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Abstract

This PEIL planning project involved conducting a survey, focus groups and key informant interviews with CSUEB faculty, staff and students in order to assess (1) current levels of involvement in community-engaged pedagogy, research and campus activities, (2) student, faculty and staff perspectives on how these practices contribute to student learning outcomes and (3) student, faculty and staff perspectives on barriers that inhibit and facilitators that support implementation of and benefit from these practices. Findings indicate wide variance in levels of student exposure to and staff and faculty implementation of all identified community engagement practices, despite strong endorsements of the value of these practices for supporting five of six of CSUEB's institutional learning outcomes. Findings suggest that barriers to the implementation of these practices at CSUEB include; limited staff and faculty knowledge of community engagement practices, varied perceptions of institutional support for these practices, and concerns about the adequacy of concrete resources and infrastructure currently available to support their implementation. Recommendations are provided for developing strategies to address these barriers and to build on existing knowledge of, interest in and commitment to the use of community engagement practices to support student learning and success.

Student Learning and Success Focus

Community Engagement & Student Learning and Success

Community engagement involves individuals, communities and institutions building ongoing, mutually beneficial relationships in order to develop and apply a collective vision for social change and foster the accomplishment of individual, interpersonal and social-structural developmental goals among participants. The use of community engagement practices in higher education represents an evolution beyond the perspective that the academy's most important
roles are traditional instruction and research, and has been conceptualized as the "third mission" of higher education (Bernardo, Butcher & Howard, 2012).

The methods and practices associated with community engagement encompass a wide variety of activities that include service, internships, practicum, and field placements associated with coursework, degrees and credentialing; community-engaged research that occurs in the context of coursework or independent scholarship; and co-curricular activities, events and programs that engage students, on and off-campus service projects. All community engagement activities are intended to put University campuses into dialogue and active cooperation with their surrounding geographical and sociopolitical communities in ways that provide clear benefits to those communities, to the achievement of the Universities' missions and, most centrally, to student learning and development.

The American Association of Colleges and Universities has identified service learning, community-based learning and internships as among the high impact practices most central to student preparation for work, citizenship and life (Kuh, 2008). The key features of these experiences are identified as (1) giving students the opportunity to apply knowledge and skills to real world settings and (2) providing a format for students to reflect on their service experiences in the classroom setting. Kuh (2008) notes that such experiences model the ideas that working with community partners and giving back to the community are both important outcomes associated with the college experience.

Relationship of Community Engagement to CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes

The CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are focused on developing student skills and competencies related to; (1) creative, critical and analytical thinking and reasoning, (2) strong communication skills, (3) addressing diversity and multiculturalism, (4) collaboration
teamwork and leadership, (5) acting responsibly and sustainability locally, nationally and globally, and (6) expertise in a specialized discipline. Participation in community engaged learning experiences has the potential to bring to life the relevance of the University mission statement to students' learning and development, and to deepen students' understanding and application of these ILOs.

The data assessing the impact of community engagement practices on student learning and success highlights the ways in which community engagement experiences can be intertwined with other higher education practices so that each is synergistically enhanced. As such, many community engagement experiences align with multiple ILOs. Community engagement experiences such as service learning, community based research and community service projects require creative, critical and analytical thinking and reasoning of participants in the processes of preparing for, enacting and reflecting on these experiences. These practices help students develop strong communication skills by requiring them to communicate effectively and appropriately with a variety of people, ranging from organizational staff and administration to other volunteers to service consumers, in a variety of typically novel circumstances and settings.

Community engaged learning experiences frequently involve addressing diversity and multiculturalism in that they require students to step out of their comfort zones, not only as observers, but also as participants. These experiences typically forward students' capacities to engage with individuals hailing from varied communities and cultures toward the achievement of common goals. As such, collaboration is at the foundation of most community engagement practices. Indeed, students' community-based participatory educational experiences typically require practical teamwork and leadership behaviors that develop these skills in ways not possible in a classroom setting.
Students' collaborative interactions with communities and community organizations in the context of community-engaged learning can serve to initiate student awareness of the need for social responsibility and thus promote their investment in acting sustainably at a local level. This experience can, in turn, help develop students' awareness of the need for social responsibility at the national and global levels, and provide a platform for considering how service can be scaled to different levels of impact. Finally, the integration of real-world experiences into course work, research and co-curricular activities is often seen as essential to the development of expertise in a specialized discipline. When upper division students are able to observe and demonstrate work their area of expertise, they are uniquely enabled to realize the value of their specialized disciplinary knowledge. These experiences build student confidence and provide a springboard to expand and apply new skills in local, national and global settings.

**Background**

*Scholarship on Community Engagement and Student Learning & Success*

A growing literature supports the unique utility of community engaged pedagogy, research and co-curricular experiences for student learning. In an analysis of major national surveys of these practices, Campus Compact (2008) concludes that "community-based, participatory educational experiences can positively contribute to students’ academic performance and persistence" (p. 2). Vogelgesang, Ikeda, Gilmartin, & Keup (2002) report that engaging in service through either service learning or volunteerism is positively correlated with student persistence, student satisfaction, and students' sense of personal success at college. Kuh, Kinzie, Cruce, Shoup & Gonyea (2007) report that community engagement during college students' first year of study yields particularly significant gains for historically underserved students, especially in student persistence.
The bulk of the empirical research on community engagement in higher education has focused on service learning. In a review of this research, Campus Compact (2008) reports evidence that service learning "promotes deep/integrative learning and personal development among both first-year students and seniors" (p. 2). In another review, Eyler, Giles, Stenson & Gray (2001) report that among college students, service learning has been associated with enhanced personal and interpersonal development, social functioning, academic learning and outcomes, career development and relationship quality with institutions of higher learning. Levesque-Bristol, Knapp, & Fisher (2010) found that among over 600 students in over 30 disciplines, participation in a single semester of service learning significantly increased positive forms of motivation, civic skills, problem solving and appreciation of diversity. Multiple studies have identified positive correlations between service learning and students’ intention to reenroll and/or actual reenrollment at the same institution (Campus Compact, 2008).

Simonet (2008) provides an in depth empirical analysis of the mechanisms through which service learning indirectly impacts student success. He identifies service learning as a mediator of the well-established relationship between student engagement and student success, noting that service learning "creates and refines the social and learning connections thought to be important to institutional commitment and educational success" (p. 2) among college students. He outlines data from a variety of sources that demonstrate relationships between the cognitive, behavioral, emotional and social engagement associated with service learning and gains in (1) students' sense of purpose, (2) students' perceptions of academic studies as relevant, (3) students' views of their college experiences as meaningful, and (4) students' feeling of belonging on campus, noting that these gains are all associated with student integration, persistence and retention (Simonet, 2008).
In a survey of more than 2500 faculty at 47 campuses, Axlund, Renner & Cress (2009) examined faculty perspectives on the impact of service learning on both students and faculty. They identified three domains of student learning and development that faculty saw as being impacted by service learning, including (1) enhancement of course-specific learning through greater engagement with, deeper understanding of and application of course content, (2) enhancement of student career development through gains in professionalism, leadership skills and career-specific skills, and (3) enhancement of cognitive and behavioral development through gains in problem solving, critical thinking and reflective judgment. They also identified three areas in which service learning impacts faculty's personal and professional development, including (1) enhancement of teaching and learning related to improved relationships with students, becoming more effective, and evolving use of effective pedagogies, (2) increased job satisfaction related to sense of accomplishment, inspiration and personal satisfaction, and (3) improved community relations related to expanded community awareness, improved relationships with and increased responsibility for community (Axlund, Renner & Cress, 2009).

Best Practices in Community Engagement

As recognition of the value of community engagement in higher education has grown, concepts related community engaged practices have become increasingly prevalent in University mission statements, identified institutional learning outcomes and measures of student success (Campus Compact, 2011). The Carnegie Foundation has taken the lead in the process of establishing best practices for community engagement in higher education and has become a leading arbiter of how well Universities are implementing and utilizing these practices across the United States. In 2010, the Carnegie Foundation established an elective classification in Community Engagement. This classification is intended to distinguish Universities at which
formalized programmatic structure and resources support "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" (Carnegie Foundation, 2012).

Institutions seeking the Carnegie classification in Community Engagement in 2015 must demonstrate (1) clear and effective means for ongoing campus-wide assessment of community engagement practices and programs, (2) the development and sustenance of community partnerships that are colored by true reciprocity in their communications, collaborations and commitments, (3) significant attention to faculty rewards for community engagement and community-based achievements as reflected in promotion and tenure policies and practices through which they are included in teaching and research as well as service categories, and (4) the integration and alignment of community engagement practices with other high impact institutional initiatives such as "first-year programs that include community engagement; learning communities in which community engagement is integrated into the design; or diversity initiatives that explicitly link active and collaborative community-based teaching and learning with the academic success of underrepresented students" (Carnegie Foundation, 2012).

Through review of the literature on student outcomes of and best practices for community engagement, our research team came to recognize that although the positive impact of community engagement practices on student learning has been clearly demonstrated, the current capacity for CSUEB to use these methodologies to serve our students and communities might be limited. It became clear that in order to increase capacity for community engagement at CSUEB, a much more comprehensive understanding was needed of how community engagement practices are currently implemented on our campus, how effectively they are being connected to
student learning outcomes, and what barriers exist to further developing our capacity in this arena. As such, investigation of these issues guided our research.

**Research and Findings**

*Data Collection and Analysis*

The goal of this research was to conduct a structured, empirical, replicable institution-wide assessment of community engagement practices and student learning at CSUEB by gathering data from faculty, staff and students from all colleges and programs. This cross-sectional mixed methods study involved the administration of (1) a survey, (2) separate focus groups with CSUEB students and staff and faculty, and (3) a series of key informant interviews with CSUEB faculty, co-curricular program directors and administrators. Using a grounded theory-based approach to content analysis and theory generation focused on an iterative process of analysis and focus of inquiry (Lofland & Lofland, 1995), this project was undertaken in multiple phases so that data analysis from each phase could be used to shape and inform data collection for subsequent phases.

First, to gather data on the use and impact of community-engaged pedagogical practices on campus, a web-based survey was administered to CSUEB faculty, staff and students between April and June of 2013. Survey development was guided by an extensive review of the literature on the assessment of community engagement practices in higher education settings. The survey included demographic questions as well as multiple choice, true/false, matrix, Likert type and brief open-ended questions focused on the key variables under study and tailored to the nature of each participant's relationship to the University (either faculty, staff or student). Key questions elicited information about participants' involvement with and exposure to various forms of community engagement, the perceived relationships between those activities and University
institutional learning outcomes, and factors perceived as either supporting or inhibiting student success through enhancing or limiting those activities' impact on student learning outcomes.

Next, the patterns and processes identified through preliminary analysis of survey data were used to develop guides for focus groups in the second phase of data collection. Facilitated by an outside professional, separate focus groups were conducted with students vs. staff and faculty in order to explore the mechanisms behind the processes and outcomes observed in the survey data. Focus groups were conducted according to the methodologies developed by Krueger (1994) and Fern (2001) and questions were designed to help the research team develop deeper, more nuanced information about how community engagement practices might be best used to facilitate student success at CSUEB. Discussions focused on eliciting a contextualized model of the landscape of interpersonal and social-structural issues that limit and enhance the employment of community engagement practices at CSUEB.

Finally, analysis of focus group data was used to develop interview guides for the third phase of data collection, a series of key informant interviews with individuals whose positions and perspectives enabled them to provide knowledgeable input about the practical aspects of implementation and enhancement of community engagement practices at CSUEB. Facilitated by an outside professional, key informant interviews focused on eliciting in-depth information about concrete opportunities and ideal strategies for enhancing the impact of community engagement on student learning at CSUEB. Interviewees were asked to provide suggestions for ways that new and existing programmatic and pedagogical structures might be developed to support student success through community engagement activities.

Participants’ quantifiable responses to survey questions (items and scales) were entered into an SPSS database for purposes of statistical analysis. For the purposes of this report,
A descriptive analysis focused on identifying and interpreting (1) variance in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about community engagement practices among faculty, students and staff at CSUEB, (2) variance in experiences with community-based pedagogy, research and service projects among faculty, students and staff at CSUEB, (3) the range of perceptions of the impact of community engagement practices on student learning outcomes among faculty, students and staff at CSUEB and (4) the range of perceptions of barriers to and facilitators of the implementation of these practices at CSUEB.

Audio recordings of both focus groups and key informant interviews were professionally transcribed and transcriptions were then subjected to content analysis using Dedoose. These analyses utilized the constant comparison method of content analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and attended to conceptual analysis based on a translation rules approach (Carley, 1993). Analysis of focus group data focused on identifying underlying social processes and patterns associated with student and staff/faculty perspectives on contextual factors impacting the achievement of institutional learning outcomes through community engagement activities. Analysis of key informant interview data focused on identifying specific, concrete structural and programmatic policies and practices that might be used to guide the development and enhancement of campus community engagement capacity.

**Study Participants**

Survey participants included faculty, staff, and students at California State University, East Bay. Detailed demographic information about the 288 student survey participants is provided in Table 1. As shown, 95% of student survey participants were pursuing first bachelor's degrees, with over 80% reporting junior or senior status. These students represent all four of CSUEB's colleges, with roughly one third reporting majors within CLASS, one third within COS
and the remainder divided between CEAS and CBE. 75% of students identified themselves as female, 25% as male, and less than 1% as transgendered. Students represented a diversity of ethnicities including African/African American/Black, Arab/Middle Eastern, Asian, Caucasian/European, Latino/a and multiethnic, with no single ethnicity comprising a majority.

Table 1. Student survey participant demographic data (n=288)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>74.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African/African-American/Black</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/European</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>38.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>44.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Baccalaureate/Graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSUEB Affiliation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of note, 75% of the students surveyed were born in the United States and 77% reported primarily speaking English at home today. Slightly more (87%) reported graduating from a U.S. high school and fewer (68%) reported primarily speaking English at home while growing up. Just over half of all students described both their mothers' (51%) and fathers' (59%) highest levels of education as a GED or high school diploma. 43% reported that they would be the first person in their families to complete a Bachelor's degree. The average student respondent
identified grants as the single largest source of his or her educational funding, covering 39% of educational expenses.

Detailed demographic information about the 113 staff and faculty survey participants, who included 31 staff and 82 faculty members, is provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Staff and faculty participant demographic data (n=113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81 (71.68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30 (26.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2 (1.77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African/African-American/Black</td>
<td>3 (2.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/European</td>
<td>72 (63.72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>5 (4.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multietnic</td>
<td>7 (6.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state</td>
<td>13 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GED/High School Diploma</td>
<td>3 (2.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>3 (2.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>11 (9.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>29 (25.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>67 (59.29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSUEB Affiliation</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Student Services</td>
<td>20 (17.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>4 (3.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAS</td>
<td>24 (21.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>39 (34.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>15 (13.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>3 (2.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>5 (4.42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown, 72% of staff and faculty members surveyed identified themselves as female, 27% as male, and 2% as transgendered. 63% described themselves as Caucasian/European, with the balance identifying as African/African American/Black, Asian, Latino/a and multietnic. 87% of the staff and faculty surveyed were born in the United States, 90% reported
graduating from a U.S. high school, 91% from a U.S. college (if applicable) and 83% from a U.S. graduate school (if applicable). The vast majority of staff and faculty members reported primarily speaking English at home while growing up (88%) and today (95%). Almost 85% of the staff and faculty participants possessed a graduate (masters or doctoral) degree. These staff and faculty represented departments within all four of CSUEB's colleges as well as General Studies, the Library and many administrative and student support programs.

Research Findings

Study findings are organized to reflect the qualitatively different responses of two subgroups of participants, namely (a) current CSUEB students and (b) current CSUEB staff and faculty, to the questions posed. For each subgroup of participants, this report includes findings related to (1) knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about community engagement practices, (2) experiences with community-based pedagogy, research and service projects at CSUEB, (3) perceptions of the impact of community engagement practices on student learning outcomes and (4) perceptions of barriers to and facilitators of the implementation of these practices at CSUEB.

Student Knowledge, Attitudes and Beliefs about Community Engagement

In order to understand factors that influence the widespread adoption of community engaged educational practices at CSUEB, the survey investigated attitudes and beliefs about community engagement among students, staff and faculty. The survey opened with a brief definition and overview of community engagement practices. Student participants were then asked to indicate whether or not they were familiar with the concepts outlined prior to reading this definition, whether or not community engagement had been a significant element of their experiences at CSUEB to date, and whether or not they felt that community engagement was highly valued at CSUEB. As shown in Table 3, 62% of student participants indicated that they
were familiar with the concepts associated with community engagement prior to beginning the survey. However, only 39% of students surveyed reported that community engagement had been a significant part of their experiences at CSUEB to date. Despite this, 60% of students reported feeling that community engagement is highly valued at CSUEB.

Table 3. Student familiarity with community and experiences with community engagement practices and beliefs about community engagement at CSUEB (n=288)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before beginning this survey, could you have explained what &quot;community engagement&quot; meant?</td>
<td>62.15% 179</td>
<td>37.85% 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has community engagement been a significant part of your experience as a student at CSUEB?</td>
<td>39.58% 114</td>
<td>60.42% 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel as if community engagement is highly valued at CSUEB?</td>
<td>60.42% 174</td>
<td>39.58% 114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff and Faculty Knowledge, Attitudes and Beliefs about Community Engagement

The survey investigated staff and faculty attitudes and beliefs about community engagement through a series of questions that explored their familiarity and background with community engagement practices, their place in participants' fields or academic disciplines, and participants' beliefs in the value of and interest in learning more about these practices.

Table 4. Staff and faculty background & familiarity with community engagement (n=113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the concepts associated with community engagement in higher education</td>
<td>23.89% 27</td>
<td>55.75% 63</td>
<td>15.04% 17</td>
<td>2.65% 3</td>
<td>2.65% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices were a part of my undergraduate training.</td>
<td>8.85% 10</td>
<td>18.58% 21</td>
<td>9.73% 11</td>
<td>43.36% 49</td>
<td>19.47% 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices were a part of my graduate training.</td>
<td>11.50% 13</td>
<td>14.16% 16</td>
<td>19.47% 22</td>
<td>38.94% 44</td>
<td>16.81% 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 4, responses to these questions revealed that although 80% or participants indicated familiarity with community engagement practices in higher education, only 27% indicated that such practices were a part of their undergraduate training and only 26% indicated that such practices were a part of their graduate training. In addition, as shown in Table 5, although 71% of staff and faculty participants agreed that community engagement practices were a good fit in their field or discipline and 64% agreed that these practices would be easy to implement in their field or discipline, only 50% agreed that such practices were an established part of that field or discipline at CSUEB today.

Table 5. Staff and faculty background & familiarity with community engagement (n=113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices are an established part of my academic field/discipline.</td>
<td>22.12% 25</td>
<td>27.43% 31</td>
<td>26.55% 30</td>
<td>16.81% 19</td>
<td>7.08% 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices would be easy to implement in my field/discipline.</td>
<td>22.12% 25</td>
<td>41.59% 47</td>
<td>23.89% 27</td>
<td>8.85% 10</td>
<td>4.42% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices are a good fit for my field/discipline.</td>
<td>33.63% 38</td>
<td>37.17% 42</td>
<td>20.35% 23</td>
<td>5.31% 6</td>
<td>3.54% 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As show in Table 6, however, even within this context, 83% of staff and faculty participants indicated that they could envision the potential value of using community engagement practices within their fields and disciplines. In addition, 65% indicated that they are interested in learning more about how to implement community engagement practices at CSUEB, and 65% endorsed the belief that students see these practices as educationally valuable.
Table 6. Staff and faculty beliefs regarding the value of community engagement (n=113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see the potential value of using community engagement practices in my field/discipline.</td>
<td>40.71%</td>
<td>42.48%</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in learning more about using community engagement practices at CSUEB.</td>
<td>26.55%</td>
<td>38.94%</td>
<td>27.43%</td>
<td>4.42%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that students perceive community engagement practices as educationally valuable.</td>
<td>22.12%</td>
<td>42.48%</td>
<td>23.89%</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Experiences with Community-Engaged Pedagogy, Research and Service at CSUEB

Student, staff and faculty responses to survey questions about community engagement experiences at CSEUB revealed a wide variation in type, duration and intensity of exposure to community engagement practices on campus. Student responses indicated that students were most likely to have been exposed to community engagement practices through a course or degree program, as opposed to through a freestanding research project or through a campus club, activity, organization, or affinity group. As shown in Table 7, the most common community engagement experiences among student participants were service learning, internships and practicum linked to a class or degree, in which 45% of students had participated. This was followed by community-based, action or participatory research linked to a class or degree, in which 33% of students had participated. In contrast, only 18% of students had experience with CSUEB-based service learning, internships or practicum not linked to a class or degree, and only 12% of students reported experiences with CSUEB-based community-based, action or participatory research not linked to a class or degree.
Table 7. Student participation in community engagement activities at CSUEB (n=288)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service learning, internship or practicum linked to a class or degree</td>
<td>44.56% (127)</td>
<td>55.44% (158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning, internship or practicum NOT linked to a class or degree (but still linked to CSUEB)</td>
<td>17.56% (49)</td>
<td>82.44% (230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based research, action research or participatory research linked to a class or degree</td>
<td>33.33% (93)</td>
<td>66.67% (186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based research, action research or participatory research NOT linked to a class or degree (but still linked to CSUEB)</td>
<td>12.23% (34)</td>
<td>87.77% (244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus community service project linked to a class or degree</td>
<td>21.09% (58)</td>
<td>78.91% (217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus community service project NOT linked to a class or degree (but still linked to CSUEB)</td>
<td>15.56% (42)</td>
<td>84.44% (228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus community service project linked to a class or degree</td>
<td>13.41% (37)</td>
<td>86.59% (239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus community service project NOT linked to a class or degree (but still linked to CSUEB)</td>
<td>10.58% (29)</td>
<td>89.42% (245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7, when asked about on and off-campus service projects, students indicated notably lower levels of participation. Only 21% of student participants reported having participated in off-campus community service projects linked to a class or degree at CSUEB, and only 16% reported having participated in CSUEB off-campus community service projects not linked to a class or degree. Finally, students reported even lower levels of participation in on-campus service projects: Only 13% reported participation in on-campus community service projects linked to a class or degree at CSUEB, and only 11% reported participation in CSUEB on-campus community service projects not linked to a class or degree.

Staff and Faculty Practices of Community-Engaged Pedagogy, Research and Service at CSUEB

Staff and faculty responses to survey questions about community engagement practices at CSEUB also revealed wide variation in the types, duration and frequency of these practices on campus. The patterns reported support the patterns seen in student responses. Staff and faculty indicated, for example, that they were most likely to utilize community engagement practices
through teaching or coordinating course or degree programs that involve service learning, internships and practicum, as opposed to through freestanding on- or off-campus service projects or independent research. As shown in Table 8, 61% of staff and faculty participants reported teaching or coordinating courses involving service learning, internships and practicum. As part of their work at CSUEB, 54% of staff and faculty participants indicated that they have participated in off-campus service projects, and 50% of indicated that they have participated in on-campus service projects. Of note, only 42% indicated that they had conducted research that could be described as community-based, participatory or action research as part of their work at CSUEB.

Table 8. Staff and faculty community engagement practices at CSUEB (n=113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of your work at CSUEB, have you taught or coordinated any courses that included or were linked to service learning, field placements, internships, or clinical hours?</td>
<td>61.06%</td>
<td>38.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of your work at CSUEB, have you participated in off-campus service projects?</td>
<td>53.98%</td>
<td>46.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of your work at CSUEB, have you participated in on-campus service projects?</td>
<td>50.44%</td>
<td>49.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of your work at CSUEB, have you conducted research that could be described as community-based research, participatory research or action research?</td>
<td>41.59%</td>
<td>58.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these numbers sound encouraging, when asked about the frequency and duration of their community engagement practices, staff and faculty indicated provided contextualizing details that are important to consider when interpreting this information. As shown in Table 9, when looking at the most frequently reported community engagement practice, teaching or coordinating courses that involve service learning, field placements, internships or clinical hours, only 36% of staff and faculty participants indicated that they utilize this practice every quarter of the academic year. Another 18% reported regularly doing so one or
two quarters per academic year, and 16% reported doing so occasionally. The remaining 30% of staff and faculty participants reported never doing so. As shown in Table 9 as well, similar breakdowns in frequency data related to the other community engagement practices surveyed translate into low rates of regular utilization of these practices by the staff and faculty surveyed.

Table 9. Frequency of staff & faculty community engagement practices at CSUEB (n=113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service learning, internships, field placements, or clinical hours</th>
<th>Every Quarter</th>
<th>2 Quarters Per Year</th>
<th>1 Quarter Per Year</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service learning, internships, field placements, or clinical hours</td>
<td>36.28%</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
<td>30.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus service projects</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
<td>27.43%</td>
<td>45.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus service projects</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>7.96%</td>
<td>29.20%</td>
<td>47.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based, participatory or action research</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
<td>28.32%</td>
<td>52.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of the Impact of Community Engagement on Student Learning Outcomes

The vast majority of students, staff and faculty surveyed report believing that community engagement is a valuable tool for the achievement of many student learning outcomes. As shown in Tables 10 through 15, majorities of both sets of participants report that community engagement practices have either "moderate" or "significant" impact on key aspects of the first, second, third, fourth and sixth of CSUEB's six Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). With the exception of one aspect of ILO 1 ("applying quantitative reasoning to challenges and problems") and both aspects of ILO 6, ("demonstrating expertise in a specialized discipline of study " and "integrating ideas, methods, theory & practice in specialized discipline"), more staff and faculty than students appraise this impact as moderate or significant. In relation to ILO 5, however, markedly lower percentages of students, staff and faculty endorse the impact of community engagement on "acting responsibly and sustainably" at the national and global levels. In
addition, unlike other response patterns, students are more likely than staff and faculty to do so.

Table 10. Perceptions of the impact of community engagement on ILO 1 (N=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff/Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking creatively</td>
<td>81.59%</td>
<td>18.41%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>92.03%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying analytical reasoning to challenges and problems</td>
<td>80.91%</td>
<td>19.09%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87.61%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying quantitative reasoning to challenges and problems</td>
<td>78.48%</td>
<td>21.52%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73.45%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Perceptions of the impact of community engagement on ILO 2 (N=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff/Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening openly to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.11%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90.27%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating ideas, perspectives and values clearly</td>
<td>85.07%</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85.84%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Perceptions of the impact of community engagement on ILO 3 (N=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff/Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying multicultural competencies to promote equity and social justice</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85.84%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying knowledge of diversity to promote equity and social justice</td>
<td>80.91%</td>
<td>26.74%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87.61%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13. Perceptions of the impact of community engagement on ILO 4 (N=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff/Faculty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working collaboratively and respectfully as members of diverse teams and communities</td>
<td>85.77%</td>
<td>14.23%</td>
<td>91.15%</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working collaboratively and respectfully as leaders of diverse teams and communities</td>
<td>83.34%</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
<td>85.84%</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14. Perceptions of the impact of community engagement on ILO 5 (N=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff/Faculty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting responsibly and sustainably at the local level</td>
<td>82.99%</td>
<td>17.01%</td>
<td>85.84%</td>
<td>14.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting responsibly and sustainably at the national level</td>
<td>75.35%</td>
<td>24.65%</td>
<td>54.86%</td>
<td>45.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting responsibly and sustainably at the global level</td>
<td>67.01%</td>
<td>32.99%</td>
<td>49.55%</td>
<td>50.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15. Perceptions of the impact of community engagement on ILO 6 (N=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff/Faculty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
<td>Moderate or Significant Impact</td>
<td>Weak or No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating expertise in a specialized discipline of study</td>
<td>80.21%</td>
<td>19.79%</td>
<td>75.22%</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating ideas, methods, theory &amp; practice in specialized discipline</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>79.65%</td>
<td>20.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Barriers to and Facilitators of Community Engagement at CSUEB

In order to assess what actions are needed to build capacity for community engagement at CSUEB, staff and faculty members were asked about their perceptions of potential barriers to the implementation of community engagement practices on campus, including negative outcomes that might associated with these practices, as well as perceived levels of attitudinal and concrete support for them within CSUEB as an institution. As seen in Table 16, 71% of staff and faculty endorsed the belief that using community engagement practices increases workload. In addition, 50% agreed that engaging in these practices potentially exposes staff, faculty and students to physical, legal, or other risks. These responses reveal staff and faculty concerns about the impact of using community engagement practices on their workloads, and about potential risks associated with implementing these practices, that will need to be addressed systemically in order to increase community engagement capacity on campus.

Table 16. Staff & faculty perceptions of risks in using community engagement (n=113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using community engagement practices increases my workload.</td>
<td>26.55% 30</td>
<td>44.25% 50</td>
<td>26.55% 30</td>
<td>0.88% 1</td>
<td>1.77% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using community engagement practices exposes staff/faculty to physical, legal or other risks.</td>
<td>9.73% 11</td>
<td>40.71% 46</td>
<td>30.09% 34</td>
<td>15.04% 17</td>
<td>4.42% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using community engagement practices exposes students to physical, legal or other risks.</td>
<td>9.73% 11</td>
<td>40.71% 46</td>
<td>30.09% 34</td>
<td>15.04% 17</td>
<td>4.42% 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of data presented in Tables 17 and 18 provides information about another potential barrier to the implementation of community engagement practices as CSUEB. As shown in Table 17, marginal majorities of staff and faculty believe that community engagement practices are valued at CSUEB: 65% feel that community engagement practices are valued.
within their Departments or Programs, 58% feel that these practices are valued within their Colleges/Divisions, and 61% agree that they are valued within CSUEB's institutional culture. However, Table 18 demonstrates that far fewer staff and faculty are certain that this attitudinal support is sufficiently backed by concrete resources and infrastructure.

**Table 17. Staff & faculty perceptions of social support for community engagement (n=113)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices are valued within the culture of my Department/Program.</td>
<td>26.55%</td>
<td>38.94%</td>
<td>23.89%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices are valued within the culture of my College/Division.</td>
<td>21.24%</td>
<td>37.17%</td>
<td>31.86%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement practices are valued within CSUEB's institutional culture.</td>
<td>12.39%</td>
<td>48.67%</td>
<td>25.66%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18. Staff & faculty perceptions of concrete support for community engagement (n=113)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of resources for facilitating student community engagement at CSUEB.</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>41.59%</td>
<td>21.24%</td>
<td>20.35%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the existing infrastructure to support community engagement at CSUEB is sufficient.</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
<td>38.94%</td>
<td>33.63%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe CSUEB is well equipped to implement large-scale community engagement programs.</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>23.89%</td>
<td>39.82%</td>
<td>23.01%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 18, 53% of staff and faculty participants indicate that they are aware of the availability of concrete resources for facilitating community engagement among students at CSUEB. However, only 17% of staff and faculty view CSUEB's existing community engagement infrastructure as adequate to support these practices, and only 27% see CSUEB as
well equipped to implement large-scale community engagement programs. These findings clearly identify staff and faculty concerns about the adequacy of institutional infrastructure and concrete resources that will likely need to be addressed in order to increase staff and faculty willingness to invest individual resources in enhancing community engagement on campus.

Interpretation of Findings

Analysis of the themes that emerged from student and staff/faculty focus groups and key informant interviews aids in the interpretation of much of the survey data. Much of the focus group and key informant interview data enables this interpretation by providing extensive contextual information about observations of factors that either impede or facilitate awareness and implementation of both a curriculum and University culture that emphasize socially responsible community engagement practices. For the purposes of the findings presented here, that information is presented thematically, in relation to the emergent themes of knowledge and awareness, infrastructure and resources, and structural, practical and logistical issues.

Knowledge and Awareness

Analysis of focus group and interview data reveals that regarding overall awareness of community engagement practices and programs at CSUEB, there is general agreement on two important points: The first is that at least within the last two years, the University has placed significantly more emphasis on community engagement. This observation appears to result from clear choices by the University administration commit to a program of meaningful and effective community engagement, and as part of that effort, to fund and develop a Center for Community Engagement. Interview responses, especially, all indicate that there is a recognized, recent, administration-driven, ‘top-down’ sense of priority and urgency in implementing meaningful community engagement programs at CSUEB.
In addition, participants observe that simultaneously and perhaps independently, an embedded culture of community engagement awareness and practice appears to be developing within the CSUEB faculty. This is perceived as being a function of younger, more recently trained faculty arriving at CSUEB with prior awareness of and training and experience in community engagement practices. It is also noted that other faculty may simultaneously be starting to recognize the value of community engagement practices for student learning and success, perhaps as the result of organically changing socio-political attitudes and student needs on campus.

However, it appears that this growing awareness of community engagement is still effectively confined to disciplines with an existing tradition of utilizing community engagement practices. The strong awareness of the drive to build community engagement on campus at CSUEB appears to be less well known to disciplines within which these practices are not customarily integrated within existing curricula and culture. This is a significant point because it identifies a specific opening through which the University can transition from a place that uses limited infrastructure and support to enact community engagement practices within specific disciplines and programs, to a place where community engagement is intrinsic to the culture of the institution. By shifting this culture institution-wide through strong infrastructural support from administration and explicit recognition of the importance of community engagement to CSUEB students and community, these practices can be more widely integrated into academics, co-curricular activities and athletics, and other key elements of student and faculty life.

**Infrastructure and Resources**

Focus group and interview participants' assessments of the infrastructural support and resources available for community engagement efforts on campus vary considerably. Most of
these assessments focus on the levels of support that are available to faculty already involved in community engagement at CSUEB. At one end of the spectrum is a sentiment that was repeated many times over: Without real prioritization and funding what is the point? On the other end of the spectrum, one individual indicated that the infrastructural issues have been, or are being, effectively dealt with and that expanded implementation comes down to staff and faculty either choosing to become involved in these practices or not. In the middle of this spectrum, there is optimistic recognition of the Provost’s increased funding to service learning, but also acknowledgement that such funding is a drop in the bucket compared to what is needed.

The most clearly emergent theme in relation to infrastructure and resources is the need for further investment in them. One interviewee proposed creating a proper Office of Community Engagement at the administrative level of Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, to coordinate all aspects of community engagement, rather than only service learning. There is agreement that this fundamental change would constitute a significant step toward developing an intrinsic culture of community engagement at CSUEB. More widely, participants clearly expressed little optimism that a University-wide cultural shift toward community engagement will succeed without (1) significant funding for infrastructure and resources that aid in the logistics, facilitation and management of community engagement efforts, and (2) release time for faculty to develop and implement these practices.

Structural, Practical and Logistical Issues

Participants raise a wide range of structural, practical and logistical issues related to the implementation of community engagement practices on campus. Some participants described a lack of dissemination of key information about what community engagement resources are available to faculty now. Others noted a lack of information sharing among various faculty,
departments and programs about their community engagement involvements. Other participants raised issues related to the mechanics of involving students in community engaged activities, including issues like the transportation of students to and from campus and their community engagement commitments.

Participants' descriptions of the practical and logistical challenges associated with community engagement practices often dovetail with their discussions of infrastructure and resources. Participants stressed the need for a significantly greater infrastructural presence on campus to help staff and faculty address the myriad of details that arise in the development, implementation and maintenance of various community engagement practices. Participants emphasized that a well funded and properly staffed Office of Community Engagement should (1) help staff and faculty address practical concerns related to the time and financial support needed to develop these programs at the curricular level, and (2) focus on reducing some of the logistical burdens faced by faculty who currently utilize community engagement practices. Finally, one of the most critically important structural roadblocks to faculty embracing community engagement practices identified was the fact that many departments do not value community engagement work as either service or scholarship that counts toward the RTP process. Participants agreed that ultimately, this needs to be addressed through a broad cultural shift around knowledge of and attitudes toward these practices. This shift needs to occur within Colleges, departments and programs but needs to be implemented institution-wide. The predominant solution to this issue proposed by participants is to immediately mandate the value and importance of community engagement through the RTP document. Identification of the value and importance of community engagement practices in both pedagogy and research would stand as a clear statement that community engagement is seen as fundamental at CSUEB and that
it is deeply embedded in the University's cultural fabric.

**Recommendations For Practice**

Both the staff/faculty focus group and the key informant interviews conducted with CSUEB co-curricular program staff, faculty and administrators represent a broad range of experiences with and knowledge of community engagement as practiced at CSUEB. As such, they yielded a number of specific recommendations for enhancing community engagement capacity at CSUEB.

**Implications of Findings for Learning and Student Success**

It seems clear that CSUEB is uniquely positioned to systematically implement and benefit from community-engaged pedagogies, research and co-curricular activities. As a campus that serves high proportions of ethnic minority students, first generation college students, non-traditionally aged students and international students, our student body is one for whom community engagement can be especially valuable for learning and skill development (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2012; Kuh et al, 2007). Being situated within (and mandated to serve) the diverse and vibrant geographical, racial/ethnic, economic and political communities of the East Bay, our campus is surrounded by a dizzying array of complex social problems, as well as nationally innovative efforts to address those problems. The dynamic communities of the East Bay provide enviable opportunities for engagement that can address identified community needs, connect students with communities and issues of meaning to them, and better prepare graduates to apply the knowledge and skills they develop at CSUEB outside of the classroom.

However, in order for our campus to manifest the benefits of these practices for students, several goals must be accomplished. First, before such practices can be effectively implemented,
the concepts associated with various forms of community engagement must be clearly understood by a significant proportion of faculty, co-curricular staff and administrators, based on a common set of definitions and expectations. Next, in order for our students to have opportunities to participate in and benefit from well-conceived and well-executed community engagement endeavors, faculty, co-curricular staff and administrators must view those endeavors as valuable (and even essential) to institutionally defined educational goals. Finally, in order to develop and integrate community engagement practices across campus, significant institutional infrastructure and resources must be dedicated to enacting the changes needed to achieve these collective visions. As such, CSUEB has much work to do among the institutions, individuals, and communities in question in order to maximize the potential impact of community engagement practices on student learning on our campus.

**Excellence and Innovation in Community Engagement**

The development and implementation of well-conceived and well-executed community engagement programs is based on many factors, including the adoption of soundly theoretically-driven teaching and learning practices, the cultivation of new relationships both within and outside of the University and collaborative work among faculty, staff and students. As a starting point, it seems unrealistic to assume that already burdened staff and faculty will be able to develop such relationships, fundamentally alter existing curricula, and maintain critical relationships and programs without a committed long-term funding that yields significant organizational infrastructure and paid and/or release time for this purpose.

Within this vision, the newly formed Office of Community Engagement, as an administratively led, well and sustainably funded program, would support and coordinate all aspects of community engaged pedagogy, research and service. This would include structurally
supportive functions such as disseminating programmatic information both on and off campus, providing staff and faculty education, support and training around a variety of community engagement practices, and maintaining a current and complete web presence. It would also encompass logistical support functions related to the mechanics of maintaining necessary liability insurance coverage and waivers, facilitating background checks and fingerprinting, and scheduling necessary transportation and other tools for student participants in community engagement activities.

The Office of Community Engagement would ideally be staffed by recognized experts from both on and off campus with training and experience in the theory and practice of community engagement in higher education. Its activities would be organized around proven principals and recognized best practices in the field of community engagement, rather than what is perceived as convenient or feasible within the current campus culture. It is critical to state there is no need to re-invent the wheel in this process, as excellent templates for these types of administrative and programmatic structures and initiatives already exist within the significant research literature on community engagement practices in higher education.

An idealized scenario in which community engagement is firmly and well integrated into the fabric of the University would build on existing knowledge, attitudes, resources, and infrastructure in this arena. Some disciplines, department and programs, for example, already have deeply grounded and immersed in community engagement, practices and may need minimal adjustments and pushes forward. However, for other disciplines, department and programs, significant changes will be required to achieve this vision. As such, the establishment of this idealized scenario will have to include the introduction, development and nurturing of a culture of community engagement outside its traditional disciplinary homes.
Thus, the development of a truly University-wide culture of community engagement might begin with workshops led by knowledgeable staff and faculty-led (with stipends) for others who are interested in and at least marginally able to develop community engagement courses, research plans and service projects appropriate to their disciplines. However, unlike colleagues in disciplines where community engagement is culturally embedded, faculty in disciplines with little or no community engagement investment will be faced with the non-trivial challenge of building effective community engagement efforts that address the needs of the University, students and communities, from the ground up.

As such, the Office of Community Engagement would need to have programs and personnel focused on these non-traditional community engagement disciplines with the goal of providing fundamental education about various types community engagement as well as existing pedagogical and research tools and methods. This would have the effect of developing a common culture with a well-defined base-level understanding of and commitment to the University’s vision of Community Engagement at CSUEB. This might include University-based online training about socially responsible community engagement, similar to mandated online training about student records and confidentiality, the protection of human research subjects and conflict of interest in research, with which many faculty are familiar.

Recommendations for Application and Implementation

In sum, this planning project yielded a comprehensive assessment of the current landscape of community engagement at CSUEB, including critical faculty, staff and student perceptions about barriers to and facilitators of community engaged pedagogy, research and campus activities and their relationship to institutionally identified student learning outcomes. The set of recommendations that follows for the development and prioritization of strategies
critical to accomplishing these goals stems from this analysis:

- Refrain from re-inventing the wheel: Utilize the many outstanding existing University community engagement programs and research initiatives from which theoretically-driven, research-based models and templates for successful programs can be drawn.

- Develop a community-wide vision that clearly defines community engagement for CSUEB, including practices that span pedagogy, research and both on and off campus community service projects and events.

- Modify the University RTP document to reflect a fundamental emphasis of the value and importance of community engagement to the University in both pedagogy and research. This is perhaps the most fundamental and the most immediate way to institute a cultural and practical sea change in relation to community engagement practices.

- Establish a well-funded, well-resourced Center for Community Engagement that is a fundamental branch of the University and is responsible for providing the informational, support, education, training, management, and logistical resources critical to enacting impactful community engagement practices at CSUEB.

- Create ongoing series of funded community engagement-focused outreach seminars, faculty learning communities and staff/faculty working groups for staff and faculty development and lifelong learning, accompanied by stipends and/or release time.

- Advertise these opportunities for very heavily advertised such that all staff and faculty will be well exposed to them.

- Provide faculty release time to develop community-engaged courses, programs of research and co-curricular partnerships, perhaps with extra financial incentive within disciplines in which little grounding of community engagement practices currently exists.
- Recognize, differentiate and credit accordingly community engagement efforts that contribute to the public good, versus traditional internships and fieldwork that often focus on benefitting the student and employer through the accumulation of clinical hours.

- Provide non-departmentally based University funding for student internships

- Provide non-departmentally based University funding for student grants, fellowships and awards related to community engaged learning, research and service.

- Provide a Community Engagement web-button on the CSUEB Homepage that showcases University community engagement activities past, present and future.

- Produce and disseminate yearly University-wide reports that summarize past, present and future community engagement programs, events and opportunities. Many staff and faculty who are involved with community engagement on campus have little to no knowledge of what others on campus are doing in relation to community engagement.

It is the hope of the research team that the analysis and recommendations presented here will provide a data-based foundation for the development and prioritization of strategies for increasing CSUEB's capacity for community engagement. It is also our hope that they will serve as critical baseline measurements against which subsequent assessment of the impact of those efforts can be compared, using the insights and tools developed for this project. We appreciate the support of the Provost's Office for this research and look forward to participating in the implementation of future initiatives based on its findings.
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