

UMS Community Engagement
2014-2015 Annual Report
Theodora J. Kalikow
June 2015

After a sabbatical July and August and early September, during which I moved out of the President's House in Gorham and into Piper Shores, I started my Community Engagement (CE) work. This work followed the Community Engagement Overview and Preliminary work Plan approved at the September meeting of the Board of Trustees. As such, the work proceeded along two dimensions: the sharing and learning from best practices and the development of a three-year plan to institutionalize CE across the University System. This report should be read in conjunction with the draft 3-year CE plan submitted to the Chancellor on May 8, 2015.

Sharing & Learning from Best Practice

My initial work last fall was to survey the current state of the CE field. Twenty years ago it was a rare campus that was explicit about doing community engagement beyond being a cultural resource or a source of pure/applied research. Today it is a rare campus that isn't significantly involved in CE. This means that there is a huge amount of scholarly literature, new organizations, new initiatives and new funding and many services to help campuses clarify and accomplish the new goal of robust community engagement. Many established organizations have re-oriented themselves toward CE, most notably the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). Selected reference materials gleaned from websites and printed materials from various colleges and universities, Cooperative Extension and organizations such as Carnegie, NERCHE, Campus Compact, AAC&U, AASCU, Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR), and Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU), are listed in the 3-year plan.

Toward this same goal of identifying a solid base of current CE scholarship and work, I attended the CUMU national conference at Syracuse University, Oct. 5-7, 2014 along with several faculty and staff members from USM. I also attended NEASC and AAC&U later in the year. In all cases, CE was an important area of interest and discussion.

Summits

A primary outcome of more cohesive and unified CE across UMS is to benefit students by ultimately providing multiple CE possibilities to all students throughout their academic careers. In order to begin laying the foundation for this to occur, UMS CE Summits were held in two locations this year so that new faculty might be attracted to this work, and experienced faculty recognized for it. We engaged Maine Campus Compact as a partner to plan and carry out the summits and individually tailored follow-up sessions on each campus this spring and summer. MCC has a 20-

year track record of effective programs with faculty to spread the theory and practice of service learning (a sub-category of CE).

The summits were held in March, one at UM and one at USM. About 150 faculty, staff and community partners participated along with campus and System administrators. The Chancellor attended both sessions and gave very supportive comments. The feedback from summit participants was mixed. Those who didn't know very much about CE work learned a great deal and those more experienced participants welcomed increasing recognition and support for this work. Nearly everyone also wanted more time to network and share specific practices and tools. The two sessions were somewhat different in tone but participants were unanimous in expressing eagerness to get on with the work and a desire for serious continuing support for CE. Faculty and staff who are already experienced see clearly the value of CE for students, community, and universities and want opportunities to further that work.

The customized follow-up campus workshops are currently being designed and scheduled for late May through August. Initial feedback from the first session, held at UMM, was very positive. Attached is a list of all the events and campus leads. (Add Sally's email list from 5/20, or latest.)

The plan is for campuses to continue to design and implement new undertakings for Fall 2015 and showcase them next spring 2016 at another System event facilitated by Maine Campus Compact. It will be important to take the feedback from this year's summits into the planning of this event and, if possible, a single event would be best so all campuses can attend together.

CE Steering Committee

As noted in the initial CE work plan, a System CE steering committee was established to advise and guide our CE efforts. Although the original thought was that not every campus needed to be represented on the committee, in response to concerns raised at Presidents' Council additional representation was later identified. It took a great deal of time soliciting recommendations and visiting with and talking to faculty and staff candidates regarding the committee. The first in-person steering committee meeting was held in early December. Monthly polycom meetings followed as well as a number of smaller sub-group meetings. (Schedule and agendas if needed.) Attendance was good, with a core of regulars (UM, USM, UMF, UMA) and occasional contributions by others.

The committee was used for ideas, feedback, and for work on actual topics like planning, software, and promotion and tenure (P&T), that presented themselves during the year. Whatever the leadership option for CE that the System leadership chooses going forward, having a CE committee of faculty and administrative staff for consultation and communication will be a very useful and important structure. (The work of the sub-committees is presented in the sections below.)

Software

Software is key to the success of many CE efforts – Carnegie Classification applications; internal and external assessment, feedback and evaluation; development, and public relations, advocacy and awareness. Knowing what we are actually doing with respect to CE and assessing its impacts are fundamental challenges that all campuses are currently facing. Therefore, probably the most important thing the UMS could do to support campuses in obtaining or maintaining Carnegie designations and widely sharing CE achievements and benefits is to provide the resources for comprehensive information management and reporting.

[Aside: UM succeeded in achieving the Carnegie designation in spite of the software problem because it is big enough and constructed its own systems, which are less than ideal. UMM did it because it is small enough and collected and reported data manually. In a time of scarce resources, other campuses, including USM, where CE is a top priority in their MU initiative, may be stymied without such support.]

In addition to being an important task, identifying and obtaining CE data management software has also proven to be a time-consuming task this year. There was a great deal of talk at the CUMU meeting in October about software called the Collaboratory. Barbara Holland, a noted MU expert, demonstrated its capabilities and its use in the kind of data collection that is needed to achieve the Carnegie classification. It was reputedly in beta-testing and would be finished and available in a couple of weeks. We (the USM delegation, and I) came away convinced that this was what we needed to get. This was going to be one goal that we would be certain to achieve this year!

Despite immediately attempting to follow-up with the Collaboratory, it took weeks to schedule a call and then in late November they announced that they were still making revisions and would only be ready for demonstrations April 15, 2015. At that point April seemed like a long way away so I began looking at other possibilities for data management.

I spent a significant amount of time with data vendors at the NEASC and AAC&U conferences and I did a good deal of research on the Web. It turns out that CE is an expanding market with many potential providers, depending on which aspect of community engagement one wants to measure and assess, for example: numbers of projects, number of students involved, impacts on participants, faculty and staff activity, number of community partners...and the list goes on. This was no longer a simple problem with a single solution.

In February the CE committee set up a sub-committee chaired by Pam Proulx-Curry from UMA and Claire Sullivan from UM to explore the myriad CE data management options. The group enlisted the efforts of additional campus faculty and staff and reviewed a comparative report from Campus Compact of the Mountain West of over 20 different software packages. They further held a design workshop in April, facilitated by Brian Doore of UM, and laid out various options for what UMS needs. The group has narrowed the field down to approximately four different candidates.

There are two basic directions UMS could go. One is centered around faculty activity reports, and the other is centered around student numbers and impacts, and community partners. There are approximately four vendors that currently seem to be viable options although we may eventually need two different packages to meet all information needs.

Meanwhile, at the very end of April, I was contacted by the Collaboratory again, asking if we might like to be a pioneer and have their software for our whole system at once. I replied wanting to know more. Then two days later they took their offer back, because they are still not ready. The other providers actually have products that they seem willing to sell, so this is the direction the group has decided to go.

Dick Thompson participated in the April workshop and recommended that the next step should be an RFI process, which the group is now setting up with the help of Cindy Mitchell, Associate CIO. A fairly immediate assurance of continued leadership and support for CE is essential, however, to continuing to move forward with an RFI.

A note on software and campus culture:

The above is not to imply that just buying the software would be a panacea for CE data management and reporting. Campus systems and behaviors would have to be aligned to actually use it. Examples: a new faculty dossier system would require the faculty to enter data such as annual activity reports into it. A new student-focused CE software package would require students to enter their volunteer or service learning time into it. If community partners are to use the software they would have to be trained on it and would have to actually see some benefit over and above whatever they have already invested in, if anything. This is to say that there will need to be campus and partner culture and process changes as well as software purchased to achieve useful data reporting. This implies that System leadership and support would be needed to help with the purchase, and then provide process supports and cultural changes. There could be a role for the CE committee working with leadership and the individual campuses in ways to be determined.

Promotion & Tenure

When you talk to faculty about CE, about the first thing they say after “we already do that” is that the P&T criteria need to be adjusted to include and value CE work. The CE committee had some energy around this, and Paula Gerstenblatt and Liz Turesky (both faculty members from USM) volunteered to work with me on it. There is a large body of literature on promotion and tenure criteria. P&T is the key to faculty life as we know it now; the traditional categories of teaching, research and service may not be congruent with CE and other high-impact practices (even 25 years after Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 1990). Many institutions have revised their criteria; associations such as NERCHE and Campus Compact, CUR, and others have assisted and published guidelines.

Revising P&T criteria is never just a matter of language, it’s a matter of culture. It gets ramified down to criteria in individual departments or even programs,

especially at larger institutions. Therefore, besides writing new language, institutions need to have faculty discussions and workshops and various kinds of consulting activities (not to mention appropriate use of the governance process) so that the criteria and the practices of P&T can actually change over time. Depending on the culture of the institution, this can take a long time or go relatively smoothly and quickly. The right software (for faculty activity reports and dossiers) and cultures of practice can play an important role here, too.

It was determined in March that the CAOs were the appropriate group to initiate any review and/or revisions of P&T and that they would begin to address this issue starting this spring. The sub-group therefore, turned over their large collection of sample P&T policies and guidelines from higher education organizations to the Academic Affairs office for further review.

A generalizable result from this series of events is that CE committee members will be happy to act as resources for those planning or carrying out the work of aligning policies and practices for more effective CE support.

Planning

Please refer to the 3-year Plan Draft. Here are some of the principles we settled on in preparing the draft.

The Board's goal of each system campus attaining the Carnegie Classification of Engaged Campus (or comparable recognition) (BOT Goals & Actions, Public Service Target 1) is integral to providing the responsive service to Maine envisioned in the Chancellor's One University model. The System's unified administrative role is to encourage and orchestrate the campuses as they design and implement CE in a manner that best serves the distinct campus missions and meets the Board's expectations - UMS CE leadership is not going to perform any direct CE actions itself. Given the work to be done, immediate succession planning for CE leadership at the UMS level is essential. (See the plan for specific leadership recommendations.)

Attaining the Carnegie designation is a useful organizing principle for current UMS CE work. (It is not the ultimate goal of CE but it provides a necessary structure.) The System cannot achieve Carnegie CE designation as a whole but it can and should help campuses to achieve it.

A critical element in helping the campuses get the Carnegie designation is for UMS leadership to assist in meeting the information management application requirements. UMS needs to identify what software to acquire, purchase the software and pilot it quickly, and start to integrate its use into practices, so that all campuses can utilize it as soon as possible. The compiled data can then be used by campuses as well as aggregated at the system level to align efforts and quantify the actual amount and results of UMS CE work throughout the State of Maine.

A second critical area of campus support is in helping currently undesignated campuses understand and plan for the Carnegie designation process. The designation application process is comparable to a decennial NEASC accreditation in terms of the resources and attention needed to accomplish it, so consideration must be given to how the UMS CE leadership and steering committee may support such efforts on the individual campuses.

Talks to outside groups

My talks to outside groups (OLLI, Portland Rotary, LAC gathering, Maine Campus Compact annual awards celebration) confirmed that the public is eager for UMS involvement. In all cases I made clear to the audience the importance of CE for the future of public higher education and for the progress of our wider communities and for the state. The LAC Community Engagement Celebration at the end of May was sponsored by UMS and attended by me to stress the value of their work. Over 80 community members attended, representing many of LAC's strongest and most committed community partners, which help to make it possible for every LAC student to have at least one CE experience as part of their academic program. Attendees spent time brainstorming new cooperative ventures to continue to expand and extend opportunities for students. LAC is a model for the rest of the UMS.

I discovered in my speaking engagements, however, that there is a real danger of our rhetoric outpacing the reality. The community wants UMS institutions to be involved and they want to know how to get in contact with the right person at their local campus/site to pursue possible projects and serve students, right now. I recommend that we have a more specific list of prospective actions in the CE area and identified coordinators or leaders at each campus and site, as well as for online, as determined by the campus/location, before we attempt to recruit additional community partners or make too many more speeches.

Reality check for CE work

Perhaps the thing that has taken up the most time this year is figuring out what it is actually possible to do. I did a lot of thinking about how to organize the work of the year. The draft summary of 10/24/14 is a reasonable précis of what I planned to do, most of which I actually managed to do. The weather got in the way. I did not have as many gatherings as I had thought, because I realized that the purposes were not clear enough and more campus work was needed to identify particular CE interests and opportunities.

Effective continuing leadership at the UMS level will be important to build support for CE. This year, various campuses had tangential interests that coincided, or not. Everybody wanted to make sure I did not mess up anything that they wanted to do yet even internally many faculty and staff were not aware of what was happening or was available on their own campus. Everybody wanted support from System for what they did want to do. How UMS CE leadership meshes such tangential interests and makes CE information and opportunities more readily accessible by students,

faculty and interested community partners will be essential to achieving the vision of robust CE that serves the needs of the State of Maine.

Along a related vein, the UMS is undergoing such an extensive change process that it is hard for faculty and staff to focus on anything else right now. CE promises a lot, but fuller realization of its opportunities requires a lot of change to structures as significant as P&T criteria and/or coordination or integration with research and/or student success efforts. Such change would be difficult even if the institutions were stable but with all the potential changes resulting from the One University Model, APRIP, etc., the ability to give CE the attention it requires is limited. The new CE leadership will be challenged!

Thanks

Thanks to Becky Wyke for her consistent help and support. Thanks to the Chancellor and the BOT for allowing me to do this work. Tamara Mitchell, Director of Organizational Effectiveness, was a wonderful partner and a great source of ideas. The office staff in the persons of Jeanie Rogers and later Tina Baughman actually got necessary stuff done, like travel reimbursements, contracts, conference arrangements, meeting set-up, and so on. The CE Committee was my work group! The System Presidents were good colleagues! Gratitude to all!

Attachments:

Summary of CE Activities
Campus CE Faculty/Staff Events
September 2014 BOT CE Overview
October 2014 CE Project Summary
Steering Committee Membership

UMS Community Engagement Initiative Summary of Activities

Sharing & Learning from Best Practice

Community Engagement Summits

Organized and facilitated by Maine Campus Compact, the summits were held March 19, 2015 at the University of Maine and March 20, 2015 at the University of Southern Maine. The program included a keynote address on integrating Community Engagement with the core purposes of Higher Education; campus leadership, community partnership and faculty panel discussions; and showcases of student work.

Summit Follow-up – Tailored Campus-based Development Events

To date, four of the eight campus faculty and staff development events have taken place. All have gone very well and are contributing positively towards helping to encourage/move the system in a more intentional CE direction.

Completed Events:

- University of Maine at Machias - May 28, 2015
- University College - June 2, 2015
- University of Maine - June 8, 2015
- University of Maine at Augusta/Bangor - June 11, 2015

Upcoming Events:

- University of Southern Maine/ Metropolitan University – August 5 & 6, 2015
(combined CE/MU event)
- University of Maine at Fort Kent – late August
- University of Maine at Presque Isle – August 26, 2015
- University of Maine at Farmington - TBD

USM Lewiston Auburn College Community Engagement Celebration

Over 80 community partners and students, faculty, and administrators attended this event on May 26, 2015. The event celebrated the achievement of having every LAC student participating in at least one CE experience as part of their academic program and included an overview of CE and remarks from Vice Chancellor Theo Kalikow, USM LAC CE Scholar Michelle Vazquez Jacobus, Executive Director of USM MU Lynn Kuzma and incoming USM President Glenn Cummings.

Best Practice Showcase

Planned for Spring 2016 as the culminating event of the work completed this year. The event will be an interactive sharing and recognition of successes and will provide opportunities for CE cross pollination among and between campuses. The event will be coordinated by MCC in consultation with a yet to be identified UMS CE lead and Tamara Mitchell (UMS Organizational Effectiveness).

CE Steering Committee

The Steering Committee consisted of faculty, staff and administrators from across the system as well as two community partners. (Unfortunately, the identified student member wound-up unable to participate.) The full committee met monthly from December through May (Membership roster and meeting agendas included in annual report appendices.) Subcommittees provided substantive additional input regarding

Promotion & Tenure – The subcommittee researched best practice in incorporating CE into faculty assessment and provided resulting materials to Academic Affairs for review by Chief Academic Officers.

Software/Data Management – The subcommittee assessed data needs and investigated options for campus and system CE data collection and management to facilitate Carnegie CE designation applications and renewals as well as assessment and reporting of CE impacts at the local, regional and state level. The sub-committee is completing their investigation of enhancing an in-house/low cost option for CE data collection and reporting at UM with potential sharing of the software with USM.

CE Planning – The subcommittee assisted the Vice Chancellor in drafting the three year UMS CE plan and recommendations for submission to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.

Community Engagement Plan (Submitted under separate cover)

Speaking Engagements

The Vice Chancellor spoke at several external community and business events. Interest in increasing mutually beneficial university – community partner relationships is very strong but is currently constrained by a lack of clarity in identifying or accessing appropriate CE resources at the various campuses and locations.

UMS Community Engagement Campus Faculty/Staff Development Events

A post-CE summit individualized campus training/development event has or will be held on each of the UMS campuses and for University College to further integrate community engagement into courses and the campus/community environment. The tailored campus development events allow for each campus to identify in advance specialized needs and thematic based approaches for their campus to address and a deeper level of team building. To date, four of the eight trainings have taken place and planning is underway for the remainder.

Completed Events:

University of Maine Machias: May 28, 2015

There were about 16-18 participants at this training. Maryli Tiemann, Maine Campus Compact (MCC) Faculty Consultant was the lead trainer with Associate Professor Meghan Duff (UMM faculty) playing a key role as well. The key focus was on Campus Compact Student Learning 8 block curriculum training but also to help work on a plan to better coordinate and move forward CE initiatives on the campus. There was a terrific round robin session where everyone was given a chance to talk about what they were already doing related to CE on campus and in their courses and how they could more closely align their work with one another. A list of campus next steps for Student Learning and the need for an identified CE office/coordinating entity on campus were key outcomes of the meeting.

University College: June 2, 2015

There were 7 participants at this training which focused on embedding civic engagement into online courses. Maryli Tiemann and Ed Laine (retired Bowdoin professor and MCC Fusion online course facilitator) were the facilitators of this training. As a next step, a team from UC plans to apply for an MCC Davis \$4,000 sub-grant to embed CE and environmental stewardship into online courses. The folks at the training were especially eager for the additional training opportunities that are part of the Davis grant opportunity. Shiva Darbandi and Bonnie Sparks are working on the application and will submit it to MCC by late June. The group also discussed the possibility of further collaboration with MCC on online training materials.

University of Maine: June 8, 2015

There were approximately 25 participants at this training--of these folks, it is significant to note that about 16 were new to CE. Claire Sullivan did a great job of recruiting new faculty/staff. A key focus of the training was MCC's CE 101/ 8 block curriculum model. Several community partners were also there to discuss their experience/needs as community partners. It became clear that many folks in the room did not know what resources were available to them on campus or who to contact so we discussed next steps around this and it also brought to light the

need for a CE office on campus to coordinate these activities. (This was also a key theme at UMM and UMA).

University of Maine at Augusta/Bangor: June 11, 2015

There were 9 people at this training with Dean Pam Proulx-Curry and Maryli Tiemann facilitating/training. Each faculty member was asked to bring a course outline for a course that they would like to embed with CE. They spent some time brain storming about their courses and how best to implement CE into the courses. It was a diverse group of faculty at varying levels of their development in this area. There was a lot of enthusiasm for CE and for added professional development for faculty around strengthening curriculum in general and a desired for continued UMS CE resources. As a result of this training, they plan to build in more time for faculty to learn from each other and enhance their own professional development opportunities.

Upcoming Events:

University of Southern Maine/ Metropolitan University

This training will be held on August 5th and 6th and will focus on faculty fellows and engaged department work. Rick Battistoni of Providence College in RI and Carie Hertzberg, the RI Campus Compact ED will be the key facilitators/trainers for the two day training. In addition to the funds provided by UMS, Metropolitan U/USM has added funds to help pay for the two day training. The 2 day event will be kicked off with a keynote address from Rick and will be open to a broader audience. Sally Slovenski (MCC), Executive Director of MU Lynn Kuzma and Emma Gelsinger (MU) are working on the agenda with the key facilitators. About 30 people or so will be part of the 2 day training.

University of Maine at Fort Kent:

This training will take place during the last two weeks in August and will focus on the nursing faculty, who require a community engagement activity from each student but who have organized in ways that may be too dependent on student initiative. There is also a large online clientele, as well as a joint program with UMA, so there may be room for learning and innovation with respect to online/fusion CE development. Direct student mentoring by faculty could also be enhanced. What the nursing faculty learn to do eventually permeates the UMFK campus. MCC will follow up with Nursing Department Chair Erin Soucy and President Wilson Hess to further organize this training.

University of Maine at Presque Isle:

This training will take place on August 26th as part of a faculty training to tie CE to Experiential Learning Outcomes. Maryli Tiemann will be the primary trainer and is coordinating with Professor Lisa Leduc to plan the agenda.

University of Maine at Farmington

Maryli Tiemann, Heather Craigie (MCC Program Manager) and Georgia Nigro (Bates College) attended a meeting on June 10th at UMF led by Celeste Branham and attended by about 10 other faculty and staff focused on strategic/organizational planning around CE. Georgia presented on the Harvard Center model at Bates College as an example of an engaged center. It is unclear what UMF's next step will be with this initiative. Sally will follow up with a call to Celeste to suggest that a CE training for new faculty might be a good use of the remaining funds for this campus.

USM Lewiston Auburn College Community Engagement Celebration

Over 80 community partners and students, faculty, and administrators attended this event on May 26, 2015. The event celebrated the achievement of having every LAC student participating in at least one CE experience as part of their academic program and included an overview of CE and remarks from Vice Chancellor Theo Kalikow, USM LAC CE Scholar Michelle Vazquez Jacobus, Executive Director of USM MU Lynn Kuzma and incoming USM President Glenn Cummings.

Community Engagement Overview & Preliminary Work Plan
Dr. Theodora J. Kalikow, President Emerita and Vice Chancellor
Board of Trustees Meeting, September 21-22, 2014

Community Engagement definition: An intentional array of mutually beneficial, two-way partnerships between the University of Maine System, its campuses, and the wider world – primarily (but not exclusively) within the state, the regions, and the communities where individual campuses are located.

The **primary outcome** of community engagement is to benefit the students: to offer every student an opportunity to become a reflective practitioner—that is, to employ and practice their cognitive and affective skills, critical analysis and good judgment in high-impact experiential learning settings. This builds their employment and career success skills and provides them with relevant experience in the workplace.

The **secondary outcome** is the benefit the University contributes to the community through the transfer and application of knowledge by students and faculty, and the leveraging of university assets in order to meet community needs.

These two outcomes provide the win-win: the opportunities that engagement with the community provides for our students, and the potential benefits that community organizations can accrue from student and institutional involvement and problem-solving. Mutual partnerships can bring substantial mutual benefits in which our students, our communities and our state all profit.

Community engagement is not new – it is a major part of public service, one segment of the university’s traditional tripartite mission (along with teaching and research), fostering the public purpose and civic mission of higher education. While the University has many excellent examples of successful community engagement, we have not institutionalized it across the enterprise to ensure our campuses are relevant and responsive to the communities they serve. There is an opportunity to incentivize and better align the expectations, structures, policies, and practices around community engagement to serve more students and to ensure our communities benefit from the contributions of the University to the quality of civic, economic and cultural life.

The work on community engagement this year is to begin the process of alignment in order to increase student success, advance community partnerships, and improve recognition of the public value of our University—three strategic outcomes adopted by the Board of Trustees¹. This work will proceed along two dimensions: the sharing and learning from best practices; and the development of a five-year plan to institutionalize community engagement within the campuses of the University System.

¹ *Board of Trustees Strategic Outcomes: Increase Student Success - Education Targets 2, 3 & 4; Advance Community engagement - Public Service Targets 1 & 2; and Increase the Recognition of Public Value – Public Service Target 3.*

Steering Committee

Form a steering committee of faculty, students and community partners with experience in community engagement to advise and guide these efforts.

Best practices

Engage the faculty in sharing best practices for partnership opportunities, curriculum design, and the achievement of educational outcomes for students across the system. Convene a System-wide faculty conference to begin this process and to plan further activities to achieve these goals.

Consult with students experienced in community engagement to explore their perceptions in order to inform and contribute to the formation of best practices.

Convene established community partners, including employers, to gain their insights on the preparation of graduates for work and life, and to obtain their assistance in expanding the number of opportunities available for students and faculty to engage with the community. Network with state and regional community/economic development organizations for information, collaboration and partnership.

3-Year Plan

Produce a 3-year plan for aligning the expectations, structures, policies, and practices for community engagement across our University System to achieve the strategic outcomes put forward by the Board of Trustees for increasing student success, advancing community partnerships, and improving recognition of the public value of our University.

Work with campus leadership to explicate how their respective missions, legacies, academic programs, and service areas yield particular emphases within a common community engagement framework (examples: land-grant institution, metropolitan university, environmental liberal arts...). Identify policy and planning areas for better alignment of the University campuses with community engagement goals.

Closing

In my role as Vice Chancellor, I will chair the steering committee, assume the leadership role in pursuing best practices and developing the 3-year plan, and be the lead voice in bringing public attention to this essential work of connecting our students and faculty with our communities. I want to thank the Chancellor and the Board for the opportunity to work on this important initiative that has been my passion for most of my career. I'd be happy to take questions.

UMS Community Engagement Project Summary 10/24/2014

Primary Contact:

Theodora J. Kalikow
Interim Vice Chancellor (community engagement)
207-228-8097
Kalikow@maine.edu

OE Support:

Tamara Mitchell
Director of Organizational Effectiveness
207-973-3235
tamara@maine.edu

Outcomes

- Improve students' education for 21st c.
- Increase the "stay" option for ME students and graduates.
- Build organization, business and civic capacity through scholarship, research, and teaching partnerships.
- Increase community commitment and valuing of UMS, and increase UMS's valuing of the community.

Deliverables

- A multi-year plan for development of a structure and common framework of policy, practice, expectations and incentives that will unify, elevate and enhance Community Engagement throughout UMS within three to five years.

Plan will build upon current include items such as timetable, desired outcomes, appropriate milestones, resources needed and their sources, responsible titles or groups, BoT actions required.

- Plan for a unified method of data collection, analysis, assessment and reporting of CE activities and impacts throughout UMS.

Action Items

1. Create a steering committee to inform and guide development of the multi-year plan and recommend implementation timelines and priorities.
2. Investigate and potentially pilot a software application for CE data collection and analysis. - Assess the feasibility/costs of piloting identified software at one

campus at a reduced cost. (Will seek separate approval for a specific budget request to cover System costs for such a pilot.)

3. Build awareness of UMS CE opportunities and initiatives through a series of public speaking engagements (business breakfasts, etc.)
4. Partner with ME Campus Compact to host a (multi-day) faculty gathering to solidify awareness of CE as a major focus for students in UMS; celebrate, share and promote existing CE opportunities for all students; and begin to identify structural changes necessary to appropriately incentivize and reward faculty for this work.
5. Host a community gathering of current and potential “platform partners” and key campus faculty and staff to share successes, benefits and challenges of CE and expand opportunities throughout all geographic areas and across all business and service sectors within the state.
6. Host a student gathering to get recommendations on how to improve and expand the experience to more students.
7. Work with campuses to elevate recognition of successful CE experiences and showcase the ways they integrated theory and practice, perhaps through integration with existing celebrations of student work (e.g., Symposium Day at UMF, Thinking Matters at USM,) or at a special gathering at the State House.

Timeline

November 2014

- Establish Steering Committee
- Develop public information materials
- Prepare software pilot proposal, timeline & budget
- OE update Vice Chancellor monthly throughout project

December 2014

- Establish sub-committees and dates for faculty, partner and student gatherings and celebration of student work activities
- Begin public information sessions

January – March

- Develop draft plan (interim report to Chancellor?)
- Continue public information sessions
- Initiate software pilot (depending on approval and funding of pilot proposal and availability of technology)

March – May

- Host Faculty, Partner & Student gatherings

Attend (&/or host) Student Celebrations

June

Final plan due

Note Regarding Current Campus Initiatives

The Community Engagement project and ultimate plan will build upon and link current campus efforts for improved student and community service and public recognition while respecting and preserving mission differentiation of individual campus programs.



Community Engagement Steering Committee

Theo Kalikow, Chair, Vice Chancellor and President Emerita, UMS
kalikow@usm.maine.edu

Celeste Branham, Vice President, Student and Community Service, UMF
cbranham@maine.edu

Nicole Fournier, Director of Career Preparation and Employer Relations, UMPI
Nicole.l.fournier@maine.edu

Leigh Garstecki, Director of Murdock Fitness and Aquatics Center, UMM
Leigh.garstecki@maine.edu

Paula Gerstenblatt, Assistant Professor of Social Work, USM
pgerstenblatt@usm.maine.edu

Emma Gelsinger, Metropolitan University Steering Group, USM
egelsinger@usm.maine.edu

Mark Hews, Maine Commission of Public Service, Maine Rural Partners
mehews@mehewsandcompany.com

Lisa Laflin, CEO United Way
lisa@uwtva.org

Susan McWilliams, Assistant Provost of Undergraduate Education, USM
smcwilms@usm.maine.edu

Clyde Mitchell, Professor of Business, UMF
Clyde.mitchell@maine.edu

Bonnie Newsom, Trustee
Nutalket@gmail.com

Lorraine Pratt, Partnership for Civic Advancement, UMF
Lorraine.pratt@maine.edu

Pamela Proulx-Curry, Campus Dean, UMA, Bangor
Pamela.proulxcurry@maine.edu

Chelsea Ray, Associate Professor of French Language and Literature, UMA
Chelsea.d.ray@maine.edu

Rosa Redonnett, Chief Student Affairs Officer, UMS
rosar@maine.edu

Claire Sullivan, Associate Professor of Communication and Journalism, UM
claires@maine.edu

Elizabeth Turesky, Associate Professor of Leadership and Organization Studies, USM-
LAC
eturesky@maine.edu

Scott Voisine, Dean of Community Education, UMFK
voisine@maine.edu

OE Partner:

Tamara Mitchell, Director of Organizational Effectiveness, UMS
tamara@maine.edu

Sponsor:

Rebecca Wyke, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration & Treasurer