

Reflection to Strategic Planning: An Institutional Self-Assessment Model for Service-Engagement in Higher Education

Maggie Stevens, Ed.D.
Executive Director

J.R. Jamison, M.A.
Associate Director

1



Overview

- Introduction to the Rubric
- Process and Participants
- Give it a try!
- Next Steps

2



Intended Outcomes

- Campus Benefit
 - Opportunity for reflection
 - Chance to develop a vision and plan
 - Document
 - Create a framework for moving forward
- ICC Benefit
 - Inform campus visits and programming
 - Guide strategic planning process
 - Direct statewide programming
- 3 – Provide information



About the Rubric

- Background information
 - Defining Service Engagement
 - Building Service Engagement Infrastructure Work
 - Bringle and Hatcher Rubric
 - Carnegie Engagement Classification

4



Service Engagement

- *Service Engagement* is any endeavor that brings the community into the campus and the campus into the community, often addressing a social concern.
 - It could include service-learning, co-curricular community service, and volunteerism.
 - It could also include some internships and field experiences.
 - Ultimately, the sum of these activities leads to a campus that is fully engaged with the community.
 - Service engagement is also referred to as "civic engagement" by many national organizations.

(Adapted from the definition of "Civic Engagement" provided by National Service-Learning Clearinghouse by Indiana Campus Compact)

5



Building a Service Engagement Infrastructure

- Ten campuses were chosen by Indiana Campus Compact in 2007 to receive funding for three years with the end goal of creating a Center for Service and Learning
- Ended up opening the opportunity to all ICC campuses.

6



About the Rubric

- Adapted from Bringle and Hatcher (2002)
- Focused on five areas
 - Campus
 - Faculty
 - Staff
 - Students
 - Community
- Included a series of questions and a wild card option for each content area
- Allowed for campuses to rate themselves on a score of 1 to 5.



Process

- Introduced to membership in February 2009 at ICC Networking Council Meeting
 - Follow up email invitation to campuses in March 2009
- Invited membership to participate in Regional Workshops in May/June 2009
- Between February and May participating member campuses were asked to form teams with 5-7 individuals:
 - Suggested members included: CAAO, CSAO, faculty member, staff member, student, and a community partner
 - Meet on their campuses to focus on reflection of 2 years ago and current.

8



What this rubric is?

- A planning guide
- An information source
- A snapshot of where you have been and where you want to go
- An internal benchmarking device

9



What this assessment tool is NOT

- A means for comparing campuses
- A way to push campuses in any one direction

10



Process

- Workshops
 - Series of one day workshops across the state
 - Campus teams focused on reflective consensus building and visioning

11



Participants

- Fourteen campuses participated in May/June regional workshops
 - Five 2-year public
 - Four 4-year public
 - Five 4-year independent

12



Tips for Completing the Rubric

- Ratings between 1 and 5
- Can use whole numbers or decimals
- You do not have to strive for a five
- Wild Cards

13



Give it a Try!

14



Feedback, Reactions, Thoughts

15



Process

- Post-Workshop
 - No campuses completed the tool in one day
 - Campuses were asked to send completed rubric to ICC by August 2009
 - Seven campuses have completed the rubric to date
 - Two 2-year public
 - Two 4-year
 - Three 4-year independent

16



Themes and Trends

- The Campus
 - Identity (external)
 - Culture (internal)
 - Operations
 - AA/SA working together
- The Faculty
 - Service learning course development
 - Professional development for faculty
- The Students
 - Increasing service learning curricular opportunities
 - 17- Measuring student outcomes/assessments

Areas with the highest desired growth over time



Themes and Trends

- The Community Partner
 - Mutual Benefit
 - Reciprocal Partnerships in Program Development
- The Faculty
 - Scholarship
- The Staff
 - Professional Development

Areas with the lowest desired growth over time

18



Interpretations and Assumptions

- Areas with less desired growth may be areas that campuses already are strong
- Campuses may feel a need to strengthen and grow internal partnerships before focusing on community partnerships
- Desire for growth in service learning continues to be a value for member campuses

19



What now?

- Additional work with campuses
 - Two campuses participated in October 2009 workshop/pre-conference event
 - Advising additional campuses on best use of the tool for their work
- Strategic Planning and Grant Writing
- Program Planning
- Individualized Work with Campuses

20



Reactions/Questions

21



Indiana Campus Compact

Rubric:

<http://indianacampuscompact.org/Default.aspx?tabid=193>

Maggie Stevens, Executive Director

magsteve@iupui.edu

J.R. Jamison, Associate Director

jrjamiso@iupui.edu

Contact Information

www.indianacampuscompact.org

22 317/274-6500



Reflection to Strategic Planning: An Institutional Self-Assessment Model for Service-Engagement in Higher Education

Maggie Stevens, Ed.D.
Executive Director

J.R. Jamison, M.A.
Associate Director

23

