

**Engagement  
Subcommittee of the  
University Committee on  
Academic Planning and  
Priorities**

**Report to the Provost**

**March 15, 2007**

**Executive Summary**  
**Engagement Subcommittee of the University Committee on Academic**  
**Planning and Priorities**  
**Report to the Provost**  
**March 15, 2007**

## **Current Standards**

The Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Documentation Framework constitutes the current national engagement standard against which postsecondary schools are measured. This standard can be expected to evolve over time, but at this point, it is the appropriate measure. It was developed in consultation with national engagement leaders, themselves affiliated with the organizations responsible for earlier definitions - The Kellogg Foundation, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities, and others.

## **Recommendations**

### *Documenting Curricular Engagement and Student Engagement Activity*

This committee recommends that:

- The Registrar:
  - Designate an electronic marker for course sections that include service-learning components,
  - Designate a separate electronic marker for course sections that include other community-based learning experiences, and
  - Direct academic department course schedulers to use these markers to designate course sections that include service-learning components and those that include other community-based learning experiences in the electronic semester course schedules they submit.
- Student Affairs establish criteria for UK co-curricular (or extra-curricular) transcripts that credit student engagement activity achieving an appropriate level, and coordinate with the Registrar to make these co-curricular transcripts available to students.
- The Experiential Education and Career Services Center Service-Learning Initiatives Council make available its expertise regarding local and international student engagement via consultative services to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Director of International Affairs.

## *Organizational Structure*

- The committee recommends that the title of the Associate Vice President for University Engagement be changed to Associate Provost for University Engagement or remain Associate Vice President for University Engagement with reporting *directly* to the Provost. This position needs visibility and sufficient access to the Provost and academic deans to advance the University's engagement agenda campus-wide.

## *Faculty Rewards and Incentives*

- It is not the recommendation of this subcommittee that engagement activities be universally adopted by every faculty member. Recognizing the diversity of work at public research-extensive institutions, the committee suggests that a more reasonable goal is campus-wide integration of engagement activities that pervade every department, but at varying degrees.
- Therefore, this committee recommends the establishment of a university-wide task force made up of representatives from each college (the dean or dean's designee) to consider the role that outreach and engagement activities will play in evaluation, promotion, and tenure, in a manner sensitive to title series, college, department, and academic discipline. The Engagement Subcommittee of the UCAPP can serve as consultants to this task force and function as a liaison to the UCAPP.
- The committee suggests that the abovementioned task force review the policies established by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. These guidelines serve to encourage formal institutional recognition and reward for all faculty realizing the expectations related to community engagement.
- There will be costs associated with faculty development and reward for community engagement that may create a financial burden within some units. These resource issues should also be addressed by the task force and subsequently considered by the Provost office.

## *Communication and Increased Visibility*

- Communicate the University's emphasis on engagement through the nomenclature of the University and clearly articulate it in the mission and vision statements of the institution. According to the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, “**teaching, research, and service** have characterized the past mission of public universities . . . . the growing democratization of higher education, the greater capacity of today’s students to shape and guide their own learning, and the burgeoning demands of the modern world require us to instead think of **learning, discovery, and engagement**” ([www.nasulg.org](http://www.nasulg.org)).

- Bring expert national engagement speakers to campus regularly to educate faculty, professional staff, administrators, and Board of Trustee members on engagement practice and scholarship. More expansively, Faculty Engagement Academies are operating successfully at locations across the country. These academies use a “train the trainer” approach and build successful models of engagement well suited to their home institutions. UK should follow this model with an on-campus Faculty Engagement Academy.
- Continue sponsoring the Kentucky Engagement Conference annually to educate university employees and enhance UK visibility in the state and nationally for its engagement leadership. A more expansive goal is future co-sponsorship of the national engagement conference.
- Schedule regular visits by President Todd and other campus leaders to Kentucky communities to listen to their needs and generate potential collaborations. Such visits will be continuations of the President’s 2005 Dream Tour with only minor variations. Augment these leadership visits by focus group sessions designed to engage Kentucky’s major constituencies. These forums should solicit community responses to current UK outreach and engagement activities and recommendations on priority community needs.
- Continue funding the Commonwealth Collaboratives on an ongoing basis to maintain and increase on-campus and statewide visibility for the University’s engagement activities and to address issues raised during focus groups or Dream Tour visits.
- Provide some continuing funding for on-campus and in-community recognitions of significant UK community engagement partners.
- Fund a UK Engagement publication to appear twice a year. One issue should include UK leadership statements on engagement and features on individual researchers, partners, projects, and their impacts. The other issue should provide an annual report on UK engagement activity based on data generated by the UK Engagement Instrument.
- Routinely promote UK engagement activities and efforts on the UK home web page.
- Create a UK honorary designation, “Public Scholar” for UK researchers whose work, undertaken in collaboration with the community, produces very significant positive effects for the community over an extended time period. The title could be purely honorary or could carry a financial stipend with it for up to a few years. Consider a parallel recognition for community members whose extended partnership with UK produces very significant outcomes and impacts.
- Develop a university-level community advisory council whose sense of strategic direction for UK-community engagement and whose perceptions of UK engagement are sought regularly.

### *Enhancing Current Engagement Opportunities*

- Establish a seed fund for non-recurring support of start-up costs for inter-college UK community engagement initiatives by on-campus faculty through the Kentucky Cooperative Extension System. A revolving fund of \$100,000 will provide support for two to four such initiatives annually.

### *Assessment Strategy*

- Adopt the UK Engagement Measurement Instrument as the UK standard for identifying, measuring, and evaluating campus engagement activity.

### *Future Work of the Committee*

- Future initiatives aimed at increasing the level of engagement to the point that it permeates all disciplines and reaches the institution's academic core will require a strong mandate from University leadership. Such a charge should identify the Engagement Subcommittee's roles and parameters and provide support for the future work of the subcommittee in increasing the level of engagement at UK.
- Develop and maintain a student voice and role in planning for and directing UK engagement at the university-level and in its colleges and units through appointment of a student representative to the Engagement Subcommittee of the UCAPP.

**Engagement Subcommittee of the University Committee on Academic  
Planning and Priorities  
Report to the Provost  
March 15, 2007**

The Kentucky General Assembly, in its passage of the landmark Postsecondary Education Improvement Act, mandates that the University of Kentucky become one of the nation's top 20 public research universities by the year 2020. The true measure of the University's commitment to meeting this challenge is ensuring that its practices and policies sincerely and consistently advance University progress toward that goal. In response, President Lee Todd, in consultation with key advisors, drafted the Top 20 Business Plan that clearly articulates what UK must do to achieve this mandate. As reflected in this document, community engagement is the parallel activity that underscores all other specified outcomes. Indeed, the Top 20 Business Plan states that "for UK to defend a claim that it has indeed become a Top 20 public research university . . . it must demonstrate exceptional quality and productivity in undergraduate education, graduate education, faculty recognition, and research productivity, while improving the quality of life for Kentuckians." Furthermore, Goal V of the University Strategic Plan states that the University shall "Engage Kentuckians through Partnerships to Elevate Quality of Life." To this end, related objectives specify that:

1. The University will encourage greater engagement with outside communities.
2. The University will define research and scholarship more broadly to include work that engages the communities it serves.
3. The University will increase learning opportunities for its students by involving them in its engagement efforts.

Based on the charge put forward by Provost Subbaswamy on October 4, 2006, the Engagement Domain Subcommittee of the University Committee for Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP) was charged with the responsibility for evaluating and recommending university-wide needs, policies, and priorities related to three primary domains of activities: 1) successful attainment of the Carnegie Foundation designation as a "community-engaged institution; 2) increasing the level of engagement activities at UK commensurate with the abovementioned Top 20 Business Plan goals and objectives; and 3) ongoing monitoring of annual progress toward meeting strategic plan goals and objectives and advising the UCAPP and the Provost's office on revisions necessary to ensure success in meeting the Top 20 goals. This report addresses the first two domains of activities set forth in this charge.

The Engagement Domain Subcommittee of the UCAPP was established by President Lee Todd on February 24, 2006. The committee first convened on May 1, 2006 under the leadership of Larry Turner, Ph.D. and John Yopp, Ph.D. (Co-chairs). Following the unexpected death of Dr. Turner in August, 2006, Ginny

Sprang, Ph.D. assumed the role of Committee Co-Chair. The Engagement Domain Subcommittee consists of members selected from colleges and units across the University and a community representative. Specifically, the committee roster includes:

Ginny Sprang, Chair, College of Social Work  
John Yopp, Co-Chair, Associate Provost for Educational Partnerships  
Emery Wilson, College of Medicine  
Linda Jourdine Alexander, College of Public Health  
Steve Bullard, Department of Forestry  
David Bettez, International Affairs  
Sharon Stewart, College of Health Sciences  
Phil Greasley, Associate Vice President for University Engagement  
Dick Domek, School of Music  
Lynn Hall, College of Nursing  
M. Scott Smith, College of Agriculture  
Daryl Smith, Community Representative  
Victor Hazard, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

### *Community Engagement Defined*

A primary step in considering the meaning of community engagement is to understand that, fundamentally, it is a dynamic concept marked by an expanding set of transactions between the community and the academy. Although academic-community partnerships are a long-standing tradition in land-grant institutions like UK, the understanding of roles, responsibilities, and rewards continues to evolve. With that in mind, a consideration of current definitions used in conversations about engagement is necessary to assist administrators, faculty, and staff in the development of appropriate engagement strategies.

*Community Engagement* describes 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. According to the Carnegie Foundation, two primary classifications of community engagement are considered in its evaluation of academic institutions.

- “Curricular Engagement describes the teaching, learning and scholarship which engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.”
- “Outreach & Partnerships describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. . . . [Outreach] focuses on

the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. . . . [Partnership] focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.)."

(Carnegie Foundation, 2005)

*Scholarship of engagement*- Ernest Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (1990), a seminal document in the development of the engagement movement, describes the four scholarships of the professoriate: discovery, integration, dissemination, and application of new knowledge in collaboration with community partners. The scholarship of engagement involves faculty development and dissemination of a product that has the following characteristics: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique, rigor, and peer-review.

*Service-learning* incorporates a community-based, public problem-solving approach to teaching and learning. It is a philosophy and method of education involving application of theory or principles to public and civic life and has three goals: 1) to transform students by increasing civic awareness and reflecting upon the application of knowledge in the service of communities; 2) to transform theory or principle by testing its practical application; and 3) to transform the community by responding to issues that result in gains or make a difference.

In response to the Provost's specific queries outlined below in his charge to the committee, the Engagement Domain Subcommittee offers the following responses.

**Charge #1. Conduct an environmental scan of the national associations currently developing definitions, criteria, and benchmarks that pertain to the emerging concepts of an “engaged university” and the “scholarship of engagement.”**

Several evolving definitions of engagement, criteria, and benchmarks exist. Many of these are available online at the UK University Engagement webpage:  
<http://www.uky.edu/ue/EngagementPolicy.html>.

*The Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Documentation Framework* constitutes the current national engagement standard against which postsecondary schools are measured. This standard can be expected to evolve over time, but at this point, it is the appropriate measure (See Appendix 1). It was developed in consultation with national engagement leaders, themselves

affiliated with the organizations responsible for earlier definitions—The Kellogg Foundation, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities, and others.

Other sources for updating information on the engaged university and the scholarship of engagement include these:

*HENCE, the Higher Education Network for Community Engagement*, is a virtual network of members collaborating and contributing to work groups developing concepts of engagement and its scholarship. HENCE grew out of discussion at the early 2006 Johnson Foundation Wingspread Conference: Engagement in Higher Education. UK Associate Vice President for University Engagement Phil Greasley is a member of the HENCE network.

*The Clearinghouse on the Scholarship of Engagement*, co-directed by Amy Driscoll and Lorilee Sandmann, reviews and evaluates “the scholarship of engagement of faculty . . . preparing for annual review, promotion, and tenure. The board is composed of individuals representing varied institutions of higher education and a wide range of disciplines.” Clearinghouse board members “have been leaders in the institutionalization of community engagement, service learning, and professional service” (<http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/index.html>).

*The annual Outreach Scholarship conference*, held in early October each year, is the main national forum at which advances in engagement are brought forward. Four schools currently co-sponsor the annual conference: Penn State University, the Ohio State University, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Georgia.

*The Kentucky Engagement Conference* held its first annual meeting at the Radisson Plaza Hotel in Lexington on Wednesday, November 29, 2006. National and state engagement leaders presented at the event sponsored and hosted by UK and co-sponsored by all Kentucky public higher educational institutions, Campus Compact, Cooperative Extension, the Council on Postsecondary Education, and Secretary of State Trey Grayson.

*The National Center for the Study of University Engagement* is emerging at Michigan State University. Phil Greasley attended the first organizational meeting in October 2005. The National Center developed from an engagement benchmark-setting conference Michigan State University hosted for the Carnegie Foundation in May 2006. Paul Warner and Phil Greasley attended the May 2006 conference.

*Community-Campus Partnerships for Health* “is a nonprofit organization that promotes health (broadly defined) through partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions. Founded in 1996, . . . [C-CPH is] a growing network of over 1,300 communities and campuses across North America and increasingly the world that are collaborating to promote health through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions and other partnership strategies. These partnerships are powerful tools for improving higher education, civic engagement and the overall health of communities” (<http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/index.html>).

*Imagining America* is a consortium of seventy colleges and universities, currently based at the University of Michigan. It began in 1999 as a partner of the White House Millennium Council. Its organizational mission is to strengthen the public role and democratic purposes of the humanities, arts, and design. In order to fulfill this mission, the organization supports publicly-engaged academic work in the cultural disciplines and the structural changes in higher education that such work requires. Prominent member institutions include: Boston College, Columbia University, Dartmouth College, Duke University, Emory University, Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis, Michigan State University, New York University, the Ohio State University, Rutgers University, Stanford University, the University of California-Los Angeles, the University of Michigan, and the University of Southern California.

Journals are emerging in the field of engagement. Chief among them is the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, formerly the *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*. This journal is published jointly by the Institute of Higher Education and the Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach at the University of Georgia.

Institutional engagement publications are published regularly by most postsecondary institutions heavily committed to engagement. These magazine-like publications report and bring community and campus attention to their engagement activities. Michigan State University’s *The Engaged Scholar*, Northern Kentucky University’s *Engaging with Our Region* and its *Outreach and Public Engagement Annual Report*, Penn State University’s *Outreach*, the University of Georgia’s *Outreach*, and Virginia Tech’s *Outreach NOW*, offer strong models for campus engagement publications. Comparable format UK “magazines” are *Odyssey*, Agriculture’s *The Magazine*, and *Kentucky Alumni*.

**Charge #2. Review the planning and implementation processes employed by UK benchmark universities in achieving “engaged university” status and recommend strategies for UK to use to accomplish this goal.**

The national leaders in engagement among UK’s benchmark schools are Michigan State University, Ohio State University, Penn State University, Purdue University, the University of Georgia, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

More locally, Northern Kentucky University has emerged as a leader in engagement based on the background and interest of its President, James Votruba, who has a long history of involvement in national engagement commissions and committees.

Institutions that are national engagement leaders have developed a strong “campus culture” and expectations that value engagement activity, impact, and scholarship. To the extent that UK wishes to follow these leaders, it will need to credit engagement-based scholarship when rewarding, tenuring, and promoting faculty. More broadly, recognition and reward must be accorded to individuals and units performing the highest impact community engagement.

Sixty-two institutions received both the Carnegie Foundation’s “Curricular Engagement” and “Outreach & Partnership” classifications. Prominent institutions among these include: Bryn Mawr College, Emory University, Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis, Michigan State University, and New York University.

The University of Kentucky was one of nine institutions receiving the “Outreach & Partnership” designation. Other schools on this list include California State University-Chico, Kent State University, Oklahoma State University, Rockford College, Rutgers University-Newark, the University of Cincinnati, the University of North Dakota, and the University of South Florida.

The committee believes that to achieve the Carnegie Foundation designation in Curricular Engagement, UK efforts should center first on cataloging current UK engagement activities as they relate to student learning. Increased tracking of service-learning and other community-based learning activities is a pre-condition for UK to receive the Curricular Engagement designation. To this end, it is the recommendation of this committee that the Registrar:

- Designate an electronic marker for course sections that include service-learning components,
- Designate a separate electronic marker for course sections that include other community-based learning experiences, and
- Direct academic department course schedulers to use these markers to designate course sections that include service-learning components and those that include other community-based learning experiences in the electronic semester course schedules they submit.

Information provided to this committee by University Engagement indicates that these electronic markers are within the capability of the new “Campus Management” system. Once Campus Management begins electronically designating course sections with service-learning and other community-based learning experiences, one year’s enrollment data will be needed to document UK levels of student engagement for the Carnegie Foundation.

- The committee also recommends that Student Affairs establish criteria for UK co-curricular (or extra-curricular) transcripts that credit student engagement activity achieving an appropriate level, and work with the Registrar to make these co-curricular transcripts available to students.

These documentation activities will complement ongoing efforts to revise the University Studies Program, particularly with focus on Essential Learning Outcomes associated with “Individual and Social Responsibilities” and “Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global.” Such action will advance the integration of community engagement into the curriculum and the development of learning outcomes for those experiences.

Another possible avenue for advancing and documenting curricular engagement is the Service-Learning Initiatives Council.

- The Council, comprised of faculty and administrators who discuss programmatic and research aspects of UK’s numerous service-learning projects and their incorporation into the curriculum, is a valuable resource to the University on issues related to curricular engagement. The Council’s expertise makes it an appropriate consultant to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Vice President of Student Affairs, and the Director of International Affairs on issues related to enhancing local and international student engagement.

**Charge #3. Review the recent survey of current activities within the colleges that was used in the response to the Carnegie Foundation’s questionnaire for extent of engagement at UK and recommend ways to enhance engagement.**

A wealth of highly-developed and well-respected community engagement programs exists at the University. UK’s application to the Carnegie Foundation was limited to listing twenty such partnerships. On that basis, a handful of programs were highlighted including African-American Dementia Outreach Partnership (AADOP) at the Center on Aging, Marty Driesler 5th District Cancer Project in the College of Medicine, Pharmacist CARE program in the College of Pharmacy, the Kentucky New Economy Engineering Development (KNEED) Program in the College of Engineering, the Tobacco Policy Research Program in the College of Nursing, the Appalachian Math and Science Partnerships in the College of Arts & Sciences, the Coal Ash Remediation and Commercial Usage at the Center for Applied Energy Research, and the Central Kentucky Japanese School and Japanese Programs Kindergarten through the Office of University Engagement, to name just a few. Many additional significant college and unit-based programs exist at UK. Among these are those housed at the Center for Research on Violence Against Women, the Comprehensive Assessment and Training Services (CATS) project (College of Social Work and Department of

Psychiatry), and the College of Medicine's Office for Health Research and Development. Cooperative Extension itself is a source of many more partnerships important to the Commonwealth.

### *Enhancing Current Engagement Opportunities*

The statewide Kentucky Cooperative Extension System operated by UK and administered through the College of Agriculture, provides substantial opportunity to expand engagement in all regions of the Commonwealth. During the last five years Extension has developed partnerships with several UK colleges. The unique Fine Arts extension program in Pike County has drawn national attention; effective programs with Social Work, Engineering, Public Health, and others are also well underway and establishing a record of impact. The Committee feels that a cost-effective means of enhancing community engagement is to build upon these promising practices. For example, Cooperative Extension provides the infrastructure and networking connections in all 120 counties to build community-based research and education programs, and this capacity has only begun to be tapped by UK faculty outside of the College of Agriculture. To this end, the committee recommends that the University

- Establish a seed fund for non-recurring support of start-up costs for inter-college UK community engagement initiatives by on-campus faculty through the Kentucky Cooperative Extension System. A revolving fund of \$100,000 would provide support for 2-4 such initiatives annually.

Other recommendations are described in responses to Charge #2, 5, and 6.

### **Charge #4. Develop an assessment strategy to inventory [UK's] U.S. and international engagement activities and provide information on outcomes and impacts and recommend a plan.**

UK has an assessment instrument, the UK Engagement Measurement Instrument (UK EMI), used and adapted by permission of the national leader, Michigan State University. This instrument captures engagement activity and records location in Kentucky, across the United States, and by nation worldwide.

Typical time to complete the survey by faculty in the colleges piloting the UK EMI in 2006 was about 30 minutes. The great majority of UK EMI survey instrument responses are check boxes for rapid response; a few questions ask for brief free responses; four questions ask for longer responses—defining the problem, identifying the action taken, describing the results achieved or expected, and presenting the impact on teaching and scholarship.

The UK Engagement Measurement Instrument is a sophisticated data gathering and retrieval instrument. It is capable of providing custom reports that sort by emphasis desired. For example, reports can focus on the 1) researcher, 2)

department, 3) college, 4) area of social concern addressed, 5) mode of engagement , 6) specific problem addressed, 7) action taken, 8) geographic location, 9) external partners, 10) actual or intended outcomes and impacts, 11) number of people impacted, 12) evaluations done, 13) impact on scholarly or teaching practices, and 14) scholarly work emerging from the project.

- The committee recommends the Engagement Measurement Instrument be adopted as the UK standard for identifying, measuring, and evaluating campus engagement activity. The engagement instrument is ambitious for UK, but it provides a high standard by which outreach and engagement activity can be identified, measured, and evaluated annually. A lesser standard would leave many of the most important questions unasked and unanswered. The instrument also has additional positive potential for UK Public Relations and Development as well as for oversight and prioritization within UK's outreach and engagement mission. While the information in the instrument is self-reported, it is an official university document that is to be taken seriously. It also offers the potential for use in preliminarily documenting individual or unit engagement for annual review, promotion, and tenure if desired by the department, college, and University.

**Charge #5. Recommend changes in organizational structure, administrative processes and reward and incentive policies needed to assist in the goal of becoming an engaged university.**

*Organizational Structure and Visibility*- The committee feels that the issues of organizational structure and visibility are crucial to the success of any engagement efforts, and

- Recommends that the title of the Associate Vice President for University Engagement be changed to Associate Provost for University Engagement or that the title be kept as is but with the position reporting directly to the Provost. This position needs visibility and sufficient access to the Provost and academic deans to advance the engagement agenda campus-wide. A first task of the Associate Provost or Associate Vice President for University Engagement should be to draft a business plan that can be used for budget allocation. The recent document entitled *Status Report on University Engagement Projects and Projected Future Initiatives* (dated 1-12-07, available through University Engagement) provides cost data that can be used for budgeting purposes.

*Faculty incentives and rewards*- The *Top 20 Business Plan* clearly articulates the challenge to the University of Kentucky "... to become a Top 20 public research university . . . while elevating the quality of life for Kentuckians" (5). To this end, UK must operationalize and institutionalize outreach, engagement, and the scholarship of engagement in such a way that it is infused into the social milieu of

academic culture. The many disciplinary and professional ideas, habits, and assumptions about professional identity, roles, and responsibility that co-exist at UK make this a rich and innovative academic culture, yet they inherently limit institution-wide implementation of any engagement initiative. The ability of the faculty to effectively engage in the public dimensions of their work through teaching, research, and service is dependent upon a shift in the academic culture in a manner that will facilitate and reward engagement efforts across diverse academic subcultures.

- It is not the recommendation of this subcommittee that engagement activities be universally adopted by every faculty member. Recognizing the diversity of work at public research-extensive institutions, the committee suggests that a more reasonable goal is campus-wide integration of engagement activities that pervade every department, but at varying degrees.

Much of what is important to the University happens within and among the colleges. Teaching, research, and outreach and engagement--locally, regionally and nationally--originate from the faculty, students, and staff of the colleges.

- Therefore, this committee recommends the establishment of a university-wide task force made up of representatives from each college (the dean or dean's designee) to consider the role that outreach and engagement activities will play in evaluation, promotion, and tenure, in a manner that is sensitive to title series, college, department, and academic discipline. Effective systems must achieve consistencies in policies that affect all constituents across the University. However, this consistency must not come at the expense of the primary functions of the colleges and departments. Assessment and evaluation of engagement activities must be integrated, documented, and rewarded in the evaluation of faculty merit and program performance reviews university-wide, with some variation at the departmental or college level. The Engagement Subcommittee of the UCAPP can serve as consultants to the task force and as a liaison to the UCAPP.
- A successful reward system should specify policies and procedures to guide compensation for merit, promotion, and tenure to individuals who significantly enhance the engagement mission of the University in a manner commensurate with research and teaching expectations. The committee suggests that the abovementioned task force review the policies established by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. These guidelines encourage formal institutional recognition and reward for all faculty realizing the expectations related to community engagement.
- There will be costs associated with faculty development and reward in the area of community engagement that may create a financial burden within

some units. These resource issues should also be addressed by the task force and subsequently considered by the Provost's office.

## **Additional Recommendations Related to the Goal of Enhancing Community Engagement**

### *Communication Issues and Increased Visibility for Engagement Efforts*

The committee feels the need for a concerted effort to communicate to UK faculty, staff, and students a clear definition of engagement and how engagement activities relate to teaching, research, and student service learning campus-wide. This communication is particularly relevant to the task assigned to the deans by the Provost to address Goal V of the Strategic Plan by March 2007. Additionally, the bi-directional intent of engagement efforts should not be overlooked. The committee recognizes the importance of the community voice in the development of engaged scholarship, service, and teaching and the need to formalize the role of community partners in the University's engagement efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends that the University:

- Communicate institutional emphasis on engagement through the nomenclature of the University and clearly articulate it in the mission and vision statements of the institution. According to the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities", **teaching, research, and service** have characterized the past mission of public universities . . . . the growing democratization of higher education, the greater capacity of today's students to shape and guide their own learning, and the burgeoning demands of the modern world require us to instead think of **learning, discovery, and engagement**" ([www.nasulg.org](http://www.nasulg.org)).
- Bring expert national engagement speakers to campus regularly to educate faculty, professional staff, administrators, and Board of Trustee members on engagement practice and scholarship. More expansively, Faculty Engagement Academies are operating successfully at locations across the country. These academies use a "train the trainer" approach and build successful models of engagement well suited to their home institutions. UK should follow this model with an on-campus Faculty Engagement Academy.
- Continue sponsorship of the Kentucky Engagement Conference annually to educate University employees and enhance UK visibility in the state and nationally for its engagement leadership. A more expansive goal is future co-sponsorship of the national engagement conference.
- Schedule regular visits by President Todd and other campus leaders to Kentucky communities to listen to their needs and generate potential collaborations. Such visits will be continuations of the President's 2005 Dream Tour with only minor variations. Augment these leadership visits by focus group sessions designed to engage Kentucky's major constituencies. These forums should solicit community responses to

- current UK outreach and engagement activities and recommendations on community priority needs.
- Provide ongoing funding of the Commonwealth Collaboratives to maintain and increase on-campus and statewide visibility for the University's engagement activities and to address issues raised during focus groups or Dream Tour visits.
  - Provide some funding for on-campus and in-community recognitions of significant UK community engagement partners.
  - Fund a UK Engagement publication to appear twice a year. One issue annually should present UK leadership statements on engagement and features on individual researchers, partners, projects, and their impacts. The other issue should be an annual report on UK engagement activity based on data generated by the UK Engagement Instrument.
  - Routinely promote UK engagement activities and efforts on the UK home web page.
  - Develop a university-level community advisory council, whose sense of strategic direction for UK-community engagement and whose perceptions of UK engagement are sought regularly.
  - Create a UK honorary designation, "Public Scholar" for UK researchers whose work, undertaken in collaboration with the community, produces very significant positive effects for the community over an extended time period. The title could be purely honorary or could carry a financial stipend with it for a period up to a few years. Consider a parallel recognition for community members whose partnership with UK produces very significant outcomes and impacts. (See sample Public Scholar and Community Scholar designations as drafted at IUPUI in Appendix 2).

**Charge #6. Evaluate the capability and capacity of human and financial resources to increase the level of engagement activities at UK in order to accomplish the related goals in the UK Top 20 Business Plan.**

Barriers to building upon current engagement opportunities at the college and unit level include: sufficient staff and operating expense resources to initiate engagement programs beyond the campus, appropriate measures to assess and reward such efforts, and systems to enhance mutual understanding and communication between on-campus faculty and University-based engagement program staff working in the community. Standardized metrics for the documentation and benchmarking of activities and impact are also limited. Efforts are underway, on this campus and nationally, to advance Cooperative Extension assessment methods. This effort will be of substantial value in integrating Extension and other engagement activities into "Top 20" and Business Plan plans and metrics.

In evaluating the capability and capacity of human and financial resources to increase the level of engagement activities at UK, the Committee feels the priority is to solidify the functional ability of the Office of University Engagement

to carry out the activities proposed in this report. To this end, an analysis of the capability and capacity of human and financial resources required to carry out these tasks is provided in Appendix 3.

As noted in the committee's response to Charge #5, a recommendation is being put forth regarding the creation of a task force representing every college on campus to address issues of faculty development, rewards and incentives, and evaluation for community engagement efforts. This task force should identify resource needs and barriers that must be addressed.

#### *Future Work of the Committee*

While the goal of becoming a Carnegie Foundation designated "community engaged" university appears attainable with the changes suggested in the committee's response to Charge #2, there is significant work to be done to satisfy the Top 20 Business Plan challenge to become a University that elevates the quality of life for citizens across the Commonwealth. To this end, the Engagement Domain Subcommittee looks forward to the task of ongoing monitoring of annual progress toward meeting strategic plan goals and objectives and its role in advising the UCAPP and Provost's office on revisions necessary to ensure success in meeting the Top 20 goals.

- Future initiatives aimed at increasing the level of engagement to the point that it permeates all disciplines and reaches the institution's academic core will require a strong mandate from University leadership. Such a charge should identify the Engagement Subcommittee's roles and parameters and provide support for the future work of the subcommittee in increasing the level of engagement at UK.
- Develop and maintain a student voice and role in planning for and directing UK engagement at the university-level and in its colleges and units through appointment of a student representative on the Engagement Subcommittee of the UCAPP.

## **Appendix 1**

# **Draft of Documentation Framework for Elective Classification Community Engagement**

### **Foundational Indicators**

#### **A. Institutional Identity and Culture**

Required Documentation (Complete all 4 of the following)

1. Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?

Yes  No

Quote the mission (vision)

2. Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through awards and celebrations?

Yes  No

Describe

3. Does the institution have a system for assessing community perceptions about the effectiveness of the institution's engagement with community?

Yes  No

Describe system

Does the institution use the assessment data?

Yes  No

Describe how the data is used

4. Is community engagement emphasized in the marketing materials (website, brochures, etc.) of the institution?

#### **B. Institutional Commitment**

Required Documentation (Complete all 8 of the following)

1. Does the executive leadership (President, Provost, Chancellor, Trustees, etc.) of the institution communicate explicitly to promote community engagement as a priority?

Yes  No

Describe quote, document

2. Does the institution have a coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement?

Yes  No

Describe with purposes, staffing

3. Are there internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?

Yes  No

Describe specifications

Is there external funding dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?

Yes  No

Describe specific funding

Is there fundraising directed to community engagement?

Yes  No

Describe fundraising activities

4. Are there systematic campus-wide assessment or recording mechanisms to evaluate and/or track institution engagement in community?

Yes  No

Describe

Are course-level data used for improving courses?

Yes  No

Describe

Does the institution use the data from any of the mechanisms?

Yes  No

How?

5. Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?

Yes  No

Describe

6. Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?

Yes  No

Describe

7. Does community have a "voice" or role in institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?

Yes  No

Describe

Optional Documentation (Select 2 of the following to complete)

1. Does the institution have search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise and commitment to community engagement?

Yes  No

Explain

2. Do the institutional policies and for promotion and tenure reward the scholarship of community engagement?

Yes  No

Describe

If yes, how does the institution categorize the community engagement scholarship? (Service, Scholarship of Application, other)

If no, is there work in progress to revise the promotion and tenure guidelines to reward the scholarship of community engagement.

3. Do students have a “voice” or leadership role in community engagement?

Yes  No

4. Is community engagement noted on student transcripts?

Yes  No

## **Categories of Community Engagement**

### **A. Curricular Engagement**

(Curricular Engagement describes the teaching, learning and scholarship which engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution).

1. a. Does the institution have a definition and a process for identifying service learning (community-based learning) courses?

Yes  No

b. How many formal, for credit courses (Service Learning, Community Based Learning, etc.) were offered in the most recent academic year? \_\_\_\_\_

What percentage of total courses? \_\_\_\_\_

c. How many departments are represented by those courses? \_\_\_\_\_

What percentage of total departments? \_\_\_\_\_

d. How many faculty taught Service Learning or Community Based Learning courses in the most recent academic year? \_\_\_\_\_ What percentage of total faculty?  
\_\_\_\_\_

e. How many students participated in Service Learning or Community Based Learning courses in the most recent academic year? \_\_\_\_\_

What percent of total number of students? \_\_\_\_\_

2. a. Are there institutional or departmental (disciplinary) learning outcomes for students’ curricular engagement?

Yes  No

b. Are those outcomes systematically assessed?

Yes  No

Describe

3. a. Is community engagement integrated into the following curricular activities?

- Student Research
- Student Leadership
- Internships
- Studies Abroad

examples

b. Has community engagement been integrated with curriculum on an institution-wide level?

Yes  No If yes, indicate where the integration exists.

- Core Courses  in the majors
- first year sequence  capstone

Other

Please describe

4. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their curricular engagement achievements?

Yes  No

Examples

## B. Outreach and Partnership

(Outreach and Partnerships describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. The first focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. The latter focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).)

1. Indicate which programs are developed for community:

- professional development centers
- learning centers
- tutoring
- extension programs
- non-credit courses
- evaluation support
- training programs
- other

(examples)

2. Which institutional resources are shared with community?

- co-curricular student service
- cultural offerings
- athletic offerings
- library services

(examples)

technology  
      faculty consultation

3. Using the grid below, describe representative partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year. (maximum 20 partnerships)

Partnership Name	Community Partner	Institutional Partner	Purpose	Length of Partner	# of faculty	# of students	Grant funding	Inst. Impact	Community Impact
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									

4. Does the institution or departments have systematic mechanisms to ensure the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnerships?

Yes  No

Describe

- b. Are there mechanisms to systematically provide feedback and assessment to community partners?

Yes  No

Describe

5. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their outreach and partnerships activities?

Yes  No

Examples

## **Appendix 2**

### **Sample Draft IUPUI Public Scholar and Community Scholar Criteria**

#### **M E M O R A N D U M**

TO: Council on Civic Engagement

FROM: Working Group on Academic Affairs

DATE: April 12, 2005

SUBJ.: Public Scholar

We have attached a draft proposal for a title designated "Public Scholar." The title is designed to recognize those whose civic engagement goes beyond usual expectations for faculty work and portends continuing exemplary community service through teaching, research, and creative activities. It signifies the university's support for and commitment to faculty civic engagement. It complements a primary academic appointment for persons holding a professional title and may not be used alone.

Professor Elizabeth Kryder-Reid's proposal for Public Scholar positions in Museum Studies, (a description reproduced as IUPUI's "Featured Program" ([http://www.iupui.edu/%7Emuseum/pdf\\_forms/publicscholarsummary.pdf](http://www.iupui.edu/%7Emuseum/pdf_forms/publicscholarsummary.pdf)) for the consortium, Imagining America - <http://www.ia.umich.edu/>), has provided the conceptual framework for this proposal.

At present, there is no official or recognized title of Public Scholar at IUPUI (or IU) beyond the unofficial and informal designation used for four Museum Studies scholars. It is a position used by other universities to recognize exceptional civic engagement activities of select faculty members, and this proposal would create a formal mechanism to recognize IUPUI faculty.

The working group seeks the review and revision of this proposal prior to recommending to Dean Plater that it be adopted for use by the campus effective July 1, 2005.

**Title:** Public Scholar of Civic Engagement or  
Public Scholar in a discipline or content area

**Classification:** Honorary

**Use:** To be used in combination with an academic appointment

**Term:** Renewable term appointment of up to five years

The Public Scholar title recognizes faculty members who demonstrate excellence through the application of expertise in their respective fields to community initiatives through (a) professional service, (b) teaching, and (c) scholarship, research, and creative activity. Public scholars will have a documented record of having made academic work accessible and useful to members of the public and of having assisted the public members in making their needs, interests, and capacities understood within the academic community. At the core of the work that is to be recognized through this title is the demonstrated capacity to work effectively with community partners in a manner that (a) is participatory and values the community partners as collaborators, (b) benefits the community partners (e.g., agencies, neighborhoods, clients) in ways that are identified by them and others as being significant and effective, and (c) furthers the scholarship of the faculty member in ways that are recognized by others as having academic impact as well as community impact. Thus, the title of Public Scholars honors faculty members whose professional activities not only include exceptional and ongoing partnerships or collaborations in service to the community but also represent high quality academic achievement. Public Scholars are those faculty who successfully and continuously connect intellectual work with the public interest and common good.

Public Scholars prepare students in the best practices of their fields by involving undergraduate and graduate students in ways that contribute to the civic preparation of those students. They are skilled in the application of their scholarship and able to involve, teach, mentor, and inspire students in their public scholarship and civic engagement. In addition, Public Scholars may further the broader goals of civic engagement across the campus by developing projects with community partners that involve a wide range of students in applied work and model life-long engagement in communities. The nature of their work and achievements acknowledges recipients as collaborators who can work on interdisciplinary projects with public significance. They have the sensitivity to understand and work across organizational cultures and boundaries, and they have the leadership to build bridges among institutions in the community. Public Scholars also have the capacity to develop new and productive relationships and projects that fulfill, sustain, and expand upon the mission of civic engagement at IUPUI.

## **Qualifications**

Candidates for Public Scholar:

- must hold appointment as assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, including clinical and research designations. Librarians may be eligible when a part of their duties are formally designated for community work.
- must have a demonstrable record of civic engagement that is exceptional by whatever standard a school uses to gauge such activity as scholarly and consistent with its mission. Some schools require civic engagement as a major part of activities for some or all faculty; however, a Public Scholar would stand above others in terms of the level and quality of civic engagement according to school standards.
- must show evidence of continuing civic engagement consistent with the duration of the term of the appointment. In the event that a school might want to hire a candidate as a Public Scholar, the school should present evidence that the candidate comes with the background and commitment portending civic engagement across teaching, research, and professional service commensurate with their faculty rank.

## **Term**

A Public Scholar is appointed for a renewable term of up to five years.

## **Nomination and Appointment Process**

A school or center may nominate faculty members for the title of Public Scholar. Nominations must be approved by the department chair (when applicable), a school faculty committee designated for this purpose (e.g., unit promotion and tenure committee or a special committee), the school dean, and the Dean of the Faculties, who will seek the advice and approval of a campus-level review committee. Nominations from a center or unit other than the unit of the nominee's primary appointment must have the appointment confirmed through this process within the unit of primary appointment.

Nominations for faculty to be appointed as Public Scholars originate with colleagues in a candidate's primary school or center that offers faculty appointments. Nominees should prepare a dossier documenting activities worthy of consideration for the position, including a CV, two letters from IUPUI faculty or administrators commenting on the public work in relation to unit missions, two letters from community partners commenting on the public nature of the nominee's work, and two letters from external academic peers commenting on the significance of the intellectual contribution to public scholarship. The dossier should also include a one-page description of plans for continuing civic engagement activities during the term of the appointment. Transmittal letters from the dean and chair or center director should accompany the dossier when submitted to the Dean of the Faculties.

**Criteria and Limitations**

Schools that elect to use the title should establish criteria and review procedures, which should be available to all faculty within the unit, in accord with school bylaws. At their discretion, schools may limit the number of faculty eligible for the designation. School criteria and procedures must be on file with the Office of Academic Policies, Procedures, and Documentation.

**Compensation**

The title of Public Scholar is honorary. Schools or centers may compensate Public Scholars by assigning time to public work, providing supplemental pay for specific projects, or recognizing contributions as part of the merit salary review.

**Title:** Community Scholar. Optional: The Scholar title may be modified by the use of one of the terms: Teaching, Research, or Service. Alternative titles: Field Experience Supervisor; Clinical Supervisor.

**Classification:** Honorary without remuneration.

**Description:** Civic engagement at IUPUI takes many different forms and draws upon both institutional and external resources to meet educational objectives across teaching, research, and service. A Community Scholar represents a formal, flexible, and term appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague's significant and meaningful contributions to meeting educational objectives for IUPUI students through community-based learning activities, research, or professional service. A Community Scholar is expected to engage in these activities through such roles as supervising community-based internships, clinical placements, field experiences, or service learning; teaching in an approved curriculum of the Community Learning Network or other formally recognized school-based continuing education program; serving as a co-teacher from another state or nation via distance education; participating in organized research conducted under the auspices of an academic or academic service unit; or providing direct services at a high level of responsibility in cooperation with an academic unit of the campus. The Community Scholar is differentiated from an adjunct appointment by not having direct responsibility and authority for teaching (i.e., awarding credit), research (i.e., receiving grants or contracts), or implementation of service (i.e., obligating the institution).

**Qualifications:** Community Scholars are expected to have expertise through experience or training that prepares them to contribute to the educational achievement of students in community-based learning. A record of sustained participation with academic units of IUPUI is expected, ordinarily of at least a year's duration. Recommendation for appointment should be based on a documented record of significant contribution (e.g., certification as a qualified internship or field experience supervisor). The candidate's expertise and training must be broadly consistent with clearly understood learning objectives, research objectives, or professional service. Ordinarily, a Community Scholar will hold a baccalaureate or advanced degree.

**Appointing Unit:** A Community Scholar may hold appointment in a department, school, center, or academic service unit subject to the approval of the senior academic administrative officer of the unit and the Dean of the Faculties.

**Term:** Appointments are for up to five years. Appointments may be renewed. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment whether full or part-time.

**Appointment Procedures:** The initiative for applying to become a Community Scholar may come from either the candidate or an IUPUI faculty member or academic administrator. In either case, a complete application for initial appointment will include (1) a completed cover sheet; (2) a letter from the responsible academic administrator stating how the nominee is prepared to contribute to the educational goals of students, courses, programs, initiatives, centers, or other activities at IUPUI based on previous experience; (3) a resume of the candidate's professional background and documentation of at least one year's prior involvement with the academic mission of the campus; and (4) a draft letter of appointment. Renewed appointments need only approval of the dean or appropriate academic administrator. Recommendations for appointment should be made through the usual academic appointment process and be completed with the entry of an electronic appointment form.

**Rights and Privileges:** Community Scholars are not employees of Indiana University and are not subject to IUPUI or Indiana University regulations except that they will voluntarily commit to observing IUPUI policies regarding Academic Ethics, Sexual Harassment, and Non-Discrimination; and they will consent to a criminal background check. When applicable, Community Scholars may be asked to observe other specific policies (e.g., Human Subjects) contingent on the nature and scope of their affiliation. Community Scholars may have the

privileges of academic appointment with regard to computer access with a personal account, library resources, parking, identification card, business cards, use of facilities, and other privileges as may be stated in the letter of appointment approved by the Dean of the Faculties. In some instances, Community Scholars may be located in other cities or nations, making remote access to resources important. Community Scholars are not eligible for salary, fringe benefits, leaves, tenure, participation in faculty governance, or other privileges reserved for employees. Community Scholars may be terminated for cause at any time. Extensions or renewals of appointment are to be based on a review of mutual benefit.

**Title:** Community Associate

**Classification:** Honorary without remuneration

**Description:** Civic engagement at IUPUI takes many different forms and draws upon both institutional and external resources to meet educational objectives across teaching, research, and service. A Community Associate represents a formal yet flexible appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague's significant and meaningful alignment with and support of the mission of IUPUI in cooperation with full time faculty or academic administrators. Community Associates, however, do not have direct responsibility for supervising IUPUI students or staff.

**Qualifications:** Community Associates are expected to have specific knowledge and expertise deriving from their roles in the community that allow them to support the mission of IUPUI.

**Appointing Unit:** A Community Associate may hold appointment in a department, school, center, or other academic service unit subject to the approval of the senior academic administrative officer of the unit and the Dean of the Faculties.

**Term:** Appointments are for up to two years. Appointments may be renewed. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment whether full or part-time.

**Appointment Procedures:** The initiative for applying to become a Community Associate may come from either the candidate or an IUPUI faculty or staff person. In either case, a complete application for the initial appointment will include (1) a completed appointment recommendation cover sheet; (2) a letter from a center director, chair or dean stating how the nominee is prepared to contribute to the mission of the appointing unit; (3) a resume of the candidate's professional background; and (4) a draft letter of appointment. Renewed appointments need only approval of the dean or appropriate academic administrator. Recommendations for appointment should be made through the usual academic appointment process and be completed with the entry of an electronic appointment form.

**Rights and Privileges:** Community Associates are not employees of Indiana University and are not subject to IUPUI or Indiana University regulations except that they will voluntarily consent to observing IUPUI policies regarding Academic Ethics, Non-Discrimination, and Sexual Harassment. Contingent on the scope and nature of their affiliation, Community Associates may be asked to observe other specific policies upon initial appointment or renewal of appointment. Community Associates may be accorded certain academic privileges as specified in the letter of appointment. Community Associates do not have any rights or privileges implied by an employment relationship and may be terminated at any time at the discretion of the appointing unit. Renewal or extensions of appointments are to be based on a review of mutual benefit.

**Title:** Visiting Community Associate

**Classification:** Honorary without remuneration

**Description:** Civic engagement at IUPUI takes many different forms and draws upon both institutional and external resources to meet educational objectives across teaching, research, and service. A Visiting Community Associate represents a formal yet flexible appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague's significant and meaningful alignment with and support of the mission of IUPUI in cooperation with full time faculty or academic administrators. Visiting Community Associates, however, do not have direct responsibility for supervising IUPUI students or staff. The visiting status is designed to accommodate a person with a short-term involvement with IUPUI of six months or less. It may appropriately be used for members of program review or accreditation teams, for government officials with specific limited needs and roles, members of a task force or commission, and the like.

**Qualifications:** Visiting Community Associates are expected to have specific knowledge and expertise deriving from their roles in the community that allow them to support the mission of IUPUI.

**Appointing Unit:** A Visiting Community Associate may hold time-limited appointment in a department, school, center, or other academic service unit of up to six months subject to the approval of the senior academic administrative officer of the unit.

**Term:** Appointments are for up to six months. Appointments may be renewed but persons with involvement beyond a short time should be appointed as a Community Associate or Community Scholar. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment whether full or part-time.

**Appointment Procedures:** The initiative for applying to become a Visiting Community Associate may come from either the candidate or an IUPUI faculty or staff person. In either case, a letter from a center director, chair or dean stating how the nominee will contribute to the mission of the appointing unit and stating the privileges should be sent to the appointee with a copy to the Dean of the Faculties. Recommendations for appointment should be completed with the entry of an electronic appointment form.

**Rights and Privileges:** Visiting Community Associates are not employees of Indiana University and are not subject to IUPUI or Indiana University regulations except that they will voluntarily consent to observing IUPUI policies regarding Academic Ethics, Non-Discrimination, and Sexual Harassment. Contingent on the scope and nature of their affiliation, Visiting Community Associates may be asked to observe other specific policies upon initial appointment or renewal of appointment. Visiting Community Associates may be accorded certain academic privileges as specified in the letter of appointment, including temporary parking permits, computing access, or library privileges. Visiting Community Associates do not have any rights or privileges implied by an employment relationship and may be terminated at any time at the discretion of the appointing unit.

## Appendix 3

### Proposed Engagement Funding

Description	Amount	Notes
Continuation of recurring budgets currently held in University Engagement (including the Japanese Saturday School and Japanese Programs) plus funds for anticipated 2007-08 raises.	Continuation	
Year two of Commonwealth Collaboratives	\$130,000	Already authorized/received for the next year. Recurring funding should be considered.
Annual support of the UK EMI (servers, programming, personnel at MSU)	\$10,000	Recurring funding not needed at this time but the requirement could come at any time. Handling locally at UK would be considerably more expensive.
UK's projected cost share to host the Second Annual Kentucky Engagement Conference, assuming the same co-sponsorship as in 2006	\$6,000	Provost has approved the conference but funding will be needed. The \$6,000 is available if the Commonwealth Collaboratives' fund balance can be carried forward to next fiscal year.
Anticipated annual cost for a UK Engagement publication appearing bi-annually.	\$40,000	Best if first issue is in the hands of Kentucky legislators and community leaders across Kentucky prior to the 2008 legislative session.
One half of the recurring cost for a new position as editor/layout person for proposed UK Engagement supplement	\$20,000 plus benefits on the full salary	Annual salary is estimated at \$40,000 plus benefits.
Annual cost of in-community recognitions of major UK engagement partners	\$5,000	Cost includes plaques, refreshments, and mileage for multiple in-community recognition ceremonies.
Annual UK Engagement Academy teaching faculty	\$40,000	Cost includes speaker costs, materials, and small

and professional staff engagement approaches		engagement seed grants for Academy graduates.
--	--	---

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Multiple focus groups annually across the state designed as "listening tours" for continuing input regarding Kentucky's priority needs	\$5,000	Cost covers mileage, refreshments, and site costs for multiple sessions at locations across KY.
Recurring budget for the Assistant Vice President for Community Engagement	Undetermined	Budget is now being negotiated with the Provost.
Revolving seed fund for non-recurring support of start-up costs for inter-college UK community engagement initiatives by on-campus faculty through the Kentucky Cooperative Extension System and/or other University-based engagement programs funding 2-4 programs annually.	\$100,000	No identified funding source.
Electronic markers for service learning and community based learning experiences in Campus Management.	No cost	No additional cost is associated with this task. UK has the personnel and technology to accomplish this goal.