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I. Research Methodology

Project Challenge

A member institution approached the Council with the following questions:

Scope of Office for Community Engagement: What programs does the office of community engagement oversee at other institutions? What services or programs does the office offer to students, faculty, and community members? How did administrators at other institutions centralize all outreach efforts in one office?

Coordination with Internal and External Offices: With what other university entities does the office interact? What is the office’s relationship with colleges within the university? How does the office coordinate community development efforts across the institution? What external entities does the office interact with? Does the office manage relationships with state legislators?

Leadership: What is the title of the chief community engagement officer? To whom does the chief officer report? What qualifications does the office director possess?

Office Operations: How many staff work in the office for community engagement and how are responsibilities distributed across the staff? What entities provide funding for the office? Do any partner external organizations or partner university departments partially fund programs under the office’s purview? If so, how? What is the office’s budget?

Project Sources

- Education Advisory Board’s internal and online (www.educationadvisoryboard.com) research libraries
- National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] (http://nces.ed.gov/)
- Institutional Web sites
## I. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Research Parameters

The Council interviewed academic officers at the following institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Approximate Total Enrollment (Total / Undergraduate)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
<td>25,100 / 20,200</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>Mountain West</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>30,200 / 22,800</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>20,900 / 13,900</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>Mountain West</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>13,100 / 11,500</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>34,400 / 25,200</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University F</td>
<td>Pacific West</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>23,800 / 19,600</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University G</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>45,200 / 38,600</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University H</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>41,100 / 32,200</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University I</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>25,500 / 17,300</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University J</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>34,700 / 25,900</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Center for Education Statistics*
II. EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

Key Observations

- Contacts report that university leaders create offices for community engagement in order to elevate the importance of engagement activities and to coordinate outreach across institutions. At most profiled institutions, offices for community engagement were created within the past 15 years; however, the University J hosts the longest-standing office, which was created in 1965.

- Offices for community engagement oversee a range of activities, including extension services, continuing and online education, regional economic development, and community service. Whereas several profiled institutions prioritize extension and continuing and online education, other institutions focus on community service and service learning programs. At University B, University F, University E University, and University G, offices for community engagement focus on extension and continuing and online education. In contrast, offices at University C, University D, the University I, and the University J deliver primarily community service programs.

- Contacts report that several outreach initiatives are embedded in individual colleges within the university. Therefore, in order to coordinate these dispersed outreach activities, engagement leaders organize outreach councils. These councils typically perform operational and informational functions to help university-level engagement leaders and college-level administrators collaborate. Contacts report that council members typically include university-level engagement leaders, associate deans for outreach, and directors of other community engagement units.

- At most contact institutions, the office for community engagement is not directly responsible for liaising with government officials and lobbying for government funding; this task typically lies with an office for government relations. Rather, contacts report that engagement leaders indirectly interact with government officials through memberships on government boards and associations. Leaders reportedly leverage these interactions to promote the university’s needs.

- Contact institutions engage students through volunteer activities and service-learning courses, which are organized through a community service center. At six of 10 contact institutions, the community service center operates under the office of community engagement.

- Contacts describe several strategies for engaging faculty in outreach activities: offer curriculum development support for service-learning projects, fund scholarships in engagement, give competitive awards in engagement, and designate engagement positions. For example, contacts suggest that administrators designate faculty positions as “public service,” or award tenure for scholarship of engagement.

- Across the 10 profiled institutions, engagement leaders hold the title “Vice President” at six institutions, “Vice Provost” at two institutions, and “Director” at two institutions. Contacts indicate that engagement leaders should have easy access to senior university leaders, such as the president or provost, to gain insight into the community and academic priorities of the university.

- Offices for community engagement seek funding from a variety of sources, including the president’s office, government funding, continuing and online education fees, service fees, grants and contracts, and private donations. Contacts report that the funding derived from continuing and online education is quickly growing, and in several cases may support the entire office’s operations and in addition to other university functions.
III. OVERVIEW OF OFFICES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Creating an office for community engagement demonstrates university investment in community needs. The activities housed in these offices range across profiled institutions, but the scope of activities typically includes some combination of extension services, continuing and online education, regional economic development, and community service.

History of Offices for Community Engagement at Profiled Institutions

At most contact institutions, university leaders created an office for community engagement within the past 15 years, with the exception of the University J, which created its office in 1965. Regardless of when university administrators developed an office for community engagement, contacts indicate two objectives for developing such an office:

1. To Promote Engagement and Extension as University Priorities

The offices for community engagement at University E and University G were developed after university commissions identified engagement and extension as priorities for the university. Similarly, University B, the University I, and the University J emphasized the importance of community engagement by creating an office directly under the president or provost, thereby raising the visibility and importance of engagement and extension as a university priority equal to research and instruction.

2. To Consolidate All University Outreach Activities

Contacts at the University J report that the office was created to bring all outreach activities traditionally dispersed across colleges under the purview of a single office. Similarly, to coordinate outreach, institutions such as University B and University F, extracted extension from the college or department level (e.g., agriculture, home economics, etc.) and elevated it to the office of engagement. Although extension services are traditionally housed within the department of agriculture, contacts acknowledge that the mission of extension services is closely aligned with other outreach activities.

Centralization of Outreach Activities

Contacts explain that the role of the office for community engagement is to coordinate outreach activities across other offices and colleges. Two models emerge to describe the extent to which outreach activities are managed by the office for community engagement:

Outreach Centrally Managed Under Office (Most Profiled Institutions)

- Extension
- Continuing and online education
- Regional economic development
- Community service

Office leaders meet regularly with college deans to encourage and support outreach programs at the college level.

Outreach Centrally Coordinated by Office (University C and University I)

- Extension Services
- Continuing and Online Education
- Community Service
- Economic Development
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III. OVERVIEW OF OFFICES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Scope Office of Activities

Offices for community engagement typically oversee four core outreach activities: extension, continuing and online education, regional economic development, and community service. Several offices oversee only a narrow outreach agenda, but others manage a wider variety of outreach programs. The diagram below indicates the activities overseen by each profiled institution.

Core Outreach Activities

- **Extension** refers to the community outreach activities mandated at all land-grant institutions by the Smith-Lever Act. These activities include educational programs to assist community members in area, such as agriculture, industry, 4-H, etc. At University G, extension reports both to the office for community engagement and the department of agriculture.

- **Continuing and Online Education** refers to for-credit education programs offered at the post-secondary level. These programs can be offered on campus or online.

- **Regional Economic Development** refers to initiatives that promote economic development in the surrounding communities (see page 7 for more details).

- **Community Service and Service Learning** refer to programs that connect faculty and students with local community organizations and initiatives. These programs can help organize both volunteer and co-curricular service opportunities.

* At the University J, all extension programs are housed within the colleges, except marine extension, which falls under the purview of the office for community engagement.
III. OVERVIEW OF OFFICES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Spotlight on Regional Economic Development Activities

Regional economic development initiatives promote economic growth and stability within the surrounding communities through the services described below. (Contacts explain that several programs under the purview of community service and/or continuing online education also contribute to economic development. For example, the office for community engagement at University C collaborates with the School of Continuing Education to offer a prison education program and maintains transcripts for its students.)

### Small Business and Technology Development Centers

At several contact institutions, including University B, University E, University G, and the University J, the office for community engagement oversees a small business and technology development center (SBTDC). These centers typically charge local businesses a small fee in exchange for trainings with business experts, individual business counseling, and strategic planning support.

### Leadership Development Center

Alongside SBTDCs, several profiled institutions create centers that provide leadership development training to promote stronger community leaders in business, non-profit organizations, and government. These leadership development centers are in place at University B and University E.

### Profession-Specific Training Programs

Depending on the needs of the surrounding community and the expertise available at the university, offices for community engagement will create training programs targeted at specific vocations. For example, an institute of government at the University J provides training for government officials in governmental accounting and management. Similarly, an institute on justice and safety at University G offers professional development and vocational training for law enforcement and public safety professionals.

### State Agencies

Contacts at University B and the University J report that select state agencies fall under the purview of the office for community engagement. At University B, the office oversees an institute on water, and at the University J, the office oversees the state botanical garden.

### Research Institutes

At several profiled institutions, the office for community engagement also oversees a center focused on dedicating faculty expertise toward policy research. For example, University B’s office for community engagement oversees an institute for regional economics, which employs a faculty member and research associates who distribute state and local fiscal data and analyze the economic condition of the state. Similarly, an institute at the University J provides a forum for faculty who research and address economic issues facing the state.
IV. COORDINATION OF OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

Community engagement leaders regularly interact with both internal and external entities, including the college deans, senior university leaders, university community service hubs, community partners, and government officials.

With Colleges and Departments

Outreach and Engagement Councils

Although the office for community engagement oversees many outreach programs, contacts explain that some community engagement activities are embedded in individual colleges and departments. At several profiled institutions, the office for community engagement organizes a council composed of engagement leaders and college representatives. These councils have two main functions:

1. **Ensure Uniform Mission**: Council members carry out the mission and activities prescribed by the office for community engagement and enforce the broader engagement mission at the college level.

2. **Encourage Information Sharing**: The council serves as a forum for leaders of ongoing outreach activities within colleges; the council ensures that leaders communicate about on-going projects, the budgetary needs of colleges’ outreach efforts, and any possibility of redundancy. Additionally, through the council, community engagement leaders encourage college representatives to sponsor community outreach activities and to collaborate with the office.

The table below describes the structure and role of these councils at profiled institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Council Membership</th>
<th>Council Function</th>
<th>Meeting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>• Vice Provost for Engagement &lt;br&gt;• Contract College Deans (i.e., deans of colleges that have public responsibilities)</td>
<td>• Advisory and oversight</td>
<td>Meets every two months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E: Extension Operations Council</td>
<td>• Vice Chancellor of Engagement &lt;br&gt;• Associate Deans for Extension and Engagement &lt;br&gt;• Leaders of Outreach Units (e.g., community service director, continuing online education director) (30-40 members)</td>
<td>• Operational</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E: Faculty Committee</td>
<td>• Provost appoints 15 faculty members &lt;br&gt;• Additional volunteer faculty welcome</td>
<td>• Advisory and oversight &lt;br&gt;• Faculty award nominations</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University F</td>
<td>• Vice Provost of Engagement &lt;br&gt;• College Representatives (e.g., associate deans for outreach across all colleges) &lt;br&gt;• Leaders of Outreach Units (e.g., extension director, continuing online education director) (26 members)</td>
<td>• Advisory and oversight &lt;br&gt;• Award nominations</td>
<td>Meets quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. COORDINATION OF OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

Outreach and Engagement Councils (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Council Membership</th>
<th>Council Function</th>
<th>Meeting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University I| • Executive Director of Engagement  
• Faculty and staff volunteers (assigned to specific operational subcommittees) | • Operational  
• Award nominations | Meets monthly |
| University J| • Vice Provost of Engagement  
• College Representatives (e.g., associate deans for outreach across all colleges)  
• Leaders of Outreach Programs (e.g., community service director, continuing online education director) | • Advisory and oversight  
• Award nominations | Meets quarterly |

With Fellow Vice Provosts and Vice Presidents

Several contacts explain that some outreach programs fall under the scope of multiple student affairs or academic offices, and therefore require the office of engagement to coordinate with fellow vice presidents and vice provosts. For example, service learning initiatives may seek guidance from the office for community engagement and the office for instructional excellence. Contacts describe two strategies to facilitate coordination between vice provosts and vice presidents:

- **Vice Provosts’ Meetings**: At University F, the vice provost for engagement sits on a council with all other vice provosts to facilitate communication between the vice provosts.
- **Office Locations**: Several contacts report that the office for engagement resides in the main administration building and that the physical proximity to other core leaders allows for easy coordination between offices.

With Community Service and Service-Learning Offices

At several profiled institutions, offices for community engagement interact with community service centers through regular meetings and reporting structures; however, community service centers do not report to community engagement at all profiled institutions.

Range of Interaction

- **Collaboration**: At University C, engagement leaders meet with the public service center leaders once per quarter. The public service center functions independent of the office for community engagement.
- **Shared Leadership**: The office for service learning reports to both the vice president for engagement and the vice president for instruction at the University J.
- **Direct Oversight**: Community service programs at the University I and University D fall under the direct purview of the office for engagement.
IV. COORDINATION OF OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

With Site-Based University Outreach Programs

Extension Field Offices Share Space with Other Programs

Contacts explain that other university outreach programs share space in field offices around the state. For example, the small business development center at the University J hires field officers to work with small businesses throughout the state; these field officers are based in extension services’ field or satellite offices. Similarly, contacts at University E report that students with internships or research grants can request to use space in field offices.

With Community Partners

Contacts at most profiled institutions indicate that partnerships with community members are managed by specific outreach programs. For example, the community service center – whether under the purview of community engagement or not – builds relationships with local non-profit organizations, and the small business development center recruits local businesses to participate in programs or to contract services. However, contacts suggest that the office for community engagement can facilitate these partnerships by:

- **Advertising University Commitment to Community Development**
  
  Contacts at the University I stress that community partners are more interested in collaborating with the office for community engagement when the office’s dedication to the long-term success of the community is well advertised. This message is reinforced on the website and in face-to-face meetings with community partners.

- **Referring Community Partners to Appropriate Offices**
  
  The office for community engagement at University C serves as the public face of engagement for the university; therefore, contacts report that community partners often contact the office directly with questions about collaborating with the university. In these situations, the office of community engagement leaders refer the community partner to the appropriate office under its purview or to another office housed in a different academic or administrative unit.
IV. COORDINATION OF OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

With Government Officials

Contacts explain that the office for community engagement interacts with government bodies to raise awareness for the office and justify a need for government funding; however, only at University F do community engagement staff lobby legislators. Office for community engagement staff carry out a combination of the following roles:

1. Create Policy Documents to Lobby Government Officials for Budget Allocations

At University F, the vice provost for engagement is responsible for acquiring government funding. Vice provost creates legislative agendas and policy packages to identify emerging issues and resource needs. Vice provost presents policy packages to government officials to lobby for funding.

2. Promote University Reputation during Meetings with Government Officials

At most profiled institutions, the government relations office assumes responsibility for direct liaising with the government. However, contacts report that the office for community engagement can help raise awareness about university activities and promote the university’s reputation without directly lobbying. Contacts suggest the following strategies:

- Join Government Boards and State Trade Associations

The vice presidents for engagement at University B and University G sit on the several government boards, such as the state workforce development boards. Contacts report that these positions are primarily strategic and allow the vice president to interact regularly with government officials, boosting the image of the university’s engagement initiatives.

- Inform University Leadership of Outreach Activities

Contacts at University E and the University I emphasize the importance of informing university’s senior leaders, especially the president and provost, about engagement initiatives so that university leaders can advertise these projects to government officials. (Furthermore, contacts explain that government officials are typically highly interested in community engagement projects and are likely to increase funding engagement projects.)
V. PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS AND FACULTY

At most profiled institutions, the office for community engagement develops programs that foster collaboration among students, faculty, and community partners, thereby promoting engaged learning.

Outreach Programs for Students...

…Organized by Community Service Centers

Contacts explain that the office for community engagement targets students primarily through community service centers. Community service and service learning centers are housed under the office for community engagement at six of 10 contact institutions (see page 6). Offices for community engagement at University D and the University J prioritize student engagement with community partners through both volunteering opportunities (e.g., service trips, tutoring programs, non-profit career fairs, etc.) and engaged learning initiatives (e.g., service-learning courses).

Developing Service-Learning Courses at University D

Several profiled institutions offer service-learning opportunities, in which students earn course credit for executing specific community service projects. These activities are aligned with academic course content and require reflection through a service lens. Contacts at University D suggest the following strategies to promote service learning opportunities:

- Connect faculty with local non-profits
- Advise faculty on curriculum development and reflection assignments
- Designate courses as service-learning in the course catalog
- Host workshops to advertise service-learning courses to students
- Work with registrar to document service-learning courses on student transcripts

…Facilitated by the Office for Community Engagement

Although the majority of student programs are managed by community service centers, contacts describe two situations in which the office for community engagement directly coordinates student programs.

Collaborations with Extension Offices

At the University J, the office for community engagement oversees a project that, similar to service-learning projects, assigns faculty and students to address specific community needs through a partnership with a municipal agency or community organization. However, these projects are typically dispersed across the state and are focused on the economic development needs of counties. In order to facilitate this work, the office for community engagement works with the field extension offices, which share work space with the project’s faculty and students.

Standard Legal Policies for Student Programs

Contacts at University C explain that standardized legal policies for designing and executing student outreach programs were previously absent. Therefore, the office for community engagement has assumed the task of creating standard procedures that colleges and offices organizing student programs must follow. For example, every sponsoring college or office will be required to conduct a formal risk assessment for student programs that require travel.

Contacts at University C suggest that engagement leaders approach administrators of long-standing student programs who may be hesitant to work with the office. Specifically, contacts recommend:

- Encouraging open and frequent communication and ask for feedback
- Emphasizing potential consequences and risks associated with lack of preparation
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V. Programs for Students and Faculty

Strategies for Engaging Faculty in Community Outreach

Faculty members support outreach activities by sharing expertise with community partners, and therefore are a major constituent of offices for community engagement. Contacts describe four core programmatic approaches that provide resources for outreach, incentivize faculty participation, help to integrate outreach into curriculum, and encourage scholarship in engagement.

1. Knowledge: Centers for Engaged Learning Assist Faculty in Curriculum Development

Contacts at University D and the University J indicate that the office for community engagement prepares faculty to teach courses with a service-learning or engagement component. Similarly, at University C and University F, the offices for community engagement are developing a center dedicated to assisting faculty with engaged learning. Contacts at the University J stress that the office for community engagement aims to help faculty develop a tangible product, such as material for a new course, in order to incentive faculty to approach the office.

2. Funding: Seed Grants Support Faculty Research and Service Activities

Several contacts stress that financial incentives are important in encouraging faculty to pursue scholarship in engagement and participate in outreach activities. Contacts recommend several methods for offering funding to faculty:

- **Seed Grants**: At University E, the standing faculty committee reviews faculty applications for internal seed grants. Contacts report that 40 to 50 faculty members submit proposals each year, and, of those, 16 to 17 are chosen to receive some portion of $160,000.
- **Fellowships**: At the University J, the office for community engagement embeds tenured and tenure-track faculty in units under the vice president for community engagement. During this one-semester appointment, faculty conduct research and develop materials for their assigned unit. Participants’ department chairs are compensated for the lost faculty time.
- **Course Releases**: Contacts at the University J suggest offering course releases to faculty who participate in outreach programs.
- **Funding for Travel**: In order to encourage faculty to pursue scholarship in engagement and to participate in outreach activities across the state, the office for community engagement at the University J offers funding for travel expenses, when resources are available.

3. Recognition: Faculty Awards Elevate Reputation of Outreach Activities

Several contacts indicate that high-level recognition for achievement in community engagement motivate faculty members. Contacts describe two types of faculty awards in engagement:

- **Institutional Awards**: Provost’s Awards at the University I recognize faculty excellence in engagement work. Similarly, at University E, each college can nominate one to two faculty members to an academy that recognizes outstanding faculty of extension and engagement initiatives; of all the nominations, eight are elected to the academy.
- **National Awards**: Contacts at University E explain that the office for community engagement collects faculty nominations for the prestigious C. Peter Magrath/W.K. Kellogg Foundation Engagement Award each year.
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In addition to recognition, several profiled institutions designate faculty positions that specifically require participation in engagement opportunities.

**Tenure Requirements:** Contacts at University E suggest that a university policy adopted in 2006, which expanded tenure requirements to include scholarship of engagement, has helped encourage tenure-track faculty to work with the office for community engagement in pursuit of community-based research.

**Public Service Faculty:** At the University J, the office for community engagement oversees 500 public service faculty members who teach academic service-learning courses and organize outreach activities for students. These faculty members are typically not assigned tenure status or standard department assignments.

**Extension Faculty:** Across profiled institutions, contacts report that extension faculty work primarily out of extension offices dispersed across the state, and focus on designated extension issues, such as sharing expertise with community members in agricultural or industrial innovations.
At most profiled institutions, a high-level university administrator, such as a vice provost or vice president directs the office for community engagement. Contacts also indicate that community engagement offices maintain a fairly small central staff who works out of the leader’s office, but offices support a large number of faculty and staff across campus and in field offices.

**Developing a Leadership Position for Community Engagement**

Contacts describe three main categories of leadership titles and reporting structures; however most contacts agree that leaders of community engagement should hold a vice president or vice provost position.

**Leadership Titles and Reporting Structures at Profiled Institutions**

Across profiled institutions, the leader of the office for community engagement typically has the title of vice provost or vice president and reports to the provost or president, respectively. The following table demonstrates the titles and reporting structures at profiled institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Leader’s Title</th>
<th>Direct Office Oversight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Vice President for Outreach</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>Vice President for Engagement and Director of Extension</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>Vice Provost for Land-Grant Affairs</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>Director of the Office for Community Involvement</td>
<td>Director of Student Health (within Student Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E</td>
<td>Former Vice Chancellor of Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development</td>
<td>Chancellor (Position recently relocated to provost’s portfolio and currently under consideration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University F</td>
<td>Vice Provost for University Outreach and Engagement</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University G</td>
<td>Vice President for Outreach</td>
<td>President (Informal reporting to Provost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University H</td>
<td>Vice President for Public Affairs</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University I</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Office of Public Engagement (Also Dean of School of Pharmacy)</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University J</td>
<td>Vice President for Public Service and Outreach</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. LEADERSHIP AND STAFFING STRUCTURES

Developing a Leadership Position for Community Engagement (cont.)

Determining Direct Reporting Lines for the Office for Community Engagement

Across profiled institutions, the office for community engagement lies within the provost’s office at four institutions and within the president’s office at five institutions. Contacts indicate that vice provosts and vice presidents for community engagement value direct access to high-level university leaders but report no added value of one reporting structure over the other. Contacts at University G suggest community engagement leaders report to both the president and provost to gain perspective on both external community and internal academic needs.

Advisory Boards Provide Additional Guidance to Office for Community Engagement

Advisory councils serve as an additional source of guidance for the vice provosts and vice presidents of engagement. Contacts describe two categories of advisory councils.

- **President’s and Provost’s Council:** At University F, contacts report that the vice provost for engagement sits on the provost’s council, thereby affording him insight into the global mission of the university.
- **Community Boards:** Contacts at University G explain that an advisory board provides additional oversight and information about community needs. The advisory board is composed of 35 community members, local business owners, and non-profit leaders and provides guidance on issues such as budget allocations.

Academic and Engagement Experience Desired in Leaders

Across profiled institutions, contacts report that the leader for community engagement should possess the following core qualities and experiences:

- **Academic Experience:** Contacts maintain that knowledge of the institution’s mission and structure are important criteria for a director of outreach and engagement initiatives. Leaders with academic backgrounds also reinforce the connection between community engagement and scholarship.
- **Dedication to Community Engagement:** Contacts explain that an ideal candidate possesses a demonstrated interest in engagement initiatives and an ability to connect with community partners.
- **Understanding of State’s Economic Needs:** In order to direct the university toward addressing community needs across industries, leaders must be sensitive to the key issues facing the state.

Professional Development Resources for Community Engagement Leaders

Several contacts recommend sending community engagement leaders to the Engagement Academy for University Leaders organized by Virginia Tech University. The program is designed to assist university leaders in developing institutional plans for community engagement and includes training sessions on topics such as engaging faculty and students and fundraising for engagement. Contacts report that the training program costs individuals approximately $4,000.

VI. LEADERSHIP AND STAFFING STRUCTURES

Staffing Structures and Role at Profiled Institutions

Because offices for community engagement coordinate multiple outreach programs both on and off campus, contacts describe two sets of staff that must be accounted for, namely (1) core staff within the office for community engagement and (2) support faculty and staff for all outreach programs. The diagram below represents the staffing roles and staff sizes at University F, but is comparable to staffing structures at University B, University G, University E, and the University J as well.

**Staffing Roles and Sizes at University F**

- Vice Provost for Engagement (1)
- Administrative Staff (3)
- On-Campus Support Staff for Continuing and Online Education (40)
- Associate Vice Provosts for Extension and Continuing Online Education (2)
- On-Campus Support for Extension (15)
- Off-Campus Faculty and Staff for Extension (500)

Small Staff Structures at University C and the University I

Contacts at University C and the University I explain that the staff sizes of their offices for community engagement are relatively small.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Staff Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University C    | ● Vice Provost  
|                 | ● Assistant  
|                 | ● Staff member for website and database            |
| University I    | ● Executive Director  
|                 | ● Part-time student assistant                      |

Location of Office for Community Relations

At University B, University C, University F, University E, and University G, the office for community relations is housed in the main administration building. On the other hand, at University D, contacts report that the office for community engagement is located farther away from central campus buildings. Similarly, the office for community engagement at the University J is located on the outer edge of campus, close to the office’s continuing and online education convention center and hotel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Housed in Main</td>
<td>Office Farther Away from Central Campus:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Building:</td>
<td>● Close to community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Close to president and</td>
<td>● Close to community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provost</td>
<td>● Close to outreach program offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Close to fellow vice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provosts and vice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Close to faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VII. **Budgets and Funding Sources**

Office budgets at profiled institutions range from less than $1 million to $120 million, and contacts report that offices receive funding from several different sources, including government allocations, revenue from online education and training programs, and private gifts.

**Overview of Office Budgets across Profiled Institutions**

Contacts report two different scales for office budgets: at four profiled institutions, the office budget exceeds $1 million, whereas at three profiled institutions, the office budget is less than $1 million. The bar charts below illustrate the office budgets at seven profiled institutions. Office budgets were not available for University A, University D, and University H.

Below $1 Million
Contacts explain this smaller budget covers:
- Salaries for office staff (approximately 2 to 10 people)
- Operating expenses for one to two outreach programs
- Travel funds

Above $1 Million
Contacts explain that the budget pays for:
- Salaries for all program staff (for approximately 500 people)
- Operating expenses for five or more outreach programs
VII. BUDGETS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Overview of Funding Sources

Funding sources often align with the services and programs offered under the office for community engagement. For example, if an office oversees continuing and online education, the office will collect revenue from that program. The chart below indicates what funding sources offices rely on at select profiled institutions. Funding information for offices at University A, University D, and University H were unavailable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>President’s Office</th>
<th>Direct Government Funding</th>
<th>Continuing and Online Education Fees</th>
<th>Service Fees</th>
<th>Grants and Contracts</th>
<th>Private Donations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University G</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University J</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Funding Sources

Contacts describe specific sub-categories of funding that support specific office functions.

*President’s Office at University C ➔ All Community Engagement Activities*

Contacts at three profiled institutions report that the office for community engagement receives funding directly from the university president’s office. Because the majority of land-grant institutions are public, these funds typically originate with the state; however University C is partially funded by private endowments. Therefore, all funding for the office for community engagement is provided by private funds, through the president’s office, while funding for extension services, which lie outside of the office’s purview, is provided by the federal government.
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Description of Funding Sources (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Government Funding</th>
<th>Extension and Economic Development Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Government funding includes budget allocations made at the federal, state, and local levels for two distinct purposes: extension and regional economic development programs.

- **Extension**: In those offices for community engagement that oversee extension, such as the offices at University B, University E, University F, and University G, funding from the federal government through the *Smith-Lever Act* is funneled through the office to support extension services. Additionally, contacts report that the *Smith-Lever Act* requires the state to match federal funding, and in many cases, county governments will also allocate a portion of their budget towards the extension office that serves their county.

- **Regional Economic Development**: Contacts at University E explain that the office receives funding from the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) to direct regional economic development activities, such as the *NC Small Business and Technology Development Center*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuing and Online Education Fees</th>
<th>Distance Education and General Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Continuing and Online Education programs that are managed through the office for community engagement bring the bulk of funding to offices at institutions with this structure. At University B, the revenue from the online education program funds multiple programs within the office for community engagement, and contacts report that the rapid growth of the industry may lead the office to rely solely on funds from online education. Similarly, contacts at University G explain that the online education industry is growing at a rate of 25 percent per year. The office for community engagement feeds this funding back into the university and shares $25 million of revenue from online education programs with the college deans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Fees</th>
<th>Economic Development and Training Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In addition to online education programs, many offices for community engagement collect revenue from the service fees associated with regional economic development programs. For example, at the University J, an institute of government offers training and development programs for government officials for a fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants and Contracts</th>
<th>Designated Community Engagement Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Several profiled institutions report that the office for community engagement receives funding through grants and contracts awarded by public and private organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Donations</th>
<th>Various Programs at Director’s Discretion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Contacts at University G and University E explain that the office for community engagement receives a small portion of funding from private donations; these funds can be used at the discretion of the office for community engagement. At University G, the office maintains a staff member responsible for office development and fundraising, who is charged with a goal of raising $6 million per year. Contacts at University E suggest that community engagement leaders attend the *Engagement Academy* offered by Virginia Tech University, as they offer training in engagement fundraising.
The Advisory Board has worked to ensure the accuracy of the information it provides to its members. This project relies on data obtained from many sources, however, and The Advisory Board cannot guarantee the accuracy of the information or its analysis in all cases. Further, The Advisory Board is not engaged in rendering clinical, legal, accounting, or other professional services. Its projects should not be construed as professional advice on any particular set of facts or circumstances. Members are advised to consult with their staff and senior management, or other appropriate professionals, prior to implementing any changes based on this project. Neither The Advisory Board Company nor its programs are responsible for any claims or losses that may arise from any errors or omissions in their projects, whether caused by the Advisory Board Company or its sources.
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