National Louis University
National Louis University is a private, non-profit, independent institution serving a diverse population of approximately 8,000 students from the baccalaureate to the doctoral level.

University of Kentucky
The University of Kentucky is a land-grant, public research university serving over 30,000 students from the baccalaureate to the doctoral level.
Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

- First Offered in 2006
- Elective classification - Institutions voluntarily apply describing the extent of their engagement with their community
- Evidence-based documentation of institutional practice for assessment and quality improvement
Definition

“Community engagement describes 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.

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good”
Carnegie Application Sections

- Foundational Indicators
  - Identify and Culture
- Institutional Commitment
  - Infrastructure
  - Funding
  - Assessment
  - Professional Development
  - Faculty Roles and Rewards
  - Student Roles and Recognition
- Categories of Community Engagement
  - Curricular Engagement
  - Outreach and Partnerships

Focus of Today's Conversation
Assessment Requirements

- How does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community?

- Describe the mechanisms used for systematic campus-wide assessment and measurement of the impact of institutional engagement.

- What are the current findings from the mechanisms used for systematic campus-wide assessment and measurement: and how are these different from the findings since the last classification?

- Impact on Students, Faculty, Community and Institution: Describe one key finding from current data and indicate how you arrived at this finding.

*What mechanisms are in place at your institutions?*
Mechanisms for Systematic Assessment at NLU

NLU’s College of Education Field Evaluation Process which includes mechanisms for documenting perceptions:

- Field Evaluation
- Alumni Survey
- Noel Levitz Adult Student Priority Survey
Partnerships put in place a management system that incorporates the organizational partners, school systems, community colleges, non-profits, and businesses, at every stage of the process and maintains a record of interactions, and evaluates the impacts on NLU and the partner.

- Assessment of Degrees awarded by fiscal year to determine completion success.
- Needs Assessments are conducted for each partnership
- Surveys are completed
Mechanisms for Systematic Assessment at UK

- UK is not currently utilizing a systematic campus-wide assessment process
- Assessment occurs more frequently at the college or unit level with varying degrees of sustained and supported systems
- No institution level unit responsible for the aggregation of such community engagement data.
Mechanisms for Assessment at UK

- Strategic Plan Goal 5, “Improving the Quality of Life for Kentuckians through Engagement, Outreach and Service”
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Counts and Percentages:
  - Courses: community engagement courses, departments offering community engagement courses, student taking, faculty teaching
  - Partnerships: community engagement partnerships, purpose, length, students involved, faculty involved, grant funding amount
Lessons Learned from the Application Process NLU

- Structures need to be coordinated. Multiple coordinating structures, including the Enrollment Outreach unit, the NCE Outreach Office, and the Civic Engagement Center.
- Courses need to be designated as Engagement Courses.
- The main thing we learned is there really were no mechanisms for systematic assessment.
Benefits from the Application Process at UK

**Strengths**

- **Curricular**
  - University-wide experiential education courses
  - Large number of faculty and students engaged in this work
  - Large number of faculty with an interest in this high-impact pedagogy
  - Growth and focus on Service Abroad
  - Inclusion of community-based work in Honor’s curriculum

- **Co-Curricular**
  - Alternative Service Breaks, Other student-led partnerships

- **Collaboration across units**

- **Community Partnerships**
Lessons Learned from the Application Process at UK

**NSSE DATA**

- Just under half (43%) of first-year students and (44%) seniors reported that they had participated in a “community-based project (e.g., service-learning) as part of a regular course” (2009: 41%; 41%)

- Nearly half (49%) of first-year students and two-thirds (63%) of seniors reported they had done “community service or volunteer work” (2009: 44%; 61%)

- About two-thirds (64%) of first-year students and three of five (61%) seniors reported their experience at UK had contributed “Quite a bit” or “Very much” to their “solving complex real-world problems” (2009: 59%; 60%)

- Half (51%) of first-year students and nearly half (44%) of seniors reported their experience at UK had contributed “Quite a bit” or “Very much” to “contributing to the welfare of your community” (2009: 48%; 43%)
Lessons Learned from the Application Process at UK

Perceived Challenges

- Institutional support and coordinated infrastructure
  - Better connections among students, faculty, staff, and communities.
  - Supporting faculty who are engaged in this work and recruiting new faculty, students, and staff.
  - Common/endorsed terminology (i.e., service-learning, civic engagement).

- Strategic Plan with clear goals, objectives, and metrics
  - To include student learning outcomes
The assessment practices required by the Community Engagement Classification must meet a broad range of purposes: assessing community perceptions of institutional engagement; tracking and recording institution-wide engagement data; assessing the impact of community engagement on students, faculty, the community, and the institution; identifying and assessing student learning outcomes in curricular engagement; and providing ongoing feedback mechanisms for partnerships. That range of purposes calls for sophisticated understandings and approaches in order to achieve the respective assessment goals. We urge institutions to continue developing assessment toward those ends.
Carnegie Foundation Recommendations at NLU

- Improved Assessment
  - Assessing Community perceptions of institutional engagement
  - Track and record institution wide engagement
  - Assess impact of engagement on students, faculty, community and institution
  - Learning outcomes in curricular engagement
Carnegie Foundation Recommendations at UK

- Improved assessment
  - Assess community perceptions of institutional engagement
  - Tracking and record institutional-wide data
  - Assess impact of community engagement on students, faculty, community and institution
  - Identify and assess student learning outcomes
  - Provide ongoing feedback mechanisms for partnerships
Strategies for Institutions to Ensure Success

- Common definitions campus-wide
- Define goals related to community engagement
- Define measurable outcomes
- Assess outcomes
- Tell your story
NLU’s Community Engagement Model to Ensure Success

“Faculty must deliberate and come to a consensus on a definition of civic engagement that is most appropriate for program, campus, and institutional contexts, because the definition of civic engagement will ultimately frame and guide your assessment strategies” (Hatcher, 2011).

NLU Definition:

Civic engagement describes activities which promote the bridging of communities with socially conscious thought and action. (NLU Civic engagement Center) “Civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes.” Thomas Ehrlich
An important element in this process is assessing the alignment between institutions’ civic engagement goals and the ways in which civic engagement is supported and implemented on and off campus” (Pike, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2014).

NLU Goals:

**Community Engagement:** National Louis University will act as a good citizen by pursuing Community Engagement activities guided by a commitment to education, social justice, health, human rights and sustainable environments.

**Institutional development/advancement:** National Louis University seeks to develop its faculty, staff and students through Community Engagement and therefore provides support and opportunity to develop and enhance Community Engagement activities.

**Personal/Professional advancement:** National Louis University supports individuals, regardless of their background, to participate in higher education and to advance their teaching, learning and research development for the betterment of society.

**Teaching, research, and innovation:** National Louis University works with individuals and organizations from the university, commercial, community and governmental sectors to translate innovation into tangible products, services and outcomes that enhance the human condition.
“Based upon an extensive literature review (e.g., Daloz, Keen, Keen, & Parks, 1996; Hatcher, 2008; Moely, Mercer, Ilustre, Miron, & McFarland, 2002; Sullivan, 1995, 2005), and a review of scales and measurement procedures used by other campuses (e.g., Tufts University, Tulane University, University of Maryland College Park), a set of characteristics were identified for the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and behavioral intentions that are characteristic of a civic-minded student and, therefore, graduate. Next we compiled a list of student learning outcomes for each of the subcomponents” (Pike, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2014).

**University Level Outcome:** Students demonstrate collaboration and respect for diversity through civic engagement or experiential learning.
## What is Civic Engagement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Service/Volunteerism</th>
<th>Community Service / Volunteerism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>NLU activities/efforts:</em></td>
<td>May be one-time or ongoing service to a community in need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Associate Promotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff promotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Month of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurable Goal/Assessment:**
Promotes NLU and demonstrates our usefulness to the community. Networks, look at civic engagement center site for benefits to students.
Purpose for student.
Adds to their resume.

Lead person: Vista Associate Promotes
Vista for the Civic Engagement Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Based Research</th>
<th>Community Based Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NLU activities/efforts:</em></td>
<td>Faculty/Student/Community Research inquiry into societal disservices for example nutrition and food desert in urban settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Level Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurable Goal/Assessment:**
Lead person: Antonina and Todd and Tiffany, Diane Salmon

**Service-Learning**
Enhances what a student learns; it connects academic discussion to real-world experiences the service given to a community results in the development of soft transferable skills and increase networking and marketability for future employers for students and reinforces learned academic material.
Assessment Process and Results NLU

Indirect Assessment
1. Surveyed Faculty about course content
2. Surveyed Students on the IDEA on course content

Direct Assessment
1. Assessed 100 reflective essays using the VALUE rubric
Two assignments were identified by faculty to assess:

- A reflective paper from FND501 Community Study
- A reflective paper from HSC 512 Theories and Techniques of Group Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestone 3</th>
<th>Milestone 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Below 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30% Proficient Overall
44% FND Assignment Proficient
25% HSC Assignment
Next Steps NLU

1. Use survey data from faculty and students to further identify and code specific courses in our banner system as civic engagement.

2. Create measurable outcomes for each category of civic engagement in the institution to determine assessment methods.

3. Work with general education and foundations courses at the graduate level to create assignments that meet the criteria of the VALUE Rubric.
Assessment Process at UK

- **Assessment of UK Core Outcome**

  Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complexities of citizenship and the process for making informed choices as engaged citizens in a diverse, multilingual world.

  Students artifacts are collected every semester and scored by faculty every two years. Wide-range of student classifications.

- **Assessment of Multi-State Collaborative Outcome**

  Civic Engagement - local and global

  Students artifacts were collected in spring 2016 and scored by faculty internal and external to the university.
## Assessment Results: UK Core Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship (n=456)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% at Meets Expectations or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies an issue or problem</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides background information about the problem</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents multiple perspectives</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposes solutions/hypotheses</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument is evidence-based and logical</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87.7% of the assignments receiving two evaluations were found to be in “agreement”.

Students themselves indicated a high degree of outcome achievement through their self-reported ratings on the teacher-course evaluation. The overall rating for the U.S. area (91.4%) was slightly higher than students responding for the Global area (88.3%).
## Assessment Results: UK Core Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100-level (n=215)</th>
<th>200-level (n=91)</th>
<th>300-level (n=150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies an issue or problem</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides background information about the problem</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents multiple perspectives</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposes solutions/hypotheses</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument is evidence-based and logical</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>.84</strong></td>
<td><strong>.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeds Expectations = 2  
Meets Expectation = 1  
Does not Meet Expectations = 0
Assessment Results (Internal): Multi-State Collaborative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Criteria</th>
<th>Averages Scores (n=130)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Knowledge</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Identity and Commitment</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Communication</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Action and Reflection</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Contexts/Structures</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capstone = 4  
Milestone = 2-3  
Benchmark = 1
Next Steps at UK

- Institution-Level Renewed Focus on the Strategic Plan
  - GOAL: Outreach and Community Engagement
  - OBJECTIVE: Leverage leading-edge technology, scholarship, and research in innovative ways to advance the public good and to foster the development of citizen-scholars.
  - INITIATIVE 2: Deepen student learning through community engagement.
    - Provide every student the opportunity to participate in a community engagement experience through academic coursework, clinical outreach services, service learning, internships, education abroad, research, co-curricular experiences, or cooperative extension services.
    - Develop faculty and staff expertise to deliver quality community engagement and outreach, service-learning courses, and co-curricular experiences that will utilize current best practices and be culturally competent, measurable and sustainable.

- Program-Level: Renewed Focus on Assessment
  - Review of UK Core Courses to ensure alignment
  - Assignment Design
  - Professional Development Opportunities for Faculty
Discussion

- What mechanisms are used for systematic campus-wide assessment and measurement at your institutions?

- How do you assess the impact of institutional engagement at your Institutions?
  - Impact on Students, Faculty, Community and Institutions?

- Are there any models that you can share with your colleagues?
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Director of Assessment
National Louis University
kgorski2@nl.edu
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