**Business Plan for the Center for Community Engagement (CCE)**


**CE Taskforce Membership**: Craig Bleakney, Sherry Cable, Lynn Champion, Nissa Dahlin-Brown, Kelly Ellenburg, RJ Hinde, Carole Myers, Dulcie Peccolo, Bob Rider (co-chair), David Schumann (co-chair), Dori Stiefel ; with consultation from Elizabeth Burman

*"It is not enough to expand the intellect and talents of our students if we fail to rouse their souls to serve others and engage them in the larger issues of the day."* **Former President Judith Rodin, University of Pennsylvania, referencing her belief as to Martin Luther King's perspective on education.**

*"…the great aim and end of all learning is service to society."* **Benjamin Franklin**

Purpose of the Proposal

This proposal focuses on the implementation of a strategy to address the ongoing relationship between the University of Tennessee and the Community. By "community" we mean *identifiable groups of individuals that share similar location, interests, concerns, or practice.* "Community Engagement" is described as "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Driscoll, 2009, Carnegie Foundation). These definitions reflect the scope of our activities as a land-grant institution, including our engagement with for-profit, non-profit, and government organizations, as well as with public-interest organizations and groups of students, teachers, and citizens. These communities may be local, regional, national or international, but our engagement with each of them shares the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership, collaboration, and reciprocity.

The proposal recommends and provides a rationale for the creation of a Center for Community Engagement (CCE). It provides recommendations for a strategic approach, alliances, personnel, budget, and potential strategies for funding. The CE Taskforce strongly suggests that the University consider, as part of its next SACS accreditation process, a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) based on "Interdisciplinary Community Engagement." By having the CCE in place for the next SACS cycle in 5 years, the University will be well positioned to carry out a successful QEP.

Core Values Underlying the CCE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Academic Excellence | Cultural Competence | Participation |
| Accessibility | Empowerment | Partnership |
| Accountability | Engagement | Reciprocity |
| Advocacy | Entrepreneurship | Reflection |
| Collaboration | Intercultural | Scholarship |
| Connectivity | Interdisciplinary Approaches | Tracking and Assessment |
| Continuous Improvement | Mentorship | |
| Creativity | Mutual Benefit/Contribution | |

Learning Approaches to be ~~Promoted~~promoted through the CCE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Active Engaged Learning | Discovery Based Learning | Mentor Based Learning |
| Experiential Learning | Inquiry Based Learning | Transformational Learning |

Research Approaches to be promoted through the CCE

Multiple perspectives on philosophy of science
Multiple methods of discovery
Rigorous data analysis
Interdisciplinary research teams
Inclusion of both undergraduates and graduate students in research initiatives

Vision Statement

The vision of the CCE is to establish a presence on the UT campus and in the community recognized as the portal or point of contact between the community and the university.  This portal will facilitate communication and engagement that encourages the community and the University to work together to meet each other's needs.  While moving to connect, rather than duplicate, all existing outreach and engagement entities on campus, the CCE would also facilitate new community partnerships that address critical issues in Tennessee and worldwide.  These new partnerships would employ the best practices articulated and agreed upon by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, the Carnegie Foundation, The W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Campus Compact, and Learn and Serve America.

Mission Statement

The mission of the CCE is to provide a general connecting point and coordinated infrastructure for partnership between the Community and the University.  "Community Engagement" is described as "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Driscoll, 2009, Carnegie Foundation).  The CCE would provide the university and the community with a mechanism to engage effectively as partners to better meet each other's needs through service-learning, applied research, and other opportunities for meaningful engagement.

Drivers and Benefits

There are key drivers and derived benefits (outcomes) hat motivate this proposal and benefits that would be derived from implementation of the CCE.  These are noted in table 1 below.  Each benefit (outcome) will provide a means to assess the success of the Center in carrying out its vision and mission statements.

Table 1: Drivers and Benefits

| Drivers | Benefits (Outcomes) |
|---|---|
| Currently UT has no campus portal or point of contact to facilitate partnerships within and among community, faculty, staff, and students | Center would provide such a portal |

2

| | |
|---|---|
| UT is sometimes viewed by community as elite and disconnected | Center would facilitate faculty, staff, and student efforts to engage with community |
| Land grant mission viewed by some as only relegated to Extension | Center would help to involve the entire campus in fulfilling this mission, and demonstrate this involvement to the public and the Tennessee Legislature |
| The university presently has a number of valuable community engagement activities, but they are not receiving proper recognition for their efforts because these efforts are not apparent to the public, state legislators, or potential UT partners and funders. | The Center would showcase the university's community engagement for local, state, and national audiences, and would serve as representation of the university's value-add to society and the community. |
| The university has many units that offer services to the international, national, state, or local community, but the community is not aware of what each offers, nor are other service- or outreach-based campus units | The Center would work to promote the work that service- or outreach-units are doing, and would facilitate interdisciplinary partnerships between campus units, as well as between international, national, state, and local community groups. |
| Many faculty are engaged with the community, but they are required to coordinate the logistics themselves, which can make engagement taxing, and serve as a deterrent to others | The Center would set up a standard process to enable those already involved in community engagement to focus less on logistics and more on student learning and research. This would foster increased engagement by the rest of the campus by minimizing the legwork involved and lessening the time required of other UT units answering the same questions. |
| Students have difficulty getting plugged into service or community engagement activities | The Center would promote engagement activities that are already being offered |
| Students are demanding community service opportunities, as demonstrated by the newly formed Community Partnership Service Corps, but there is currently no structure in place to facilitate their efforts and streamline the process of serving the community. | The Center would facilitate these opportunities in collaboration with campus units to conduct research and / or service, based on shared student-staff-faculty interest and areas of community need |
| The university hopes to attract and retain exceptional students, but these students desire and expect a high level of engagement in their learning experiences | The Center will offer valuable community-based learning experiences that will help UT to meet these students' expectations |
| In the words of a student: "Students can come and go from UT and never know what it means to be a good citizen. That's a problem." | The Center would facilitate widespread student engagement in civic activities by taking on the role of getting students, faculty, and the community plugged in to each other's needs and offerings |
| Students are not participating in programs abroad at the same rate as the Top 25 students | The Center would help to showcase international service study opportunities to students through global community engagement opportunities |

| | |
|---|---|
| Faculty are missing opportunities to collaborate across departments and colleges because they are unaware of potential opportunities | The Center would communicate available opportunities for collaboration to faculty across campus and help community groups make the correct connections. |
| University research has potential to positively impact lives of those in local, state, and national community through engaged scholarship, but we are not taking advantage of this opportunity | The Center would help facilitate engaged scholarship by connecting university research to real-world needs |
| Our local, state, and national communities face complex, multi-faceted problems, and we have the expertise to address these—and faculty and students desire to address them—but our discipline-based approach is not sufficient to tackle these problems | The Center could facilitate the coordination of multi-disciplined approaches necessary to meeting complex community problems |
| Students are becoming disengaged with the traditional methods of instruction, and desire to be active participants in their learning experiences | The Center would work with the TENN TLC to help faculty in the use of service-learning or experiential learning to further student engagement and learning |

Rational for the Center for Community Engagement

The problems and issues facing society today can best be addressed through coordinated interdisciplinary efforts where institutions of higher education work directly with the community in which they serve.   Numerous political officials and university presidents have commented on the importance of this as the relationships between higher education and the communities it serves evolve (Bok 1990; Bringle et al, 1999; Gardner 1995; Kellogg Commission 1999; Kellogg Commission 2006; Lynton; 1995; NASULGC (currently the APLU), 2007 as cited in the Hanover Report, May 2008).

In addition, significant expert opinion and some recent research have reflected that community engagement can be a useful strategy for addressing and improving retention of students and improving the quality of learning (Astin et. al., 2000; Hatcher et. al., 2002; Kuh, 2005; Simonet, 2008).  For example, Simonet (2008) summarized the research that ties service learning to four critical engagement categories (cognitive, behavioral, emotional, social), each with its own set of outcomes related to retention.   Community engagement also provides a means to reinforce with State of Tennessee officials the important role the University serves with regard to the growth and improvement of communities throughout the state.

At the moment, the University of Tennessee Knoxville has no such campus wide coordinated interdisciplinary facilitation of community engagement.  All efforts to engage the community have been piecemeal, which has caused significant frustration at both the university and community levels.  This proposal for establishing the CCE will directly address this need for coordinated disciplinary and interdisciplinary facilitation of mutually beneficial activities, specifically tied to the teaching, research and service mission of the University.

The Top 25/Vol Vision, the University's Civility Initiative, and Ready for the World all focus on the need to elevate the experience of our students in our global society and to recruit and retain an engaged

faculty.  Our students want to be part of enhancing their community as evidenced in student organizations established to learn and serve, such as Team Vols, Clinic Vols, Jazz for Justice, and the Community Partnership Service Corp.  These visionary initiatives reflect the importance of engaging our students and challenging them to develop their individual skills, knowledge, and talent and become the responsible citizenry of tomorrow.  Today's "Research Very High Intensity" university faculty are continually being charged with helping resolve societal issues through research and encouraging students to increase their knowledge and experience to make important contributions to the betterment of society.  The entity proposed here is designed to facilitate the progress of our students and the engagement of our faculty in direct work to enhance the community.

Feedback from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching reviewers of UT's unsuccessful submission for classification as a Community Engagement Institution revealed the need for UT to focus on three key areas.  The first was to institutionalize engagement (engagement that is "deep and pervasive") by 1) expanding the current outreach and extension missions to a broader focus on community engagement, 2) establishing a coordinating structure for engagement, and 3) developing a campus-level mission statement for engagement.  Second, it recommended that UT adopt a campus-wide tracking/documentation/assessment mechanism for community engagement activity.  Finally, it recommended that UT establish a curricular priority for the experiential/co-curricular/service learning for students which would provide further evidence of alignment with institutional prioritization of engagement.  (A fourth point not mentioned by the reviewers but nonetheless critical is a need for increasing professional development support for faculty and staff as they desire to engage with the community)

In their 1999 report, the Kellogg Commission, with participation of many of the Top 25 university presidents, argued that the nation's state and land-grant institutions are not using their intellectual and material resources to improve their communities in a coherent way. Since this report, many of the Top 25 public institutions have made substantial progress in this area (as demonstrated by our benchmark study – please see the Market Analysis section below - and confirmed in The Commission's 2006 report). The University of Tennessee to date has yet to make such progress. Implementation of the CCE would demonstrate the University's commitment to the Commission's charge and reinforce the University's "land grant" mission through opportunities for students to be directly involved in coordinated efforts that educate, create knowledge, and provide service.

Strategic Priorities

- Involve UT students and faculty in solving today's societal problems and issues
- Leverage interdisciplinary community engagement to take on large problems and issues as determined through an ongoing process of joint assessment of need
- Offer a one stop portal through which the Community may connect with the University of Tennessee and UT may connect with the Community
- Foster coordination, purposefulness, and reciprocity in identifying and addressing societal problems
- Expand service-learning courses and course components
- Showcase to critical stakeholder groups the relationship between UT and the Community

Description of CCE

The CCE is envisioned as a center with staff support that coordinates and facilitates a large network of alliances that includes existing and future UT units, external government agencies and non-profits, school districts, other higher education institutions, and UT faculty and administrators. Some of the potential roles are listed below:

- Create and facilitate partnerships among and between faculty, staff, and students to more effectively engage with the community
- Initial coordination of listing service-learning courses
- Coordination of faculty research that requires community engagement
- Intake service for community inquiries
- Coordination of student and student organization placement with the community engagement needs
- Development and promotion of  academically based service-learning courses (ABSL) and their reciprocal benefit for the community and university
- Creation and management of a community engagement policy and process, including transportation, risk management, course design, etc. with regard to faculty, staff and student participation in service-learning activities
- Support of student initiated community engagement programs in collaboration with Student Activities
- Work with other UT learning centers (e.g., TENN TLC, Student Success Center, UT Libraries, Baker Center, OIT Instructional Support, Center for International Education) to facilitate training for faculty  and students as needed
- Coordinate with various media services through UT Media Relations to promote community engagement activities (e.g., local NPR, Associated Press wire service, local newspapers, *Tennessee Today, Beacon*).

List of Strategic Alliances

The list of Alliances appears in Appendix 1.  The categories of alliances include 1) the UT Academic Outreach and Engagement Council, 2) existing College-based centers/institutes/programs, 3) UTK/UT entities, and 4) joint entities.

Marketing Analysis

As mentioned above, the University of Tennessee Knoxville is notably behind in the coordination of its current community engagement efforts and resources. In order to establish the coordination and infrastructure needed to keep pace with our peer institutions, we assessed both the state of the community and that of our fellow public institutions by 1) compiling research on community needs and assets from UT Extension and the Cornerstone Foundation of Knoxville, and 2) conducting an extensive benchmark study of the community engagement of our Top 25 Public Institutes as compared to our own.

Table 2 below outlines the structure of this analysis.

| Researched Entities | Values Assessed | Expanded Findings |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Local, state, and national communities | • Community assets and needs | Our research sources for community assets and needs are provided in the section below |
| 2. Top 25 Public Institutions | • Carnegie classification<br>• TRUCEN membership<br>• Formalized service-learning<br>• Top-tier leadership<br>• Coordination and infrastructure | A case profile for each Top 25 institution is available upon request |

Regarding the Community: It was deemed appropriate to collect what existing data the CE Taskforce could with regard to community assets and needs. It is also recognized that an assessment by the community is critically important and that this be an ongoing process. Thus, as detailed in the Strategic Plan section below, among the first steps of the proposed process are to establish an advisory board in which we might collaborate with community partners in such an assessment. This ongoing, collaborative assessment will be used to continually inform and develop the CEE and VC services and use of student, faculty, staff, and community partner time and effort.

Regarding the Top 25: In order to better understand the state of community engagement among our university peers, the CE Taskforce sought to identify 1) existing trends in the outreach and engagement approaches among our national Top 25 sample, 2) level of effort or coordination associated with this sample as compared to UTK, and 3) potential models upon which to base our approach.

The findings of our research are presented below.

*Local, State, and National Community Assets and Needs*

The Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU), formally known as the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), has identified ten areas of engagement that public institutions should address through partnership with local, state, and national communities. These areas are: K-12 education, urban issues, democratization, health and well-being, poverty, higher education, internationalization, natural resources and environment, security, and energy (NASALGC, 2007). The CE Taskforce acquired data from UT Extension and the Knoxville Cornerstone Foundation on the state of our local, state, and national communities. Links to their research are listed below:

UT Extension
http://trend.ag.utk.edu/webinar/CapacityBuildingAssetMapping.wmv
http://trend.ag.utk.edu/webinar/Webinar2.pdf
http://srdc.msstate.edu/fop/brochures/fop.pdf
http://trend.ag.utk.edu/overview.html

Cornerstone Foundation of Knoxville
http://www.cornerstoneofknoxville.org/research.html

*Engagement Characteristics of the Top 25 Public Institutions*

The results of this benchmarking study are outlined in Table 3 below, followed by UTK's results in the same categories. The indicators were as follows:

*1. Carries Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's Community Engagement Classification =17 total (65%).*

> In order to receive this new (2006) classification, institutions must document institutionalized practices of community engagement that show alignment among mission, culture, leadership, infrastructure, strategic planning, resource budgeting, faculty teaching and scholarship, community partnerships, student engagement tied to the curriculum, and the use of institutional measurement tools to track and assess both the university impact and community impact of these mutually-beneficial practices. Tennessee institutions also carry this classification, including UT Martin & UT Chattanooga.

*2. Member of Campus Compact (noting TRUCEN membership \*) (The Research University Civic Engagement Network) = 19 total (73%) Campus Compact; 11 total (42% TRUCEN)*

> Campus Compact is the only national association of higher education that focuses exclusively on campus-based civic engagement. The membership includes public and private 2 and 4 year institutions of higher education. The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN), established in 2007, works to advance civic engagement and engaged scholarship among research universities and to create resources and models for use across higher education. TRUCEN calls upon research university colleagues to embrace a bold vision for civic and community engagement and work to bring it about.

*3. Has formal, campus-level, service-learning program = 21 total (81%)*

> May include: Funding available for faculty stipends for course development and/or community-based project expenses (Berkeley); database of opportunities (Maryland); "civic engagement" minor (UCLA); Community-based research grants for students (Virginia); resources (and fund-raising) for student teams, graduate student fellowships, faculty fellowships, common courses, training workshops, and seminars (Virginia); robust support and information for community partners (North Carolina, Chapel Hill); associated learning community (Illinois); strong connections with student volunteer programs (Wisconsin); connections with graduate research to link theory with practice (UC Davis); links with campus diversity and globalization initiatives (Washington); connections to undergraduate research (Washington); connections to extension office (Penn State); tracking and evaluation instruments (Ohio); ongoing faculty development: workshops, round-tables, consultations (Georgia)

*4. Has top-tier Outreach/Engagement leadership at Assistant-Provost level or above = 21 total (81%)*

> Generally the presence of a top-tier leadership position at the Assistant-Provost level or above is associated with a high institutional outreach/engagement priority.

*5. "Traditional Center" or unit as defined below = 12 total (46%)*

> The criteria used to qualify units as a "traditional center" were: 1) the unit has a community focus, 2) the unit is campus-wide, 3) the unit serves as a portal to the community, and 4) the unit serves students, faculty, and the community. Generally those institutions that held such a unit did not have a system of coordinated units with a central office (value #6), but the University of Minnesota had both. Also notable is that UCLA has two units that fit the above criteria: The Center for Community Partnerships and the Center for Community Learning.

*6. System of coordinated units with a central office = 8 total (31%)*

> This value applies to those institutions that have an infrastructure of coordinated units under the umbrella of—or in some way coordinated by—a central office. As noted above, generally those institutions do not have a "traditional center" as defined above (because the central office plays this role), but the University of Minnesota has both.

Table 3 Benchmarking Distribution List for Top 25 and UTK Community Engagement

| Institution | Carnegie (1) | Campus Compact (TRUCEN *) membership (2) | Formal SVLN (3) | Minimum Assistant-Provost O/E leadership (4) | Traditional "Center" (see criteria below) (5) | System of coordinated units with central office (6) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Aspirational* | | | | | | |
| UC Berkeley | | X * | X | X | X | |
| UCLA | X | X * | X | X | X | |
| Virginia | | X | X | X | X | |
| UM-Ann Arbor | X | X * | X | X | X | |
| UNC-Chapel Hill | X | X * | X | | X | |
| Illinois-Urbana-Champaign | X | | X | X | | X |
| UW-Madison | X | X * | X | | X | |
| UC-Davis | | | X | X | | |
| UC-Santa Barbara | | | | | | |
| UW-Seattle | | X * | X | X | X | |
| Penn State | X | | X | X | | X |
| Florida | | X | X | | X | |
| Ohio State | X | X* | X | X | X | |
| Maryland-College Park | | X* | X | | X | |
| Pittsburgh | | X | | X | | |
| *Target* | | | | | | |
| U of Georgia | X | X* | X | X | | X |
| Clemson | X | X | X | X | | X |
| Purdue | X | X | X | X | | X |
| Texas A&M | | | | | X | |
| Minnesota | X | X* | X | X | | X |
| Rutgers | X | | X | X | X | |
| Indiana | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Michigan State | X | X* | X | X | X | X |
| *Peer* | | | | | | |
| Auburn | X | X | | X | X | |
| Iowa State | X | | X | X | | |
| NC State-Raleigh | X | X* | X | X | | (proposed) |
| UTK | | X* | | X (position under review) | | |

Through the course of our investigation, the CE Taskforce determined that the university and the community share the same overarching need. That is: the university needs coordination of existing outreach and engagement efforts in order to streamline processes and advance its national standing in

outreach and engagement; the community needs a single portal for communication and partnerships with the university. Thus, the proposed plan addresses both of these needs.

<u>Strategic Plan</u>

Center for Community Engagement
- Objective 1: Identify funding, both internal and external
    - Strategy 1: establish with the Provost and Chancellor initial funding or initial budget
    - Strategy 2: approach external funding sources (e.g., Cornerstone, East Tennessee Foundation, Niswonger Foundation, Netter Center at University of Pennsylvania, PACE, etc.)
    - Strategy 3: establish a UT Development team to assess and recruit donor support
- Objective 2: Put initial leadership and support staff in place
    - Strategy 1: recruit a director and support staff (see Personnel Section)
    - Strategy 2: write PDQ's, have reviewed to confirm salary range (members of the CE Taskforce could serve as search committee for the director)
- Objective 3: Under the director's leadership establish planning committee
    - Strategy - Identify community representatives, faculty, administrators, staff, and students
    - Strategy  - Plan and convene an initial meeting
- Objective 4: Under the director's leadership, establish a community advisory board to help the CCE assess community needs
    - Recommendation: This board could reflect a combination of the existing University Outreach and Engagement Council and a group equal or greater in number, of identified community leaders.  It is the CE Taskforce's belief that this would be an ideal role for the existing Council given the faculty representation across campus and the level of commitment from Council members.
    - Strategy 1 - Identify community representatives
    - Strategy 2 – Plan and convene an initial meeting
- Objective 5: Identify with the Provost an initial space for the CCE (consider Dunford or Greve Hall, or try to secure a space in the University Center)
- Objective 6: Initiate a comprehensive online website and eventually a searchable and fairly granular database to record contacts, events, and assessment of community related activities.
- Objective 7: Establish relationships with other teaching and learning entities on campus (UT Learning Consortium (UTLC), Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center (TENN TLC), Student Success Center (SSC), UT Libraries, Center for International Education (CIE), Baker Center for Public Policy, individual colleges
- Objective 8: Establish a network of alliances with other UT community providers
- Objective 9: Identify initial services and promote them, starting small and publicizing early successes
    - Strategy 1: make the community aware (announcement and reception (use Lynn Champion's survey to assess community needs, contacts, and services)
    - Strategy 2: focus on a small set of community projects (e.g. working in schools, becoming community research conduit, others) and learn from existing successful programs such as Pond Gap, Austin East High Architecture, etc.
    - Strategy 3: establish the service-learning clearinghouse (create service-learning designation and registration procedure, create database, highlight programs such as Nursing, highlight from student's perspective)
    - Strategy 4: Investigate and coordinate insurance plan that facilitates process for students and faculty

- o Strategy 5: make the UT community aware
  - ▪ Tactic: announcement and reception with community and university partners
  - ▪ Tactic: hold communication forum
- o Strategy 6: establish a network to include government and community agencies, UT units and individuals, school districts, and other colleges in the area
- o Strategy 7: communicate with student advocacy groups (Team Vols, Clinic VOLs, INSPIRE, Service Corps)
- Objective 10: Establish CCE Learning Community similar to the Baker Center and College of Business Administration learning communities

Personnel Plan

**Stage 1: To Commence Fall 2011**

| Position | Year 1 FTE |
|---|---|
| Administrative Coordinator for Service Learning | 1.0 |

**Stage 2: To Commence Fall 2012**

| Position | Year 1 FTE | Year 2 FTE | Year 3 FTE | Year 4 FTE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CCE Director | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| CCE Community Coordinator | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| CCE Administrative Coordinator Service Learning (see above) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Graduate Assistantships | .5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

Financial Plan

| Center for Civic Engagement | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | | Yr 1 FTE | Year 1 | YR 2 FTE | Year 2 | YR 3 FTE | Year 3 | YR 4 FTE | Year 4 |
| Labor | | | | | | | | | |
| | Director - 12 mos. | 1 | $ 80,000.00 | 1 | $ 84,000.00 | 1 | $ 86,500.00 | 1 | $ 89,000.00 |
| | Community Coordinator | 1 | $ 48,000.00 | 1 | $ 50,000.00 | 1 | $ 52,000.00 | 1 | $ 54,000.00 |
| | Administrative Coordinator | 0.5 | $ 16,250.00 | 1 | $ 32,500.00 | 1 | $ 34,000.00 | 1 | $ 35,500.00 |
| | Administrative Assistant | 0.5 | | 1 | $ 23,000.00 | 1 | $ 24,500.00 | 1 | $ 26,000.00 |
| | Graduate Students | | | 0.5 | $ 13,500.00 | 0.5 | $ 13,500.00 | 2 | $ 27,000.00 |
| | Undergraduate Students | | | 0.25 | $ 4,000.00 | 0.25 | $ 4,000.00 | 0.25 | $ 4,000.00 |
| Operations | | | | | | | | | |
| | General Operations | | $ 15,000.00 | | $ 18,000.00 | | $ 21,000.00 | | $ 25,000.00 |
| | Technology | | $ 18,000.00 | | $ 4,000.00 | | $ 5,000.00 | | $ 8,000.00 |
| | Travel | | $ 10,000.00 | | $ 10,000.00 | | $ 12,000.00 | | $ 15,000.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals for CCE | | 3 | $ 187,250.00 | 4.75 | $ 239,000.00 | 4.75 | $ 252,500.00 | 6.25 | $ 283,500.00 |

Potential Locations (in order of preference)
- UC
- Greve Hall
- Dunford Hall

**Reference List**

Astin, A., Vogelsgang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). How service learning affects students. Los Angeles: UCLA, Higher Education Research Institute.

Bok. 1990. *Universities and the Future of America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bringle, Games, and Malloy (eds).1999. *Colleges and Universities as Citizens.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Corporation for National and Community Service. October 2006. "College Students Helping America". http://www.nationalservice.gov/pdf/06_1016_RPD_college_full.pdf

Gardner. 1995. *National Renewal.* Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hatcher, J. A., Bringle, R. G., & Muthiah, R. (2002, March). The role of service learning on retention of first-year students. Paper presented at the American Association of Higher Education National Conference, Chicago, IL.

Howe & Strauss. 2003. *Millennials Go To College: Strategies for a New Generation on Campus*. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Life Course Associates: Great Falls, VA.

Kellogg Commission. 1999. "Returning to our roots: The engaged university". http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=183

Kellogg Commission. 2006. "Public Higher Education Reform Five Years After The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities". http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=180

Kiesa et al. 2007. "Millennials Talk Politics: A Study of College Student Political Engagement". *CIRCLE: The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement* and the *Charles K. Fettering Foundation*. http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/CSTP.pdf

Kuh, D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lynton. 1995. *Making the Case for Professional Service.* Boston, MA: American Association for Higher Education.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. 2007. "NASULGC on Engagement". http://www.nasulgc.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=401

Rice. 1996. *Making a Place for the New American Scholar.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Simonet, D. 2008. "Service-Learning and Academic Success: The Links to Retention Research". Minnesota Campus Compact. http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/resources/downloads/MN-SL_and_academic_success.pdf

**Appendix 1 – Strategic Alliances (Note: We acknowledge this list is not presently inclusive of all potential or existing alliances)**

- 2011-12 UT Academic Outreach and Engagement Council
    - Administrative Sponsor – Wes Hines
    - Architecture and Design – Rep: Barbara Klinkhammer, Scott Wall
    - Arts and Sciences – Reps: Lynn Champion, Stuart Elston, Marvelene Moore, Sherry Cable
    - Business Administration – Rep: Cindy Raines, David Schumann
    - CASNR – Rep: Robert Burns
    - Communication and Information – Rep: Sam Swan
    - Education, Health and Human Sciences – Reps: Fritz Polite, David Cihak
    - Engineering – Rep: Roger Parsons
    - Law – Rep: Paulette Williams
    - Nursing – Reps: Nan Gaylord; Carol Myers
    - Social Work – Rep: Paul Campbell
    - Veterinary Medicine – Rep: Dennis Geiser
    - University Libraries – Rep: Margaret Casado
- College Based Centers/Institutes/Offices
    - Institute for Smart Structures (Architecture/interdisciplinary)
    - Center for the Study of War and Society (A&S)
    - Center for Social Justice (A&S)
    - Anderson Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation (CBA)
    - Center for Corporate Governance (CBA)
    - Forum on Global Supply Chain Management (CBA)
    - Center for Workplace Safety (CBA)
    - Center for International Study of Youth and Political Conflict (EHHS)
    - KORN Assessment and Social Skills Center (EHHS)
    - Center for Literacy Studies (EHHS)
    - Center for Sustainable Business and Tourism (EHHS)
    - Center for Transportation Research (Engineering/interdisciplinary)
    - Advocacy Clinic (Law)
    - Business Law Clinic (Law)
    - Domestic Violence Clinic (Law)
    - Environmental Law Clinic (Law)
    - Innocence/Wrongful Convictions Clinic (Law)
    - Mediation Clinic (Law)
    - Wills Clinic (Law)
    - Tennessee Cooperative Extension (with connection to CASNR)
    - Center for Profitable Agriculture
    - Obesity Research Center (EHHS/interdisciplinary)
    - Social Work Office of Research and Public Service (SWORPS – Social Work)
    - Center for Applied Research and Evaluation (Social Work)
    - Children's Mental Health Services Research Center (Social Work)
- UTK/UT Entities
    - Alumni Affairs
    - UT Athletics
    - Baker Center for Public Policy
    - Black Cultural Center (BCC)
    - Independent Campus Ministries

- Career Services
- International House
- Office of Equity and Diversity (OED)
- Center for International Education/English Language Institute
- Graduate School
- Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center (TENN TLC)
- Student Success Center (SSC)
- Institute for a Secure and Sustainable Environment (ISSE)
  - Center for Clean Products
  - Center for International networking Initiatives
  - Center for Sustainable Business and Tourism
  - China-US Joint Research Center for Ecosystems and Environmental Change
  - Community Partnership Center
  - East Tennessee Clean Fuels Coalition
  - Southeastern Water Resource Institute
  - Tennessee Multi-hazard Mitigation Consortium
  - Tennessee Water Resources Research Center
- Center for International Networking Initiatives/GLORIAD
- National Institute for Mathematical and Biological Synthesis (NIMBios)
- Institute for Public Service (IPS)
  - Huge staff and many constituent programs. Chief ones:
  - Center for Industrial Services (CIS)
  - County Technical Assistance Service (CTAS)
  - Law Enforcement Innovation Center (LEIC)
  - Municipal Technical Advisory Service (MTAS)
  - Municipal Administration Program (MAP)
- UT Libraries
- Office of Outreach and Continuing Education
- WUOT
- Student Affairs
- Student Government
- Student Groups focused on community engagement
  - Clinic Vols
  - Student Community Engagement Corps
  - Team Vols
  - Alternative Breaks
- Joint Entities
  - Relevant Joint Centers and Institutes with ORNL
    - Joint Institute of Biological Sciences
    - Joint Institute for Computational Sciences
    - Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education
    - Science Alliance
    - Sustainable Energy Education and Research Center