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I. OVERVIEW: OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY

A. Mission and Guiding Principles

Michigan State University’s commitment to outreach and engagement begins with its institutional mission statement, which reflects the institution’s historical founding designation as a land-grant college and its continued commitment to serve the public:

Michigan State University strives to discover practical uses for theoretical knowledge and to speed the diffusion of information to residents of the state, the nation, and the world. . . .

Michigan State University is committed to . . . emphasizing the applications of information; and to contributing to the understanding and the solution of significant societal problems. . . .

. . . [T]he land grant commitment now encompasses fields such as health, human relations, business, communication, education, and government and extends to urban and international settings. . . .

Michigan State University fulfills the fundamental purposes of all major institutions of higher education: to seek, to teach, and to preserve knowledge. As a land-grant institution, this university meets these objectives in all its formal and informal educational programs, in basic and applied research, and in public service” (Board of Trustees, June 24-25, 1982).

In 1994 then MSU President M. Peter McPherson also showed leadership in committing the institution to a model and practice of community engagement. Through the “Guiding Principles,” the institution committed to:

- **Improve access to quality education and expert knowledge**: Overcome geographical barriers to access, improve opportunities for part-time and non-traditional students.
- **Achieve more active learning**: Enhance undergraduate education, strengthen active connections between classrooms and student life, continue to evaluate and refine curriculum.
- **Generate new knowledge and scholarship across the mission**: Review current university investments in research; review and revise the reward system; improve linkages with university mission.
- **Promote problem solving to address society’s needs**: Set priorities that address key Michigam issues in partnerships with government and the nonprofit sector in Michigan communities, e.g., children, youth and families; K-12 education; economic development;
primary health care; urban and rural distressed communities; environment; sustainable agriculture; public policy.

- **Advance diversity within community**: Increase retention of a diverse set of students, faculty, staff, and administrators; review current initiatives to improve the climate.
- **Make people matter**: Review personnel and management practices; expand the use of technology to provide better communication.

Then, in 1999 the “Promise” focused the *Guiding Principles* into concrete statements about the University’s current priorities:

- MSU will offer one of the best undergraduate educations available by providing the advantages of intellectual inquiry at a major research university and practical learning in the land grant tradition.
- MSU will extend its national and international prominence in research, creative arts, and graduate and graduate/professional education, through selective investment in programs of distinction and unusual promise.
- MSU will be a great global university serving Michigan and the World.
- MSU will be an exemplary “engaged university,” transforming and strengthening outreach partnerships to address key Michigan needs and developing broadly applicable models.
- MSU will be a more diverse and connected community.

Current President Lou Anna Kimsey Simon stated in her February 2005 Founder’s Day/Inaugural Speech:

> Who would have imagined 150 years ago . . . that we would become the global prototype of a genuinely American brand of higher education—one that is an engine of the economy, a force for the democratization of public learning, the model for engagement with the world beyond the campus, and a catalyst for improving the quality of life in Michigan and around the world.

At the sesquicentennial academic convocation on September 8, 2005, President Simon announced “Boldness by Design,” a strategic positioning initiative that will play a defining role in shaping MSU in the years ahead. Each of the strategic imperatives President Simon articulated in that strategic design has direct implications for the University’s outreach and engagement agenda: enhance the student experience; enrich community, economic, and family life; expand international reach; increase research opportunities; and strengthen stewardship.

MSU has taken seriously its commitment to be an “engaged university” turning the mission, principles, and promise into concrete practices in numerous forms. All units at Michigan State University are expected to contribute to the outreach and engagement mission of the university at the unit level. This allows flexibility for individual faculty to contribute to the outreach research, teaching, and service mission in unique ways. Faculty in every college and in most departments report their outreach and engagement work through an outreach online survey—the Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument [OEMI]—as part of their academic assignment. (Data from this 2004 survey are reported throughout this document.) The staff of the Office of
University Outreach and Engagement are studying how deeply embedded the mission has become since a landmark definition of outreach was adopted in 1993.

**B. Definition and MSU Model**

Transformational events generally emerge from an underlying Zeitgeist and, therefore, it is difficult to discern specific causal determinants of change. Such is the case with transformational movements in contemporary higher education. One might look to the publication of Ernest Boyer’s *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (1987) and *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990) as seminal events. The first volume drew attention to eight tension points or critical problem areas affecting the quality of undergraduate education. The second volume challenged higher education to examine the definition and role of scholars and advanced the idea that scholarship involved four key components: discovery, integration, application, and teaching (p. 16). Campuses throughout the United States also engaged in debate about Boyer’s scholarship model. The collective weight of the six reports from the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities represented another signature event in higher education, because the reports generated national discussion about how universities and their faculties could improve the undergraduate learning experience, focus research on the pressing issues of the day, and amplify their engagement with the society that supported them—all aimed at having colleges and universities renew and revitalize their covenant with society. Since 1993, changes at MSU have been taking place in synergy with these reports and conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Events in the Development of Michigan State University's Approach to Outreach and Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989: Office of University Outreach established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993: Provost’s Committee produced report defining of outreach as engaged scholarship across the mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996: <em>Points of Distinction</em> guidebook published for planning and evaluating outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000: Reappointment, Promotion &amp; Tenure Form revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: Office name changed to University Outreach and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004: Outreach &amp; Engagement Measurement Instrument implemented to provide direct faculty input to university online data systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005: Center for the Study of University Engagement established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006: Full institutional alignment to be achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1993, Michigan State University has been deliberate and purposeful in defining, planning, implementing, and assessing outreach and engagement. This work has, in fact, become a signature area of the university. The 1993 definition stressed that outreach and engagement are scholarly activities embedded in the generation, transmission, application, and preservation of knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences rather than being a set of separate “service” activities detached from teaching and research (Provost’s Committee on University Outreach, *University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society*, 1993, p. 1). We have nested our resources in a key foundational principle in order to guide development of the MSU outreach model. That principle is the scholarship of engagement; that is, outreach and engagement activities should reflect a scholarship-based or knowledge-based approach to teaching, research, and service for the direct benefit of external audiences. We
rejected a service-based approach on the grounds that the service-based approach would have little purchase in a research extensive university where the reward system is defined by scholarship.

The scholarship emphasis does not mean, of course, that we ignore engagement that is service. But, for the most part, in every section of this report we have selected examples and reported numbers that are related to scholarly work, scholarly products, and the scholarship of engagement.

C. Forms and Types

Since outreach and engagement cross-cuts the mission, one way to represent outreach at an engaged university is by examples that relate to the three aspects of the mission—research/creative works, teaching and learning, and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF OUTREACH AT AN ENGAGED UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>Research/Discovery/Creative Works</th>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Service/Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied research</td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>Clinical services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based research</td>
<td>Study abroad programs</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual research</td>
<td>Distance education and off-campus instruction</td>
<td>Policy analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration projects</td>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>Service to community-based institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions/performances</td>
<td>Contract courses or programs for specific audiences</td>
<td>Expert testimony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessments</td>
<td>Conferences, seminars, and workshops</td>
<td>Commercialization of discoveries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Contributions to managed learning environments</td>
<td>New business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/technology transfer and research</td>
<td>Educational programs for alumni</td>
<td>ventures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>Participatory curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (described below) identifies seven broad forms, or types, of activities and initiatives, for the purpose of capturing a wide variety of faculty work that serves external constituencies:

- Outreach research
- Consulting and technical assistance
- Instructional outreach: Distance education, credit-based
- Instructional outreach: Noncredit
- Instructional outreach: Public information
- Experiential and service-learning
- Clinical services

Definitions for each of these types can be found in the OEMI instrument in print and online at [http://outreach.msu.edu/oemi/noauth](http://outreach.msu.edu/oemi/noauth) (reviewers will be assigned guest accounts to review the instrument). Numbers of responses received from faculty engaging in these various forms are available in OEMI reports, the full binder of which is available through the Office of University Outreach and Engagement.

### D. Constituencies

References to constituents and their involvement in MSU’s engagement enterprise are embedded throughout the reports below, particularly in the large amount of anecdotal evidence. That is, each piece of documentation lists or describes the external entities with whom or for whom the initiative was planned, implemented, and assessed. The report on service-learning and civic engagement, for example, demonstrates how local communities and organizations are involved in developing requests for student involvement and in evaluating their work; it also describes and reports numbers for the various ways students reach out to local constituents through academic service-learning, program-based internships, and co-curricular activities. The reports on continuing education and on public events and information describe a broad assortment of educational programs and managed learning environments for children, science educators, those in need of health services, underserved middle and high school students, alumni, international students. The reports also cover the “public” in large numbers who utilize cultural, athletic, and libraries services. And the MSU Extension report demonstrates the ways in which residents in all 83 Michigan counties are reached by the Extension service. The section on community-based collaborations reports on faculty members engaged with external partners and gives narrative examples of collaborations with faith-based, nonprofit, and economic development organizations, school systems and individual educators, national and overseas corporations, local neighborhoods and community action agencies, foundations and other funders, government agencies at all levels, commodities groups, and professional associations. Likewise, the report on international outreach provides several examples of the overseas constituents with whom university and faculty engage through education, technical assistance, and business and economic development.
The fact is that through its joint initiatives and funding with partners, communications to them through Web sites and reports, local and statewide data collection and needs assessment, evaluation of constituent perceptions by interviews, surveys, and focus groups—through these and many other ways MSU fully engages a broad range of constituents at individual, group, neighborhood, organization, or larger political or geographical systems levels.

Web communications. One of the ways the University can communicate to its numerous and diverse constituents and stakeholders is through Web sites. In fact, “Extension & Outreach” gets prime real estate on the MSU Home Page. Here we would like to mention a few of those sites designed specifically to enable the public to access outreach and engagement information at MSU in ways that are usable and useful to them.

- **Professionals and practitioners.** The Statewide Resource Network (SRN) is a large, database-driven catalog of nearly 1800 outreach programs and services offered by Michigan State University that would be of interest to professionals and practitioners across Michigan. The SRN is searchable by topic, location, and keyword, and the programs and services are listed by type of outreach activity, such as off-campus instruction or expert assistance. Usage data are found in Appendix A. (See [www.statewide.msu.edu](http://www.statewide.msu.edu).)

- **Children, youth, parents, educators.** The Spartan Youth Programs Web site lists records for pre-K to 12th grade activities offered by the University. The site lists over 200 such activities and is valued by local residents as well as university faculty and staff and their families. The site is searchable by grade-appropriateness as well as by topic. Usage data are found in Appendix A. (See [www.spartanyouth.msu.edu](http://www.spartanyouth.msu.edu).)

- **MSU Extension portal.** See MSU Extension report below for fuller explanation of this newly developed interactive tool. (See [http://www.msue.msu.edu/portal/](http://www.msue.msu.edu/portal/).)

### E. Capacity and Commitment

The University has established structures at many levels, instituted a strategic plan, created funding opportunities, and encouraged faculty and student involvement in order to fulfill the outreach and engagement mission and work with its many constituencies.

#### 1. Infrastructure

*Office of University Outreach and Engagement.* Since its creation in 1989, the Office of University Outreach and Engagement has worked on several fronts to fulfill its mandate at MSU and to advocate, model, and provide leadership for the engagement effort across the University and nationally. These efforts have focused on:

- Culture change: Embedding the concept of scholarship in the engagement work faculty do and revamping the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure form to include outreach, Extension and urban and international efforts.
- Evaluation and measurement: Developing a guide for evaluating and planning for quality outreach (*Points of Distinction*, 1996) and creating indicators for a variety of types of
noncredit outreach (available in hard copy and online at [http://outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp](http://outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp)). In 2004 it implemented the OEMI, an online data collection survey for faculty and academic staff reports of engagement activities and initiatives ([http://outreach.msu.edu/oemi/noauth](http://outreach.msu.edu/oemi/noauth)). In 2005 UOE held a Conference on Benchmarking University Engagement for research universities across the nation ([http://outreach.msu.edu/conf2004](http://outreach.msu.edu/conf2004)). The Office is giving leadership to the national benchmarking movement through the CIC’s Committee on Engagement and NASULGC’s Task Force on Benchmarking. In 2005, the Office launched the Center for the Study of University Engagement and is exploring the possibility of a national Consortium of Engaged Colleges and Universities ([http://csue.msu.edu](http://csue.msu.edu)).

- **Modeling collaborations:** Working with a variety of communities and community organizations to develop models and best practices for university-community collaborations ([http://outreach.msu.edu/capablecommunities](http://outreach.msu.edu/capablecommunities)), involving faculty to develop the methodology and conduct community-based research ([http://outreach.msu.edu/ucp](http://outreach.msu.edu/ucp)), and producing *Best Practice Briefs* for community practitioners ([http://outreach.msu.edu/bpbriefs/](http://outreach.msu.edu/bpbriefs/)) More on community-based work below.

- **Public access to information:** Developing the first Web-based “catalog” of faculty and Extension engagement work for professionals and practitioners, creating a Web site for youth that includes all of the pre-college activities and events offered by MSU, and putting tools and models of university-community collaborations into a Web site for both faculty and community members. The Usability & Accessibility Center was founded by UOE in 2004 to assist internal and external clients in assessing the user-friendliness and accessibility of Web sites and information systems ([http://usability.msu.edu](http://usability.msu.edu)).

- **Cultural engagement:** The MSU Museum and the Wharton Center for Performing Arts create educational outreach programs for schools, families, nonprofit organizations, scientific and cultural associations, and the public throughout the Great Lakes region. (See [http://museum.msu.edu](http://museum.msu.edu) and [www.whartoncenter.com](http://www.whartoncenter.com).) In addition, the Cultural Engagement Council, formed in 2002, meets monthly to discuss cross-cutting programming within the MSU community as well as cultural events and activities that link Michigan State University with diverse community partners.

More information on the Office of University Outreach and Engagement, its organizational structure and staffing, and its various services, can be found at its Web site: [www.outreach.msu.edu](http://www.outreach.msu.edu).

**MSU Extension offices.** MSU is committed to engaging with organizations and communities throughout the state of Michigan and has developed an infrastructure that maintains a university presence in all parts of the state. In 1994 the Cooperative Extension Service was renamed Michigan State University Extension, signifying that Extension’s network of offices in all 83 Michigan counties would serve as public links to all parts of Michigan State University, not just to the traditional agricultural and family programs offered under the Extension Service’s aegis. Those offices became hubs where community members could get answers to admission questions, take part in video conferences and classes beamed from the East Lansing campus, and the like and where faculty from all parts of the campus could meet and work with groups and organizations in specific counties. In addition, the Office of University Outreach and Michigan State University Extension established six (now five) joint regional offices across the state where
the two entities cooperate to increase faculty involvement with communities and groups outside the Lansing metropolitan area. These offices serve as continuing education centers, and they initiate and manage programs for urban redevelopment, land-use planning, and insuring positive outcomes for youth that provide opportunities for faculty to engage in applying their scholarly expertise to issues of concern to those communities. The University also maintains 14 experimental farms scattered throughout the state; several of these—especially the W. K. Kellogg Biological Station—cooperate with surrounding schools to improve students’ mastery of science as well as providing opportunities for the public to learn more about food production, the environment, and science. (See MSU Extension report below.)

**Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement (CSLCE).** The Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement (CSLCE) provides active, service-focused, community-based, mutually beneficial, integrated, learning opportunities for students, building and enhancing their commitment to academics, personal and professional development, and civic responsibility. The Center functions as a jointly administered unit reporting to both the Assistant Provost for University Outreach and Engagement and the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, and provides support to faculty, students, and staff in the areas of academic, curricular and co-curricular service-learning, civic engagement and service. The CSLCE also serves as the administrative office for the MSU America Reads/America Counts initiative, and the State of Michigan Office of the Attorney General work-study projects. See Service-Learning and Civic Engagement report below.

**Medical campuses.** The University’s two medical schools that focus on human (rather than animal) health are also represented across the state. When MSU opened its medical schools in the 1960s, the schools decided to focus on training primary care physicians committed to working with clients in community, not just hospital, settings. Therefore, these colleges chose not to affiliate with a single research and training hospital but to ally with hospitals and practices located in cities throughout the state where students seeking the M.D. and D.O. degrees completed their third and fourth years of training in a community setting outside of East Lansing. Part of that experience involves extended periods of experiential learning in community-based clinics. The colleges also provide intern and residency training programs in those locales and medical faculty focus much of their research efforts on issues pertinent to those specific communities.

**Centers, institutes, and research facilities.** The University Outreach and Engagement team that manages the Statewide Resource Network Web site for external audiences has identified 213 centers, institutes, research centers, laboratories, and clinics that have an outreach and engagement and applied research focus as part of their work. Not every MSU center has been included on this list. Descriptions can be found in the Web site: [www.statewide.msu.edu](http://www.statewide.msu.edu). See also Appendix B.

### 2. Strategic Planning

From 1992-1993, a faculty committee was charged by the Provost to develop a formal definition of outreach and make recommendations on implementing change. Besides a definition of outreach as scholarly work, the report generated a 20-item action agenda that deals with rewards,
promotion and tenure, evaluation and measurement, leadership, and so forth. Since then the Office of UOE has been charged with implementing those recommendations. Many of the recommendations have been fulfilled or acted on. A few, particularly those dealing with full institutional alignment, are still in process. A “scorecard” of activities and achievements in fulfilling that strategic plan is found in Appendix C.

3. Funding

It is difficult to determine the total funding invested in engagement across the University. However, the University provides general fund support, and faculty, departments, and centers and institutes obtain funds through fees, services, contracts, and grants. Below are some illustrations of the scope of funding:

- From the OEMI we have determined a salary investment of nearly $20 million for those faculty and academic staff (about 20%) who reported their FTE related to their outreach and engagement work.
- Noncredit educational activities for last year were $39M in sales and services.
- Grant income for “public service” is $67M, or 22% of all grant revenue (2003-04).
- MSU Extension’s 2004-05 budget of over $47M is from numerous sources—see Extension report below.
- The Office of University Outreach and Engagement has a general fund allocation of approximately $3.6M each year; its overall leveraged revenue is over $20M depending on sales of services, contracts, and grants in any year.

Beyond these figures, of course, are all the budget allocations within centers, institutes, and research facilities and laboratories, as well as other units, for outreach and engagement. Such figures are not available, in great part because of the definition of outreach and engagement as cross-cutting the mission.

Seed grants for community-based research. Community-based research, evaluation, and technology transfer are critical components of Michigan State University’s commitment to a scholarship-based approach to outreach. One mechanism used to facilitate outreach research is internal seed granting, providing start-up funds for programmatic research and allowing the testing of new ventures prior to applying for external funding. These internal seed grants for community-based research provide opportunities for young investigators, Extension researchers, and others to experience a federal-like grant process through a peer review process. There are three sources of seed money available to support community-based research, evaluation, and technology transfer: Outreach and Engagement – Extension grants, Families and Communities Together grants, and Community Vitality grants. During the 2004-2005 academic year, a common proposal and review process was adopted for these grants. In addition to utilizing NIH Form 398 as the basis for application, all grants must be interdisciplinary, show evidence of an established community partner, and/or involve Extension staff. Awards range from $15,000 to $50,000 per year and have a duration period of 18 months to 3 years. Each year, nearly $500,000 is available. To date, evidence compiled by an evaluation of FACT indicates a 7:1 return on investment with respect to sustained funding from extramural sources. (See FACT Web site at www.fact.msu.edu.)
4. Faculty and Academic Staff

Within the context of disciplinary needs, departments explicitly recruit faculty whose scholarship agenda includes applied research, technology transfer, evaluation science, or other scholarship-based approaches to outreach. In recent years examples of such recruitment include faculty positions in community psychology, urban sociology, construction management, fisheries and wildlife, environmental science, land use, and other campus-wide initiatives. In several of these areas campus leadership is given great visibility through the procurement of endowed professorships and substantial foundation and internal funding. Currently, Research and Graduate Studies, Outreach and Engagement, and Sociology administrators are leading the planning process for a campus-wide initiative on families that will result in the allocation of faculty positions to be jointly shared between disciplinary units and the campus initiative. A substantial portion of this initiative will involve community-based scholarship. In addition, a number of MSU units have commitments to outreach scholarship that are fundamental to their mission. Examples include Labor and Industrial Relations, Social Work, Family Practice, Nursing, Engineering, Business, and Anthropology. Recruitment of community-based scholars has been and continues to be fundamental to unit missions.

In addition to faculty, MSU employs a large number of academic specialists who are classified according to duties in teaching, curriculum development, advising, research, and outreach. Currently, MSU employs 206 academic specialists with the designation of outreach, though other specialists with teaching or research designations may well have outreach as part of their responsibility. One unresolved issue in the human resources classification system is the cross-cutting nature of outreach as defined at MSU. By distinguishing outreach from research and teaching, the system creates a distinction that may not be meaningful and which makes it difficult to count specialists engaged in outreach according to their classification alone. For this reason, the University’s full complement of specialists who engage in outreach is probably not limited to those classified as such.

Of the 4,493 (Fall 2004) faculty and academic staff, 1,059 responded to the OEMI survey. Of these, 828 claimed to be conducting outreach and engagement activities. Hence, of the full pool of academic staff, 23.6% responded to the survey and 18.43% reported their activity. The investment by the institution in outreach and engagement activities during this period was 249.51 FTE’s and $19,823,471 in salary investment. This was the first year for collecting data university-wide.

5. Faculty Development

The Office of the Provost supports an active faculty development agenda. The Director of Faculty and Organizational Development and Senior Advisor to the Provost is responsible for generating and coordinating all faculty and organizational activities of the university. (See www.provost.msu.edu/facdev.) Examples of such activities with important links to outreach and engagement include:
Meet Michigan. The Meet Michigan program is a very successful “traveling seminar” that provides members of the MSU community with an opportunity to learn more about MSU’s extensive research, outreach, and cooperative efforts throughout the state. The Meet Michigan program offers a one-day interdisciplinary trip each fall semester and a three-day broadly defined disciplinary trip each spring semester. The Meet Michigan program is designed to increase awareness of opportunities for outreach, research, and service to meet the needs of Michigan’s diverse communities and citizens, to assist in developing collaborations and finding funding sources to support these collaborations, to promote collegiality and community among MSU faculty, administrators and graduate students across the disciplines, and to clarify the faculty role in outreach and engagement.

Lilly seminars. Now in its 14th year, Conversations about Active Teaching and Learning is a series of workshops and seminars focused on innovative approaches to teaching, learning, and assessment at the university level. The program sponsors a series of half-day workshops, attended by large numbers of faculty from across the University. Each year one or two of the workshops is devoted to experiential and service learning as strategies for improving student learning.

MULTI workshops. MULTI workshops are targeted for deans, chairs, directors, and executive managers. The term MULTI originally referred to the Model Unit Leadership Training Initiative at MSU. One MULTI session annually focuses on the scholarship of engagement and MSU’s outreach mission.

6. Engaged Students

MSU has articulated the importance of and commitment to active, engaged, “real-world” learning through the MSU Promise and Guiding Principles (updated January 2002). The first principle states, “MSU will offer one of the best undergraduate educations available by providing the advantages of intellectual inquiry at a major research university and practical learning in the land grant tradition.” The third implementation point under this principle notes, “Support additional experimentation with real-world learning strategies such as problem-based learning, cooperative learning, case-based learning and service learning.” Attention to opportunities and learning outcomes for undergraduate students through research, living-learning options, and study abroad are also stressed in the implementation points.

The number of student applications for service-learning placements received by the Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement (see www.servicelearning.msu.edu), summer semester 2004 through spring semester 2005, was 10,039. This represents an increase of 1,565 applications over the prior year. All students who sought placements were accommodated. The majority of the MSU students who participate in service-learning and civic engagement opportunities at MSU are undergraduate students. The fall 2004 undergraduate enrollment was 35,408. Therefore, the applications for service represent approximately 28% of the undergraduate population. Because civic engagement is not required to be recorded through the CSLCE, these numbers may actually be low, not necessarily representing all the service-based and community engagement initiatives currently taking place. A minimum of 33% of the service applications processed were for academic service-learning.
The majority of the service-learning and civic engagement opportunities are offered in the greater Lansing area. The CSLCE offers national and international service opportunities through its sponsorship of the MSU Alternative Break experiences. The CSLCE partners with faculty in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Office of Study Abroad to offer a “for-credit” Alternative Break experience in Mexico. (See report on service-learning and civic engagement below.)

Graduation requirements. Michigan State University does not have a university-wide, standardized graduation requirement for experiential learning, service-learning, and/or community-based service. However, individual colleges or departments do. For example, the College of Nursing, James Madison College, the School of Social Work, Teacher Education, and Family and Child Ecology have academic service-learning and community engagement as graduation requirements. Curricular-based service-learning is a pre-admission requirement for the College of Nursing, the College of Human Medicine, and the College of Osteopathic Medicine. Additional colleges and majors encourage service and engagement, but do not formally require or track them. MSU highly encourages students to participate in study abroad opportunities, but does not have a graduation requirement in this area.

MSU does not note student engagement on the official university transcript. The implementation of a service, “S-option,” designation for courses and the use of a “co-curricular” transcript are being explored. The Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement has been designated as the university unit responsible for maintaining and issuing the official Record of Service for students. Any student, upon request, can obtain such a record. (The service performed must have been registered with the CSLCE.)

F. Data Sources and Assessment Tools

Because it seeks accreditation institutionally and by professional program or discipline, MSU is continuously engaged in assessment. For this self-study, over 135 units reported “best practice” examples of assessment related to their outreach and engagement activities. Units were asked to describe the goals, activities, assessment, and improvement of their outreach and engagement activities. The types of activities reported in sections 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d varied widely. From this source we have selected examples primarily for community-based collaborations, service-learning and civic engagement, and international outreach. Very few of the entries included distance education or continuing education. Analysis of the submissions can be found in Appendix D.

A second data source used for this chapter was the Carnegie Reclassification Pilot Study submitted to the Carnegie Foundation in July 2005. In the over 100 pages we described and documented MSU’s engagement identity and commitment and gave evidence for three categories: curricular engagement; continuing education, public information, and shared resources; and collaborations. The report is available through the Office of University Outreach and Engagement.
Third, the Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument has provided quantitative data about engaged faculty and academic staff. The survey was designed to produce data at the academic unit and institution levels that would enable better monitoring of engagement investment, focus, and planning; and to encourage faculty and academic staff to document their engagement activity more systematically and make such documentation more telling in the assessment of individual performance. A further goal was to stimulate greater attention to engagement on campus, attention that can lead to greater consensus about what scholarly activities are to be classified as engagement and how they are to be evaluated. During late 2004 and early 2005 MSU conducted the first online institution-wide survey. One quarter of the possible faculty and staff responded, indicating how much time they spent in outreach, the social issues on which their work focused, the numbers of people outside the institution they worked with, the geographic focus of that work, and external funding generated for the university and its partners to support the work. The survey also asked respondents to supply a narrative description of their work. A non-secure version of the form can be found at http://outreach.msu.edu/oemi/noauth.

Analysis of the quantitative sections and an in-depth qualitative analysis have been conducted by UOE staff, and reports have been provided to administrators, deans, and department chairs. Data are woven throughout various sections of the reports below. Sample reports can be found in Appendix E.

Fourth, the staff of UOE added seven questions to UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute’s survey of faculty. The questions asked how much time faculty spend on scholarly engagement activities compared to three years ago, how supportive the university is of such activities, external funding for such activities, integration of engagement activities with teaching and research, and length of a single engagement scholarly activity. The results can be found in Appendix F.

Finally, we also examined a variety of data sources across the campus, including Contracts and Grants data on outreach, public service, and international proposals; CLIFMS data sources for noncredit outreach; and numbers from the Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement. We sent requests to specific units such as the library and museums for usage data; and many others. MSU Extension has its own data collection and reporting—the Extension Information System (EIS)—from which it draws in its report below.

G. Reports

Although the University’s outreach and engagement work is decentralized and distributed across the colleges, departments, centers, and institutes, we are choosing to give specific reports on some of the categories more traditionally associated with this part of the mission. Within each report are specific examples and data related to constituencies, capacity and commitment, responsiveness, and value. The individual reports are:

- Community-based collaborations
- Service-learning and civic engagement
Following the individual reports is a summary assessment and recommendations for outreach and engagement over the next few years. The chapter closes with a number of appendices.

H. Publications and Presentations Related to Outreach and Engagement Across the University

1. Scholarly Publications


2. PowerPoint Presentations and Posters


II. COMMUNITY-BASED COLLABORATIONS

Community-based research is one major approach that embodies MSU’s scholarship-based model of outreach and engagement. Hills and Mullett (2000) state, “Community-based research is collaboration between community (constituent) groups and researchers for the purpose of creating new knowledge or understanding about a practical community issue in order to bring about change. The issue is generated by the community (constituent) and community (constituent) members participate in all aspects of the research process. Community-based research therefore is collaborative, participatory, empowering, systemic and transformative” (p. 1). Strand, Cutforth, Stoecker, Marullo, and Donohue (2003) further posit that “Community-based research has emerged in response to the criticism that colleges and universities are insufficiently responsive to the needs of communities. CBR has a long and diverse history, and this history provides a basis for the three major principles that guide our model of CBR for higher education institutions: collaboration, validation of multiple sources of knowledge and methods of discovery and dissemination, and the goals of social change and social action to achieve social justice” (p. 15). These principles of community-based research are complementary with MSU’s model of outreach and engagement and provide one major lens to understand our current work.

MSU strives to construct community-based collaborations within the framework of our scholarship-based model of outreach and engagement. While every major academic unit articulates outreach and engagement within the perspective of its mission, there are three common foundational principles in the MSU model:

- Outreach and engagement is reciprocal and mutually beneficial. There is mutual planning, implementation, and assessment among engagement partners.
- Outreach and engagement cuts across the mission of teaching, research, and service. It is not a separate activity.
- Outreach is scholarly. Our scholarship-based model of engagement involves both the act of engaging (bringing universities and communities together) and the product of engagement (the spread of discipline-generated, evidence-based practices in communities).

To help community partners and faculty successfully establish community-based collaborations, the Office of University Outreach and Engagement has developed tools and applications on its Capable Communities Web site (see www.outreach.msu.edu/capablecommunities/).

A. Constituencies

An early step in creating university-community collaborations is assessment of need. The assessment can take many forms. For example, in the MSU Extension report below is a full
description of community involvement statewide in issues identification. This report contains evidence and examples of various forms of collaborative needs assessment.

Of the 656 respondents to the OEMI who filled out the descriptive and analytic section, 120 or 18% said their work included needs assessment.

Needs assessment can, of course, be a form of one-way research conducted by university faculty for later application or a collaborative partnership where assessment is the first step of design of program interventions. The examples here are only of those that are collaborative. They also represent work related to diversity issues.

Since much social research, including collaborative and community-based research, utilizes such methodologies as surveys, interviews, focus groups, outcomes analysis, etc., the examples that follow are merely representative of a large amount of work conducted on the MSU campus. In fact, many examples throughout this report utilize these methods.

Muslim Immigrants: Social, Cultural and Religious Issues of Youth, Families and Schools in Greater Lansing. A partnership of MSU’s departments of Sociology and Family and Child Ecology with Family and Community Development Services, this project focuses on assessing Muslim immigrant youth development, identifying issues and risks and strengths (assets) using information from students, parents, and schools. The Muslim community in the Lansing area includes immigrants from Somalia, Pakistan, Middle Eastern countries, and refugees from Bosnia. This diversity of ethnicities and languages presents great challenges of adjustment for immigrant families, their children, the school system, and the community. The goal is to guide youth development and cultural education programs and to identify useful adjustment strategies for immigrants and their children.

Creating School Readiness in High-Risk Children through Involvement in Early Childhood Science Education. This study is exploring how early childhood science education programming may promote school readiness for low-income children. Investigators from MSU’s colleges of Human Ecology and Agriculture and Natural Resources and from Grand Valley State University are collaborating with Capital Area Community Services Head Start to study the processes and outcomes of science education among Lansing area Head Start teachers and families. This work will aid in the development of appropriate measures to assess teaching strategies, school readiness, and family engagement. Investigators believe low-income children who receive science education will show positive developmental outcomes that will help decrease the current disparity in school readiness between low-income children and children in private preschools.

Southcentral Michigan White-Tailed Deer Research. MSU researchers are working with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to examine deer movement patterns, impacts of hunting and other factors that contribute to deer mortality, and outcomes of deer-human interactions (e.g., deer consumption of crops, wildlife viewing, deer-vehicle collisions). In addition to the research on deer behavior that affects the community, the project manages a Web site designed to educate and inform people about the complex issues related to white-tailed deer research and management in south-central Michigan. Current outreach efforts focus on improving capacity of resource agencies to make effective decisions, professional development
for agency personnel, program evaluation, and techniques to integrate human and environmental dimensions of deer management.

**Small Town Design Initiative (STDI).** This project helps small communities reinvent commercial and other public spaces, while preserving character and history. Faculty and students from MSU’s Landscape Architecture program hold a series of meetings with local residents, business owners, and government officials to create a picture of what they want their community to look like in the next ten years. The MSU team turns this creative input into visual design images and written reports that focus on ways to revitalize the neighborhood’s built environment. Through an iterative process, which takes place over several months, community members are given opportunities to review and comment on the changing designs, which are then distilled into about 30 “before” and “after” images of key locations within the neighborhood that the students present during a final community meeting. The community organizations involved in the project may follow up by asking for volunteers to work on developing action plans, or by engaging professional design consultants to prepare technical studies and specifications to turn the project ideas into reality. Since 2001, the STDI has assisted planning in more than 40 communities in 22 Michigan counties. The STDI provides an opportunity for multidisciplinary scholarly research on topics such as social policy development and review processes, as well as an excellent service-learning opportunity and capstone experience for MSU landscape architecture students.

**Muskegon County.** University Outreach and Engagement’s partnership with Muskegon County dates to 1999. The partnership involved training youth to conduct interviews with 300 residents of a neighborhood regarding how youth and adults might increase their positive interactions through the sharing of skills and interest. (This program has been replicated in Lansing, East Lansing, in five other Muskegon neighborhoods, and statewide through the Office of Minority Health.) The project has also been involved in documenting how members of the county’s Family Coordinating Council used social capital in order to impact teen pregnancy rates, levels of substance abuse, emergency needs responses, and other human service issues. The Council’s chair—the county sheriff—is collaborating with the MSU team (including faculty from the College of Education) on the design and piloting of a retrospective study of how decisions of school personnel, Family Independence Agency, law enforcement, and family affected the involvement of ADD/ADHD and emotionally impaired youth in the juvenile justice system.

**Mapping Cultural Assets in a Detroit Neighborhood.** Identification and mapping of a community’s resources has been recognized as a valuable component of the efforts to maintain and enhance a community’s vitality. Many community-university collaborations have made use of this technique—to identify housing or land use patterns, to locate local resources of special interest to young people, to display locations where social service resources are available. One of the most interesting of these efforts identified the cultural assets of a decaying neighborhood in Detroit in an effort to highlight the strength, pride, and well-being of the area and to document the efforts of local citizens and neighbors to reinforce community ties and institutions. The project was a collaboration among the MSU Museum and the Dexter-Elmhurst Community Center sponsored by the Wayne County Family Independence Agency office and the Detroit Police Department. Museum specialists and community members worked together to:
• build an electronic resource directory of 408 community assets,
• collect 35 oral histories of the neighborhood from community residents and construct a community profile from those histories that emphasized both the area’s historic contribution to blues and gospel music in America and its vitality as an ongoing center of African-American culture, and
• produce the *Dexter-Elmhurst Neighborhood Resources Discovery Workbook*, designed to allow community members to continue the cultural resources project on their own.

The asset mapping effort rested on the belief that most urban neighborhoods have seen their most significant success at revitalization comes after identifying, connecting, and cultivating relationships among local institution, groups, and individuals.

*Community Income and Expenditures Model (CIEM).* With the support of the Economic Development Administration and the U.S. Department of Commerce, MSU has developed the Community Income and Expenditures Model (CIEM) to help communities identify their economic assets. Using a community-based survey method, communities can discover how much money enters the community and how much of it remains local. The greater the amount of money that is spent locally, the more it contributes to the overall economic growth of the community. By understanding the flow of money, communities can begin to identify potential strategies for retaining more of the money locally by developing new businesses, expanding existing businesses, or attracting new development.

**B. Capacity and Commitment**

1. **Infrastructure**

Historically, engagement has primarily been accomplished on the individual level—individual faculty connecting with individual constituents. While this constitutes an important mechanism of engagement, it does not leverage greater engagement in cost-effective ways. Moreover, individual engagement with community partners seldom addresses the full complexity of community programs. To leverage greater engagement the Office of University Outreach and Engagement created “Advancing Knowledge Transforming Lives (AKTL) Networks” of faculty to connect internally at a multidisciplinary level and externally at a community systems level. This is a new way of realizing engagement, moving engagement from individual faculty/community partner level to a broader systems approach to develop sustainable and expanding networks of connection. AKTLs are conceptualized as environments that can quickly create multidisciplinary responses to federal and foundation funding and research opportunities that aid in the amelioration of complex community issues. These networks bring together faculty and academic staff who collaborate with community agencies, organizations, schools, public institutions, and businesses. Currently the Office is making operational five geographic-based AKTLs—Lansing, Detroit, Grand Rapids, Flint, and the Upper Peninsula. UOE also supports two issue-based AKTLs—one on obesity (in collaboration with MSU’s FACT Coalition) and community and economic development—and is exploring the establishment of additional issue-based AKTLs in the areas of youth development, early childhood care and education, and engaged fatherhood.
In addition, University Outreach and Engagement offers practical support to local groups and organizations who are working to improve their own communities and the lives of their residents. These partnerships are based on the Outcome-Asset Impact Model (O-AIM), for increasing local capacity to build positive change. The goal of the O-AIM is to make outcome evaluation relevant to practitioners in diverse settings and to shift their thinking toward an assets or strength-based approach. Using an evaluative framework also shifts thinking from action to result, thereby assisting practitioners with outcome-based program planning and design. University-Community Partnerships engagement specialists use the O-AIM as the basis for their community and organizational development work. They also offer training sessions to community participants. The model is continually assessed and improved by training session participants’ evaluations, direct feedback from community partners using the model, and peer-reviewed comments from journal articles. The O-AIM is the core of Capable Communities, a Web site created by UOE to help disseminate the model (www.outreach.msu.edu/CapableCommunities/).

Earlier we reported on the 213 centers, institutes, and research facilities that have outreach and engagement as a focus. We also conducted a more in-depth study of these to determine that 22 have exemplar programs illustrating the collaborative nature of their work. Interestingly, these 22 fall across all of the colleges and major units of the university.

The University has offices that provide support for various kinds of collaborations for resource development, technology transfer, copyright and patents, contracts and grants administration.

*The University Corporate Research Park*, owned and operated by the Michigan State University Foundation, benefits MSU and its tenants through the advancement of research, technology, development of new knowledge, and commercialization of intellectual property. Research Park tenants qualify for occupancy based on the contribution they make to advancing this mission.

*The Office of Intellectual Property (OIP) and the Copyright Licensing Office* facilitate the commercial development and public use of technologies and copyrightable materials developed by MSU faculty and staff. If the technology is patentable, OIP works with inventors to obtain patents and then to license the invention to third parties in return for royalties. MSU licensees include large and small companies worldwide and a growing number of entrepreneurial ventures in and around Lansing, Michigan. If the material is copyrightable, Copyright Licensing staff assist with licensing the product to third parties or with distributing the product through university channels. OIP staff assist faculty with applications for external funding, review intellectual property language in pending grants and contracts, and assist faculty contemplating startup companies.

### 2. Professional Positions and Staff

One indicator of faculty involvement in outreach and engagement collaborations is their “sustained relationships” with partners: the OEMI analysis indicates that 342, or 60% of the 656, have partnerships that are more than 2 years in endurance. Another indicator is joint planning: 39% of the 656. A third indicator is involvement in community/partner capacity building: 30%.
The 209 respondents who indicated a relationship between their collaborative engagement work and ongoing research represent an investment of 41 FTE’s and a salary investment of $3,590,883 by the institution. Of these 209 respondents, 172 indicated work with external partners. These respondents represent an FTE investment of 36.6 and a salary investment of $3,193,062.

The 187 respondents whose qualitative responses indicated highly engaged relationships with individuals or entities outside the university represented an investment by the institution of 58.5 FTE’s or $3,962,592 in promoting these highly complex collaborative activities. A fuller assessment is found in Appendix G.

3. Faculty and Student Development Programs for Collaboration

An important way of building capacity and commitment is through professional development and graduate education. Three examples are described below.

Applied Developmental Science. The Interdepartmental Graduate Specializations in Applied Developmental Science were approved for implementation fall semester 1997. The ADS graduate programs were designed as a model for university outreach research and instruction that focuses on linking faculty and staff to outreach opportunities in the community. Partnerships address community-defined concerns with the goal of solving problems, generating new knowledge, and enhancing the capacity of community partners to be increasingly self-sufficient through research and instruction. The ADS initiative was established to achieve three broad objectives:

- to facilitate establishment of university-community partnerships and interdisciplinary affiliations,
- to emphasize the integration of theory, research, policy, and practice, and
- to address issues of concern to the community that simultaneously enhance university research and instructional programs.

Twenty-seven degree-granting units supported establishment of the ADS approach, and the ADS graduate specializations are cross-listed on degree program descriptions for all units. There are five key core components of the ADS graduate specialization, and, therefore, five key competency areas: developmental systems theory and developmental methodologies, diversity, context, strengths-based approaches to program evaluation and community development, and models of university-community partnerships. All graduate student guidance committees must be interdisciplinary and all students must complete a written comprehensive examination. Great flexibility in how students achieve competency will be part of the revised curriculum. However, all students must attend the ADS Seminar and all students must be engaged in community-based research activities. Students were first enrolled in the program in spring 1998. Positions currently occupied by ADS doctoral graduates include:

   Evaluation Scientist, Child Trends Inc., Washington DC
   Vice President for Eastern United States, Hugh O’Brien Foundation
   Systems Analyst, State of Ohio Department of Education
Infancy and Early Childhood Development. The Interdepartmental Graduate Specializations in Infancy and Early Childhood Development (formerly Infant Studies) were approved in 1991 by the Michigan State University academic governance system. Twelve departments or schools participated in developing the curriculum: Anthropology; Audiology and Speech Sciences; Counseling, Educational Psychology and Special Education; Family and Child Ecology; Food Science and Human Nutrition; Kinesiology; Nursing; Pediatrics and Human Development; Psychiatry; Psychology; Sociology; and Social Work. Originally conceived of as an 18 unit course-based curriculum, the program was converted to a 12-hour competency-based curriculum for the 2005-2006 academic year and administrative oversight was transferred from the Department of Psychology to the School of Social Work. Fourteen community agencies serve as partners for student placements and collaborative research and clinical training. Students must master specific objectives in each of the following domains: theoretical foundations, practice foundations, foundations of policy and advocacy, and foundations of research and evaluation. All graduate student guidance committees must be interdisciplinary and community placements are required. To date, graduates of the program have found employment as:

Social Worker, Lansing Public Schools, MI
Social Worker, Jackson Community Action Agency, Jackson, MI
Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Buffalo
Professor, College of Nursing, Michigan State University
Private Practice Clinical Psychologist, Turin, Italy
Deputy Director, National Center for Infants, Toddlers & Families: Zero to Three
School Psychologist, Waverly School District, Waverly, MI
School Psychologist, Troy School District, Troy, MI
Research Psychologist, Child Development Labs, University of Pittsburgh
Research Scientist, Child Trends Inc., Washington, DC
Research Scientist, SRI Inc., San Francisco, CA
Research Scientist, University of Arkansas Medical School
Professor, University of the Andes, Venezuela

Outreach in Fisheries, Wildlife, and Natural Resources. An example of a graduate course particularly designed to develop students for outreach collaboration is Outreach in Fisheries, Wildlife and Natural Resources Management (FW 884). This course is described as “theory, research, practice and current issues in using outreach in fisheries, wildlife and natural resources management.” The course covers such topics as developing environmental stewardship practices in various audiences, including citizens, non-traditional outreach clientele, and youth; a review of the fields of environmental stewardship education in formal and nonformal settings; resource-related outreach research and evaluation; information and education in resource agencies; and Extension education in resource management.
C. Responsiveness

The University and its many departments, centers, and institutes respond to the social issues and concerns identified through various forms of needs assessment to create a wide variety of collaborations, many of which are long-term. Appendix G gives an analysis of the narrative data provided in the OEMI related to collaborations with external partners. This section gives examples that illustrate community initiatives, business startups, technology centers, capacity building, program evaluation, clinics, partnerships for access to higher education, and resource development.

The “Zoom” Project. The partnership resulted in a conversion of the entire Catholic Social Services of Lansing/St. Vincent Home (CSS/SVH) organization to one with an asset-based, outcome focus. The collaborative relationship developed two key components:

- The organizational capacity to shift to an asset/outcome model of operation and
- The capacity to continuously measure progress toward the mission of CSS/SVH, both by individual program and across all programs, using a common set of standards.

The effort eventually involved over two hundred people, almost all CSS/SVH staff. It was challenging conceptually because it required having staff from all programs become knowledgeable about the asset approach, logic modeling, and evaluation design. The evaluation was not conducted by the MSU staff and handed to CSS/SVH in a package, but rather it focused on increasing the capacity of all programs to have their own asset and evaluation design specialists. The specialists learned how to conduct program evaluation through practice and training by University-Community Partnerships and the support of their lead ZOOM Team members.

¿Dónde Está la Justicia? A Call to Action on Behalf of Latino and Latina Youth in the U.S. Justice System. This study, published in 2002 by Building Blocks for Youth (a national partnership to promote rational and effective juvenile justice policies), was the first national analysis of Latina and Latino youth in the U.S. justice system. The report found overrepresentation of young Latinos at every stage of the justice system and gave recommendations for both policy change and community action. The authors were invited to testify at a briefing about these issues for the Congressional Hispanic Caucus in May 2003. The international attention received by this work led to additional funding for an investigation of adult Latinos in the justice system. That research has now been published in a book, Lost Opportunities: The Reality of Latinos in the U.S. Criminal Justice System (2004). The researchers were again asked to share their findings at a second Congressional hearing in October 2004.

Building Capacity for Evaluation in the Detroit’s Mayor’s Time Initiative. In the current environment of competitive funding and accountability, local organizations need to increase their ability to collect and use program data. MSU researchers are partnering with Mayor’s Time, Inc., a Detroit-based network of community-based organizations that provide youth development...
programming, Detroit Public Schools, and Michigan Department of Education to build evaluation and data management capacity among 100 youth-serving organizations in Detroit. The cornerstone of this effort is a Web-based data system that tracks student information, activities, and participation information that can then be used to demonstrate both the service utilization and impact of youth programming efforts.

**Evaluation of Genesee County’s Implementation of a Health Education Program for Preschool-Aged Children and their Families.** For the past four years, MSU’s departments of Psychology and Communication and University Outreach and Engagement have partnered with the Genesee Intermediate School District (GISD) and its affiliated 21 school districts to provide evaluation support to programs for children and families. Recently an initiative was started by GISD to train personnel such as teachers, nurses, and home visitors in the Color Me Healthy (CMH) program. CMH, a curriculum that is intended to increase preschool-aged children’s use of healthy habits, includes lessons on nutrition, physical exercise and health, and physical safety. There had not been an evaluation of the effectiveness of use of CMH, and there had been very little research conducted in the evaluation of such programs in preschool classrooms. This project studies the training components, and trainees of the CMH curriculum address questions related to training and outcomes for the promotion of preschool children’s health habits.

**Examining Gendered Bullying, its Psychological and Academic Outcomes, and Anti-Harassment Policies among Rural High School Students.** Prior to high school graduation, over 80% of adolescents experience some form of school-based sexual harassment (SH) or gendered bullying (GB) (bullying based on gender or the enforcement of gender-role expectations). As a result, many experience academic withdrawal, depression, and feelings of worthlessness. These estimates make SH/GB the most common form of violence experienced by American children, with high costs for both victims and schools. Despite its prevalence, few empirical studies of sexual harassment among minors exist. This realization led investigators from MSU’s departments of Psychology, Education, and Sociology to team with the Eaton Intermediate School District, Bath High School, and Safe and Drug Free Schools to investigate SH/GB among high school students, the resulting academic and psychological outcomes, and the impact of anti-harassment policies. Toward these goals, interview and survey data are being collected from students and teachers at Bath High School in Clinton County. Student interviews explore the nature of harassment at school, the ways in which bullying is gender-based, and student perceptions of school policies regarding harassment and anti-harassment policies. Similarly, teacher interviews address factors that facilitate or hinder the ability to enforce anti-harassment policies. Finally, results from interview data are incorporated into a survey to explore harassment, its outcomes, and the impact of anti-harassment policies on adolescents. These efforts not only contribute to the literature on school-based harassment, but also illuminate points of intervention to end harassment, improve school climate, and thereby promote positive development among youth.

**Keys to Excellence for Your Schools (KEYS): A System-Wide Approach to Building Capacity for School Improvement.** KEYS is an academically focused intervention strategy for those schools identified as “priority schools” in Michigan because they have not met standards of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by federal and state standards. KEYS is a national initiative, sponsored by the National Education Association, regionally organized, to create capacity within
individual schools and among a set of external assistors (“coaches”) to help schools improve their operations and outcomes. KEYS helps schools develop capacity to ensure learning gains on the part of all students, particularly disadvantaged students, and develops and trains coaches to provide essential supports to schools and school districts in their school reform efforts. The project also establishes a network of university faculty who serve as online support for KEYS coaches as they work in schools and districts to improve academic achievement through improved teaching and learning.

**Michigan SmartZones.** Michigan SmartZones are collaborations among universities, industries, research organizations, government, and other community institutions intended to stimulate the growth of technology-based businesses and jobs by aiding in the creation of recognized clusters of new and emerging businesses, those primarily focused on commercializing ideas, patents, and other opportunities surrounding corporate, university or private research institute R&D efforts. The program coordinates all of the community assets and services necessary to support technology development in the knowledge based economy. Supported by the cities of Lansing and East Lansing, in partnership with Ingham County, the Lansing Regional Chamber of Commerce, MBI International, Michigan State University, the Michigan State University Foundation, and the University Corporate Research Park, the zone stimulates the growth of technology-based businesses in the Lansing region. It focuses on business attraction, creation, and expansion in the fields of life sciences, advanced manufacturing, and information technology. Special attention is given to helping firms capitalize on research and technical resources at Michigan State University and MBI International.

**The Michigan Higher Education Land Policy.** MIHELP, a consortium of MSU, Wayne State University, and Grand Valley State University, has been granted over $6 million in funding by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to conduct land use policy research into problems facing Michigan’s metropolitan areas and deliver a range of options and analytic tools to assist policymakers and stakeholders. Challenges being addressed include urban infrastructure deterioration, unbridled sprawl, traffic congestion, and a decline of public education opportunities. The Consortium will sponsor a metropolitan issues seminar, establish a seed grants program for research and outreach projects, and develop a metropolitan studies Web site and a faculty expertise database.

**Usability & Accessibility Center.** Today’s competitive markets require well-designed Web sites that are easy to use and meet consumer objectives. The UAC evaluates the design, usability, and accessibility of Web products to ensure that they exceed users’ expectations. The services of the Center are open to external clients as well as university units and personnel. They include:

- Expert review of the usability and accessibility of technology products, employing user-centered design techniques
- Formal evaluation of product usability by working directly with typical end-users
- Research collaborations
- Training in user-centered design techniques, evaluation methodologies, and accessibility compliance
- Rental of state-of-the-art facilities for meetings, focus groups, and videoconferencing
a) Clinical Services

MSU has an extensive medical education program and clinical practice—human and veterinary medicine as well as nursing—that extends throughout the State of Michigan, with teaching facilities and clinics on the East Lansing campus and in rural and urban community hospitals.

*Human medicine.* MSU’s colleges of Human Medicine and Osteopathic Medicine participate in a broad network of primary care and specialty care clinical services. The Department of Pediatrics is the largest single provider of pediatric care to poor children in the Lansing area. Faculty provide services at the Ingham County Health Department and at clinics serving the homeless, persons with substance abuse problems, and the indigent. In the Lansing area medical students provide basic health screening and preventive education to the medically underserved. They also provide diabetic counseling, glucose testing, cholesterol checks, blood pressure checks, BMI measurements, and health literature at various public events. Students at the colleges’ other training sites are similarly involved with providing medical services to the communities in need. Medical school faculty are also involved with a wide variety of international health programs, including the Institute of International Health; malaria research and clinical care in Malawi; health care consultation in the United Arab Emirates; establishment of a medical clinic in the Belizean jungle; studies of hypertension in Zimbabwe; neurology in Zambia; and suppression of river blindness in several African locations.

*Nursing.* Similarly, the College of Nursing maintains a clinic, associated with the Department of Veterans’ Affairs, that provides primary care using nurse practitioner teams. The clinic provides management of both long-term and short-term medical problems as well as health maintenance and preventative care. Nursing students and faculty also provide ongoing consultation and care to residents of several senior housing complexes in the Lansing area.

*Veterinary medicine.* An important part of the mission of the College of Veterinary Medicine is to provide diagnostic, pathology, and advanced care services for companion and food animals to citizens in all parts of Michigan. It runs three separate centers to carry out this mission. The Clinical Pathology Laboratory provides state-of-the-art diagnostic testing in clinical biochemistry, hematology, hemostasis, immunology, urinalysis, and diagnostic cytology. The Veterinary Teaching Hospital is the state’s only tertiary veterinary hospital and deals with thousands of referrals of badly injured or seriously ill animals. It provides essential services to the horse-racing and dairy industries. Well-known for its work in orthopedics, the Hospital has recently opened an advanced rehabilitation center for animals recovering from orthopedic surgery. The Diagnostic Center for Population and Animal Health’s world-class veterinarians, epidemiologists, and scientists diagnose the sicknesses or causes of death of the state’s companion animals, livestock, and wildlife. Established in the mid-1970s to help the state understand the cause of unprecedented deaths on cattle farms throughout Michigan (diagnostic tests at the Center determined that a fire retardant chemical had been mixed with livestock feed), the Center is now taking the lead in tracking and preventing the spread of bovine tuberculosis disease which threatens once again to devastate the beef industry crucial to the state’s economy and is providing farmers with services crucial to their meeting export and food safety requirements. Each year the Center handles 160,000 cases, performing one million separate diagnostic tests.
**Grand Rapids Area Medical Education Center.** MSU’s College of Human Medicine partners with Spectrum Health, St. Mary’s Mercy Medical Center, and Grand Valley State University to form the medical, health education, and research consortium known as the Grand Rapids Medical Education & Research Center (GRMERC). The mission of GRMERC is to enhance the health of the Grand Rapids community through a variety of programs, education, research activities and services.

**Child Welfare Collaborative.** Since the fall of 2000, University-Community Partnerships and the School of Social Work staff have facilitated meetings of the Collaborative to design, implement, and test the use of Catholic Social Services of Lansing/St. Vincent Home (CSS/SVH) as a “teaching agency” for social work students. The Child Welfare Collaborative is an innovative application of a teaching hospital and modification of grand rounds, as used in medical training, to a human service agency. The Collaborative provides MSU social work students with hands-on experience in CSS agencies. The students assist in Lansing-area CSS programs such as foster care, refugee services, and Ballentine’s Stepping Stones, a transitional housing program for homeless mothers and children. The partnership directly affects 500 children, including those at St. Vincent’s Home, a residential center for troubled wards of the court that serves 200 youths a year. This Collaborative is also exploring and developing best practice and advocacy models for service delivery to children and their families. For example, one of the annual public conferences sponsored by the Collaborative created opportunities for young people to share thoughts about their experiences in foster care and in schools with educators, social service administrators, foster parents, and community leaders. The collaborative has published two anthologies of letters from foster children, “Dear Governor” (2002) and “Dear Teacher” (2003).

**Brief interventions for alcohol problems.** UOE is working with physicians at the McLaren Surgery Department and Regional Trauma Center in Flint to evaluate a brief intervention designed to screen trauma patients for alcohol use and assess readiness for change. Identification of alcohol-related trauma injuries is critical to generating evidence-based interventions that can be used to seek major grants for a clinical trial at five Midwestern trauma centers.

There are a number of smaller clinics and diagnostic centers at the University. The Department of Family and Child Ecology offers low cost marriage and family counseling services. The Department of Psychology maintains a psychology clinic. The College of Agriculture and MSU Extension maintain a diagnostic center that focuses on weed science, plant pathology, entomology, nematology, and plant identification and provides an essential problem-identification service to farmers and nurseries throughout the state.

**b) Partnerships for Access to Higher Education**

The University maintains extensive partnerships with community colleges and high schools within the state. Among the goals of the programs cited here are: ease of transfer and improved articulation, increase in underrepresented students in the university, and increase in number of students entering higher education.
Partnerships with community colleges and secondary schools. The Office of Admissions and Scholarships joins with its counterparts in the state’s other 15 public universities to offer a one-day workshop for high school admissions counselors about issues of admissions, transfer, advanced placement, and the like. This initiative was taken in response to the realization that limited budgets in the state’s high schools prevented college counselors from visiting colleges and holding discussions with admission counselors. Thus the public universities banded together to pay for and conduct these workshops.

Pre-college programs. Michigan State University offers a wide range of pre-college programs serving as opportunities for access and educational enrichment. Some programs, such as Vetward Bound offered through the College of Veterinary Medicine, and Math, Science and Technology Program for Junior High offered through the Honors College, are college-specific. Others, such as the King Chavez Parks College Day Program, are administered through the Office of the Assistant Provost for Academic Student Services and Multicultural Issues. To assist in the coordination of the pre-college efforts, the University launched a Pre-College Programs Steering Committee in 2000 that is jointly chaired by the Assistant Provost for University Outreach and Engagement, the Assistant Provost for Academic Student Services & Multicultural Issues, and the Director of Admissions. The Spartan Youth Programs Web site, http://spartanyouth.msu.edu/, is an outgrowth of the work of this committee, as are the middle-school Pre-College Programs Scholarship and Admissions tracking of enrollees in pre-college programs. Over the last two years, the committee has focused on developing a common mission statement and objectives and overall assessment techniques. To assist university pre-college initiatives to be strategic, both internally and externally, funds have been appropriated through the Office of the Provost, beginning with the 2005-2006 academic year, for a Pre-College Programs Specialist and Strategist.

Transition to university. The University has designed a variety of programs for assisting underrepresented students new to the institution to make a successful transition. These include, but are not limited to, the High School Equivalency Program for migrant students and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), which provides incoming migrant and seasonal farm worker students at MSU with support services for entering and staying in school. Operating continuously since 1966, Upward Bound is a federally funded TRIO initiative targeting potential first-generation college students. The Detroit Area Pre-College Engineering Program (DAPCEP) is an academically intensive pre-engineering program that introduces students to the rigors of calculus, physics, and other engineering-related sciences through a four-week, intensive on-campus residential experience and Detroit-based, ongoing support efforts. Maximizing Academic Growth in College (MAGIC) is a transitional summer program designed to provide newly admitted racial/ethnic minority students with important information before they attend classes at MSU.

Partnership for learning. MSU staff members from UOE, Financial Aid, and Admissions have joined local community efforts to increase the number of students entering higher education programs. Coordinated by a community agency called Partnership for Learning, the group is working with Lansing Public School administrators and teachers to identify and implement programs that will assist students in successfully completing high school and transition to
postsecondary programs. The group has begun to identify needs and work on grants to bring additional resources into local middle and high schools to meet those needs.

Articulation agreements for P–16. MSU encourages community college students to transfer to the University, and a large number do so every year. The University publishes and distributes to all the state’s community colleges guides that specify exactly which of those college’s courses students should take in order to enter each one of MSU undergraduate majors. Some members of the admission counseling staff are specially trained to work with community college students as they prepare themselves to qualify for admission to MSU. During the 2004-05 academic year approximately 3,084 students applied, about 1,750 were admitted, and 1,261 enrolled as transfer students.

Rather than cite the University’s articulation agreements here, we decided to analyze the ease of access for the public to find such information from MSU’s Web pages. We discovered that MSU has excellent, easily found information for transfer students that is very clearly and even enthusiastically laid out. We examined access to information on transfer credit policies, including transferring from a Michigan community college; transferability of coursework; links to Michigan community colleges; an explanation of credit equivalencies; transfer guides of the various MSU colleges/departments; the community college visit schedule; summer orientation sessions and schedule of events; and “Transfer FAQ” page. Other resources we discovered include a Transfer Orientation Newsletter, To-Do Checklist, and travel information. Students are able to sign up for the orientation program online from this site.

D. Value and Evaluation

1. Assessment at the Unit Level from the Self-Studies

Assessing how units learn from their constituents and understand their capacity to engage, their responsiveness, and the value constituents place on that engagement takes on many forms: formal evaluation, input from advisory boards or other groups, informal means such as conversations and individual feedback, and a variety of others.

Formal evaluations. Of those who submitted materials for Criterion 5 of the NCA self-study, approximately 52% use formal evaluative methods. These methods include, but are not limited to, surveys, interviews, focus groups, and formal program evaluations. For example:

- **U.S.-Canadian initiatives.** To learn about common economic issues and trans-border concerns of U.S. and Canadian legislators, government officials, and business leaders to maintain and expand the economic comparative advantage of the upper Great Lakes region in a North American and global context, the Canadian Studies Center’s (CSC) Internal Studies and Programs interviewed key informants in the Ontario Ministry of Trade and Economic Development, Ontario Exports Inc., North American Institute, Michigan Department of Trade and Economic Growth, the Great Lakes Commission, the Detroit and Canada Tunnel Corporation, and the Canadian Consulate General in Detroit. As a result of feedback from interviews and evaluation of these activities, the CSC
decided to concentrate recruitment of Canadian Fulbright Visiting Scholars each year (which it has been successful in doing) on experts in policy-related areas and also to concentrate on two major initiatives that would be planned with interested parties: (1) an annual forum on a major issue (on supply chain in fall 2005) and (2) a major conference on the U.S./Canadian auto industry in spring 2006. The CSC was successful in obtaining a $200,000 endowment from Canadian National Railroad (CN) for an annual forum and has been invited by the Canadian government to submit a proposal for an additional $50,000.

- **Civil and Environmental Engineering alumni.** To improve their responsiveness to the evolving needs of their constituents, the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering periodically surveys their alumni and the employers of their alumni. One such survey indicated the need for improvement of proficiency in written communication. In response the Department created a half-time position for a technical writing specialist that was first filled in 1997. The specialist developed a Technical Communication program consisting of instructional elements for the two required Civil Engineering courses that have intensive writing requirements, a new elective course on technical communication, Web resources, and a writing help room.

**Advisory boards or other groups.** Another assessment method is the use of formal internal and external structures or groups. Approximately 7% of the self-study respondents utilize this method. This approach involves alliances with professional associations or the establishment and use of advisory boards. Examples include:

- **Osteopathic Medicine Association.** The College of Osteopathic Medicine has strong linkages with the Michigan Osteopathic Association and the approximate 5,000 practicing osteopathic physicians in Michigan. The Michigan osteopathic physicians and affiliated health care institutions provide faculty and infrastructure resources needed to support the delivery of their clinical education curriculum and partner with the college to provide quality graduate medical educational opportunities. The college’s commitment to and responsiveness to the articulated interests of their constituent groups is probably best illustrated by their recent commitment to increase their class size on the East Lansing campus to 200 students per year and the ongoing planning for the development of a satellite campus in the metropolitan Detroit region. This is in direct response to articulated need by and support from their constituent groups.

- **Finance Advisory Board.** The Department of Finance, within the Eli Broad College of Business, seeks advice from its Advisory Board concerning the changing needs of business. At the present time the Advisory Board consists of 23 prominent finance professionals with a variety of educational backgrounds including business, economics, and law. The Board members represent a diverse group of organizations, including Daimler Chrysler Corporation, National City Bank, Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, Chicago Mercantile Exchange, and Highbridge Capital Management.

**Informal assessment.** Informal means to assess outreach and engagement efforts are used by 21% of respondents to the OEMI. These include face-to-face conversations, interactive presentations and workshops, e-mails, and feedback from faculty and staff. Examples include:
Student-neighborhood relations. Community forums and neighborhood conversations are held through the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs’ Off Campus Initiatives and efforts of the Office of the Vice President for Governmental Affairs to develop a better understanding of the range of issues and the perspectives of particular groups that impact university/student and neighborhood relationships. These conversations emanated from student disturbances and have provided baseline information for collaborative problem-solving between all partners. Stakeholder groups have established relationships, regularly discuss issues, and seek one another for collaboration and cooperation. Party ordinances have been changed; landlords are developing an administrative manual and training for property owners; hospitality businesses have increased health and safety education for servers; educational efforts have increased with incoming students and their parents through Academic Orientation Program and Parent Orientation Program. Additional community-based groups that reside in the near neighborhoods (e.g. faith-based organizations) are being sought as partners for the Community Relations Coalition.

Stakeholder conversations. The Department of Plant Pathology uses informal conversations with Plant Pathology Departments in other universities, external organizations, and similar internal MSU departments to help set the direction for the generation of new scientific knowledge about plant pathogens and the diseases they cause. According to the department, the generated knowledge is used to further the discipline of plant pathology and to assist their stakeholders in agriculture, forestry, and urban systems by providing tools that promote environmental safety and economic productivity.

Interactive workshops. The College of Social Science’s Environmental Science and Policy Program is planning to conduct an interactive workshop with the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality to discuss where they have been and develop plans for the future. In April 2003 they signed an agreement to work collaboratively, resulting in funding from the National Science Foundation to support a series of workshops for Michigan leaders on decision making under uncertainty climate change conditions.

Other assessment methods. Finally, 20% of the OEMI respondents use other methods of assessing outreach and engagement activities including self-assessments, environmental scanning, and standards from the field. For example:

Market information. The Department of Management, in the Eli Broad College of Business, practices periodic environmental scanning to understand the changing needs of its constituents and their communities by collecting market and salary information from alumni, the Human Resource Association, and the General Management Association.

Web design assessment. The College of Social Sciences International Studies and Programs conducts self-assessments to improve the Web design for their efforts to provide K-12 teachers and students access to high-quality, comprehensive teaching and learning topics about Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The self-assessment includes regular consultation between people creating content and those responsible for Web design. Teachers and curriculum designers who have used the Web sites and discovered their strong and weak points have provided some of the most useful suggestions for improvement. For example, suggestions have been made to include more graphics, maps,
pictures, photographs, and interactive activities in the modules created for these Web sites.

In addition to analysis of the unit submissions for Criterion 5 of their assessment methods, several projects illustrate value placed by the community or organization on the collaborative work of faculty. One form of value, of course, is longevity and repeat business. The Learning to Give project is an example of that. Another form of value is in-kind contribution from the community. The partnerships for resource development projects give data illustrating that form of valuing.

*Learning to Give.* Funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Lilly Endowment, and others, the Learning to Give (LTG) project seeks to help K-12 students understand the concepts of philanthropy, civic responsibility, and the common good. It is designed to encourage them to develop ideas, skills, and projects that build character and instill positive attitudes and behaviors toward citizenship and toward other people in their families, neighborhoods, schools, and communities. LTG is a thoughtful complex project employing a comprehensive set of strategies: curriculum development, assessment, in-service teacher training, pilot testing and field testing, supplemental materials development, evaluation, and dissemination through Web-based presentation. MSU’s Office of Outreach and Engagement, College of Education, Department of Political Science, and Department of Geography are working with the Learning to Give project staff and steering committee to evaluate the program. In order to assess student understanding, attitudes, and behavior changes as well as teacher experiences, the evaluation incorporates classroom observation, school climate surveys, teacher surveys, teacher interviews, student surveys, school administrator focus groups and interviews, and student testing. Based on results from this research over an 9-year span, LTG has helped teachers to transform their roles and the project is giving students a solid foundation of the basic concepts of philanthropy and the common good with almost all of the students participating in some form of voluntary service to their community at a rate of involvement almost twice that of most school children. A Michigan-based project, it is moving to a national application with a national steering committee in 2005. The MSU team began working with the LTG project staff and steering committee as formative evaluators when the project was just beginning. Since then, the contract has been renewed every three years, and the evaluation has expanded. This longevity and expansion are evidence of the value placed on MSU evaluators’ role in the project’s success.

*Partnerships for resource development.* An evidence of the mutuality of resource development with partners—and the joint value—can be found in the number of responses on the OEMI’s qualitative section of those who indicated they had external partners and gave evidence of joint planning and assessment. We took these numbers and cross-tabulated the responses with amount of external monies brought into the University and the partners, as well as the monetary value of in-kind contribution by the partners. The results are shown in the table on the following page.

*Capital Area Youth Alliance.* As part of this Lansing, Michigan, area alliance, MSU’s UOE and Department of Family and Child Ecology helped to prepare the proposal that was awarded a $180,000 grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to conduct professional development activities in reading and emergent literacy for teachers in kindergarten and preschool settings. This grant was followed by a two-year award ($388,000) from the Kellogg Foundation in
January 2004 that focuses on community mobilization systems alignment, provider training, and using best practices to create a community-wide seamless system for school readiness.

Many of the collaborative research projects cited throughout this report have involved nonprofit organizations and/or state governmental agencies that have jointly prepared proposals and sought funding from private foundations such as the W. K. Kellogg Foundation or from the federal government, such as through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services or NSF. Many of them are, therefore, examples of value placed by external agencies or organizations on the collaborative outreach and engagement work with MSU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of money, in dollars</th>
<th>Number of responses that indicated external partners and gave evidence of joint planning and assessment for:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money brought into the University</td>
<td>Money generated for partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 – 20,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 – 100,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Publications and Presentations Related to Community Collaborations

1. Publications


2. Presentations


III. SERVICE-LEARNING AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

As the pioneer land-grant university, Michigan State University has, at the core of its mission, the intent to connect the acquisition of knowledge to real world applications and dissemination of learning. Michigan State University’s commitment to university-community connections, therefore, made the evolution to systematically adopt, develop, and implement service-learning and civic engagement, congruous with the mission of the university. MSU has a rich history of student-led co-curricular service, academic and curricular service-learning, and civic engagement.

MSU was one of the first universities to formally establish a university-wide Volunteer Bureau/Center, enacted via decree of the Board of Trustees in 1967, and to have that volunteer center evolve into a Service-Learning Center (SLC) (1979). In 2002, the SLC was renamed the Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement (CSLCE) and became an independent unit, reporting jointly to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services and the Assistant Provost for University Outreach and Engagement. This renaming and dual reporting structure recognized the growth of the efforts of the Center and MSU’s commitment to co-curricular, academic and curricular service-learning, and civic and community engagement. (See www.servicelearning.msu.edu.)

The Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement empowers students with service and civically-based educational opportunities that extend beyond the classroom. Students who participate in service-learning and civic engagement contribute to the public good of local, national, and international communities via co-curricular and academic service placements. Students relate service to university-based experiences, allowing for real-world applications of learning and development of personal, professional, leadership, and citizenship skills. Numerous opportunities exist, applicable to all academic majors. In addition to providing direct service to students, the CSLCE supports the service-learning and civic engagement work of faculty and staff and the needs and roles of community partners.

A. Mission

The mission of the CSLCE is to provide active, service-focused, community-based, mutually beneficial, integrated, learning opportunities for students, building and enhancing their commitment to academics, personal and professional development, and civic responsibility. The Center works in close cooperation with community agencies and organizations, colleges, academic departments and faculty, applicable university-wide committees, student groups, and individual students to provide reciprocal experiences. It serve as both a clearinghouse and support unit. Much, though not all, of MSU service-learning endeavors activities are coordinated and/or otherwise supported through the CSLCE.
The work of service-learning and civic engagement coincides with categories and strategies noted in MSU’s *Guiding Principles* and *Promise*. Through its work it meets the needs of internal and external constituents. Here are a few excerpts from those guidelines:

*MSU Guiding Principles:* Achieve more active learning; advancing diversity within the community

*MSU Promise:* Offer one of the best undergraduate educations available by providing the advantages of intellectual inquiry at a major research university and practical learning in the land grant tradition; be a great global university serving Michigan and the World; be a more diverse and connected community

The examples below illustrate these guidelines.


*Diversity.* Evidence of increased/broader perceptions of diversity exists through involvement in 2004-2005 courses such as:

- Teacher Education 250: Human Diversity, Power, and Opportunity in Social Institutions, 26 sections
- Integrative Studies in Social Science (ISS)
  - ISS 210: Society and the Individual, 3 sections
  - ISS 215: Social Differentiation and Inequality, 4 sections
  - ISS 225: Power, Authority and Exchange, 4 sections
  - ISS 315: Global Diversity and Interdependence, 2 sections
  - ISS 335: National Diversity and Change in the US, 2 sections

*Community role.* Individual student ability to articulate role in community within the context of and beyond the academic course is also demonstrated through academic service-learning, e.g., American Studies 280: Major Themes in American Studies; and Family and Child Ecology 270: Introduction to Family Community Services.
B. Constituencies

Ongoing communication with, assessment of the needs of, responsiveness to, and collaboration with campus partners and community nonprofit organizations, educational and health institutions, and other constituent groups is the norm for CSLCE. Here are several illustrations of assessment of community needs:

- Receive and post requests for MSU service-learning students from more than 300 community constituent groups, with 43 new agencies requesting MSU students. The requests come from human and social service agencies, neighborhood organizations, health care and rehabilitation providers and hospitals, schools and educational institutions, senior citizen programs, pre-school and daycare centers, community revitalization efforts, recreation facilities, environmental programs, museums and other cultural facilities, government and legislative offices, and on-campus service-based programs and initiatives. Utilize position descriptions generated by community constituents seeking the services of MSU students in voluntary service-learning and co-curricular service placements. The use of community-authored requests and descriptions ensures that constituent needs are articulated through community voice.
- Conduct phone surveys three to six times annually to ascertain satisfaction and determine ongoing and future needs. Position descriptions are amended, added to, or deleted based on constituent response.
- Assign permanent staff liaisons to larger programs, such as the partnership with Sparrow Health Systems (634 students in 2004-2005), Ingham Regional Medical Center (353), and the Alternative Spring Break Program.
- Garner input from students through e-mail surveys, informal e-mail correspondence and conversations. Formal and informal discussions and correspondence take place with faculty. Feedback from students and faculty, both positive and constructive, is shared with community partners as means of addressing issues of quality and risk management.

C. Capacity and Commitment

In 2005, MSU responded to the Kellogg Commission Review of Outreach and Engagement with the following statement related to service-learning and civic engagement:

…We have upgraded the Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement and linked it both to student services and to outreach and engagement, thereby anchoring CSLCE more firmly in the scholarship of engagement. We have provided a sharper definition to the civic engagement components of service-learning experiences, and have increased the volume of academic service-learning courses in addition to the usual volunteer services and career-based internships. The Center has expanded its relationship with both the medical and school communities in local Lansing settings. …
This notation is indicative of the university’s commitment. Additional evidence is found in the inclusion of service-learning and civic engagement in the *Carnegie Reclassification Pilot Study on Engagement*, July 2005.

1. **Infrastructure**

The capacity of the university, in general, and the CSLCE, in particular, to support its constituencies is evidenced by the steady growth of student applications for service placements, academic, curricular and co-curricular, over the last five years:

- 2000-01: 4,492
- 2001-02: 6,778
- 2002-03: 7,073
- 2003-04: 8,474
- 2004-05: 10,039

In addition, in 2004-2005 the CSLCE:

- Worked with approximately 125 academic courses and their faculty
- Affiliated with all university colleges (though not all academic majors)
- Directly supported the efforts of “Into the Streets,” the VITA Program, and Alternative Spring Break (ASB) registered student organizations, partnering with ASB to offer 18 national and international, credit and not-for-credit service trips
- Managed the MSU America Reads/America Counts and Office of the State Attorney General work-study initiatives
- Administered the Michigan Campus Compact/Michigan Service Scholars AmeriCorps project (awarded a Midwest Campus Compact Citizen-Scholar Fellowship program AmeriCorps grant for 2005-06)

2. **Professional and Staff Positions**

The CSLCE currently employs 5 full-time personnel: a director; associate director; student services assistant; database and office manager; and accounts, work-study programs, and office manager. In addition to these full-time staff, the CLSCE employs a variety of graduate and undergraduate students as program and project coordinators and student staff advisors. Faculty and academic specialist respondents to the OEMI survey who selected “Experiential/Service Learning” as their primary form of engagement represented 17.25 FTE.

3. **Funding**

The Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement had a budget of nearly $200,000 in 2004, not counting in-kind support from community contributions. The faculty respondents to the OEMI who selected “Experiential/Service Learning” as their primary form of engagement represented a salary investment of $1,187,249, for 2004.
4. Faculty and Student Development Programs

*Faculty and specialist development.* CSLCE provides the following services:

- Identifies community placements suitable for academic discipline and course content and helps to develop best practices regarding curriculum integration and reflection. Provides individual and group consultation to faculty in these areas.
- Facilitates service-based linkages matching academic, professional, and personal interests with community needs.
- Maintains a database of service-learning and civic engagement opportunities as defined by community agencies and organizations.
- Conducts class presentations on request.
- Facilitates student enrollment in service-learning positions.
- Interviews and/or orients students as to opportunities and expectations.
- Maintains library of resources related to service-learning and civic engagement.
- Provides support for faculty interested in the scholarship of engagement. Faculty development includes, but is not limited to, the offering of MSU Lilly seminars for faculty and Office of the Provost “MULTI” seminars for deans, directors, and chairs.
- Partners with Michigan Campus Compact to promote and deliver regional and statewide conference and colloquium opportunities for faculty.
- Works with community partners to establish and maintain quality and safe service placements.

*Student development.* The CSLCE supports student development related to service-learning and civic engagement by:

- Providing in-class presentations and curricular and co-curricular information sessions regarding engagement opportunities through the CSLCE.
- Offering course-related and site-specific orientations.
- Developing and distributing specialized informational materials; e.g., “What Every ISS Service-Learning Student Should Know.”
- Serving as advising, training, and operational support to student-led initiatives for service; e.g., Alternative Spring Break, Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA), and “Into the Streets” (days of action).
- Maintaining university-wide, public, student database of service-learning and civic engagement opportunities representing more than 400 community nonprofit agencies and organizations, hospitals, health care and educational institutions, and government offices.
- Providing individual interviews and consultations as appropriate.
- Promoting training, educational, and recognition events available through the Michigan Campus Compact and other applicable venues.
D. Responsiveness

MSU defines curricular engagement as teaching, learning, and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions are supported by the institution and address community identified needs, deepen student learning, enhance the well-being of the community, and enrich the scholarship of the college or university. Educational opportunities focused on engagement are offered through such venues as academic and curricular service-learning and civic engagement opportunities, community-based, course-affiliated internships, community-centered field experience and practica, and study abroad experiences.

The University has numerous practica, internships, and field experiences tied to its majors and professional programs. We have not made an attempt to survey the University or its electronic systems to determine the number, but we give examples. In addition, there are undergraduate and graduate courses which either focus on community-based research or have sections of it.

E. Academic Service-Learning

Michigan State University has adopted the Campus Compact definition of academic service-learning: “Service-learning is a teaching method which combines community service with academic instruction as it focuses on critical, reflective thinking and civic responsibility. Service-learning programs involve students in organized community service that addresses local needs, while developing their academic skills, sense of civic responsibility and commitment to the community” (http://www紧凑.org/resources/SLres-definitions.html).

MSU offers both required and optional service-learning opportunities through core, general education, integrative studies, and discipline-specific courses. From summer semester 2004 through spring semester 2005, the CSLCE supported a minimum of 3,369 students in academic service-learning settings.

**General education courses.** Examples of general education courses offering academic service-learning are:

- **Writing, Rhetoric and American Culture 135: Public Life in America – The Service-Learning Writing Project.** Service-learning is a requirement and fully integrated into the course. Approximately six sections are offered each semester. On-line syllabi for two of the sections can be found at: http://www.msu.edu/~bartonf/ATL135/ and http://www.msu.edu/~ejidowell/135/135Home.html
- **Integrative Studies in Social Science (ISS) 210: Society and the Individual**
- **ISS 215: Social Differentiation and Inequality**
- **ISS 225: Power, Authority and Exchange**
- **ISS 315: Global Diversity and Independence**
- **ISS 335: National Diversity and Change: United States.** ISS 335 was the first ISS course to offer service-learning as an alternative assignment in a large-lecture course, and faculty work in ISS 335 helped to lead to the institutionalization of service-learning in the
ISS curriculum. ISS 335 is also unique as sections are offered through both the East Lansing campus, with community engagement in urban Lansing, and in Hawaii through the College of Social Science “Study Away” program. Service in Hawaii includes tutoring of Chinese immigrants for the citizenship exam and working with indigenous populations.

**Discipline-specific courses.** Examples of discipline-specific courses incorporating service-learning and civic engagement are:

- *American Studies 280: Major Themes in American Studies*
- *Family and Child Ecology 270: Introduction to Family Community Services*
- *Information and Technology Management 311: Systems Analysis and Design*
- *Internal Medicine 401: Clinical Emergency Medicine Research I*
- *Mechanical Engineering 481: Mechanical Engineering Design Projects*
- *Teacher Education 250: Human Diversity, Power, and Opportunity in Social Institutions*
- *Teacher Education 301 and 302: Learners and Learning in Context*

**1. Curricular Service-Learning**

MSU defines curricular service-learning as service related to a particular academic major or field of study in which the service is attached to the discipline rather than a specific course. An example is the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) Program, which is a joint project of the VITA registered student organization, whose membership is comprised primarily of Accounting and Finance majors; Eli Broad College of Business; faculty in the Department of Accounting and Information Systems; the CSLCE; the state VITA organization; the Internal Revenue Service; the Capital Area United Way; and the local Earned Income Tax Credit coalition. During spring 2005, 304 MSU students registered to serve with VITA, giving free tax preparation assistance to MSU international students and low-income community residents at a variety of campus and community locations.

Curricular service-learning is embedded in the fields of pre-medical and pre-nursing studies, and in campus living-learning options such as James Madison College, the LA CASA Spanish-immersion program, the Residential Option in Arts and Letters, the Residential Initiative in Science and the Environment, and CONNECTIONS, a first-year experience for no preference/undecided students.

**Community-based academic internships, field experiences, and practica.** While all internships and practica are designed to provide students with opportunities to apply “lessons learned” and skills acquired through a succession of courses, certain academic majors at MSU also view the internship as a form of community engagement. The community-based internship, field experience, or practicum is required for the respective degree. Academic preparation and concurrent assignments are included with the engagement experience to assist students in processing, applying, and articulating the experience, as well as to insure focus on community. Prime examples are:
• Anthropology 464: Field Methods in Archaeology
• Family and Child Ecology (FCE) 491: Internship Preparation, FCE 492: Internship Seminar, and FCE 493: Internship
• James Madison College (MC) 400: Field Experience and MC 401: Field Experience: Analysis and Interpretation
• Medicine 633: Extended Clinical Experience. Based in community hospitals and ambulatory sites, this experience goes beyond the traditional “clerkship” and is a 4-week clinical experience emphasizing interviewing skills, history, physical exam, problem solving, and therapy.
• Parks, Recreation and Tourism Resources: Professional Internship in Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources
• Resource Development 493: Professional Internship in Resource Development
• Social Work 494A & B: Field Education: Foundations I & II
• Social Work 894A & B: Social Work Field Education: Graduate Generalist Practice
• Teacher Education 501 and 502: Internship in Teaching Diverse Learners, full academic year, full-time student teaching experience

F. Office of Study Abroad

Michigan State University continues to rank as one of the largest study abroad programs in the nation (ranked third by the IIE). Over the past decade, the University has worked to develop international study sites where the expenses of such study abroad are similar to those associated with on-campus study (Mexico and Nepal, for example), thus making these extended study experiences outside the United States available to a much wider group of students. In 2003-04, nearly 2,500 MSU students studied in over 200 different programs in more than 60 countries.

Examples of study abroad experiences designed with service-learning and/or community engagement as core/integral to the programs are:

• Community Engagement in Rural Ireland. Sponsored by the departments of Community, Agriculture, Recreation and Resource Studies (CARRS); Fisheries and Wildlife; the Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program; University Outreach and Engagement; MSU Extension’s Barry County office; and the College of Social Science. Arranged through the Office of Study Abroad (OSA).
• International Social Issues, Recreation and Service Learning in Mexico. Administered as a partnership with OSA, CARRS, the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the MSU College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), and the CSLCE Alternative Spring Break Program.
• Race Relations in South Africa. History 480, 490; Integrative Studies in Arts and Humanities 211A: Area Studies and Multicultural Civilization.
• Education Society and Learning in South Africa. Teacher Education 250: Human Diversity, Power and Opportunity in Social Institutions; TE 311: Growing Up and Coming of Age in Three Societies; TE 490: Independent Study in Teacher Education; TE 890: Graduate Readings in Education.
• *Ethics and Development in Mali.* Collaborative effort of the Department of Philosophy, College of Arts and Letters, and the College of Social Science.

**G. Value and Assessment**

*Faculty evaluation.* From the qualitative analysis of the narrative and analytic sections of the OEMI, 7 of 22, or 32%, of the faculty who indicated experiential/service learning as their primary form of outreach and engagement work received formal evaluations.

*Assessment of and by students.* Michigan State University does not have a centralized method of assessing student learning in the areas of service-learning and civic engagement. Individual faculty, frequently in consultation with the director of the Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement, devise rubrics, research, research-writing, presentations and/or forum-based assignments specific to individual course needs and desired outcomes. As an example, faculty in *Writing, Rhetoric and American Culture 135: Public Life in America: the Service-Learning Writing Project* utilize a rubric that integrates the core academic components of the course with the service-learning writing project portfolio ([http://www.msu.edu/~ejdowell/135/135Home.html](http://www.msu.edu/~ejdowell/135/135Home.html)). This method of assessment utilizes instructor evaluation, end-of-the semester written input from the community site supervisor for each student, and student self-evaluation.

In virtually all of the course-based assessment models used, community input is obtained regarding student performance through individual evaluation forms completed by the community supervisor. While these evaluations deal with individual students, they also serve as a barometer of how students interact with community members. Where feedback warrants, adjustments in orientation procedures, numbers of students placed, etc. are enacted. An example submitted in the NCA departmental self-study is presented by the RISE program:

• *Residential Initiative on the Study of the Environment (RISE).* All RISE outreach and service-learning is assessed either following the activity or as part of the RISE exit survey. Staff meet with the student advisory committee on a monthly basis to garner summative evaluation data. They also meet with school faculty and principal quarterly to gather continuous improvement feedback.

Through the CSLCE, ongoing procedures are in place to monitor the success of the service experience, and, therefore, considerable assessment as to the success of the service experience is determined on an individual basis. The student applies for a position and is interviewed or directly placed depending on the situation. At mid-semester each student receives an e-mail asking for feedback regarding the experience to date. At the end of the semester, each is asked if he/she plans to continue the following semester. If a student, at any point, provides a response that indicates there is an issue regarding the opportunity, the student is contacted for additional input, and the site supervisor is also contacted. CSLCE staff then serve as the intermediary. Feedback from both the student and the agency are incorporated in order to maximize the experience in terms of the current situation and for future affiliations.
In addition to the ongoing, individual monitoring, approximately once each academic year, the CSLCE surveys students serving in select CSLCE program areas to obtain end-of-the-semester feedback regarding students’ perceptions of the service-learning experience. Each student surveyed is asked to speak to the perceived value of the experience; whether or not the experience met their expectations; if the experience was course-based, whether it helped to reinforce the themes of the course; and whether or not the student would recommend the experience to other students. As an example, at the end of fall 2003, an e-mail survey was sent to students who were assigned to service-learning placements in Health and Human Services, Community Development and Enhancement, Education and Special Populations, and Student Leadership Programs. Of the 279 surveys that were returned, 87.1% indicated that they would recommend the service placement to others.

In 2003, to assess the impact of service on student perceptions beyond that of academic assessment of students in a particular course and student satisfaction with service experiences, faculty from the Department of Family and Child Ecology and the Department of Educational Administration partnered on a study, “Learning about Differences through Service Learning.” In this study, students in diversity-focused courses, in which service-learning was an option, were surveyed regarding changes in perceptions of differences (to include ethnicity and special populations). Students utilizing the alternative assignment option in large lecture courses such as Integrative Studies in Social Science (ISS) 335: National Diversity and Change – United States, as well as utilizing the alternative research-writing assignment in Writing, Rhetoric and American Cultures (WRA) 125: The American Ethnic and Racial Experience, were compared with students exercising traditional options in the same courses. Increased perceptions and self-efficacy related to perceptions of differences were found among those students who had utilized the service-learning options. Data were analyzed by course, gender, class level and previous interactions with those perceived as “different.”

Continuous improvement. Evidence that internal audiences value service-learning and use assessment to improve program results is illustrated by the text submitted by the Center for Integrative Studies, College of Social Science, for the self-study report:

Assessment of student learning outcomes in courses and related activities such as service learning, study abroad, study away, and tutorial enhancements, has been used to improve our products for the future. We plan to launch for the 2005-06 academic year a new design for active learning which would diversify opportunities for civic engagement and service learning and incorporate community data collection, analysis, and civic forum that undergraduates in ISS courses may opt to engage in. Convinced that the creation of a variety of learning environments inspired by best practices is crucial to the advancement of student learning, the Center has reflected in its long-term plan to increase the options in as many ISS classes as possible to have active and participant learning in a variety of modes, including study abroad, study away, living and learning communities, service learning, and internships. It has even been suggested that no MSU student should graduate without the benefit of a good dose of active learning that would involve out-of-classroom learning opportunities such as service learning and study abroad. The Center for Integrative Studies partners closely with the CSLCE
in implementing its service-learning offerings, and the CSLCE directly handles all placements for ISS students.

Community satisfaction. Michigan State University views civic engagement as mutually beneficial involvement between students and faculty and the community partner. In order to insure that the affiliations and partnerships are positively reciprocal, the CSLCE assesses agency/organization satisfaction on an ongoing basis. In addition to agency evaluation of individual students as noted above, agency input is gained a minimum of three times annually. CSLCE staff phone each of the 400+ active agencies a minimum of once each semester to follow-up on students placed and update placement needs. Partner feedback is noted and addressed as needed.

Further evidence is provided by the requests from community partners for expanded, mutually beneficial opportunities for both the university and the partner. A prime example would be the creation of the Internal Medicine (IM) 401: Clinical Emergency Medicine Research I course at the request of Ingham Regional Medical Center. This opportunity was born from the long-standing, curricular, but not specifically academic, service-learning program in place with IRMC:

**Internal Medicine (IM) 401: Clinical Emergency Medicine Research I.** As a result of the long-term partnership between Ingham Regional Medical Center (IRMC) and the MSU Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement (CSLCE), an attending physician, IRMC Emergency Room, approached the hospital administration, the MSU Department of Human Medicine and the CSLCE regarding expanding the work of MSU service-learning students beyond service to include research. The result was the launching of the IM 401 course during the 2003-2004 academic year. IM 401 offers juniors and seniors students concentrating in pre-professional health science a unique opportunity to perform both research and service in a community health setting. Students gain experience in data collection and analysis while serving as assistants to emergency room physicians and staff. Emergency room administrators and physicians benefit from the data gathered. Emphasis is placed on writing reports covering topics in emergency medicine. Fifty-six students participated in 2004-2005.

In-kind support is another evidence that the services are valued. For example, the Capital Area Transit Authority (CATA), the local public transportation system, annually provides the CSLCE with free bus tokens for use by students to travel to and from service placements. Approximately 2400 tokens, equaling $1,200, were given for student use in 2004-05.

**Recognition and awards.** Evidence that external audiences value the work is indicated by recognition received by MSU faculty, service-learning staff and programs via various awards; e.g., Campus Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning (David Cooper, WRA), Michigan Campus Compact Lifetime Achievement Award (David Cooper), Michigan Campus Compact Outstanding Faculty/Staff Community Service Awards (various), first Annual Mayor’s (Lansing) School Volunteer Award (The Young Spartan Program), the inclusion of MSU service-learning personnel at community volunteer recognition events, and invitations from community agencies and organizations for the CSLCE director to sit on community boards of directors (currently four).
Positive media coverage. Positive media coverage of service-learning and community and civic engagement initiatives further exemplify the value perceived. A recent example is the Saints’ Rest Archeological Dig, Department of Anthropology and MSU Museum, which was covered by internal and external media:

Saint’s Rest Archeological Dig, Department of Anthropology and MSU Museum. During summer 2005, in conjunction with the celebration of the sesquicentennial of Michigan State University, students and faculty from Anthropology 464 excavated the site of MSU’s first residence hall, Saints’ Rest. The MSU students provided a public exhibition and interpretation of their findings during an open house on July 9 and 10, 2005. Select artifacts found will become part of the “Memories of MSU” exhibit at the MSU Museum. The Saints’ Rest excavation project also involved community constituencies through two special courses for high school students and teachers focusing on archaeology (http://special.newsroom.msu.edu/digMSU/). The project was covered in the Lansing State Journal, the greater-Lansing daily newspaper, on July 7 and July 10, 2005. In addition President Simon mentioned the work in her weekly Web address (July 16, 2005: http://president.msu.edu/blog/index.php?id=21).

1. Scholarship Connected to Service-Learning and Civic Engagement

From the OEMI analysis, 7 of 22, or 32%, of those who indicated experiential/service learning as their primary form of outreach and engagement gave evidence of a relationship between their outreach and engagement activity and scholarly activity. The same number gave evidence of production of scholarly work and intellectual property.

The examples below cover both student and faculty scholarship.

a) Undergraduate and Graduate Student Research, Presentations, and Publications

Design Day: Mechanical Engineering (ME) 371 – Mechanical Design I, and ME 481 – Mechanical Engineering Design Projects. Each fall and spring semester, students from these junior and senior level Mechanical Engineering courses engage the community through public display and interpretation of their research and product development. ME 371 students work in teams to tackle a problem of their choosing, build fanciful yet practical devices, and are challenged to both demonstrate and explain the work during the end-of-the-semester Design Day event. The senior-level students work with corporate, industry, and nonprofit partners to research and design a product and devise or adapt it for actual use. Students interpret their results to the community partners, fellow students, faculty, and the public through open presentation and poster sessions. A minimum of one team per semester works with a school, health institution, or community nonprofit organization to create an adaptive mobility device; e.g., cycle, scooter, mechanized chair for use by a physically challenged individual or school setting dealing with special student populations. During the 2004-2005 academic year, approximately 155 ME 481 students shared their research and designs through Design Day. A third component of Design Day is participation by students from 3-5 area middle and high schools in engineering-type competitions coached and supervised by ME upper-class and graduate students. An additional aspect of the young students involvement is to award the “People’s Choice” designations to the
junior-level ME projects. The lead professor/coordinator works closely with middle and high school technology and science teachers in this process and utilizes representatives on the program’s advisory board.

Writing, Rhetoric and American Cultures (WRA) 135: Writing: Public Life in America: The Service-Learning Writing Project. This course was specifically designed as a community engagement course in which first-year students engage with and write for public audiences. The community partners and writing projects vary each semester based on community requests and faculty and student interest. Many projects are pragmatic—such as promotional brochures for the local zoo, informational pamphlets for parents regarding state testing standards, Web sites for community nonprofits and the like. Another segment of the writings is informational in a broader sense, speaking to civic and civic engagement issues. Through a partnership in 2002 with WRA 135, the Michigan Nonprofit Association, the Michigan Children’s Network Michigan Campus Compact, and the CSLCE, faculty and students published the volume, Generation Y Speaks Out: Public Policy Perspectives through Service Learning. Students researched issues involving health, the environment, technology, and social policy, and wrote background and opinion pieces on topics of their choosing. The publication was presented to state legislators in a public forum as an attempt to insure that lawmakers “heard” the voices of young voters when addressing and formulating policies.

H. Publications and Presentations Related to Service-Learning and Civic Engagement

1. Publications


### 2. Presentations

Casey, K. M. (2205, April). Learning in context: Utilizing social science courses as both a methodology and means of assessment. In F. Hussain (Chair), *Classroom assessment of undergraduate students*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the North Central Sociological Association, Pittsburgh, PA.


IV. CONTINUING EDUCATION

This report addresses credit-bearing continuing education and noncredit instruction. At MSU continuing education primarily serves professionals and practitioners at the post-baccalaureate level. Most of the responsibility for offering continuing education opportunities to audiences external to the University is lodged in the individual departments and colleges. That these units are to make the fruits of their scholarly work available beyond the campus is an expectation shared across the institution.

A. Constituencies—Collaborative Needs Assessment

Most of MSU’s continuing education offerings are developed in response to and built with input from groups and organizations outside the University. Continuing education programs serving practitioner audiences—whether credit or noncredit—usually follow the same developmental pattern. Faculty research on emerging challenges or technologies in a field, or departmental advisory committee discussion of emerging needs in the field of practice, or a combination of both, leads to a recognition of a need for additional training for those already in practice. Faculty, committee members, and other representatives from the field explore what needs to be taught, how it can be successfully marketed, and what format of instruction would be most appropriate. The result is training in using computers in K-12 classrooms, incorporating molecular techniques in medical technology labs, or understanding how food law in different countries affects agricultural exports. Usually the initial strategy is to package the training in some kind of noncredit format, but very often participants and potential participants make it known that they would find work bearing academic credit more attractive, especially if that credit would contribute toward their earning an advanced degree. The next step often is creation of a three- or four-course certificate program carrying academic credit. The process of creating these programs pushes the offering department not only to incorporate instruction in the emerging needs in these off-campus continuing education programs, but also to incorporate them in on-campus courses. Since for-credit continuing education programs can only offer courses and degrees that are also offered on campus, the incorporation of new material to meet new needs in the professions occurs simultaneously in continuing education and “regular” instruction, often at the instigation of those serving the continuing education market.

B. Capacity and Commitment

1. Infrastructure

Overall monitoring of off-campus credit continuing education programs falls to the Dean of the Graduate School, appropriate since all but one of the programs are offered only at the graduate level.
The University also maintains, under the Vice Provost for Libraries, Computing, and Technology, the Virtual University Design and Technology unit (vuDat) to assist departments and faculty members using the Internet in their teaching to deal with technological and intellectual property issues so crucial to the success of such courses. The service is free to those building continuing education credit courses; there is a small fee for services offered in support of noncredit courses.

In the late 1990s MSU Global was established as a new and separate office to stimulate use of the Internet for continuing education offerings, especially those with potential national and worldwide markets. At the time of Global’s creation, the university leadership hoped that it would generate significant profits. With goals scaled back considerably since then, MSU Global focuses on supporting existing online programs and cultivating collaborations with overseas universities that will result in joint degree programs in which MSU offers some of the instruction (in person and online) and the collaborating institutions offer some. The first program—in crop and soil science with an emphasis on turf grass management—is underway as a collaboration between four Chinese institutions and MSU. More such programs are in the pipeline with a goal of developing at least ten in the next three years. MSU Global has also developed several online noncredit courses, in collaboration with such organizations as the Finance, Credit, and International Business (FCIB) Association, the American Horticultural Society, the National Basketball Development League, and the like. MSU Global also works with the Dean of the Graduate School to facilitate and oversee the whole roster of off-campus credit programs.

2. Funding

All revenue earned in noncredit continuing education belongs to the offering unit (if the unit uses the University’s vuDat personnel or facilities, 10% of the revenue is returned to central administration). Tuition revenue earned in credit-bearing continuing education courses returns 75% to the offering unit. Ever since this decentralized responsibility was put into place in the mid-1980s, the University has provided some subsidy to departments and units to help them initiate new off-campus degree programs. Even though subsidies have been reduced over recent years, many academic units have increased their continuing education portfolios as ways of generating revenues and supplementing declining general fund support. The professional schools, especially, see continuing education as a possible way of doing so.

Amount of earnings and expenditures is one means of getting a sense of the size of the noncredit continuing education activity in the University. Such income and expenditures are accounted for separately (in what are called 21-accounts for “auxiliary activities”) at MSU. Revenue and expenditures associated with credit continuing education are not recorded in these accounts (their revenues are accounted for through regular general fund tuition accounts). In 2004 the University recorded bringing in $39 million in sales and services of educational activities in these accounts.

3. Professional and Staff Positions

Because continuing education is decentralized at MSU it is not possible to report the number of professional and staff positions. However, of the 800+ faculty who responded to the OEMI
survey, 287 or 35% said they were involved with off-campus credit instruction and/or noncredit instruction. The MSU Global office has four professionals and three staff positions plus student help.

C. Responsiveness

1. Credit-bearing Continuing Education

Credit-bearing continuing education are those courses directed at students taking classes at remote sites; however, many departments offer advanced degree programs for working adults where all the classes are held late in the day or in the evening. These too could be considered continuing education, but since no revenue from these programs is returned to the offering department they are not included under the “continuing education” rubric for purposes of this discussion.

Almost all of credit-bearing continuing education efforts provide advanced studies for practicing professionals, principally at the master’s degree and graduate certificate level. Departments generally believe that they can best serve the needs of the state through this post-baccalaureate level of continuing education. Other state institutions provide undergraduate programs leading to baccalaureate degrees at a lower cost; few have MSU’s capability of offering a wide array of advanced professional programs. Moreover, because MSU’s off-campus continuing education programs must have the same requirements as on-campus programs and the majority of their courses must be taught by regular tenure stream faculty, the University faces limits on the number of classes it can offer off-campus. Thus, it is thought best to use that limited capacity at the professional level.

Currently MSU offers eighteen master’s degree programs at off-campus sites and/or online and/or as hybrid combinations of intensive on-campus experiences and Internet-based coursework. The College of Nursing also offers a BSN for practicing RNs. In addition, the University offers fourteen certificate programs, usually consisting of three or four master’s level, credit-bearing courses focused on a particular theme. Students are encouraged to transfer completed certificate coursework into master’s programs. The University offers master’s degrees for practicing professionals in packaging, food safety, teaching and learning with technology, curriculum and teaching, educational administration, advertising, public relations, youth development, nursing (with specialties in clinical leadership, nursing education, and nurse practitioner preparation), judicial administration, security management, social work, and community development. Graduate-level certificates are offered in packaging, molecular laboratory diagnostics, educational technology, international food law, watershed management, coaching education, medical technology, health care labor relations, and school social work. In 2004-2005, enrollment in credit-bearing continuing education courses totaled 16,789 credit hours. In relation to its overall size, MSU’s academic credit-bearing continuing education is relatively small. Nonetheless, the wide variety of topics reflects the number of departments across the University that seek to meet the needs of professionals in their fields.
2. Noncredit Continuing Education

Noncredit continuing education as used here refers to formal programs of instruction for adults that contain at least half a day of instruction, where there is direct interaction between instructor and participant (electronic or face-to-face), and that have stated learning objectives. The term does not include individual lectures, tours, exhibits, and the like. Nor does the discussion that follows cover the vast array of continuing education offered by MSU Extension; that work is covered in the Extension report below.

The noncredit continuing education enterprise is considerably larger than the credit one, but its dimensions are much more difficult to specify. All of the University’s colleges (except the exclusively undergraduate James Madison College) offer some noncredit continuing education. It is difficult to track because, unlike the University’s central registration and tuition collection systems for credit-bearing continuing education to provide exact information about enrollment and revenue, no such centralized systems exist for noncredit instruction. Rather, there are numerous kinds of arrangements, from a single faculty member who offers training to a company or professional group with which she also consults, to a highly formalized college-wide program such as the continuing medical education programs found in the College of Osteopathic Medicine. Like the credit programs, noncredit continuing education is heavily focused on providing advanced training for practicing professionals—among them medical technicians, labor leaders, nurses and physicians, journalists, business managers, police and other security personnel, and K-12 educators. This last group receives the most attention since departments across the whole span of the University provide opportunities for teachers and administrators to advance their mastery of both pedagogy and content.

In addition to funding streams discussed above, there are at least three ways, none perfect, of estimating the size of the University’s noncredit efforts since the data are lodged in multiple information systems, each serving different purposes.

First, the OEMI asks respondents to indicate the form of their outreach from a given list of options. Data collected from faculty for calendar year 2004 provide some idea of the amount of non-credit instruction being conducted. Inputs in the form of faculty time are aggregated into full-time equivalents (FTE), and also salary value. Estimates of numbers of attendees of the noncredit instruction are included, as well as revenues generated for the University and the partners, and estimates of in-kind contributions. The table below shows university-wide data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Salary Value</th>
<th>Attendees/ Participants</th>
<th>University Revenue</th>
<th>Partner Revenue</th>
<th>In-kind Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td>$5,340,163</td>
<td>412,528</td>
<td>$34,801,052</td>
<td>$18,499,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second source of data is the Course Load, Instruction, Funding and Modeling System (CLIFMS), a university-wide system designed primarily to collect data on faculty effort and professional accomplishments. CLIFMS contains one form for reporting “Instructional Outreach,” asking reporting academic units to record the number of non-credit events conducted...
by their faculty and academic staff, the number of hours of instruction offered in each event, and
the number of attendees. For each event the number of hours of instruction is multiplied by the
number of attendees to produce an “attendee hours” number, providing a figure that, like credit
hours for credit instruction, provides a sense of the scope of the activities. The table below shows
university-wide data (compliance in reporting is decreasing; the numbers below are surely a
significant undercount).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges and MAUs Reporting</th>
<th>Total Events</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Attendee Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>16,957</td>
<td>22,763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table includes CLIFMS data from two colleges: the College of Human Medicine
(CHM) and the College of Osteopathic Medicine (COM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments Reporting</th>
<th>Total Events</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Attendee Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, some of the larger providers of noncredit continuing education keep careful records of
their activities. Discussion of the work of MSU Extension, which provides the greatest number
of noncredit continuing education events, is dealt with in another part of this section. The School
of Labor and Industrial Relations offers the next higher number, followed by Executive
Programs in the Eli Broad College of Business, the School of Criminal Justice, and the Colleges
of Human and Osteopathic Medicine. MSU’s medical and nursing colleges and registrar’s office
each maintain separate records of continuing education units awarded to professionals who
complete what are typically noncredit classes.

Complicating this multiple recordkeeping and reporting scenario is the fact that data included in
the OEMI and CLIFMS may reflect duplicative accounts of the same noncredit instruction, and
that yet an additional account of the work, if it results in the issuance of continuing education
units, may also exist in one of the systems that record completion of such units.

3. Alumni Lifelong Education

MSU’s Alumni Association maintains the one major continuing education program that does not
fit this model of graduate-level programming for professionals and practitioners. Focusing on
personal enrichment, the MSUAA Alumni Lifelong Education Evening College courses are
primarily in the liberal arts but may include classes on communications; business management
and computer technology; home and family living; health, physical education, and recreation;
and career development. A sample of current offerings include: Accounting for the Non-
accountant, The Crusades, French Conversation, Grant-Seeking for Nonprofit Organizations, and
Writing Your Will. The Evening College also offers overseas lifelong education tours, online enrichment classes, on-site offerings of its classes at a local residential retirement community, and walking/fitness activities. Alumni Lifelong Education annually enrolls about 2,000 people.

D. Evaluation and Value

1. Market Value

Like courses taught on campus, continuing education courses and programs are evaluated through formal surveys of students and careful comparison of student achievement in on- and off-campus courses. In several cases, members of the departmental advisory committee that identified the employer need which the program seeks to address meet with some of the students (some of which are their employees) to test the congruence between what is being taught and their original goals for the program. In addition, the units spend considerable effort in the first years of a program soliciting participant feedback on such issues as whether course sequencing and scheduling are realistic, whether more or fewer group sessions (via Internet, two-way video, or face-to-face) would be appropriate, whether there is too much or too little group work. These questions are especially intense now that most of the programs are using the Internet as the principal vehicle of instruction. In addition, every program has established one or two persons—a program director, an administrative assistant, sometimes an instructor—as the principal point of contact for distant students with their myriad questions about admission, payments, requirements, and the like. These contacts collect, informally, a great deal of feedback both about program content and instruction and about how the program serves the needs for convenience and ease of use of the practicing professional for whom it is intended. Unlike on-campus programs, continuing education programs have to cover their costs from participant payments; therefore, program directors are very alert to participant feedback and do their utmost to tailor the delivery of the programs to accommodate the special needs of their students who are working full-time—modifying the schedule’s intensity, making more of the reading material available on the Internet, reducing the amount of time devoted to face-to-face meetings. Since these programs must cover costs, the market provides the ultimate evaluation. If insufficient numbers participate, the program receives significant revision or is discontinued.

2. Attendance, Revenue, and In-Kind Contribution as Evidence of Value

While the University does not yet have comparative or longitudinal data, the 2004 OEMI data shown above provides indicators of the value of noncredit continuing education. Nearly $35 million in revenue was earned by the faculty reporting (the 21-account system shows $39 million), with over 400,000 in attendance. More significant in providing “valuing” evidence, and evidence of collaboration, is the $18 million in revenue earned for the partner. And most significant of all is the $7.5 million in in-kind contribution from external organizations.

3. Sustainability—a Value of Collaboration

A good example of the collaborative approach to providing continuing education is found in the School of Labor and Industrial Relations’ initial intervention, and the resulting three to four year
experience, at Post Cereals in Battle Creek. In the spring of 1999, Post Cereals contacted MSU’s Program on Innovative Employment Relations (PIERS) to provide training in interest-based bargaining (IBB) to prepare both labor and management for bargaining that was to open in about four months. PIERS staff met with the eighteen-person joint committee and laid out their experience in working with joint labor/management groups. The PIERS staff decided, after a long discussion with the leaders on what had brought them to this point and to the possible use of IBB, that extensive interviews and focus groups with leaders and line workers would have to precede the training. Following the interviews and focus groups the IBB training proceeded, with the understanding that the PIERS staff would “practice” IBB with the joint committee on the toughest issue that they would be facing (and the one creating the animosity on the work floor): the wall-to-wall redesign of work at the facility. The PIERS staff ended up leading this piece of the bargaining (after the joint committee’s training in IBB techniques). The initial IBB training and redesign spun off a number of other pieces of linked work; the training of supervisors and stewards in the use of IBB for shop floor problem-solving (so they could explain and use the IBB process while bargaining was ongoing); the training of facilitators to cascade the new redesign to each work group which needed to redesign their own work areas within the bargaining-established framework; and the active side-by-side work or redesign facilitation with the previously trained supervisors and stewards. Assessment of the training and the other aspects of MSU’s intervention were facilitated by an ongoing dialogue with the parties as to what had worked and what had not and what the next challenges were going to be. The staff continually modified the program as circumstances at the plant changed. A primary assessment tool for valuing MSU’s contribution is the sustainability of the program. This one continued at the Battle Creek plant for four years; the cereal company’s parent (Kraft Foods) subsequently asked the PIERS staff to conduct similar training in four other food production plants.
V. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Michigan State University Extension is a significant part of the outreach and engagement of the University. Because it has counterparts at all of the other land-grant universities and because it is established by federal statute (Smith-Lever Act of 1914), a separate section of this chapter is devoted to its self-study.

A. Constituencies—Educational Programming Addressing the Concerns of Michigan Residents

As an integral part of its land-grant mission, MSU Extension (MSUE) systematically gathers public input to determine its priorities for educational programming. Extension’s unique public funding partnerships with the federal government through the USDA, with state government through MSU, and with county government demands this type of citizen input. Advisory groups with ties to subject matter initiatives (e.g., agriculture, 4-H, Expanded Food Nutrition Education Program), state and county advisory councils, and ongoing informal interactions with program recipients have all been part of the processes used by the organization to identify priority concerns for educational programming. The information below briefly highlights the comprehensive issues identification processes implemented by MSU Extension during the past 12 years, an internal organizational review process, and a current issues identification process underway.

1. Focus on Michigan’s Future, 1992

This issues identification process was launched in 1992 to determine current and emerging local, regional, and statewide issues that were of most interest to Michigan residents. The document summarizing the process, Focus on Michigan’s Future (1997, April), states that the results were intended for use in helping to formulate policy and for helping the University link its knowledge resources with the issues of greatest concern.

This process was initiated with the publication of the document, Michigan’s Future: Trends and Perspectives, written by more than 80 campus-based faculty and staff members. This provided a common base of information for use by county groups. Advisory groups were called together in every county throughout the state, representing a diverse array of interests and levels of involvement with MSU Extension. Working with the local staff, the committees selected various strategies to scan, identify, clarify, and prioritize the concerns in their communities.

The county priorities were reviewed and synthesized by multi-county and regional teams. Representatives of a selected sample of county advisory groups and Extension staff members joined administrators and faculty members to review the regional results and designate the three
critical statewide issue areas that would be the focus of major MSU outreach efforts during the next few years. The issues were:

- Children, youth and families
- Agriculture and natural resources
- Community and economic development

Three SIRT (Statewide Issues Response Teams) were formed to analyze and develop a response strategy for the priority areas. These teams were comprised of multi-disciplinary faculty, county Extension staff, and representatives of various agencies and organizations.

2. **Sharpening Our Program Focus, 2001**

This issue identification process was launched in February 2001 and culminated in a series of regional sessions in September 2001. Part of the impetus for this process was to identify broad themes that would help the organization better communicate its priorities to university administrators and state policymakers.

County Extension directors were asked to convene county councils and other stakeholders to identify and prioritize the issues that could be addressed by Extension’s educational programming. Counties were given a set of tools to help in scanning local needs and assets and identifying and prioritizing the critical issues that MSU Extension could address. Demographic data and the results of a specially commissioned survey concerning citizen awareness of MSUE (IPPSR, 2000) were provided to assist counties in this process.

The issues identified by each county were summarized on a regional basis. These results were shared at six regional meetings of staff and county council members in September 2001. The meetings were designed to provide an opportunity for sharing among council members and for learning more about the top-priority issues. Counties were encouraged to review their issues on a regular basis.

All of the input from the county processes was summarized into five broad themes that have provided the basis for Extension’s programming and communication since 2001. Those themes are:

- Helping youth succeed
- Building healthy families
- Building strong communities
- Enhancing profitability in agriculture
- Encouraging responsible land and natural resource use

3. **Strategic Investment Review, 2001**

Instead of focusing on what issues Extension should be addressing, this process was directed at examining how the organization functions in carrying out its work throughout the state. The Extension director initiated the process in December 2001 to “review and make
recommendations regarding three important areas of investment in MSU Extension: (1) program content, (2) support systems used in program delivery, and (3) administrative structure.” The ad hoc committee, comprised of campus-based faculty members and county-based educators, gathered information on existing MSUE programs and operations. Committee members conducted 73 focus groups throughout the state, involving more than 850 stakeholders in discussions about the current status and future of MSUE. They collected written surveys from more than 700 stakeholders and staff members. The committee also interviewed individuals, including administrators from MSUE and its partner colleges and MSU central administration. In addition, the committee surveyed seven other state extension programs and staff members from the USDA Cooperative State Research, Extension and Education Service. The committee recommendations were focused on three areas: changing the culture, changing the administrative structure, and changing the operation of support services.

4. Issues Identification, 2005

In preparation for submission of a five-year plan of work to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, MSU Extension and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station is conducting a comprehensive issues identification process during fall 2005. This will mark the first time that such an effort has been carried out jointly between the two organizations. This process includes:

- A set of questions commissioned as part of an August 2005 State of the State Survey. The State of the State Survey collects information via telephone survey from a random sample of the state’s population four times throughout the year. Michigan State University’s Institute for Public Policy and Social Research conducts the survey, which can be modified to include special questions. Respondents were asked to assess the importance of MSUE education and MAES research related to the priority theme areas.
- A series of focus groups is being held throughout the state seeking input from people not usually reached by the two organizations.
- A Web-based survey is being developed.
- County Extension councils and advisory groups for the MAES research stations are conducting focus groups to determine priorities.
- A survey of faculty members is being distributed to assess MSU’s capacity to address key issues.
- A series of focus groups is being conducted with various stakeholder groups to further define some of the issues that are identified as priorities.

B. Capacity and Commitment

1. Overall Reach

Since its beginning, Michigan State University Extension has focused on bringing knowledge-based, educational programs to the people of the state to improve their lives and communities. Today, county-based staff members, in concert with on-campus faculty members, serve every county with programming focused on agriculture and natural resources; children, youth and
families; and community and economic development. A flyer with a brief outline of MSUE’s mission and statewide themes can be found in Appendix H.

Today’s problems are very complex. Solutions require the expertise of numerous disciplines and the collaboration of many partners. Operating synergistically with the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station and other Michigan State University units, MSU Extension extends the University’s knowledge resources to all Michigan citizens and assists them in meeting their learning needs through a variety of educational strategies, technologies, and collaborative arrangements. Appendix I contains samples of MSUE/MAES thematic white papers.

MSU Extension offers programs in all 83 counties, which are operated out of 82 county offices across the state. Extension faculty members on the Michigan State University campus conduct research and translate research results into educational programs. They act as resource people for Extension staff members in the counties. More than 29 academic departments and eight colleges work directly with Extension.

2. Human Resources

More than 1,200 MSUE employees, nearly 700 FTE, help people improve their lives through an educational process that applies knowledge to critical issues, needs, and opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Natural Resources Educators</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth and Family(CYF) Educators (+Food Nutrition Program--FNP)</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYF Program Associates (4-H + FNP)</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Economic Development Educators</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Directors</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (specialists, program leaders, program support and chairs)</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff (regional, campus, FNP)</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, MSUE relies on the support of more than 27,000 specially trained volunteers who provide more than 3.49 million hours of service per year. With an estimated value of volunteer time at $17.19 an hour (source: Independent Sector), MSUE’s volunteer time is valued at nearly $60 million.

3. Budget and Distribution

MSU Extension delivers a broad array of programs supported by a complex funding structure including federal, state, and county resources. Program areas are funded in different ways; however, state and federal funds are the fiscal foundation used to leverage other funds. Grant and county funding support some programs while state and federal dollars support others. Regardless of funding, it is important to understand that state and federal dollars comprise the foundation used to leverage additional funds. In the past, MSU Extension has taken reductions and adjusted
the organization to create new efficiencies. Any reductions in these funding sources create ripple effects of lost resources matched and contributed by other partners.

The total Extension budget of $76 million consists of these components:

**MSU Extension Revenue FY04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Investments</td>
<td>$22.263</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU Grants</td>
<td>$14.966</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU General Fund</td>
<td>$479</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>$28.604</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Earmarked Funds</td>
<td>$2.197</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Formula Funds</td>
<td>$8.149</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal** – $10 million ($2 million earmarked for Expanded Food Nutrition Education Program, Pest Management, EPA Pesticide Applicator Training, Renewable Resources)

**State** – $28.6 million

**County funds** – $22.2 million provided for local operating and cost shared county funded positions.

**MSU grants and general fund** – $15.4 million (the majority of the $14.9 million grant-funded programs are family and youth-related programs)

The interdependence of MSUE’s multiple funding sources is illustrated by the funding of educator positions in the field. Overall, 326 FTE are distributed across five program areas (see figure below). In some program areas (agriculture, community and economic development), state and federal funds cover the majority of the funding for these positions, but county and grants contribute as well. Grants and earmarked federal funds cover the majority of funding for Family and Consumer Science programs, with approximately 25 percent provided by state and federal funds. In 4-H and natural resource program areas, educator funding comes primarily from county and grant funding, with less than half of the funding from state and federal funds. In every program area, the state and federal base funding is a key element that helps to secure funding from county and grant/contract sources.

It is noteworthy that only 6 percent of the total Extension budget ($76 M) is spent on administration, reflecting our commitment to use resources as efficiently as possible to provide education programs in communities across the state.
C. Responsiveness and Impact

Michigan State University Extension planning originates with constituent and stakeholder input that moves from stated community needs to regional and state initiatives and back to communities through local, regional, and state programming. Program planning is based on stakeholder input from thousands of participants, parents, and volunteers; hundreds of collaborators and partners; more than 500 advisory groups; 1,000 community organizations; funders; and citizens. Input from the macro level includes findings from the State of State Survey conducted by the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research at Michigan State University, research (often generated by Michigan Agricultural Research Station-affiliated scientists), and state statistical trend data. At the local level, county Extension council volunteers contribute ideas and input on the direction for local programs and indicate community priorities. At times, these volunteers are involved in surveying or gathering public input. See Appendix J for MSUE’s 2003-2004 Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results.

In addition, information is collected from participants in Extension programs on satisfaction, needs met, knowledge gained, skills acquired, and when applicable, behaviors and practices changed. Information from these processes is used by local and state Extension councils, community partners, county commissioners, County Extension Directors and staffs, Area of Expertise (AoE) Teams, campus faculty members, and the MSUE administrative team to set priorities, goals, and objectives for the plan of work. Forecasting and trend analysis done by Extension specialists and Area of Expertise Teams also influences priority setting. Cycles for the data collection, planning, and evaluation processes vary. State goals, priorities, plans, and evaluation are typically three to five years in duration with minor annual changes, and local goals

---

1 MSU Extension data, including assessment data, are gathered by the Extension Information System (EIS). See Appendix K, Michigan Multistate Extension Form and Documentation and Michigan Integrated Extension Form and Documentation, for samples of quantitative reporting.
are assessed and evaluated annually, though modified throughout the year (see Appendix L, Changes to Five Year Plan of Work.)

1. Noncredit Instruction

About 80 percent of the 506 MSUE-funded professionals and all of the 252 paraprofessionals provide noncredit instruction. Participant counts are given in the box below by primary goal areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>55,630</td>
<td>56,918</td>
<td>112,548</td>
<td>26.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety*</td>
<td>11,137</td>
<td>15,050</td>
<td>26,187</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Nutrition and Health*</td>
<td>47,547</td>
<td>48,749</td>
<td>96,296</td>
<td>22.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>23,141</td>
<td>35,497</td>
<td>58,638</td>
<td>13.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Human and Youth Development**</td>
<td>60,899</td>
<td>75,555</td>
<td>136,454</td>
<td>31.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198,354</td>
<td>231,769</td>
<td>430,123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To avoid duplication, participants who received both food safety and food nutrition were counted only once (20 percent Food Safety and 80 percent Food, Nutrition and Health).

** To avoid duplication, youth who crossed goals were not counted again in youth development.

2. Responsiveness to Emerging Needs

One of the hallmarks of MSUE program delivery is that in addition to our systematic and strategic efforts to plan programs around anticipated needs, the organization also strives to respond to needs that could not have been anticipated. Often these needs emerge from natural or societal events that were unpredictable. Some examples include natural emergencies such as the emergence of diseases in wild or domesticated plant or animal populations; e.g., bovine tuberculosis in the wild herd of whitetail deer in the state, or the appearance of nuisance exotic species such as Asian soybean rust, purple loosestrife, zebra mussels, or emerald ash borers. Other examples include societal changes such as a protracted recession in Michigan’s economy, new trends in juvenile justice, or unanticipated food-borne diseases. In cases such as these, MSUE plays a critical role as facilitator of collaborative responses to the challenge and as provider of educational programs that help people to adapt to the unanticipated change. Some recent cases are highlighted below.

**Bovine tuberculosis in the Michigan whitetail deer herd.** As early as 1974, wildlife scientists detected a few incidences of bovine tuberculosis in whitetail deer in northeastern counties of Lower Michigan. By the early 1990s incidence of the disease had expanded and it became clear that the disease was being transferred from wild deer to domesticated livestock, particularly cattle. MSUE has played a key role as educator in informing beef and dairy producers of the threat and the options that they had in responding to the threat. MSUE also worked closely with land managers for hunt clubs in the area to help them understand how they could change their management practices so as to minimize spread of the disease among deer or between deer and cattle. MSUE worked closely with regulatory agencies (Michigan Department of Agriculture, US Department of Agriculture) and with scientists in the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station.
in helping to develop strategies for managing through this severe challenge to wildlife and farm managers.

*Asian soybean rust.* In September 2004, scientists first detected the presence of this invading crop disease in a few southern states in the U.S. MSUE specialists and MAES scientists quickly engaged with colleagues across North America in developing potential response plans for the potential spread of this disease into Michigan and other northern and Midwestern states. By the beginning of the growing season in 2005, MSUE specialists, together with Michigan Department of Agriculture staff, had developed a network of 30 monitoring plots on private and university land across Michigan in order to detect the presence of Asian Soybean Rust as early as possible in the state. In addition to building the network of plots, MSUE specialists developed capacity for testing for the rust in remote sites throughout the soybean growing region of Michigan. MSUE specialists and educators have also developed preliminary recommendations for use of fungicides under various environmental scenarios and are prepared to deliver these quickly and effectively if and when the disease appears in Michigan.

*United Growth of Kent County.* This organization was developed by MSUE staff from our Urban Collaborators program in which MSUE played a key role in bringing together representatives of rural and urban neighborhoods to address the stresses that urban sprawl was causing on both sets of neighborhoods. In our facilitator role, MSUE has helped these previously adversarial groups to realize that they have common challenges brought on by the effects of uncontrolled suburban and exurban expansion. In addition, MSUE has brought curriculum from the Citizen Planner program (see below) to bear on this effort in order to build capacity among citizens from both sets of communities in developing alternatives to sprawl that can address the concerns of both groups. Today, this program has become a model which is being replicated elsewhere in Michigan with funding from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

*Preventing food-borne illnesses.* Extension specialists in the MSU National Food Safety and Toxicology Center have developed an online resource that facilitates early detection and treatment of outbreaks of certain food-borne illnesses. The Web site provides an opportunity for health care professionals and others to log incidences of food-borne illnesses that are commonly associated with improper or unsafe food handling and that might affect other individuals as well. An incidence entered on the Web site is automatically entered into a database, which is monitored frequently by specialists at MSU, allowing them to detect patterns of illness outbreaks. This facilitates more rapid determination of the cause and location of the outbreak and speeds the process of appropriate detection of other cases and treatment.

3. **Best Practices and Impact Examples**

Some of the “best practices” listed below also emerged from initial early responses by MSUE to emerging community needs. The Citizen Planner program emerged from a need in Grand Traverse County and neighboring counties to build capacity among residents to understand the complexities of planning and conflicting land use, thereby enabling them to be more effective agents of change in determining optimal solutions. The Michigan Sugar Beet Advancement program emerged in response to grower concerns about declining yields and the impacts of competing production in other regions of the U.S. The Better Kid Care program was adapted to
urban neighborhoods in Saginaw specifically to accomplish the dual result of improved child care for children in urban neighborhoods and improved income generation for individuals who developed child care centers to meet the needs of these neighborhoods. The youth mentoring program emerged from partnerships in which county governments identified juvenile justice as an issue for which they needed assistance. MSUE County Directors worked with local partners to develop the initial intervention models upon which newer programs have expanded. The Emerald Ash Borer program has developed over the past four years in response to the detection by an MSUE district educator of an agent that was killing ash trees in southeastern Michigan.

**Michigan Sugar Beet Advancement program.** The Great Lakes Sugar Beet Advancement Program is a cooperative partnership comprising MSU, the sugar processing companies and growers. It was founded in 1997 in response to production problems and declining profitability in the sugar beet market. Its mandate is to conduct on-farm, applied research and increase educational opportunities to revitalize Michigan’s sugar beet industry. The Sugar Beet Advancement program is funded through fees assessed to sugar beet producers and grant dollars appropriated from Project GREEEN, the state’s plant industry initiative based at MSU.

- **Impact example.** Two-thirds of Michigan sugar beet growers responding to a 2001 survey reported that they considered the Sugar Beet Advancement program the most credible and/or reliable source of sugar beet production information available. Nearly three-fourths of respondents said they gained research-based information and skills for improving sugar beet production. The survey of growers showed a positive relationship between increase in yield and the number of management practices adopted by growers. It established that yield increases were not dependent on farm size. Respondents reporting yield increases averaged a two-ton increase per acre. Survey findings suggest that if improved management practices are adopted across the state, it could result in an estimated potential benefit of nearly $2.4 million to Michigan’s sugar beet industry. MSUE and MAES are partners in the program, which supports Michigan’s $111 million sugar beet industry.

**Citizen Planner.** Local planning commissioners and zoning boards of appeals are often called on to make important decisions to guide the growth and development of their communities. Issues surrounding land use planning and regulation, and the tools and techniques available within Michigan to address them, have become increasingly complex. This has created a need for a program to teach these skills and improve local planning. The Citizen Planner program addresses the basic ongoing training needs of citizens, often volunteers, who are appointed to serve on local land use planning bodies. The program’s primary goal is to equip community leaders and interested citizens with technical knowledge, an understanding of the legal framework of planning and zoning, and leadership skills to perform their duties more effectively and to create a forum to build a core of program participants to advance land use education within their communities.

- **Impact example.** Since 2001, more than 2,000 citizens and elected officials representing 76 Michigan counties have learned about tools available to conserve land while allowing community growth and development through the Citizen Planner program. Most participants are members of local planning and zoning boards. The 64 percent of
participants who serve on local planning and zoning boards indicated in an evaluation of the program that they paid closer attention to legal issues. The Michigan Municipal Risk Management Association spent $15 million in the past 10 years on legal fees and damages because of flawed planning and zoning decisions. Better-educated community planners will help decrease that cost.

MSU Product Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources. The MSU Product Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources was established in spring 2003 with funds from the MAES and MSUE to improve economic opportunities in Michigan’s agriculture, food and natural resource sectors. The Center helps develop and commercialize high-value, consumer-responsive products and businesses in the agriculture and natural resource sectors. The Center connects entrepreneurs to university resources through a statewide network of innovation counselors. These trained professionals from MSU and partnering organizations are strategically positioned across Michigan to serve as initial contact points. They are educated to assess the developmental phase of new businesses and product lines, identify markets for innovative new products, help entrepreneurs make critical go or no-go decisions, and guide them from idea to start-up.

- **Impact example.** The Center has worked closely with the west Michigan apple industry to conduct market and production research for fresh cut apple slices. In April 2004, McDonald’s announced that it would offer fresh cut apple slices on its children’s meals and allow restaurants to offer the product on their adult menu. A Michigan processor was one of three chosen nationally to produce the slices. McDonald’s reports that movement of fresh cut apple slices is exceeding expectations, with annual consumption of 35 million pounds. MSU research has identified an additional seven potential market channels for the Michigan product.

Better Kid Care. Better Kid Care is a statewide program that works to educate and train current and potential licensed child care providers. This program has coupled MSUE and the Michigan Family Independence Agency to improve the availability, accessibility, and quality of child care across the state. The two-part program works to positively affect the quality of child care in Michigan communities. This is achieved through a satellite training series that increases providers’ knowledge of appropriate practices. It offers an active approach to child care needs as Extension staff members work to train current and potential providers in low-income neighborhoods.

- **Impact example.** A joint effort between MSUE and the Saginaw Family Child Care Network increased the number of licensed child care providers in one low-income neighborhood from just two to 54. The neighborhood now boasts 560 licensed child care slots, and the new providers are collectively grossing incomes totaling more than $1 million per year.

4-H youth mentoring. Mentoring is a major priority for the governor and thus the state of Michigan. The state’s goal is to match every child that needs a one-on-one relationship with a caring adult who can serve as a positive role model. The MSUE Explore, Experience, Achieve Through 4-H Mentoring program is working to accomplish this goal.
Impact example. The 4-H mentoring program engages 20 full-time AmeriCorps members
to build the capacity of 17 communities across Michigan to establish one-to-one, small
group or peer mentoring programs. Members are assisting in recruiting 600 volunteers to
spend at least one hour per week for a minimum of eight months as mentors. As a result
of these efforts, 1,800 low-income, at-risk or underserved youths ages 5 to 19 are
participating in ongoing mentoring relationships, particularly during their out-of-school
hours. Because of these relationships, youths acquire or improve competencies in
communication skills, relationship building, and group process and do better in school.

Impact example. Michigan 4-H Youth Development programs work with the Michigan
Department of Human Services and family and/or juvenile courts in seven counties to
offer mentoring experiences to at-risk youths. In Macomb County, mentoring efforts are
credited with saving taxpayers approximately $3.7 million annually because youths are
being diverted from the youth home system. Mentoring programs for vulnerable youth
are expanding or beginning in at least 10 additional Michigan counties.

Multi-state emerald ash borer eradication and prevention program. Emerald ash borer (EAB),
Agrilus planipennis Fairmaire, is an exotic beetle discovered in southeastern Michigan near
Detroit in summer 2002. The adult beetles nibble on ash foliage but cause little damage. The
larvae (the immature stage) feed on the inner bark of ash trees, disrupting the trees’ ability to
transport water and nutrients. Emerald ash borer probably arrived in the United States on solid
wood packing material carried in cargo ships or airplanes originating in its native Asia. The
beetle is also established in Windsor, Ontario, and was found in Ohio in 2003 and northern
Indiana in 2004. Since its discovery, EAB has:

- Killed at least 10 to 15 million ash trees in Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana. Most of the
devastation is in southeastern Michigan.
- Caused regulatory agencies to enforce quarantines (Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan) and
fines to prevent potentially infested ash trees, logs, or firewood from moving out of areas
where EAB occurs.
- Cost municipalities, property owners, nursery operators, and forest products industries
tens of millions of dollars.

A concerted effort to stop EAB has been launched by state and federal officials. Research is
being conducted at universities to understand the beetle’s life cycle and find ways to detect new
infestations, control EAB adults and larvae, and contain the infestation. Data from research are
used to create regulatory policy and eradication strategies. Eradication efforts by state and
federal agencies in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Canada are under way to prevent small
infestations from growing into large infestations. Quarantines are in place to prevent infested ash
firewood, logs, or nursery trees from being transported and starting new infestations.

Impact example. The emerald ash borer (EAB) has infested and killed an estimated 10
million Michigan ash trees since it was discovered in 2002. MSU Extension EAB
educators and more than 200 Master Gardener volunteers are now trained in detection of
the pest and have been responsible for finding numerous new infestations outside of the
quarantined southeastern Michigan counties. MSU Extension also works closely with
state and federal agencies in their role as education and outreach coordinators, reaching
homeowners, industry professionals, community leaders, and legislators on how to identify ash trees and EAB and how to deal with EAB infestations once they are found.

4. The MSUE Portal System

MSU Extension is nearing the final stages of implementing a new information management system. The system consists of a portal, an online meeting server, shared/collaborative workspaces, an e-learning server, and a knowledge repository that will serve as an electronic clearinghouse for information. Implementation began with the launching of the portal and will end with the deployment of the knowledge repository during fall 2005. Considerable effort has gone into training staff and providing enhancements to the portal system. A number of benefits, listed below, have been realized thus far.

- Staff members are responsible for their personal information or profiles. Various e-mail lists can be generated from the profile database. This has eliminated the need to maintain multiple lists on campus, in regions, or in administrative units. E-mail lists can be generated each night and be current as of the last update from a user.
- All county offices have a Web presence that reflects a consistent, unified MSUE look and feel.
- All county offices, no matter how small the staff, can have robust Web presences by using information modules created by campus staff.
- County offices can concentrate on organizing and delivering information without the need to have a local Web expert.
- MSUE can force information onto county portal home pages, assuring consistent information delivery across the organization. This is especially true for breaking new or hot topics.
- Local control of content and information display assures that county offices can provide a mix of information most suitable to local needs. County portals provide residents with both local and statewide information, eliminating the need to access the MSUE parent site. These multiple points of presence should make it easier for citizens to locate information and expertise. It also allows campus staff members to create one instance of a module that can appear on numerous county pages.
- Portal instances can be created to serve as information centers. For instance, a portal has been created for tourism and another for land use, both managed by AoE teams. Another portal instance is being created by the MSU Library to provide library information and services to MSUE employees.

Behind each portal, and available to each registered user, is a set of workspaces. Workspaces can contain a number of objects. The most common objects are files of many formats, calendars, online meeting rooms, additional workspaces, threaded discussion groups, and notes. Workspaces can be shared with individual users or user groups. A number of MSUE staff members and units have begun using workspaces to perform the following tasks:

- Committees or workgroups post files, minutes, and other materials to a shared workspace rather than use U.S. mail or e-mail files.
- Conference program materials and forms are placed in a shared workspace to be downloaded rather than mailed.
- A shared workspace will appear on each staff person’s personal portal, eliminating the need to search for the documents or workspace.
- MSU Extension faculty members have asked to expand access to workspaces to non-MSU cooperators so that workspace tools can be used in a broader context. That feature has been funded and ordered.

The online collaboration server provides video, audio, chat, whiteboard, and presentation mode to enable online meetings for staff members with high-speed Internet access. Meetings or educational presentations can be recorded to be replayed later by those who miss meetings. Staff members who would not be able to spend considerable time and funds to travel to campus for a one- or two-hour meeting can now participate without leaving their desks. Examples of collaboration server use are listed below.

- A specialist conducted training consisting of several one-hour sessions for staff members dispersed throughout the state.
- The monthly meeting of the technology steering committee is done online.
- All meetings with the system vendor, based in Toronto, are handled via the collaboration server.

The knowledge repository was delivered in July 2005 and is currently being tested as training materials are developed. This feature was created to provide a central location for MSUE information products. Products could be publications but may be images, audio files, saved meetings, video clips, presentations, hyperlinks, and many other resource types. Each resource is associated with a metadata record to assure it can be found later. The knowledge repository is a knowledge domain that uses the National Agricultural Library Thesaurus (NALT) as the internal schema. The system makes extensive use of Web services to provide the functionality described below.

- Search terms are vetted against the thesaurus. If the user enters “pig,” the search string is modified to include the preferred term “swine.”
- The metadata can be syndicated with knowledge repositories at other institutions. This assumes they also use NALT as the schema and have Web service capability. The MSUE knowledge repository can either export or import metadata.
- The basic and advance search capabilities are Web services. These will be provided to citizens as modules are added to the county portals and the MSUE parent portal.
- The advanced search function allows users to select partner knowledge repositories as search targets. For instance, a user could search the knowledge repository of an extension service in another state if such a relationship had been created.
- An additional Web service can be added to the Research task pane in Microsoft Office as a URL. The service will add the knowledge repository to the list of information sources that can be searched within Microsoft Office.

A number of other features provide potential future functionality. The most promising of these is the ability of county Extension offices to create accounts for clientele. Clientele will be assigned
to groups, and when they log in the information they see in their personal portals will reflect their group membership. For instance, if a client selects the land use group, the information provided by a personal portal will relate to land use. The future use of this function depends on the full implementation of the knowledge repository and the organization of expertise and information suitable for each group.

The MSUE information system is designed to enhance the historic hallmarks of the Extension system. The local or community presence is reinforced by providing a local portal that is managed by a local staff. The second hallmark is research-based information. The collaborative tools allow greater ease in creating information and the knowledge repository makes it more easily accessed. The entire system allows MSUE to manage a greater portion of the information that is otherwise lost or cannot be found while providing connects points to be a node in a national electronic land-grant system.

D. Value

1. Support for State Funding

In November 2003 a newly elected Democratic governor was facing a nearly $1 billion deficit in the state budget. She was challenged to work with a Republican-controlled House and Senate. She set up a series of invitation-only town hall meetings across the state to garner input on how to address the budget shortfall. She listed 19 programs for reduction or elimination and asked participants to express their priorities by an ad-hoc polling. Her list included elimination of state funding for MSU Extension and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station. Almost immediately following these meetings commodity groups, councils, advisory groups, and concerned citizens began to flood their local legislators’ offices and local media with letters and stories of support for MSU Extension and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station. One of the most powerful groups was the more than 230,000 4-H youths and 22,000 4-H volunteers. Not only did constituents speak out against these proposed cuts, but many stakeholders, including state-funded partners, stated their concerns about the loss of the educational programming that MSU Extension provides to communities. As a result, MSU Extension and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station not only avoided elimination but also avoided any budget cuts.

Again in February 2005 the Governor faced budget shortfalls and a continued structural deficit. She issued an executive order to rescind funding from a number of state programs, including nearly 10 percent of MSUE’s budget for FY05. Again constituents voiced their opposition of the cuts and legislators removed the rescission from the final version of the executive order.

In addition, the Governor proposed a 25 percent reduction in MSUE’s budget for the 2005-2006 state budget. MSU Extension’s constituents and partners also opposed this cut, and the legislature approved budgets for MSUE and MAES that had no reduction to their funding. The final version of the budget for 2005-2006 has not been determined at this time. It is clear that MSUE’s supporters feel strongly about the programs MSUE delivers in communities across the state, as evidenced by their continued insistence that MSUE not face undue budget reductions at a time of serious state budget constraints.
2. **County Funding**

More than 50 county resolutions have been adopted during the last three years in support of MSU Extension. In many Michigan counties MSU Extension is an integral component of county government, providing education to government officials, communities, and families. Budget cuts to MSU Extension also equal cuts to county government.

3. **Partnerships**

Nearly 1,000 organizations partnered with MSU Extension in 2004, including organizations such as AmeriCorps, township governments, the Michigan Agri-Business Association, Bay Mills Community College, Michigan Farm Bureau, the Michigan Department of Community Health, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, intermediate school districts, and the University of Michigan.

Examples of these partnerships provide evidence of the value of MSU Extension to its constituencies:

*Washtenaw County Slow Food Project.* Huron Valley Slow Food (HVSF) is an organization focused on increasing local agricultural commerce. The group has coordinated studies of the Washtenaw County food system and identified opportunities to strengthen food production and distribution networks.

- **Support.** Washtenaw County Farm Bureau has endorsed Huron Valley Slow Food and contributed financial resources to support recommended educational and logistical work to enhance local food networks. It will make a financial contribution to support this project and will participate in the leadership team.
- **Support.** The Washtenaw MSUE Agricultural Advisory Council has requested that a MSU Extension educator participate in a leadership team that will develop a business plan for strengthening the local food system and recruit resources from within the land-grant system to help meet goals related to agricultural entrepreneurship, farm product marketing, and consumer education. The advisory council will make a financial contribution to support this work.
- **Support.** Agricultural commodity organizations, including the Corn Marketing Program of Michigan, the Michigan Soybean Promotion Committee, and the Michigan Agri-Business Association, endorse this initiative and have committed to serving on the leadership team and providing financial support for this work.

*Lapeer County Family Partnership.* The Lapeer County Family Partnership is a collaborative effort to sponsor parenting education for Lapeer County residents. For the last 10 years, county partners have described parenting education as a local priority and need.

- **Support.** Collaborators include the Almont, Dryden, Imlay City, North Branch, Lapeer and Lakeville school districts; Lapeer Family and Child Coordinating Council multi-purpose collaborative body; the Strong Families Safe Children Committee; the Family
Independence Agency; the Lapeer County Health Department; Community Mental Health; Nalo Therapy; Christian Family Services; Manna Ministries; and local restaurants.

4. Advisory Groups Provide Input

Michigan State University Extension and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station link issues of concern in local communities with the research and teaching resources at the state’s land-grant university. A network for organized citizen input at the local and state levels enhances that linkage. County Extension councils identify and prioritize issues, seek collaborations and resources, and communicate to others the importance of Extension’s educational programming. Citizen advisory councils help establish research priorities at the state’s 15 Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station field stations. The MSU Extension and Experiment Station Council serves as a liaison between the county councils, field station advisory groups, and state agencies and organizations. Members communicate to policymakers, organizations and agencies, university administrators, and others about the importance of the educational programming and the applied research from Michigan’s land-grant university.

The MSU Extension and Experiment Station Council is comprised of 25 members, representing the county councils throughout the state as well some of the organization’s key partners (e.g. Michigan Community Service Commission, the Michigan Beef Industry Commission, and the Michigan Department of Human Services). State council members come together to learn about the integration of research and education to address important issues throughout the state. Especially during the past two years, the state council and the county councils have been actively engaged in communicating to policymakers the importance of Extension’s educational programming.

Since 1997 a network of 80 local councils and 29 Area of Expertise councils have provided a critical link for MSU Extension in identifying priority issues and communicating the value of the educational programming to policymakers at all levels of government. These councils bring together a diverse group of residents to identify community assets, issues and concerns and to prioritize according to need and available resources. The councils also identify community collaborators to address specific issues and assist in evaluating the progress of Extension programming. Council members help communicate the availability and importance of those programs, and they serve as advocates for the organization. Representatives from local councils typically serve on interview committees to help select county personnel for key positions.

In addition, there are more than 300 program advisory groups that include 4-H councils, innovative farmer groups, child and family advisory bodies and natural resource advisory committees.

Examples of the support of such advisory groups provide evidence of the value of MSUE programming.

_Iosco County Child Protection Council_. Council members keep MSUE staff members informed about county work with families and allow the MSUE Food and Nutrition Program (FNP) to be a
visible and working part of important services with similar foci. They also provide sources of referrals for MSUE programs as well as support FNP programs.

Mackinac County Water Safety Review Team. This group works to reduce water-related injuries and deaths through better facilities and education around dangerous currents and hazardous weather conditions.

5. MSU Extension Staff Participation on External Community Boards and Steering Committees

MSUE staff members serve on more than 700 external committees and boards such as the Breastfeeding Support Network, the Sanilac County Human Services Coordinating Board, the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, and the National Pork Producers Educational Committee.

Examples of the value of staff participation on community boards:

Creating a Healthier Macomb Board of Directors. This group examines issues related to the health of families and the community. It provides a liaison with county hospitals and other human service and educational units such as MSUE that share these same concerns.

Rotary Charities of Traverse City. This foundation provides grants to programs and organizations that are working on local environmental issues. MSU Extension’s Sea Grant educators serve on such boards as resource persons for environmental issues. Serving on foundation boards provides a vantage point for educators to monitor and assess Michigan Sea Grant’s role and effectiveness.

E. Plans for Improvement and Change

One of the key challenges facing MSU Extension is anticipating the kinds of educational programs that communities, industries, and families will need in the future. MSU Extension administration anticipates that needs will change dramatically in the next five to 10 years and foresees a need to be flexible in determining the program areas that MSU Extension develops, and entrepreneurial in sourcing and staffing these programs. Programs must be based on a collaborative foundation that assumes that partnerships are the most productive means of approaching constituent needs. The changes that MSU Extension is developing include the following, some of which are explained in detail elsewhere in this report:

- Carrying out an issues identification and plan of work process jointly with the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station that will become sustained as a segment of a regular market research and development unit.
- Consolidating the six regional administrative field units into five for greater efficiency of operation.
- Strengthening online communications and program delivery tools.
• Connecting more frequently and deliberately with community colleges to meet regional needs.
• Developing and applying multi-county models for program delivery and staffing.
• Developing multi-state collaborations to access program expertise and share in development and delivery of programs that have value beyond the borders of Michigan.
VI. INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH

Although an entire section of the self-study report is devoted to MSU’s international presence and initiatives, this section of the Engagement and Service criterion provides data on international outreach and examples that highlight the diverse constituencies, areas of the globe, and social issues and concerns. As a result, this report is organized differently than the others in Criterion 5. First is a section on university-wide capacity and commitment derived primarily from OEMI data. Next are a number of descriptions illustrating international outreach for K-12 and community college educators. Last are several presentations submitted by departments as part of the self-study on international outreach for business and government. Each of these illustrations captures the four components of constituencies, capacity and commitment, responsiveness, and value.

A. Capacity and Commitment

As the MSU community adapts itself to new and changing global conditions, international outreach efforts manifest themselves in various forms. These efforts could take shape in increasing the understanding of global issues and culture by local constituents, or in the transfer of local ideas to global audiences. The Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI) collects information about international outreach along these two dimensions—both on international focus of outreach activities and on international location of such work—and allows us to generate reports for these activities cross-tabulated with other variables.

1. Human Resources

*International focus*. Of a total FTE investment of 249.5 with a salary investment of $19,823,471 by MSU in outreach and engagement activities in 2004 (as reported through the OEMI), 38.97 FTEs with a salary investment of $4,045,126 were devoted to activities focusing significantly on international development and understanding. These activities represented the work of 25% or 207 of the faculty and academic staff out of the 829 claiming outreach activity on the OEMI. These outreach activities involved 470,332 participants and helped generate $62,208,624 for the University and $16,154,351 for the partners. Of the various forms the activity could have taken, Outreach Research and Outreach Instruction represented the largest share in terms of number of respondents.
International locations. An FTE investment of 14.19 with a salary investment of $1,336,581 was made by MSU in outreach and engagement activities that look place in locations internationally. These activities represented the work of 92 or 11% of the faculty and academic staff who report their activities. These activities involved 25,880 participants and helped generate $34,783,092 for the University and $5,781,000 for the partners. Of the various forms the activity could have taken, Outreach Research represented the largest share in terms of number of respondents.
B. International Outreach for K-12 and Community College Educators

a) LATTICE

MSU has an extensive outreach to K-12 teachers. One example of this is the LATTICE (Linking All Types of Teachers to International Cross-cultural Education) project which has offered professional development with international content to K-12 teachers in the Lansing area. This outreach partnership between Lansing area school districts and various units at MSU brings together about 25 MSU international students and 25 K-12 teachers once a month for intensive study and discussion of international and multicultural issues. A cumulative total of 450 individuals and 13 school districts have now participated. The project has received a number of awards and has been widely reported at professional meetings. An empirical evaluation of the program has been published in the peer-reviewed journal *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 28 (2002, pp. 315-328). In recognition of its outstanding work, MSU received the prestigious Goldman Sachs Foundation’s Prize for Excellence in International Education.

b) Teaching about East Asia

The Asian Studies Center, in conjunction with the Freeman Foundation, has offered a course on *Teaching about East Asia* to a total of 61 Michigan middle and high school teachers in three of the past five years. Teachers could earn either continuing education or graduate credit for this seminar, which involved 30 hours of instruction about Korea, China, and Japan and also provided $500 for books and teaching materials for each teacher and school. Each teacher who took the course had the opportunity to take a three-week, expenses-paid study tour to one of the East Asian countries.

c) Educational Materials on Canada

At the request of the Newspapers in Education program of the *Detroit Free Press* and *Detroit News*, a faculty member and two master teachers affiliated with the Canadian Studies Centre prepared a 24-page educational supplement on Canada, teachers’ guide with lesson plans and activity sheets, and full-color poster for K-12 teachers. Titled “Canada and the United States: One Border, Many Challenges,” 100,000 copies of the supplement were distributed in March 2005 to high schools throughout Michigan and northern Ohio, with financial support from the Consulate General of Canada in Detroit. Because it was regarded so highly, the Newspapers in Education program is strongly considering seeking corporate support for two more supplements about Canada to be prepared by the Canadian Studies Centre.

d) Group Projects Abroad

This project provides K-12 and community college educators in Michigan with opportunities to visit and learn about other countries, after which they create new curriculum units which will result in expanding the international education of their students.
Activities. Seminars abroad for educators have been organized by several MSU units, including International Studies and Programs, the Asian Studies Center, Center for Latin America and the Caribbean Studies (CLACS), African Studies Center, Center for Advanced Study of International Development (CASID), MSU Extension, and the College of Education. Funding awards for these four-week seminars have been obtained from the Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad (GPA) program of the U.S. Department of Education (US/DE), the purpose of which is to integrate area and international studies into the curriculum.

During the past six years, MSU units have conducted five GPA seminars for educators:

- Vietnam – focus on culture and the arts since the war, led by Asian Studies Center (15 K-12 teachers, 2004)
- Nepal – focus on rivers, environments, and cultures; grew out of the Riverside Education Program, a water quality monitoring program for middle schools in Southeast Michigan and Nepal that was sponsored by MSU Extension; led by ISP and MSU Extension (10 K-12 teachers, 2003)
- Oaxaca, Mexico – focus on cultural diversity and social change, led by CLACS and MSU Extension (13 K-12 teachers, 2003)
- Mexico and Belize – focus on globalization in social studies and language curricula, led by CLACS (16 faculty from community colleges and small colleges, 1999)
- South Africa – focus on multiculturalism and diversity, led by the College of Education’s International Studies in Education with LATTICE (15 K-12 teachers, 1999)

In all of these seminars, participants made a commitment to produce curriculum units – from several class periods to several weeks in length – based on what they learned from the seminar. The curriculum units from the three recent GPA seminars are linked to Michigan and/or national curriculum standards. Curriculum resources from the Vietnam and Nepal seminars have been posted on Web sites to make them easily available to other educators. (See [http://www.isp.msu.edu/asianstudies/fullbrighthays/vietnam/index.htm](http://www.isp.msu.edu/asianstudies/fullbrighthays/vietnam/index.htm) and [http://www.isp.msu.edu/nepal/](http://www.isp.msu.edu/nepal/)).

Evaluation and assessment. Grants from the GPA program are awarded on a competitive basis by the US/DE; projects that receive funding are deemed to have sound plans of operation, quality personnel, and adequate resources. US/DE requires that all GPAs include an evaluation plan to assess the effectiveness and impacts of the program. In recent years, US/DE also required that each participant complete an on-line evaluation form at the conclusion of the seminar; the coordinators have access to these evaluations.

The programs organized by MSU units have developed methods for both formative and summative evaluation. All the programs have incorporated evaluation meetings at least weekly during the trips to allow for mid-course corrections to improve the quality of the experience for participants. These meetings include such topics as scheduling and other logistics as well as activities and speakers. All the programs also include summative evaluation from which lessons can be learned for future programs. In the months after the seminars, contact is maintained with the participants in various ways to share the teachers’ draft curriculum materials and provide feedback on them. For example, participants in the Nepal and Vietnam programs shared draft
curriculum units with other teachers and international students in the LATTICE program (described above) and received feedback; they also presented these units at in-service sessions for Macomb County and mid-Michigan teachers, respectively.

Participants’ evaluations during the seminars focused on two main areas: logistics and program content. Participants in some of the study trips requested time for group reflections every day and more detailed information about the schedule of events on the following day. Some participants wanted to visit places for which arrangements had not been made. The periodic assessment during the trip helped to enhance the experience and translate the information of the new culture into practical ideas for the classroom. The meeting conducted upon the return provided the best forum to decode the experience into practical curriculum ideas. The assessments from some programs revealed that the process of decoding new information and experiences from other societies demanded more guidance and orientation by coordinators than originally thought. All participants fulfilled their responsibility to create curriculum units, although a few teachers in the most recent program are still completing theirs. The vast majority of participants expressed positive overall evaluations of the seminars. One participant in the Mexico seminar said, “My whole philosophy of teaching is changing. I have been ‘internationally inspired’.” One teacher was so strongly affected by her experience in Nepal that, upon her return, she raised funds to build a new school there.

Enthusiasm about the seminars has led participants in some of the trips to organize follow-up activities. For example, participants in the South African seminar invited a multiracial group of South African secondary school students to Michigan in fall 1999, where they visited MSU and area schools. And participants in the 2003 Mexico seminar invited and raised funds for indigenous artisans to visit their classrooms and give teacher training workshops at the Michigan Educational Association Conference. Positive evaluations from teachers who have participated in these seminars have encouraged the centers to apply for additional GPA awards. In summer 2005, the African Studies Center and CASID are organizing a seminar to Ghana for community college faculty; CLACS and MSU Extension will take K-12 teachers on a GPA seminar to Belize.

Improvement. More recent programs have been designed with the experiences and best practices learned in the previous GPAs, making the GPA applications more competitive and the programs themselves of higher quality. This enables coordinators to improve both their planning and scheduling of the trips and their work with participants in translating the experiences of the seminars into curricula useful in their teaching.

e) ISP’s Online Resources for Teachers and Students

The goal of this initiative is to enhance teaching and learning on international topics by providing K-12 teachers and students access to high-quality, comprehensive information about Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the world via electronic resources utilizing the rapidly expanding capabilities of the Internet.

Needs assessment and activities. International Studies and Programs (ISP) and its area studies centers have created four online resources for teachers and students: Exploring Africa
The African Studies Center, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, Asian Studies Center, and ISP consulted widely with K-12 teachers, curriculum designers, MSU faculty, administrators, and the College of Education before developing these resources. With advice from its varied constituencies, each center then undertook the development of its respective curriculum materials and Web site, with partial financial support from the ISP Dean’s Office. MATRIX, MSU’s humanities and technology research center, was contracted to advise about the design concept of Exploring Africa and LASER and to do the technical design and hosting of these sites. The other two Web sites were designed by the staff of the units. Each regional Web site provides curriculum units, lesson plans and other pedagogical activities, basic information about the countries in its area, and links to other sites for further research and information. Each site is a “work in progress” with change built into its structure; information and links are regularly upgraded, modified, or newly constructed.

Assessment and value. The centers have used both self-assessment techniques and feedback from users to improve their sites. Self-assessment includes regular consultation between people creating content and those responsible for Web design. Assessment by users is encouraged in a variety of ways, including email contact, face-to-face meetings, presentations to school and community groups, and workshops for teachers on specialized topics. MSU Global Access has an online feedback form where users can communicate their opinions and suggest other resources to include in the directory of online resources on various world areas and international themes. Staff, faculty, teaching assistants, and students at MSU have been asked to evaluate the content and presentation of some of the sites. LASER conducts evaluation focus groups with K-12 teachers. Each center has received positive evaluation of its product and its usefulness for educators and students, both nationally and internationally. For example, the National Curriculum Committee of Belize has adopted Exploring Africa for use in its schools, and some of the Exploring Africa units are being translated into German for use in German schools. Teachers and curriculum designers who have used the Web sites and discovered their strong and weak points have provided some of the most useful suggestions for improvement. For example, suggestions have been made to include more graphics, maps, pictures, photographs, and more interactive activities. Users have even recommended additional sites to which the ISP Web sites should link. However, one of the ongoing problems mentioned in assessments has been that links to other Web sites quickly go out-of-date and that these links must be checked frequently. Requests also have been made that curriculum modules be annotated to reference the national standards for social science and humanities education.

Improvement. A number of activities have been undertaken to improve the sites. At the request of teachers who were using the site, LASER has been translated into Spanish for use in the Michigan high school curriculum. LASER is creating an interactive section in Spanish and English focusing on current events and issues, and is working with K-12 teachers who are developing units and lessons specifically for the Web site. CLACS and MATRIX also changed the entire look of LASER to make it more user-friendly and easier to navigate. Also, MATRIX
made the site easier to maintain and update by designing a content management system to enable CLACS staff to update content via online forms. The Asian Studies Center has contracted with three faculty members to provide interactive course modules dealing with East, South, and Central Asia, and the center continues to update the content and incorporate more visual materials in *Windows on Asia*. *Windows on Asia* is providing analyses about the history, religion, geography, and culture of each country as a result of teachers’ suggestions. *Exploring Africa* is working with MATRIX to have its modules include more interactive activities. The African Studies Center plans to link all 30 *Exploring Africa* teaching modules with national curriculum standards as they are completed. (The Center has experience with designing units linked to curriculum standards, as it did this previously with the six study guides in *After September 11: Teaching Resource for High School and College Classrooms* that it created for the Social Science Research Council [see: www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/teaching_resource/tr_intro.htm]).

*MSU Global Access* has created special sections dealing with national and international news stories, such as the September 11 tragedy and the War in Iraq and is cross-linked to country-specific data on MSU-CIBER’s well-established *globalEDGE* international business resource Web site (see below). In addition to creating their own teaching modules and lesson plans, the centers provide links to other electronic collections of lesson plans that they consider to be of good quality so that teachers have ready access to them. The centers more frequently update links to other Web sites. *Exploring Africa* and *Windows on Asia* are linked to *MSU Global Access* to provide connectivity between these sites. ISP has publicized the *MSU Global Access* Web site each year at the Study Abroad fair and has encouraged faculty members to incorporate use of the website into students’ preparation for study abroad.

Each of the Web sites is an ongoing creation that is continuously being updated, with new materials and teaching units added or improved. Thus, change based on feedback and assessment is an integral part of their development. Responses to suggestions, complaints, and requests for additional information continue to be handled as they are received.

### C. International Outreach for Business and Government

#### a) *globalEDGE: Your Source for Global Business Knowledge*

This knowledge Web portal connects international business professionals worldwide to a wealth of information, insights, and learning resources on global business activities. It is the most frequently consulted online resource on international business (recording over 3 million hits per month since February 2005). New sections are continually added to the portal addressing current needs of business. Some examples are: National Security and Risk Management, and Social Responsibility and Sustainability. This portal is presented at numerous conferences and business outreach programs. The feedback garnered here combined with the feedback obtained from online surveys is used to make it more effective.

*Description.* Created by the Center for International Business Education and Research at Michigan State University (MSU-CIBER), *globalEDGE™* is partially funded by a U.S. Department of Education Title VI B grant. The site offers:
• Global Resources - more than 5,000 online resources
• Country Insights - a wealth of information on all countries
• Community - an interactive forum for business professionals
• Knowledge Room - latest issues in international business
• Academy - extensive research and teaching resources
• Diagnostic Tools - decision-support tools for managers

Assessment and Value. As a knowledge Web portal, the efficacy of globalEDGE™ is measured by usage. Based on this criterion, globalEDGE is the #1 most frequently consulted online resource on international business. In this regard, it has exceeded expectations.

Google™ Ranking¹: 1
Yahoo™ Ranking¹: 1
MSN™ Ranking¹: 1
Monthly Hits²: 2,139,839
Monthly Page Views²: 431,389
Monthly Visitor Sessions²: 97,365
Average Visitor Session Length²: 13 minutes, 57 seconds

¹Based on a search for the term ‘International Business’ as of March 2005
²Based on average statistics for the past 12 months

globalEDGE often gets featured in publications as well as textbooks. For example, for over two years now, globalEDGE has been an integral part of the leading International Business textbook *International Business: Competing in the Global Marketplace*, by Charles W. L. Hill. At the end of every chapter are exercises that require the use of globalEDGE as a research tool. globalEDGE has been recording over 3 million hits/month since the month of February 2005 (300 percent increase since 2001), demonstrating that globalEDGE is the farthest-reaching vehicle that equips business executives, faculty, and students with the most recent knowledge and developments in global business.

Since the goal has been exceeded, the challenge becomes how to stay at the top, a daunting task given the power of the artificial intelligence that many search engines are developing. What sets globalEDGE apart from search engines is the value of the material provided in addition to the format the information is being provided through. New sections address current needs of business. Recent events highlight the security aspects of doing business internationally as well as nationally. To address this situation, the group has identified three critical areas that U.S. businesses must be current on: Corporate Governance, National Security & Risk Management, and Social Responsibility and Sustainability. They have also added a brand new section just for faculty: the Academy at globalEDGE (http://globalEDGE.msu.edu/academy/). The Interactive Online Course Modules, Video Depositories, Textbook Publishers, Job Postings, Grant Opportunities, Conferences, Journals, Academic Publishers, and many more sections provide academicians with valuable resources to internationalize their research and teaching.

Improvement. Assessment is performed daily, not monthly or annually. globalEDGE is being presented at numerous conferences and business outreach programs, and feedback from usage
gets built into strategic plans. We are also conducting regular online surveys of our users and improving accordingly. See http://globaledge.msu.edu/.

b) Mali Market Information Support Project / Projet d’Appui au Système d’Information Décentralisé du Marché Agricole (PASIDMA)

In cooperation with the Assemblée Permanente des Chambres d’Agriculture du Mali, this 13-year project created an agricultural and food marketing information system in Mali to help farmers know where and when to sell their products at the best possible prices. A solar-powered computer network was created that links local market information system offices through e-mail sent over high-frequency radio. The overall goal of the decentralized market information system (DMIS) project is to foster an efficient, timely, reliable, and donor-independent agricultural and food marketing information system in Mali and strengthen the capacity of the private and public sectors to use the resulting market information effectively to promote agribusiness growth and food security.

Needs analysis. In the initial stage of the project the users who constituted the private sector (including farmers/herders, traders, food processors, and consumers), NGOs, government and donor organizations were surveyed to identify the types of information products needed/desired by each as well as outreach/training activities the users desire. These surveys were then used to help set priorities for future activities. Organizations were surveyed to determine if they were active in related activities at the local levels, their willingness to participate in the DMIS, the availability of local staff, and their training needs. After the surveys a national workshop involving all the major stakeholders was held and produced two outputs: a) recommendations for the design of a decentralized market information services delivery system and b) creation of a task force for implementing the recommendations.

Project Impacts.

- 2000-2004: Played key role in establishing Mali’s national committee of the Partnership to Cut Hunger and Poverty in Africa. The committee played a key role in developing Mali’s technical contributions to reports of the Partnership (which is co-chaired by Malian President Touré and former President Konaré). It also became the core of the new Malian national Technical Committee for the Coordination of Food Security Policy, which is a key advisory board under the National Food Security Strategy.
- 2000-2001: Increased Malian cereals exports and livestock due to commercial contacts among traders developed during the annual outlook conferences:
  - More than 60,000 tons of cereals were exported through business contacts built during the first two outlook conferences.

c) **Rwanda Coffee Economic Development Project**

MSU is the lead partner in a project to help rebuild and link agricultural institutions and rural communities of Rwanda. The project has given faculty of Rwanda universities access to new educational opportunities and has already helped to revive the country’s foundering coffee industry. Called PEARL—Partnership for Enhancing Agriculture in Rwanda through Linkages—the project began in 2000 and is funded by the US Agency for International Development (USAID). Other partners are Texas A&M University, the Universite Nationale du Rwanda, and the Institut des Sciences Agronomiques du Rwanda. In 2001, PEARL partners began working with the coffee growers’ cooperative of Maraba, the poorest district of Rwanda, to develop a high-quality specialty coffee that would sell for higher prices under fair trade agreements.

**The need.** After war, genocide, desperation, and agricultural market collapse, Rwandan farmers and widows of the 1994 war and genocide, are building their futures on new ways to grow, process and export coffee. In a world of complex problems, PEARL’s coffee plan has an elegant simplicity:

- Help farmers organize in cooperatives and pool essential resources, especially washing stations crucial to specialty coffee;
- Disseminate strict growing procedures;
- Teach how to wash and sort the beans, a painstaking task that separates the quality beans from the so-so beans;
- Offer assistance in marketing and sales; and
- Instill not only quality control, but community pride, an ingredient that creates not only success, but sustainability.

**The activity.** The project started by establishing a relationship with the National University of Rwanda. Initially 17 young instructors at Rwandan agricultural institutions were brought to U.S. universities for master’s degree training in agricultural sciences. The students returned home to go forth and apply research. Partnerships were soon formed with USAID and ACDI/VOCA, a private, nonprofit organization that promotes broad-based economic growth and civil society in developing countries. PEARL also brought in another land-grant university, Texas A&M.

PEARL has also created partnerships with industry and with professionals donating time to train the farm cooperative to evaluate the coffee by taste. PEARL also assists with finding markets for the coffee, and cooperatives work to meet farmer’s needs beyond the crop—helping subsidize children’s education and health insurance, teaching basic money management, and promoting women in business.

**The outcome.** Through project linkages, Community Coffee, the largest coffee company in the South, became the first buyer of the specialty coffee. In 2004, 31 Whole Foods stores began to carry the Rwandan specialty coffee.

d) **U.S.-Canada Free Trade Outreach**

The goal of this International Studies and Programs project is to learn from U.S. and Canadian legislators, government officials, and business leaders how MSU can increase its contributions to
helping them address common economic issues and harmonize trans-border concerns so as to maintain and expand the economic comparative advantage of the upper Great Lakes region in a North American and global context. The Michigan economy, particularly the auto industry, has been organized around systems of economic cooperation between Michigan and Canada (especially Ontario); MSU can help its constituents to preserve and expand this cooperation in the current era of increased political and security complexity.

Needs assessment and activities. During the past five years, MSU has (1) consulted with the various constituencies who have an interest in trans-border economic issues to learn how MSU can assist them to address these issues and (2) undertaken numerous outreach activities intended to serve these constituencies and evaluated their effectiveness. The Canadian Studies Centre (CSC) and its affiliated faculty, often with the active participation of the Office of the President, have pursued a path toward this end that has included (a) several proposals to create structures to promote ongoing programs on Michigan/Ontario economic issues and (b) numerous one-time activities that address this need while continuing to build capacity for the longer-term. It is impossible to name all of the activities here, but the more significant ones that reflect the intended trajectory include: (i) holding two conferences in Washington, D.C. on the desirability of a second round of negotiations on extending the Free Trade Agreement between the U.S. and Canada (2000-2003); (ii) making a proposal for a Michigan/Ontario Center with the State of Michigan and Ministry of Trade of Ontario (2003); (iii) hosting five Canadian Fulbright Visiting Scholars who were focused on U.S./Canadian economic issues related to their expertise in law, economics, political science and engineering (2002-2004); (iv) presenting MSU faculty members’ recommendations concerning opportunities for trade and cooperation with Ontario to the Director of the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (2003); (v) submitting a successful proposal to the Canadian National Railroad to endow an annual Canadian National Forum at MSU on issues concerning U.S.–Canadian relations and graduate and undergraduate prizes for papers on Canadian studies (2004; see “Gift to MSU Canadian Studies Centre Bolsters Canada-U.S. Relations, http://www.msutoday.msu.edu/news/index.php3?article=01Dec2004-4); and (vi) providing ongoing research and a presentation to Michigan legislators and other interested parties on the export of Canadian trash into Michigan (2004-05).

Assessment. The assessment plan included interviews with the interested parties to learn about their priorities and how MSU can be most relevant and also organizing programs whose relevance is assessed by gauging participation and interviewing/surveying participants. Interested parties who were interviewed over a period of five years included: Ontario Ministry of Trade and Economic Development, Ontario Exports Inc., North American Institute, Michigan Department of Trade and Economic Growth, the Great Lakes Commission, the Detroit and Canada Tunnel Corporation, and the Canadian Consulate General in Detroit. Programs organized by CSC were regularly attended by public affairs officers from the Detroit Consulate General, who sent reports to the Academic Relations officer at the Canadian Embassy. Frequently, these officials provided useful feedback about the programs. The CSC also identified and met with MSU faculty who have an interest in and are engaged on U.S./Canadian economic issues.

From these interviews and interactions, the CSC learned that Michigan and Ontario government officials were aware of the potential benefits of cooperation and collaboration in addressing trade, environmental, and employment issues, but there were relatively few suitable venues for
them to discuss issues and define responses at the state-provincial level. We learned that business leaders had similar concerns and that there was considerable interest in a mechanism, such as a Michigan/Ontario Center, that might facilitate the process, but there was not funding available for it from government sources. We learned that there is considerable interest in carefully-planned events on major issues where the program is planned based on the needs of major business and government participants. The CSC learned that MSU faculty in the fields of supply chain, tourism, law, fisheries and wildlife, and security have expertise that is valued by our business and government constituencies. The CSC developed relationships with MSU faculty in forestry, packaging, and composite materials of whom it had not previously known.

As a result of the feedback from interviews and the evaluation of activities, the CSC decided to concentrate recruitment of Canadian Fulbright Visiting Scholars each year (which it has been successful in doing) on experts in policy-related areas and also to concentrate on two major initiatives that would be planned with interested parties: (1) an annual forum on a major issue (on supply chain in fall 2005) and (2) a major conference on the U.S./Canadian auto industry in spring 2006 which has been designated as an MSU Sesquicentennial event. The annual forum would have an Advisory Board that would select the topic, speakers, and respondents. The conference on the auto industry has a planning committee formed in 2004 that includes faculty in labor and industrial relations, supply chain management, law, journalism, engineering, and anthropology. MSU faculty from a broader number of fields are being included in the planning and implementation of programs on U.S./Canadian economic relations.

Value. As a result of this carefully-developed plan, the CSC was successful in obtaining a $200,000 endowment from Canadian National Railroad (CN) for an annual forum and has been invited by the Canadian government to submit a proposal for an additional $50,000. The success of the CN Forum proposal can be traced to the earlier conceptualization of the proposal for a Michigan/Ontario Center; the strong ongoing activities of the CSC; and the support statements from the Director of the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth, the Ontario Minister of Trade and Economic Development, and the Canadian Consul General in Detroit. Relationships have been built with these offices through the multiplicity of activities and the interviews that have occurred during the past five years.

The Advisory Board of the CN Forum will become a valuable sounding board for obtaining input from business and government leaders about their interests and priorities in order to organize relevant and timely programs in the future. Similarly, the advisory panel assisting with the planning of the 2006 automotive conference is proving to be very helpful.
VII. PUBLIC EVENTS AND INFORMATION

The University has numerous ways to respond to the public’s need for information. In addition to outreach teaching and outreach scholarship, MSU also shares resources with the public through:

- Managed learning environments (e.g., museums, libraries, gardens, galleries, exhibits)
- Educational materials and products (e.g., pamphlets, web sites, educational broadcasting, software)
- Events (e.g., expositions, demonstrations, fairs, and performances)

MSU’s public events and information are aimed at a wide range of audiences and reflect the institution’s breadth of expertise. They are an eclectic mix in subject area and form. Some of these resources are formal entities with ongoing programs; others are short-term activities; others are products that may have long-lived usefulness.

This report first provides an overview, addressing constituencies served by these shared resources, the institution’s capacity and commitment to them, indicators of the ways in which these resources embody institutional responsiveness to the public, and indicators of how the public values them. Then the report gives examples of specific resources and the assessment of their value.

Data were gathered from the accreditation self-study reports of the units, from the Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI), the MSU Statewide Resource Network (SRN) Web site, the Spartan Youth Programs (SYP) Web site, MSU Today, and other MSU Web sites. The report of MSU’s recent pilot study of indicators of engagement for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching also provided useful information. Additional data were gathered by direct contact with university staff responsible for the operation of the resources.

A. Constituencies

Constituencies served include teachers, school-age children, professionals, and the general public. OEMI data for 2004 indicate the areas of social concern faculty addressed through their efforts in public events and information (see pie chart below). The distribution of activity across the 14 areas suggests that faculty covered a very broad and diverse spectrum of issues. The top four areas, accounting for 46% of the activity, were:

- Arts and Humanities
- Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade
- Science and Technology
- Natural Resources, Land Use, and Environment
The ways in which these resources are informed by public input varies. The largest of the managed learning environments are supported by formal advisory boards. This includes Wharton Center, MSU Museum, Kresge Art Museum, and Hidden Lake Gardens. The roles of these bodies vary—some give advice to administrators, some participate in fund raising, and some volunteer services. Though most of the resources are not supported by formal bodies, nearly all gather input from the public in other ways. These methods vary in form and formalization. Wharton Center and the MSU Museum have conducted focus groups. The MSU Museum and Kresge Art Museum receive input from evaluators as part of their grant-funded offerings. Many conduct surveys of visitors either onsite or post-visit. Some collect feedback through comment cards and visitor books. Some less formal approaches include reliance on solicited and unsolicited comments in conversation with public stakeholders (e.g., professional associations, colleagues, donors, volunteers).

The level of reciprocity plays a larger role in the management of some resources than in others. In some cases resources depend on the input of the public to make content decisions. Where they exist, advisory boards often serve this purpose, helping resource administrators make decisions about what to show, demonstrate, make etc. The Clarence E. Lewis Landscape Arboretum and G. Robert Vincent Voice Library increase the holdings of their respective plant and recording collections by way of donations from the public. In this way the public has a direct role in shaping the resources. In other cases, the resource depends on the actual labor of the public as volunteer docents, laborers, etc. One of the ways the Bird Sanctuary at the Kellogg Biological...
Station engages the public is through annual deer hunts aimed at decreasing the size and damaging effects on the Sanctuary of Michigan’s overpopulated deer herd; over three years this activity has resulted in the donation of 2,000-3,000 pounds of venison to local food banks. (Appendix M provides information on community input into managed learning environments.)

B. Capacity and Commitment

1. Infrastructure

The University operates a number of managed learning environments in order to create spaces for specialized learning. These facilities provide a wide variety of educational venues for learning about culture, the arts, and the sciences. They include: Wharton Center for Performing Arts, MSU Museum, Kresge Art Museum, Human Environment & Design Collections, G. Robert Vincent Voice Library, and the Abrams Planetarium. Besides the main campus library, the MSU Libraries operate nine branch libraries, including one off-campus branch at Gull Lake. In addition to managing a research university collection, which it makes available to any adult citizen of Michigan by way of a borrower’s card, the Library conducts a number of seminars and events that are open to the community. MSU’s gardens and natural science collections add to these shared resources. They include: Horticultural Demonstration Gardens, W. J. Beal Botanical Garden, which is the nation’s oldest teaching garden, Michigan 4H Children’s Garden, MSU Herbarium, Clarence E. Lewis Landscape Arboretum, Hidden Lake Gardens, Campus Wood Plant Collection, and MSU Bug House. (See Appendix H for information on staffing of managed learning environments.)

The other forms of public events and information are not dependent on a particular kind of space or organizational structure. Further, because faculty across the campus are encouraged to engage in outreach as a part of their research, teaching, and service, the resources they create as educational materials and products and events are closely tied to the work they do through their units. Consequently, in most cases, these forms of public events and information are not supported by an infrastructure that is distinguishable from the existing colleges and departments that employ faculty.

2. Funding

It is difficult to estimate the total funding invested in public events and information. With regard to managed learning environments, it may be possible to report operational general fund budget data for the larger resources (e.g., Wharton Center, MSU Museum, Kresge Art Museum). For those that have mixed public/campus purposes (e.g., MSU Libraries, Abrams Planetarium), it is probably not possible to parse the general fund dollars that fund only public events and information. With the smaller managed learning environments (largely the gardens), funding may simply be the salary value of the staff, all or part of whose time is assigned to maintain the resource. Educational materials and products may or may not have grant funding (some software, Web sites, and publications). The University can track grant funding; however, in many cases only a portion of the grant funds may be allocated to educational materials or some other kind of
public event and information. Finally, events may have revenue sources by way of admission fees.

One approach to addressing these difficulties is to use the university-wide data of the OEMI which cuts across the multiple sources of funding and specifically asks about faculty work in public events and information. OEMI data indicate that the University invested $2,331,157 of faculty salary toward public events and information in 2004. That funding was matched by the in-kind contributions from partners (consisting of salary value and actual dollars) of $3,536,141. The total salary and in-kind partner contribution, then, amounts to nearly $6 million in 2004. This may be a significant underestimate because the OEMI only accounts for time spent by individual faculty and academic staff members, not professional and clerical-technical personnel, and a survey does not have a 100% response rate.

3. Professional and Staff Positions

Because outreach and engagement is decentralized at MSU, it is not possible to report the number of professional and staff positions. However, of the 800+ faculty who responded to the 2004 OEMI survey, 247 or 30% said they were involved with public events and information. Of the 656 respondents who completed the narrative section, 419 or 64% indicate having engaged in some form of public dissemination. This dissemination could have taken the form of publications, bulletins, newsletters, Web sites, etc. A very large segment of the people who staff public events and information falls outside OEMI figures. Each resource must assess its ability to maintain staffing appropriate to its needs, using a mix of full time, part time, academic, professional, student, and, in many cases, volunteer labor.

C. Responsiveness

Through managed learning environments such as the Wharton Center, Michigan 4H Children’s Garden, and the Bug House, the University creates and manages educational programs in the arts, environment, and sciences for school aged children. Other resources, like the MSU Museum, Abrams Planetarium, and Hidden Lake Gardens, offer programs for a broad range of adults and youth on topics of popular interest such as folk arts, current themes about space in the news, and gardening. Educational materials and products are also developed with an interest in responding to public interests. Web sites for the public, such as the Center for International Business Education and Research’s (MSU-CIBER) globalEDGE, a large news and information portal on international business, serve the information needs of particular groups of professionals. The staff that maintains the portal routinely gather data from users on their interest for cutting edge information on globalization and expand the site to meet that need. The educational software package called the Fantastic Food Challenge, developed by the MSU Communication Technology Laboratory in partnership with the MSU Extension’s Family Nutrition Program and supported by federal funds through state government, is composed of games designed to motivate young adults to learn about nutrition, food safety, food preparation, and comparing food prices. Publications, email lists, and other communication organs are also used to disseminate information from the University to the public. Finally, events such as Ag Expo and the annual conferences on information technology usability and accessibility, attempt
to make information about new developments in different fields available to a broad cross section of practitioners whose professional development is enhanced through attendance.

D. Evidence of Value

Revenues and attendance provide evidence of the extent to which the public values MSU’s public events and information. While the University does not yet have comparative or longitudinal data, in 2004 faculty reported (in the OEMI survey) that their public events and information brought $8,563,580 in revenues to the University, with over 343,346 in attendance. More significant in providing “valuing” evidence, and evidence of collaboration, is the $6,832,337 in revenue earned for the partnering organizations and the partners’ investment of $3,536,141 in in-kind contributions. These may be a conservative estimate given the limits of the survey’s population (faculty and academic staff members) and response rate.

Appendix M contains a table of the data collected on staffing, usage/access, community input, and evaluation of public events and information. In the following sections of this report are specific examples of managed learning environments, educational materials and products, and events. The examples focus on the outreach and engagement aspects of the initiatives.

E. Managed Learning Environments

This section includes examples that illustrate the variety and quality of the University’s managed learning environments. These include Wharton Center’s Arts in Education programs and the Department of Entomology’s Bug House.

1. Arts in Education

The Arts in Education programs are an integral part of Wharton Center’s mission and include the following primary programs:

- Act One School and Family Series (52 performances; over 28,000 in attendance including students from 108 public, private and home-school groups; more than 2,800 free tickets given for school shows)
- Jazz Kats – Jazz For Kids (10 performances; over 3,800 in attendance)
- The Young Playwrights Festival, a collaboration between Wharton Center and the MSU Department of Theatre now in its ninth year. The program focuses on high school students who submit original one-act plays to a juried panel and work with industry mentors.
- Additional activities include internship programs, life-long learning evening college, master classes, and more.

In addition to these programs, the Wharton Center gave tours to approximately 1,300 people in 2004-2005. Wharton Center is a popular tour destination for school groups, boy and girl scout troops, and groups from all over the world including Japan, Ukraine, and Kenya. Additional tour
groups included Spartan Daycare, Seminar Group, Admissions Office, Greater Lansing Convention & Visitors Bureau, Agricultural Extension, and others.

Wharton Center’s Advisory Council, comprised of 35 mid-Michigan business and community leaders, helped position Wharton Center as one of the premier performing arts centers in the country and, through fund raising and contributions, ensured that the arts at Wharton Center were accessible to the entire community.

The 273 volunteer members of Wharton Center’s Inner Circle contributed more than 4,700 hours of service including ushering for Arts in Education programs, serving as docents in local classrooms, and operating the gift shop with revenues exceeding $102,000 to support Wharton Center programs.

Wharton Center’s newly formed Cultural Advisory Groups assist with guiding the staff’s efforts to reach underserved communities. Currently formalized are the African-American Advisory Group and the Hispanic/Latino Advisory Group, which meet on a semi-regular basis.

Wharton Center is currently in the process of developing a comprehensive research program focused on audience perceptions, buying habits, etc. To date, the Center has conducted limited focus groups with underserved audiences as part of its Community Outreach initiative.

2. The Bug House

The Entomology Department developed an outreach program for students and teachers in K-12 schools. A committee of faculty, graduate students, and staff who had done preliminary outreach work identified potentially fruitful ways of engaging the community. One opportunity was the long-term loan of a professional museum-quality insect display. A related opportunity was the existence of a developed network of K-6 teachers/classes who had already visited a butterfly house that had been developed several years earlier. The committee determined that the display could be built into a new outreach effort called the Bug House, an insect display/museum/live ‘petting-zoo’ and mini-classroom for outreach presentations and teaching. A grant was obtained from MSU Outreach to fund the first three years of stipends and supplies.

The Bug House program targeted grade school students. In spring 2002 K-6 classes visited the Bug House in increasing numbers, peaking at 78 tours per month. Teacher evaluations filled in during the tours showed overwhelmingly positive response to the Bug House program. Approximately 25% of the department’s graduate and undergraduate students have volunteered to be docents for one more terms. Participating students have provided feedback to improve the program and (like the teachers) have shown overwhelmingly positive responses to their participation. The program was expanded to include a mentor program that paired graduate students with actual classrooms for term-long science projects. (This program was subsequently discontinued due to loss of funding.) Summer Bug Camps for elementary and middle school children were initiated and continue to fill every summer. Bug Camps generate enough funds to be self-supporting. Although tours in the Bug House have decreased somewhat in the last year due to cuts to the Lansing School District budget, currently the department is exploring several promising sources of external funding to support outreach education.
F. Educational Materials and Products

Information collected from the accreditation self-study reports of the units, the Statewide Resource Network Web site, the Spartan Youth Programs Web site, the OEMI, and MSU Web sites was used to identify examples of software, Web sites, publications, and other materials. The SRN and SYP may provide the most comprehensive view of the University’s production of educational materials and publications accessible to the public. Of the 1,763 records stored in the SRN database, 280 or 16% are categorized as “Publications, Software, and Databases,” and 20 of the 234 records in the SYP database fall under the heading “Software, Reading Materials, and Websites.”

1. Alliance for Building Capacity in Schools (ABCS) Academic Coaches Institute Materials

University Outreach and Engagement (UOE) provided support to an MSU College of Education project to establish and operate the Alliance for Building Capacity in Schools (ABCS) Academic Coaches Institute. Funded by the Michigan Department of Education as part of its response to federal “No Child Left Behind” initiatives, the project called for the recruitment, training, and certification of a cadre of 100 senior educators who would be available as independent school improvement consultants to the leaders of schools failing to meet Michigan school assessment standards. UOE developed three components: a public Web site to recruit potential candidates for the Institute; a Web-based environment to support the intensive face-to-face training provided by the College of Education and online collaboration between learners and instructors; and a public Web registry to be used by school leaders trying to find and hire academic coaches. The College of Education completed its contract with the State, which reported its satisfaction with the project at a capstone briefing. Some subsequent work between the State and College of Education, based on the Institute, is currently being explored.

2. Victims and the Media Program Web Sites

The School of Journalism’s Victims and the Media Program connects with professional journalists who need to learn how to interview victims of violence without re-victimizing them, journalism educators who benefit from materials that they can use in their classes, and victim advocates who often find themselves caught between reporters and victims, acting as facilitators or buffers.

Besides courses for the school’s students and workshops for the Michigan Press Association, the Associated Press, the Headliners Club of Chicago, the Illinois Press Association and numerous Michigan news organizations such as the Detroit Free Press and the Bay City Times, the Victims and the Media Program maintains two Web sites for journalism educators. The program Web site (see http://www.victims.jrn.msu.edu) shares all of the program materials with educators. The seminar Web site at http://www.seminars.jrn.msu.edu provides resources and a Web cast of seminars on special topics. For the past three years, the program has benefited from funding from the Michigan Crime Victim Services Commission. The funding supports outreach to victim
advocates, through a three-week online Web course on Building an Effective Media Strategy, as well as an annual conference.

Visitors to the Web site email the program director thanking us for the online information. The program coordinator has also been asked to speak at other universities, to professional media organizations, and other groups. The online course includes an online evaluation form, and victim advocates consistently rate the course as an A-, the same as for the annual workshops. Feedback from last year has persuaded the MCVSC to provide funding this year to revise the online course as an asynchronous and unfacilitated course, to allow victims advocates to participate whenever they choose.

3. Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR) Materials for Teachers

In order to promote and strengthen foreign language teaching, CLEAR develops materials for teachers that are made available free of charge or for a minimal cost. Most are available as links or downloads directly through CLEAR’s Web site and can be obtained by any interested teacher or language learner. These materials range from instructional guides for small group settings (available for the teaching of various African languages, Thai, Hindi, and Vietnamese) to packets for use in business language classrooms (available in French, German, and Spanish). Thousands of copies of CLEAR’s various materials have been downloaded and/or purchased, and anecdotal evidence indicates that teachers find the materials very useful.

CLEAR’s newsletter, published twice a year, reaches over 16,000 language teaching professionals and includes articles on current teaching trends and ideas. Readers of the newsletter are invited to submit ideas for articles, and in the fall 2004 issue, readers’ opinions were solicited in a survey about topics for future issues. In response to this survey, the spring 2005 issue focused on trends in language and technology and has been well received. Future issues will have other themes that survey respondents ranked as interesting and useful.

G. Events

Information collected from the accreditation self-study reports of the units, the SRN, the SYP, the OEMI, and MSU Web sites was used to identify examples of expositions, demonstrations, fairs, and performances. Some review of the MSU Today news Web site was done to sample news stories about MSU events. A list of these is included in Appendix I. A very visible example that illustrates MSU events for and with the public is the Great Lakes Folk Festival, sponsored by MSU’s Museum and the city of East Lansing, among many others.

1. Great Lakes Folk Festival

In response to the need to create a statewide multicultural educational event/program that celebrates and educates the people of Michigan and also serves as an economic development asset for the East Lansing/MSU community, the MSU Museum, working with East Lansing and other cultural communities, has annually produced the state’s largest living museum exhibit each August. The Great Lakes Folk Festival provides effective mechanisms for humanities scholars to
engage the public in the exploration of humanities issues, especially those pertaining to ethnicity, occupation, regionalism, religion, and cultural identity. This living educational event builds on the research activities of the Museum’s Michigan Traditional Arts Program (with major support from the Michigan Council for the Arts and Cultural Affairs and numerous granting agencies and corporate contributions). Each year the Festival has had one or two selected themes to provide a focus for research, interpretive design, and educational programming. The presentation of cultural traditions takes place in a format where tradition bearers, scholars, and the public audience interact through staged performances and demonstration areas. Since its founding, the Museum Folklife Festivals have creatively sustained and fostered understanding of cultural heritage, supported lifelong learning, and global education, and served as a center for community engagement with the arts and humanities.

The Festivals are assessed and evaluated using a visitor survey developed in concert with Public Sector Consultants. The evaluation is administered using scientific sampling to ensure the quality of the assessment using trained volunteers. The survey results are analyzed and summarized by the professional staff of Public Sector Consultants. In addition, the East Lansing Police Department counts visitors and reports results to the museum staff (the Festival takes place in downtown East Lansing).

The Museum Folklife Festivals annually attract approximately 100,000 visitors. The visitors include a highly diverse multi-generational audience that includes over 45% from beyond the mid-Michigan area. Survey results indicate that attendees value the educational value of the experience as one that enriches their understanding of other cultural traditions including international traditions that are showcased at the event.

Targeted marketing efforts reach specific cultural audiences to ensure awareness and expanded participation by these groups. A Community Advisory Committee is actively involved in program development. In addition, a partnership has developed with the Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage to develop joint programming and to share resources (museum staff also assist in the annual Smithsonian Folklife Festival and the museum is now a Smithsonian Affiliate Museum). The Festival has also now been used to showcase new museum research and programs.

The Museum Folklife Festivals are now used by MSU International Studies and Programs, colleges, and departments as a featured event for summer programming on campus. Many campus units plan their summer conferences, workshops, and special program to coincide with the Festival. In addition, a number of Humanities Institutes for Teachers (sponsored by the Eisenhower Foundation and the Michigan Department of Education) have been offered leading into this event to enrich the teaching of the humanities and social sciences in Michigan schools. The Museum’s Folklife Festivals have been recognized by the National Endowment for the Arts as among the best educational festivals in the country. The event was selected as the Outstanding Michigan Humanities Council Project in its 30 year history (1974-2004). The museum festival also received the Imagining Michigan Award for outstanding university-community partnership programming in 2004. The event is now considered a cornerstone event for the university and community each year that has significant economic and educational impact for the university and the state.
VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. MSU has instituted an annual campus-wide administration of a Web-based survey of faculty and staff activities and accomplishments in the mission area of outreach and engagement. The instrument itself and the data collected have potential to strengthen MSU’s leadership as an engaged university. To that end, we recommend the following:

   - From the increasing amount of quantitative and qualitative data, the newly established MSU Center for the Study of University Engagement should fund publishable studies of the process and the analysis of the data, focusing particularly on impact on external partners and on scholarly work.
   - The instrument itself has potential for national application. MSU should move forward to investigate the possibilities with other colleges and universities and with national data-gathering organizations. One desired outcome would be a small set of nationally utilized indicators/benchmarks for engagement.

2. A published tool, the Points of Distinction (MSU, 1996, rev. 2000) for guiding faculty in engaging with community partners and assessing the work is being disseminated campus-wide to assist units with planning and measuring the quality of their engagement work. This guidebook should be coupled with a newly developed analytic tool for units to assess and plan their engagement with constituents. Specifically, we recommend the following:

   - The constituent analysis tool should be pilot tested and disseminated across the campus for use in engagement planning and in accreditation reporting.
   - The “package” of tools should be published and made available nationally through a variety of venues.
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