminology also has a dampening effect on faculty understanding of community engagement and the potential of service learning to improve student performance and learning outcomes, and to generate new research ideas and partnerships.

- Confusion is further exacerbated by the role imposed on CSL to coordinate community volunteer placements for students assigned community service hours as punishment for student conduct violations. This has placed an enormous burden on the staff and resources. How can service and service learning be framed as exciting and productive learning and developmental processes when the term community service is used as the label for punishment?

- The confusion around terms also makes the name of the Center for Service Learning a problem in moving forward to support goals of Vision 2020 and QEP. While called CSL at this time, the bulk of the resources of the Center and thus, the weight of its image among students, faculty and staff are focused on service and volunteering. It is only since the appointment of the current director that some greater profile for service learning facilitation has been seen as an emerging function of the unit, and it is important to note that that work falls almost exclusively on the director alone. In our review we find the unit’s activities and services, the actions that consume staff time, and the strategic needs of the University are not well aligned.

- Few courses have been tagged with the service learning designation; fewer than one would expect given the plans WCU has developed. In the Review, faculty did not view the designation process as onerous, but rather saw the barrier as more basic – many faculty don’t know what service learning is or how or why they should consider
integrating into their teaching. Nor did they see how the designation added value to their courses or to the students’ learning outcomes.

- Throughout the review, all agreed that whatever the mix of programs and services, CSL needs to create an efficient, sustainable, and focused system for tracking activities, participation, partnerships, and intended/realized impacts or outcomes. The Reviewers agree this will be critically important to meeting institutional needs and goals.
- With the main weight of current CSL capacity focused on service and volunteering, wonderful programs and partnerships are offered to students and community. Among those involved, the Center has an excellent reputation – a “can do” attitude. However, it is not clear what percentage of students partake of these programs, how visible the programs and opportunities are to all students, and which students are “disengaged” in service and volunteer activities. There is little tracking of participation and outcomes.
- There is no apparent synergy between curricular and co-curricular programming. There is a great opportunity to align the two so that they support each other by focusing on linked topics, partnerships, geographic locations or other points of connection.
- There is a clear need for more faculty and staff professional development around engaged teaching and learning methods and the relevance of the co-curricular to curricular work. There is open opportunity to partner with academic administration, faculty orientation, department meetings, and Coulter Faculty Commons to explore key issues relating to community engagement and scholarly work.
- Partners also crave training so as to be supportive and productive in working with WCU students, faculty and staff. They crave more complex, multiple relationships that would not only connect them to student volunteers or service learners but also to interns, faculty and others who might do research and evaluation projects.
- During Review sessions, several people mentioned the Faculty Fellows program offered in the past. Experience across other institutions suggests that funding faculty to create new models, mentor others or similar tasks meant to promote change must have a clear purpose and outcome. The Review Team heard from some former fellows and while it is clear they had a great experience and appreciated the remuneration for their efforts, it has created an expectation in some that doing service learning incurs costs and should be compensated. This makes the idea of reviving a fellows program tricky, and thus should be considered with great care regarding the intended purpose and measurable benefit to the institution. A possible approach would be to designate one faculty member as a CSL faculty fellow charged with working with CSL to address initiatives 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 in the strategic plan. Clearly, additional infrastructure, staff support, and resources will be necessary to realize the 2020 vision.
- Similarly, the Review Team asked about any history of a CSL advisory group, and heard that there had been one in the past, but it was uniformly described as “passive.” As with fellows programs, any consideration of revival of an advisory group will need a clear purpose and outcome.

In our Analysis of the CSL unit, informed by the Review sessions with CSL, faculty, students and partners, it is clear that each constituency sees the part of CSL that is important and relevant to
them, but not the whole picture. Faculty seek help almost exclusively with service learning; students seek the volunteering events.

This Review’s recommendations seek to suggest ways to create a more coherent agenda of work, an approach to staffing and an approach to accountability that will add up to a more cohesive and well-understood support unit.

III. Analysis of Staff

Based on the site visit input, the Review Team made the following observations regarding current staffing in terms of how the current positions are being used to address the goals and deliver the programs and services of the CSL unit.

- Throughout the recent CSL transitions, people providing feedback to this Review found the CSL helpful and responsive. The Review Team is not able to assess how the rest of the University perceives CSL services since site visit participants only included experienced users of the Center.
- CSL is mostly associated with community service and volunteering. The unit is seen as responsible for overseeing large community service projects, running student led programs, and recruiting volunteers on an “on demand” basis for partners. They are also identified with organizing community service as student punishment.
  - Two of the CSL staff focus primarily on community service and volunteering activities and programs and related services, and are involved very little if at all in service learning issues or initiatives.
    - The staff see service and service learning as separate realms but don’t want them to be separated as different units. However, the two realms continue to travel in parallel paths.
    - In part, the issue is there are not enough staff to serve both realms well even if they were well coordinated.
  - The goals of the institution in Vision 2020 and QEP cannot be met if the CSL director is the only position dedicated to support of academic service learning and engagement.
  - The administrative assistant position as currently conceived involves advanced and independent leadership of programming activities, external communications, and problem resolution.
  - Revolving student labor is required to meet true administrative and operational functions, but this creates a management challenge in that students are constantly rotating.
- CSL staff will always require access to mentoring and professional development support. Community service and service learning are developing fields characterized by innovation and informed by ongoing research. The staff would benefit from learning about other program models and about other designs and approaches for operating other centers at similar universities.
IV. Analysis of Facilities and Budget
We found CSL facilities to be pleasant but inadequate, especially in regard to ensuring CSL is a gathering place for students, faculty, staff and partners seeking to work together to design, launch and assess collaborative projects. The responsibility for the student conduct punishment program places a space burden on the unit since there is no privacy for any of the staff in the open office plan. The location of the current facility is favorable, but the features are inadequate for their role today, and for the role envisioned for the future.

From the Review conversations, it is clear that transportation and risk management are areas requiring urgent attention – these are seen as significant barriers by all to program innovation, sustainability, and to student participation.

V. Summary of Recommendations

Institutional
1. Clearly articulate and define service/service learning and other forms of engagement.
2. Pay attention to the inclusion of service learning and other community engagement strategies in the review of departmental plans relevant to Vision 2020 and QEP. Consider re-directing current internal seed funds or other incentives toward departments with innovative engagement strategies.
   a. Require departments/units to explicitly elaborate on their engagement agenda and the support they would require from CSL to accomplish their goals
      i. Using this information, CSL can further develop programs and devise an action plan to address needs specified by departments/units
3. Re-assign the coordination of student disciplinary service to a student affairs unit and having the punitive service hours completed on campus. Consider renaming it – Campus Service, or Peer Reconciliation or other.
4. We advise that you not pursue a combination of CSL and Career Services. Doing so further diminishes the capacity of CSL to be seen as an academic resource for faculty and as a source of expertise and assistance that will have a direct benefit to their scholarly performance in support of WCU goals.

Programmatic and Staff Alignment
5. Consider the match between the Center name and what it does. Center for Community Engagement might encompass all roles the Center can play in meeting institutional goals.
6. Assess the job descriptions of the two current staff positions for alignment with implementation of aspects of this review. In addition:
   a. The duties performed by the current administrative assistant are above class and should be reviewed for reclassification.
b. To provide minimal capacity to implement any aspect of this review, a true administrative assistant position should be created.

7. Decisions must be made about the balance of attention to service/volunteerism and to service learning and engaged scholarship. Consider the following options:
   a. Creating a volunteer management hub in student affairs and focus CSL on community-based learning through the curriculum
   b. Keep the two forms of community activity together in CSL, but develop a greater balance between the two through the following strategies:
      i. Design links so that some co-curricular activities explicitly align with and connect to curricular service learning (or vice versa)
      ii. Use a community partner relationship management system to record and monitor the curricular and co-curricular connections to the University
      iii. Reshape current staff positions to represent shared responsibilities for both forms; for example, partnership coordination is no different whatever the design of the activity.
      iv. Provide cross-training for all staff members on all CLS program

8. Consider with caution the idea of renewing a fellows program or an advisory body for CSL. These can waste resources unless they are based on very specific and important, even urgent, outcomes that can be measured. (This aligns with Recommendation #8)
   a. Avoid strategies that associate faculty or staff involvement in academic service learning or other engagement activities with release time or extra remuneration. Such programs tend to not to attract new participants and the concept is not sustainable.
   b. Input, advice, planning activities, etc. are best accomplished through collaborative, diverse working groups with specific, short term assignments
   c. Consider integrating accountability for leading engagement into existing administrative and academic leadership roles

9. In support of Vision 2020 and QEP, convene a fixed-term working group (as opposed to an advisory group) with specific tasks/outcomes/deliverables to develop. The working groups should have a mix of administrative leaders, faculty, staff, students, partners and CSL staff members in various mixes that will consider ideas and initiatives such as:
   a. Designing one or more sequential pathways of student learning that integrates curricular and co-curricular experiences (leading to a minor, or a certificate, or a scholarship (fundraising opportunity), or other recognition.
   b. Areas of alignment between WCU academic strengths and interests and community questions and opportunities; develop interdisciplinary teams to use service, service learning, research and other strategies to engage in collaborative creation of knowledge (take the Poverty Project as a good model). Link to goals in 2020, QEP and departmental plans.

Communication

10. Redesign and make use of CSL website
    a. Provide easily accessible information for all constituencies
    b. Create a database of all service learning courses, service and volunteering projects
c. Build a comprehensive and searchable database of community partners with information on connections to WCU activities.

11. Charge Communications/Media Relations/Web administration to make WCU community service and service learning projects more prominent on the website and in external communications.
   a. Consider adding a statement regarding “the engaged university” or other description of community engagement as a cultural value in marketing materials, job ads, and recruitment criteria (see Northern Kentucky University)

12. Develop Recognition Programs for:
   a. Community Partners – years of service, etc. Convene, thank, and engage in a reflective discussion about impacts and outcomes. The university currently has an annual awards banquet for faculty/departments and community partners, but there is no publicity associated with the event; thereby, limiting its impact, both internally and externally.
   b. Faculty and Students
      i. Articulate the goal of the recognition program
      ii. Host an Open House for faculty in the fall. Identify faculty who have clear learning outcomes/use best practices to participate in poster sessions highlighting their service learning work. This will raise awareness and help create a network of campus leaders doing community engagement/service learning. Make sure that top administrators, including the chancellor, provost, deans and department heads are invited and in attendance. Coordinate event with Office of Public Relations to garner maximum exposure. A white paper or other publication highlighting these best practices in community engagement/service learning could result from the event. This could contribute to the branding of CSL/ WCU as models/leaders in community engagement/service learning.

Faculty Concerns
13. Faculty professional development is a high priority and should be explored in collaboration with Coulter Faculty Commons, new faculty orientation, and in special convocations and discussion events.
   a. CSL needs to determine the current attitude of WCU faculty toward service learning and CSL and their readiness to realize the 2020 vision.
   b. Topics to include in discussion and training sessions: Clarify the language of engagement! What does it mean to be an engaged university? How does service learning link to research? How do I document engaged scholarship for promotion and tenure review? What are similar Universities doing? Etc.

14. Review the service learning course designation and revise as needed to make links to 2020 and QEP more explicit. Involve academic leaders in understanding the marketing and structural advantages of the designation. Consider offering incentives at the departmental level rather than at the individual level.

15. Work closely with University General Counsel on risk management issues
   a. Develop forms and procedures to minimize risk to all participants
   b. Create a mechanism to disseminate information and ensure compliance
Assessment
16. Challenge CSL to create a three-year plan for its work, with measurable outcomes. This should be done as a collaborative and consultative process.
17. Create a team – OSL, institutional planning, faculty researchers and engagement practitioners, partners, and students – to develop simple and relevant assessment tools that can be used for service and volunteering events.
   a. This will require articulating learning or developmental goals for events
   b. Consider using Blackboard or social media to make it easy for students to complete the short (6 Q max) post-event evaluations
   c. Create a mechanism (social media or scanning student ids) to create unique, unduplicated headcounts for all service and volunteer events

Resource Allocation
18. In light of Vision 2020 and QEP, assess current non-staff salaries and make adjustments to reflect program goals and support structure for faculty/students/community partners engaged in service.
19. Staffing
   a. Determine if current staffing levels are in line with university goals for the engagement portfolio
   b. Provide sufficient budget for professional development of staff
20. Create a plan for transportation in support of service and service learning
   a. Centrally-funded system with standardized processes and forms
   b. Dedicated vehicles with simple reservation system (pre-approve those who can sign up)

Development
21. Consider crafting a case for the cultivation of a named endowment gift for CSL
   a. Identify and involve regional donors whose interests in community issues align with community engagement projects of CSL
   b. Make scholarships that reward student achievement in community engagement
   c. Opportunities for funding
      i. Community-Based Research Grants
      ii. Recognition Program for Faculty/Students/Community Partners
      iii. Transportation
      iv. Programming