INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade UMKC has garnered significant recognition for community-engagement in teaching, scholarship and service. In particular, in 2012 and 2008 UMKC received the highest national honors available to a University from the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll.

Despite these honors, however, the institutional infrastructure and support for community engagement at UMKC is largely under-developed. We have no recognizable center for community engagement within Academic Affairs and we have only minimal staffing (less than one FTE) specifically dedicated to support service-learning activities. Much of the reporting and tracking of engagement activities is done by individual faculty and units without systematic accounting or assessment of impacts especially for our community partners.

The initiatives that have been successful are largely led by faculty, academic units, and by administration/staff without institutional support or investment. As such, some efforts have had greater long term sustainability while many community projects come and go with the interests of funding and faculty. This situation creates a mixed perception of UMKC from the Kansas City community and limits the real impact and effectiveness of our community partnerships.

In 2010 the Provost appointed a committee to determine whether UMKC should pursue the Carnegie Classification Committee on Community Engagement and to design a “portal” for UMKC and Kansas City.
sections that would support engagement, reciprocity, student learning, and UMKC’s Strategic Plan. This final report of the Carnegie Classification Committee on Community Engagement presents the committee’s decision regarding pursuit of the elective classification as well as actionable plans for a campus-community “portal.”

SECTION 1: RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN

The University’s Vision Statement provides a clear commitment to creating an engaged university:

“UMKC will become a model urban research university characterized by signature graduate and professional programs, a dynamic undergraduate population, a highly diverse faculty, staff and student body, and active engagement with its city and region.”

This vision has been central to the way the committee conceptualized a campus-community “portal” as not just a piece of software, but people to lead the work, meaningful academic work that is part of undergraduate and graduate student classes and faculty research, and projects that connect with diverse communities. It is important to the committee to think of this work in its most rigorous academic context because the “portal” would not just be UMKC students helping out in the community rather it would be the full implementation center for UMKC’s vision for how the University extends into the City and how the City connects inside the University.

Pursuing the Carnegie Classification on Community Engagement and re-establishing a campus-community “portal” are both rooted in the UMKC’s Strategic Plan, 2010-2020: http://www.umkc.edu/provost/strategic-plan.asp

While many of the Plan’s Goals connect with the committee’s conception of academic community engagement, the following represent the intersection of the committee’s plan as described and addressed in this document and the strategic plan.

- Goal 1: Place student success at the center:: “Engage and retain students by providing ‘high impact’ educational practices.”
  - The committee noted that while service-learning was not specifically mentioned in the bullet, it is a high-impact educational practice according to the Association of American Colleges and Universities (http://www.aacu.org/meetings/psr09/documents/HighImpactPractices.pdf).

- Goal 3: Advance urban engagement: “Expand relationships in the Kansas City area to ensure that UMKC is embedded in the fabric of the community and the community embedded in the University.”
  - Through meaningful service-learning characterized by a high degree of reciprocity, UMKC can achieve this expanded relationship that many faculty have with the community but in a way that is campus-wide and acknowledged.

- Goal 5. Embrace diversity: “Provide a diverse learning and life experience to create culturally competent citizens.”
  - Many of the partnerships that the committee envisions for the campus-community “portal” will be with diverse communities and give students the opportunity to learn from and work alongside people who have different life experiences and worldviews than many UMKC students and to do this work in a way that respects and upholds the value and importance of diversity.
  - The Committee recommends creating a partnership with FACET and the Division of Diversity, Access and Equity to bring community engagement expert Jodi Rios to speak at UMKC in 2013-14 academic year and to host a workshop for faculty teaching the Anchor 3 courses.
• Goal 6. Promote research and economic development: “Create cross-disciplinary programs, at all levels, and align with strong community partnerships that support research, innovation and economic development.”
• “Strengthen workforce development programs to address current and future market needs.”
  o At a big-picture level, engaging with the community helps students understand and take with them in their professional careers that giving something back to the community is an outcome of college and the types of projects envisioned by the committee are good preparation for work and life.
  o Many of the most active community-engaged scholars and programs are based in the professional programs at UMKC across the Colleges and Academic Units. These professional programs have untapped potential to leverage the impact of engaged work in the Kansas City area through better communication, coordination and investment.

As demonstrated above, the committee’s ideas for leading, structuring and sustaining community engagement are natural fits with the University’s vision and strategic plan. The next section of the report provides an overview of the main finding of the committee regarding the Community Engagement Classification.

SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS PERTAINING TO CARNEGIE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION

From review of other applications for the Community Engagement Classification as well as conference calls with other UM System campuses, the committee concluded that UMKC has significant deficiencies that will make an application for the Carnegie designation very difficult. However, the committee did see that the application sets forth a structure of best-practices based on the work of leading experts in community engagement that make a useful self-study and template for working to institutionalize UMKC’s existing community engagement. Guidelines for the 2015 Carnegie application were released in January 2013. Since their release, the committee now has a clear sense of the exact criteria for the application.

The committee determined two basic findings:
1. UMKC should apply for the Carnegie Elective Classification in Community Engagement because it provides a clear framework and basic criteria for the engaged university;
2. UMKC has a lot of work to do to institutionalize community engagement across the University and to be ready for the application. As the committee pondered its main findings, we determined there were more good reasons than risks to apply. Here are the reasons:
   • UMKC has a long-standing commitment to community engagement that should be recognized.
   • Community engagement is an integral part of the UMKC Strategic Plan
   • The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification can help galvanize the campus toward a common goal while putting in place processes, leadership, and infrastructure that support the vision and strategic plan.

To be a true contender for the elective classification, there are five areas of improvement that need to be immediately addressed at UMKC.
1. Support existing UMKC faculty, staff and units engaged in community partnerships through capacity building, bridge grants and other dedicated funding, and clear work load policies that support community-engaged research, teaching and service.
2. Use the UMKC Foundation’s capital campaign to build on the success of existing faculty and programs in community-engagement by identifying “best practice” approaches that can be expanded and tied into the new general education curriculum as well as other important strategic goals.

3. Create a truly campus-wide coordinating structure for engaged faculty, staff and students.
   a. Most of the peer and best practice institutions have at least one Center or Office of Engagement located within the Provost’s Office. Most also have additional centers, institutes or programs that link specific academic programs and areas of research to specific community partnerships and curricula.
   b. The success of any community engagement initiative is the result of the effective collaboration between community partners, faculty, university staff, and students where faculty take the lead as part of their research and teaching.

4. Develop and circulate clear policy statements that support Promotion and Tenure for faculty who engage in community-based research, teaching and service.
   a. The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the University should require tenure-granting units to review their P&T criteria for consistency with the University’s Strategic Plan in terms of Urban Engagement
   b. The Provost should develop a statement or policy directive P&T criteria for consistency with the University’s Strategic Plan Goal 3 Urban Engagement, in terms of Research, Teaching and Service Learning.

5. Set specific goals within the new general education curriculum model for community and civic engagement as well as support for the faculty who develop and teach these time intensive courses.
   a. Create financial incentives for Departments and Programs to hire faculty with community engagement experience in terms of research and teaching.

The conceptualization of this Committee’s main task was to create a “portal” for all activities related to Community Engagement. As the Committee stated in our February 2012 report, a campus-community portal is necessary but not sufficient to garner the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. The application criteria for the classification clearly require more than a website or “portal”. In particular, the Carnegie criteria include the following:

1. Mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution’s engagement with community aggregation and use the assessment data
2. Systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement
3. Systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms to measure the impact of institutional engagement
4. Campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement
5. Internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community

Each of these criteria and recommended next steps to resolve deficiencies is addressed below.

SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP

Throughout the best practice institutions on community engagement, it is clear that leadership matters. The Provost and Chancellor have set a clear message at UMKC about the desire to build an engaged-university, but the practices of the institution don’t always support stated aspirations and goals. This message now needs to be
supported with financial investment in campus-wide, community engagement infrastructure that has faculty leadership and is strategically coordinated with the programs and projects - and their faculty and staff leaders - that have excelled.

Excellence in community engagement cannot be achieved without both the leadership from the top and the willingness from faculty, student and staff to participate and deliver results. While faculty leadership is necessary, there also needs to be staff management to provide consistent point of contact for the community partners who make possible community engagement.

Community partners who are already committed to UMKC must be re-engaged in a process that will address the development of a new center for community engagement and its programs in order to create local buy-in and long-term sustainability for this effort.

**Recommended next steps:**

1. Move campus-wide service-learning from Institute for Human Development to Academic Affairs.
2. Appoint an interim faculty director to guide the development of the new Center within Academic Affairs. This interim director will develop a budget for the Center, an Advisory Board of Community Partners, and a 3 year Action Plan. This must be a faculty member with at least an Associate level ranking and tenure, as well as a demonstrated track record of excellence in community-engaged teaching and research.
3. Develop a structure for the new Center or Office, including at least one administrative, full-time staff to work under and support the faculty Director.
4. Develop a plan and budget for additional faculty support, including paid student assistants and funds to support community-engaged research and teaching funds. Develop a means to recognize engaged scholars across the campus, such as affiliations with financial support.
5. Develop a plan and budget for community support in collaboration with a small, community-based advisory board. Community supports would include community work study students assigned to their organization, paid student assistants who work on-site, and significant representation on the leadership team that advises the community engagement work.
6. Create a clear strategy and budget for staff outreach activities. Leadership for this position will also reach out to the staff-led community engagement initiatives so that staff members are also part of the campus-community portal. Acknowledging that many staff members care deeply about both student learning and Kansas City, the campus-community portal could mobilize staff contributions in areas where students cannot and at times when academic projects are not feasible.

**A Targeted Approach to Community Engagement: the Sustainable City Year Program**

In addition to recognizing the need for an Office or Center for Engagement and Partnerships under Academic Affairs with a real budget, there is a need to develop a new catalyst for community-engagement at UMKC.

Launching a new chapter in community engagement at UMKC will require a clear community-based strategy to overcome the perception that UMKC is still not doing enough in the city and the metro region. One clear finding from our review of the existing activities of faculty and conversations with various leaders and community members is that UMKC is clearly doing a lot of community-engaged work, but the work is all over the map and perhaps too often under the radar of general public awareness.

Having leadership to engage students, faculty, staff, and community serves an important purpose in bringing visibility to the many and varied projects, and launching focused, sustained projects that are a clear fit with UMKCs academic strengths.
Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan for UMKC – Advancing Urban Engagement includes references to Sustainability. Faculty across campus often work on research and teach classes directly related to sustainable communities.

One possible focused project could be modeled after the Sustainable City Year Program/Sustainable Cities Initiative developed at the University of Oregon (http://sci.uoregon.edu/). This innovative approach would be sustainable in 5 years and would provide a framework to coordinate student service-learning and faculty research that provides direct, valuable services for area municipalities. This type of an approach would provide a coordinated framework for UMKC’s community engagement activities by creating a yearlong academic partnership with a particular city, county or other governmental unit within the metropolitan region. By concentrating faculty, staff and student attention to one specific place within the region each year, this type of approach could better leverage existing resources and service-learning activities.

**Recommended next step:** Bring one of the founders of the Sustainable City Year program to UMKC for a workshop and talk about the model through FACET and the Office of Research.

Develop a process to implement a Sustainable City Year program at UMKC for fall 2014 in collaboration with the Anchor III community engagement courses of the General Education Curriculum Committee.

SECTION 4: INFRASTRUCTURE

UMKC currently lacks campus-wide coordinating infrastructure for community engagement. Instead, a network of faculty and institutes provides a series of programs and technical assistance working with existing community partners. Programs come and go as funding sources come and go. **There is a real need for sustained capacity building within the institution to better support existing engaged- faculty and to attract new scholars with a commitment to applied research and engaged teaching.**

In the past there was a large program that operated out of the Center for the City and engaged at its peak over 2,000 students each year in service-learning and provided funding for faculty to redesign existing courses. What remains of the center is structurally located within an institute that is not located on campus nor led by faculty. Upon the retirement of the founding director of The Center for the City and the dissolution of its program, the Provost at the time placed the remainder of The Center for the City under the leadership of Dr. Carl Calkins and the Institute for Human Development, and Dr. Calkins has oversight for the programmatic functions once led by The Center for the City.

For service-learning, there is one 30% time research associate who serves as co-director of service-learning. With renewed campus interest in community engagement and service-learning, especially with the Anchor III and Discourse III course connection requiring community engagement, it is time to build infrastructure to support the high-impact learning potential of service-learning. UMKC's lack of a visible center and a clear organization is indicative of the under-development of our campus-wide infrastructure.

**Recommended next step:** The committee recommends that any new center for engagement at UMKC should be centrally located within Academic Affairs. In looking at precedents from other peer and exemplary universities it is clear that universities typically locate their Office of Community Engagement within the Provost’s Office. As soon as leadership is in place for the office of community engagement, the committee recommends that the leadership work with the Academic Affairs to design a new Center for Engagement with a clear budget, staffing priorities, marketing/branding (including a new name) and programs. This process needs
to engage three key constituencies: community partners and potential funders, faculty (particularly those who are already engaged) and students.

SECTION 5: BUDGET and FUNDRAISING

What is the budget for community engagement at UMKC? Currently our lack of a clear support structure for community engagement is evident in our inability to answer this question. There is a lack of clarity of how exactly the budget for community engagement at UMKC is allocated and reported. Currently activities associated with community engagement are reported and tracked at the departmental, institute or program level. There is a need for better accounting of how we fund this work as well as a clear fundraising strategy within the UMKC Foundation. This is a requirement of the Carnegie Community Engagement classification.

**Recommended next step:** Establish a budget for the community engagement office as part of Academic Affairs that includes an administrative staff, faculty leader, paid student interns or work-studies, and implementing the Sustainable City Year Program discussed above.

**NOTE:** See sample budget in the appendix.

SECTION 6: DOCUMENTATION

Documentation of efforts appears to be more consistent as new systems are being developed. However, the committee has reported that the use of the FAS is inconsistent across the University. The UM System is currently considering new technology for tracking faculty research, teaching and service activities. This new tracking system needs to include staff activities as well as faculty since there is currently no way to track staff activities. It must include ways to categorize or tag community-engaged activities across the research, teaching and service aspects of faculty, staff and student work.

The Registrar reports that UMKC can easily add a course designation for Community Engagement or Service Learning (SL) similar to the Writing Intensive (WI) designation. This designation already exists within the UM System and can be activated by the Registrar for the campus. However the committee recommends that a Review Committee be established to review these courses for approval (Curriculum). Given the new structure for General Education which includes Anchor III: Civic and Community Engagement, the approval of these courses should include some oversight related to service learning outcomes.

**Recommended next steps:** 1. Establish a committee organized out of Academic Affairs charged with formalizing a process to add service-learning courses to student transcripts and to note them in Pathway.

2. Develop a new format for tracking Faculty activity that is linked to the Promotion and Tenure process (portfolio development) with a clear and consistent format for tracking engaged research, teaching and service as well as high impact learning activities.

3. Develop a training system for new and existing faculty to use the FAS replacement system correctly and consistently in terms of data entry.

SECTION 7: SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS

UMKC currently has no means to assess community perception of our engagement activities on a systematic and regular basis for the whole institution. Much of assessment of community perceptions and the impact of this work that is reported are found in the reports of Departments, programs, institutes and other units.

While progress is being made on curriculum assessment and learning outcomes, this process will not include outside community partners unless individual faculty or programs specify and create a means for outside assessment. For programs that require internships, for example, there may be existing assessment tools but these are largely designed for program needs not institutional assessment of community perceptions.
**Recommended next step:** The committee finds that the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRAP) should develop new tools to assess UMKC’s impact on the community through our service learning and community engagement activities by linking course activities to assessment of community partners’ experiences. An annual “census” of community partners could help capture the activities of each partner and interactions with multiple units on campus. Since it is likely that many community partners have multiple interactions with faculty, staff and students, it is important to develop one survey instrument and not to overload our community partners with multiple surveys.

---

**Strategic Connection: General Education Assessment Plan of the General Education Oversight Committee**

Civic and community engagement are listed as one of eight Student Learning Outcomes in the General Education Assessment Plan of the General Education Oversight Committee:

- **Civic and Community Engagement:** Students will be able to identify the problems, challenges, and opportunities of an urban university. Students will also understand their relationship to both a local and global community and the social, political, and cultural issues therein. They will develop an appreciation for the meaning and global impact of urbanization. They will have an understanding of the U.S. and Missouri Constitutions and their impact on issues facing these various communities. They will engage with the UMKC community of learners.

The General Education Assessment Plan also recognizes high-impact learning experiences including service learning, internships, and learning communities.

**Recommended next step:** Coordinate with Nathan Lindsey and establish a consistent means to promote Community Engagement and include it in assessment. Some assessment measures and mechanisms already exist on a course-by-course, program-by-program level, etc. These could be used as examples for other faculty to integrate the assessment of SL and CE into their course assessment.

---

**SECTION 8: PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA**

It is not the position of this committee to tell other faculty and Departments how to structure their P&T criteria. However it is very clear that P&T policies across the University need to reflect a higher level of support for community engagement. In light of this, the Committee recommends that the Provost consider promoting alternative frameworks for P&T, such as the Boyer Model, that emphasize the importance and value of applied and engaged research and discovery.

**Recommended next step:** The committee finds a Provost’s directive or policy requiring tenure-granting Departments to review the Boyer Model and other means to promote active use of community engagement and service-learning in P&T Criteria is warranted. In addition, as faculty reviews their P&T policies, they should be encouraged to identify and remove obstacles to promotion of community-engaged faculty. The Provost could request that each unit complete a review of P&T criteria for inclusion of community-engagement in research as well as in the traditional teaching and service categories. Finally, the Committee finds that the Graduate School’s exit survey should include questions about service learning and community engagement for tenured faculty who leave UMKC, to gather data on reasons for leaving, including issues related to support for community-engaged activity.
SECTION 9: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND NEXT STEPS

This section summarizes our findings and recommendations.

- Create a truly campus-wide coordinating structure for engaged faculty, staff and students by moving campus-wide service-learning from the Institute for Human Development to Academic Affairs.
- Appoint an interim faculty director to guide the development of the new Center within Academic Affairs. This interim director will develop a budget for the Center, an Advisory Board of Community Partners, and a 3 year Action Plan. This must be a faculty member with at least an Associate level ranking and tenure, as well as a demonstrated track record of excellence in community-engaged teaching and research.
- Develop a structure for the new Center or Office, including at least one full-time staff to work under and support the faculty director.
- Develop a plan and budget for additional support, including paid student assistants and funds to support community-engaged research and teaching funds.
- Develop a plan and budget for community support in collaboration with a small, community-based Advisory Board. Community supports would include community work study students assigned to their organization, paid student assistants who work on-site, and significant representation on the leadership team that advises the community engagement work.
- Create a clear strategy and budget for staff outreach activities. Leadership for this position will also reach out to the staff-led community engagement initiatives so that staff are also part of the campus-community portal. Acknowledging that many staff members care deeply about both student learning and Kansas City, the campus-community portal could mobilize staff contributions in areas where students cannot and at times when academic projects are not feasible.

- Consider adoption of the City Year model as a catalyst for Community Engagement at UMKC. Bring one of the founders of the program to UMKC in 2013-14 for a workshop at FACET.
- Support existing UMKC faculty, staff and units engaged in community partnerships through capacity building, bridge grants and other dedicated funding, and clear workload policies that support community-engaged research, teaching and service.
- Establish a budget for the community engagement office as part of Academic Affairs that includes an administrative staff, faculty leader, paid student interns or work studies, and implementing the Sustainable City Year Program.
- Use the capital campaign to build on the success of existing faculty and programs in community-engagement. Target additional investments that can leverage successful faculty with a track record.
- Develop and circulate clear policy statements that support Promotion and Tenure for faculty who engage in community-based research as well as engaged teaching and service.
- Develop tools to assess UMKC’s impact on the community and community engagement’s impact on teaching and learning. Consider a coordinated approach to limit the impact on community partners who may have multiple interactions with UMKC faculty, staff and students.
- Engage all constituencies (students, faculty, staff, community partners) in a way that promotes reciprocity, embraces university, and helps connect campus and community.
SECTION 10: BUDGET

In our analysis of peer and best practice institutions we gathered data about budget allocations for institutions in terms of their commitment to community engagement. This information is available in the Portal Research Appendix. Portland State University – an aspirational peer – has an annual budget for all of its engagement centers and activities estimated at about $1 million. This number sounds large, but when you look at the value it is clear that the $1 million is a modest investment with dramatic returns. Per student costs to provide two centers and multiple programs at PSU is only $130 per undergraduate per year (with 7,800 undergraduate students engaged).

We propose that UMKC invest a modest $50 to $100 per undergraduate student, per year in a Community Engagement budget that would fund a new center within Academic Affairs and the General Education curriculum model for Anchor III courses (which requires all undergraduates to take at least one course) as well as additional community engagement programs, internships, and incentives for faculty, staff and students. This funding would be used to re-invest in UMKC’s commitment to our region while providing a “down payment” to help attract the 20,000 students by 2020 goal.

IRAP data show that there were about 8,400 undergraduates at UMKC for Spring 2013. Assuming that these students spend 3-4 years at UMKC and all are required to take at least one community engagement course, there would be approximately 2,100 to 2,800 students enrolled in at least one community engagement course per year. This number justifies a modest budget investment of $210,000 to 280,000 per year for community engagement at UMKC ($100 per engaged student). Again – an aspiration peer invests $130 per student engaged with a budget of over $1 million.

Assuming that the University also invests in a modified Sustainable City Year program in addition to the new center as a catalyst for faculty collaboration – there would be the very real possibility that over time community-based projects could also generate a match from municipalities in the region equaling or exceeding this minimal amount. A one-time start up for the City Year approach would cost between $80,000 and $100,000.

SECTION 11: CONCLUSION

Through the process of the committee’s work, an exciting new opportunity has arisen which has the potential to re-energize community engagement at UMKC. Pursing the Sustainable City Year Program model begins with a dedicated administrator and a committed faculty member with a vision for campus-community partnerships. It may be that a program that has campus-presence and is assessable to students and community partners comes first and builds toward a full-blown center. What is needed is a program that creates some excitement about doing engaged research and teaching at UMKC. What captures people’s imaginations is a program that has real opportunity for students and faculty to be engaged with community partners in real world, creative problem solving. Most students at UMKC are highly motivated by engaging with community partners. Whatever structure is designed moving forward, it needs to include some means to sustain win-win partnerships for UMKC faculty, students, staff, and our community partners.
Establishing a new center is certainly one means to re-brand the community-engagement activities at UMKC. Our peer institutions include many of the typical arrangements, including a designated Office of Community Engagement or a Center for Service Learning. These main organizational units are often connected with other research institutes, programs and centers that are all engaged in community-based research or teaching activities. Establishing a clear administrative structure is important, but is not going to change any perceptions off campus.

The Sustainable City Initiative at the University of Oregon demonstrates a different approach. The Sustainable City Year model is a means to coordinate multiple classes and research projects led by a diversity of faculty across many University departments, centers and units to create a targeted impact with one municipality, county or governmental partner over the course of one academic year. The program was launched with a minimal budget as an experimental program and has grown to a significant success story in the last few years with substantial support from outside of the University.

The City Year approach seems warranted at UMKC given our need for greater coordination of existing activities because it leverages the University’s limited resources within a particular geography. Such an approach could build upon existing partnerships. However, there is a need to invest in the basic support staff and training to coordinate a City Year program at UMKC.

With the City Year model there are also clear connections to the emerging General Education model with its Anchor course III focused on Civic and Community Engagement. The strength of the model is that it allows faculty to remain in control of their course activities, curricula and research projects while agreeing to focus on a specific location and set of challenges with the willing collaboration of a pre-selected community partner organization (such as a city or county government). This City Year approach could be piloted as early as fall 2013 with proper planning over the course of spring and summer semesters.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

*What would be the start date for establishing it?* - Fall 2013 for a soft launch and hiring of the full-time staff to begin the work of assembling the pieces.

*How long would it take to get up and running?* – It could be up and running in one year and gaining results in three years.

*What are one-time start-up costs?* –

Community Portal/Office of Community Partnerships: $150,000
City Year Program: $80,000-$100,000

*What are ongoing operational annual costs?* $100 investment per student (undergraduates only, 2100-2800 students engaged per year) – estimated at $210,000 to $280,000 per year investment.

Sustainable City Year model – model pays for itself over course of 3-5 years.

*What metrics would be used to measure success?*
Number of Classes Offered with a Community Partnership/Community Engagement component

Number of Students Enrolled in Recognized Community Engagement and Service Learning Classes

Number of Community Partnerships (includes research as well as teaching and service projects)

Number of Volunteer Hours of Work by Students in a Community Engagement Project