Institutional Overview

Founded in Seattle in 1861, the University of Washington (UW) is a public research university with campuses in Seattle, Tacoma, and Bothell. The UW is the largest university in the northwestern United States and is one of the oldest universities on the west coast. The UW Fiscal Year 2015 budget totals $6.4 billion, and its endowment is approximately $2.8 billion. The University employs more than 30,000 benefits-eligible faculty and staff and 4,400-plus benefits eligible graduate-student employees.

The state’s flagship university, the UW enrolled more than 54,000 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. The three campuses offer a broad range of undergraduate and graduate degrees, and collectively support over 440 degree options, over 280 degree programs, over 780 student organizations, and over 7,000 undergraduate research opportunities. In 2014-2015, the UW awarded nearly 16,000 bachelors, masters, doctoral, and professional degrees. The UW is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) and is a member of the Association of American Universities.

The UW President (Ana Mari Cauce) and Interim Provost (Jerry Baldasty) oversee all three campuses, while also serving as the chief academic officers for UW Seattle. UW Bothell and Tacoma campuses also have a Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Wolf Yeigh and Susan Jeffords at UW Bothell). All three campuses share coordinated, central systems (e.g., UW libraries, human resources, registrar, advancement, the Graduate School) as well as having distributed administrative structures, specific budget resources, and unique institutional identities shaped by their histories and geographies. They also share many signature projects, such as the Race and Equity Initiative recently launched by President Cauce.

The campuses are linked in a myriad of ways through formal structures and informal networks. At the level of the faculty, affiliate appointments in schools and departments across the three campuses create a web of intellectual alliances and understandings conducive to formal and informal collaboration. Pertinent to this proposal, each campus has developed specific administrative organization and infrastructure around community engagement and diversity efforts; many of those charged with leading these efforts coordinate, organize with, and learn from one another intentionally.

On the Seattle campus, the Simpson Center for the Humanities and the Carlson Center for Public Service and Leadership, located in the College of Arts and Sciences and in Undergraduate Academic Affairs respectively, represent two campus nodes for organizing public scholarship and community-based learning: the former supports faculty and graduate
students from all three campuses with funding and learning communities. On the Bothell campus, the emergent Office of Community-Based Learning and Research, along with the Career Center, ground campus efforts to build out community-engaged teaching and scholarship. (See Addendum, Timeline of the Development of the Office of CBLR). Similarly, the Chief Diversity Officer for the University of Washington, the Interim Vice President and Vice Provost for Minority Affairs and Diversity, coordinates with the diversity officers for the Tacoma and Bothell campuses; the Office for Faculty Advancement and Diversity Research Institute, while located on the Seattle campus, provide supports for all three campuses.

UW Bothell Campus Mission and Development

Founded in 1990, the University of Washington Bothell is a public university with a mission focused on diversity, access, and achievement for students in Washington state and beyond. It is among the most diverse campuses in Washington state: a majority of its students are of color and/or first generation (54% students of color; 18% under-represented minority; 44% first-generation college students; 34% Pell eligible). It is the fastest-growing campus in Washington, and the fourth fastest in the United States. Growth modeling has UW Bothell expanding from 5000 to 6000 state-supported student FTE by 2020. In the past year, UW Bothell has been nationally and regionally recognized for its high levels of access, affordability, and outcomes (2014: American Enterprise Institute, Money Magazine, Washington Monthly, Center for Educational Reform).

Located adjacent to a restored wetlands less than 20 miles north of Seattle and less than 20 miles south of Everett, at the suburban intersection between Snohomish and King Counties, the University of Washington Bothell was founded to expand educational opportunities for Washington state. Beginning as an upper-division campus offering BA completion for community college graduates and transfers, a largely regional, non-traditional student body, it has since expanded into lower-division and graduate education. The campus currently offers over 40 undergraduate and graduate degrees across five schools: the School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, the School of Educational Studies, the School of Nursing and Health Studies, and the School of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics.

Recent strategic planning efforts have sharpened UW Bothell's focus on diversity and engagement as key drivers of the campus's success with regard to the education of all students, and particularly students of color and first-generation college students. The 21st Century Campus Initiative, adopted in 2008, named seven priority areas: Growth, Resourcefulness, Diversity, Student-Centered, Community, Innovation, and Sustainability. In 2013-2014, the campus invited Andrew Furco (University of Minnesota) and Barbara Holland (Portland State University) to visit the campus as independent reviewers and provide formal recommendations for integrating and advancing UW Bothell’s civic engagement mission. (See appendices.) In 2014, Chancellor Wolf Yeigh affirmed the values of the 21st Century strategic plan and articulated three areas of focus—diversity, access and
achievement, and sustainable growth—to guide Phase 2 of campus planning and development over the next 5-10 years.

At the same time, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Susan Jeffords oversaw efforts to articulate the distinctive academic practices that form the foundation of the campus’s success with diverse student learners. The resulting “3 Cs Framework” of Cross-Disciplinarity, Connected Learning, and Community Engagement anchors UW Bothell’s institutional identity and informs strategic action on its mission and goals. These include a privileging of projects, initiatives, and partnerships that catalyze cross-unit collaborations and center community engagement as the academic drivers for campus’s diversity, access, and achievement goals. The framework, developed in consultation with faculty and schools, enjoys broad-based support and guides academic resource investment.

We see the prospect of hosting Imagining America as one key element in our efforts to push forward these plans at this critical stage of the institution’s maturation. The relationship with Imagining America will allow us to partner with and lead a national consortium of institutions with similar mission-based commitments to diversity and engagement, while also focusing our efforts locally and regionally. The timing of the opportunity coincides with two recent task force reports on diversity and engagement, both of which recommend next step investments to advance and embed these institutional initiatives, with the latter specifically suggesting that the campus should develop this proposal to host Imagining America and move toward applying for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2019.

Why UW Bothell seeks to Host Imagining America: An Organizing Moment

UW Bothell is a young institution whose demographics reflect the changing nature of higher education in the United States. Over 70% of our full-time faculty members have been hired in the past five years, resulting in a faculty that is now the most diverse of the three UW campuses. Many of those new hires have chosen to come to the campus explicitly for its articulated focus on cross-disciplinarity, diversity, access, and engagement. The campus’ scale and history of development means that there are low barriers to cross-unit collaboration and high investment in the founding mission. Yet the rapidity of recent growth also means that the challenge of our next stage of development is one of organizing and orienting the significant energies and resources of the campus in sustainable, long-term ways.

We see Imagining America as a partner and a catalyst that will help us move forward in the next phase of development. This phase must move the campus from emergent projects to transformational change, by integrating public engagement and diversity, and creating institutional infrastructure for deep and sustained practice. UW Bothell has laid the path for this development over the past three years, with the creation of directorships for Community Based-Learning and Research, Integrated Learning, Diversity, Institutional Research, and Strategic Initiatives; with the commissioned Furco/Holland report and the clarification of academic vision in the 3Cs framework; and with the campus Community Engagement Task
Force and the campus Diversity Council. The campus unveiled the Diversity Action Plan at the end of Fall Quarter, and shared the Community Engagement Task Force Report for public comment at the very beginning of Winter Quarter (January 5-20, 2016). The report recommends that the campus pursue Carnegie classification, hire a Director of Community Engagement, charge a Community Engagement Council, build a trans/regional network, and invest in staffing systems to support this development (See appendices.) Independent of the proposal to host IA, UW Bothell administration is committed to identifying equal or great funding investments to develop local engagement infrastructure over the next ten years.

The proposal that follows invites Imagining America to partner with us as we develop campus infrastructure for regional impact. Because these discussions are evolving and plans are in the process of being solidified, there is considerable flexibility for how Imagining America might be strategically integrated on campus. We foresee Imagining America as a partner that can help us develop these structures in ways that are truly transformative of the campus during its 5-10 year residency. The footprint and legacy of IA’s work will be greater here than at a larger, more traditional campus.

The proposal that follows also foregrounds developing IA’s membership base. This interest addresses questions of national reach and impact as well as questions of resources and revenues. It responds to campus conversations that emphasized the need to ensure that hosting IA would help build campus infrastructure, rather than operating as a separate initiative, or diverting scarce resources: students too wanted to see their interests served in the partnership.

**What UW Bothell Can Offer IA**

The comparatively low barriers to collaboration at UW Bothell mean that there is extraordinary potential to showcase the value of Imagining America in the institutional context of a public university. We are uniquely representative of new trends in higher education in several ways: our diverse and non-traditional student demographics; our emphasis on cross-disciplinarity and integrated learning; and our focus on problem-based research and curricula responsive to regional and global concerns. Our campus has a full participation agenda in relation to on-campus and off-campus communities, and is in a position to demonstrate the social, intellectual, and ethical imperative not to separate the institutional agendas of diversity and community engagement. We are positioned to catalyze, support, and deepen national conversations about the critical role of public institutions and higher education in society.

The campus brings significant curricular and co-curricular assets across a wide range of academic disciplines and professional fields doing engaged/applied research and education. Imagining America can expect to contribute to and benefit from initiatives, partnerships, and granting opportunities in areas such as: cultural, media, and diversity studies; design, digital technology, and engineering; environmental and earth sciences; social justice and community health; STEM education and civic science; social enterprise and sustainable
development. IA@UW Bothell would work in partnership across campus units to highlight the case for collaboration across knowledge sectors and communities on and off campus.

Our location is also a major asset. UW Bothell is sited on traditional lands of the Duwamish/Dkh’w’Duw’Absh, in what is now Washington state’s mostly densely populated corridor: an innovation-focused region dominated by technology, aerospace, healthcare, education, and philanthropy, invested in environmental stewardship and sustainability, and rich in creative industries and arts-and-culture non-profits. Global flows of trade, labor, migration, and culture have shaped and continue to shape the region, its economic opportunities as well as its various social struggles for equity and justice. UW Bothell’s community engagement and diversity goals explicitly acknowledge and engage with the local communities and global forces that contribute to defining our region. A key focus of our proposal will be on structures and practices of civic engagement in this globally-influential region.

Notably, 92% of our graduates remain in the Puget Sound area. UW Bothell alumni currently serve in positions of regional influence and leadership in city and county government, non-profits, businesses, foundations, and universities. In these positions and others, our alumni are current and potential partners for community engagement and regional development, as well as key advocates and supporters. Moreover, UW Bothell’s reputation for innovative practices and commitment to diverse populations has earned us the support and participation of key leaders in regional industries, school districts, museums, and civic agencies.

Our proposal to host IA enjoys the support of high-level leadership, at the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor levels, as well as a distributed and knowledgeable network of direct participants in IA activities, including the national conferences and regional convenings, the Presidents Council, the Publicly Active Graduate Education program, and the Full Participation, Integrated Assessment, and Civic Science initiatives.

**Agendas for Partnership with IA**

The strengths of our proposal include a mission focus on diversity, access, and regional development, and recognition that community engagement is a pillar of this work. We have an ethnically, economically, and religiously diverse student body and a growing alumni base that is deeply interested in how their education can give back to their communities of origin. Our increasingly diverse faculty have been recruited to the campus mission of access, equity, and engaged and interdisciplinary scholarship and they participate in a range of partnership activities. The scale and history of the campus mean that there are currently low barriers to collaboration across campus, while we enjoy the resources and benefits of the tri-campus University. The larger metropolitan region in which we are situated is a major international crossroads known for leadership in environmental, health, and technological innovation as well as social justice activism.
With this promise come challenges. To date, there has been considerable campus-community engagement activity at the initiative of individual faculty members, but it has wanted for strategic leadership, direction, and development, and with it, deeper coordination and integration. In addition, as a public university that has been subject to dramatic state funding cuts, we must be judicious and accountable in expenditures, and be able to justify the short and long-term value of campus resource investments to our students, their families and communities, and our faculty.

Research undertaken in our proposal development process and outlined below underscores this necessity. IA’s campus presence must enhance, not divert, resources needed for the purposes of local development. Hence this proposal entails a corollary commitment to invest in local infrastructure at a level that equals or exceeds campus funding for IA. In this local context, it is also significant that IA’s own revenue streams, through membership and conference fees, equals or exceeds the campus investment.

We see in this combination some unique opportunities for partnership with Imagining America. The following propositions, which will be elaborated, are interdependent. The aim is to build mutual and respective organizational capacity, to mutual benefit.

- **Develop local community engagement infrastructure for UW Bothell.** Under local leadership, UW Bothell is committed to this transformational project in order to support the development of faculty, staff, student, and partner capacity for mutually-beneficial partnership and positive impact regionally. This local development will be greatly enhanced and informed by the presence, circulation, and knowledge of IA colleagues and networks.

  We envision a close working relationship between the IA office and the UW Bothell Office of Community-Based Learning and Research, facilitated structurally by co-location, an IA Managing Director position responsible for local integration, and the development of a regional organizing consortium (See below.)

  As our campus seeks to fulfill the first recommendation of the Community Engagement Task Force report—“Pursue Carnegie classification as an end and a means of developing community engagement infrastructure”—we see IA’s networks and leaders acting as consultants and interlocuters to this process, helping us strategize and operationalize this local work. These connections will place our local work in dialogue with national trends and contexts. Because many Bothell faculty aspire to careers that are eccentric to dominant disciplinary and professional models, exchange with IA’s network of like-minded scholars, and its work to transform the evaluation of scholarship promise great mutual influence.

- **Develop and expand membership as a sustainable/sustaining revenue source and organizing base for IA.** Moving towards financial independence and away from reliance on university funding moves IA from patronage towards partnership relations. While this is a pragmatic consideration, and necessary to the kinds of
accountability we need to demonstrate to our campus constituencies, it offers significant opportunities for increasing the reach and influence of the consortium.

- **Develop a regional consortium** (UW Bothell and IA). The regional organizing consortium is meant to be complementary to the IA national advisory board, but it also provides an opportunity and a mechanism for linking and actualizing the preceding two agenda items. It dovetails with the recommendations of our Community Engagement Task Force as well. If this co-development involving regional higher education and community organizations is successful, it will be an infrastructure that continues to serve both organizations after IA has moved on to its next host institution.

- **Be student-centered.** (UW Bothell and IA). Student-centered is a long-standing value of UW Bothell, whose mission statement “holds the faculty-student relation to be central.” IA has nurtured vibrant graduate student leadership and networks. We anticipate that further involving undergraduates in the work of IA will also expand the reach and impact of the consortium, nationally as well as locally.

**Proposal Development Process**

The Imagining America proposal process has been led by working group comprised of Kara Adams (Interim Director of Community-Based Research and Learning), Miriam Bartha (Director of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS) Graduate Programs), Jonathan Cluts (Director of Strategic Initiatives), Scott Kurashige (IAS Professor and Special Advisor for Faculty Diversity and Development), and Terryl Ross (Director of Diversity), with support from the project manager, Brooke Graham Doyle, and the input and assistance of a larger steering committee composed of campus and community stakeholders.

The working group sought to connect the occasion of proposal development to long-term goals through a process designed to build relationships, trust, and momentum for internal and external partnerships; seek alignment with plans for developing diversity and community engagement infrastructure; and clarify opportunities and pathways for acting on these goals.

We formulated and pursued an action research and community organizing strategy of one-to-one listening sessions and focus groups, designed to identify common interests and concerns about partnership with IA (and with UW Bothell) as well as networks of influence and opportunities for participation/action. In all, we spoke with eight focus groups and an additional twenty-three individuals. (See appendices for a list of stakeholders engaged and their affiliations, as well as the interview protocol for one-to-ones and focus groups.) Key findings from these researches were presented to the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor in mid-December. Summarized below, they provide context for the specific budgeting and staffing proposals that follow. To frame this summary, we highlight several insights critical to understanding our findings and to future partnership development in connection with Imagining America.
First, internal and external partners who have had some past interaction with Imagining America (through conferences, institutes, or visits) were much better able to identify and generate the possibilities a regional residency and partnership might provide. Those who only learned about the organization from the website had more trouble projecting what this might mean for us or them.

Second, for many scholars and practitioners connected to our interdisciplinary campus, the language of “arts, humanities, and design” signals distinct fields, and is not particularly conducive to imagining partnerships on social issues or community development. It was consequently very important to frame IA’s mission as “using arts, culture, and design methods to engage and strengthen communities.”

For this reason, moving forward, we see a better partnership identification and development strategy would be to ask who is doing work that is congruent with our campus objectives of diversity, access, and community engagement; who is interested in partnering with our campus on that work; and who is interested in what arts and cultural methods of engagement might bring to this work? We return to this in discussions of “partnership planning” later in this proposal.

**Stakeholder research findings: campus/internal partners**
In our stakeholder research we heard our internal partners—faculty, staff, students, and administrators—express the following interests and concerns regarding a proposal to host Imagining America at UW Bothell.

They identified IA as positively contributing to, animating, and forwarding the following campus-community values, conversations, and frameworks:

- Social innovation/entrepreneurship
- Scholarship, art, and activism
- Social justice and community organizing
- Design for social good, transforming industry

They envisioned that a hosting partnership with IA would:

- Help coalesce community engagement efforts on campus and strategize our partnerships
- Jumpstart/catalyze local partnerships and development
- Connect local development to national network and conversations
- Complement and enhance diversity initiatives
- Complement and enhance student community organizing skills
- Advance a more nuanced story about the campus, congruent with the values of students, alumni, and faculty

They also voiced the following concerns and questions about the proposal to host IA.

- Is leadership ready to commit to prioritizing and sustaining community engagement and diversity efforts now and over the long term?
- Are we prepared for additional demands on time, energy, money, space, bandwidth, and infrastructure?
• Will IA substitute for, or otherwise take away from, investment in building local infrastructure for community engagement?
• Is this premature? Can we deliver on a partnership with IA?

We note here that IA proposal research and development was launched prior to the campus release of the Diversity Action Plan and the Community Engagement Task Force Report. These plans and reports represent important but initial steps towards actualizing and operationalizing core commitments. Faculty, staff, and student concerns and questions reveal anxieties attending this important bridge moment.

This proposal consequently takes care to address concerns that IA will substitute for rather than enhance the development of local infrastructure. The Community Engagement Task Force report was released to the campus for public response on January 5. After the public comment phase is closed on January 20, we expect that the campus will move swiftly to hire a Director of Community Engagement and convene a Community Engagement Council this spring. Subsequent to January 20, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs will also release the proposal to host IA to the campus, so that it may receive broader discussion than our initial research phase allowed.

**Stakeholder research: external partners**

We also consulted select representatives from regional non-profits, government agencies, and other higher education institutions with which UW Bothell has existing or emerging partnership interests. Because their specific positions and locations are pertinent to these discussions, and not necessarily representative of all UW Bothell community partners, we name them here (as well as in the appendices).

• Diane Douglas, Executive Director of Seattle City Club, former Executive Director of the Bellevue College Center for the Liberal Arts and the Bellevue Art Museum
• Joshua Heim, Arts Program Manager for the City of Bellevue; recently Cultural Arts Administrator for City of Redmond
• Jared Leising, Faculty and Meagan Walker, Director of External Relations, Cascadia College
• Keni Sturgeon, Director, Pacific Science Center
• Susan Surface, Program Director, Design in Public AIA
• Moira Payne, Provost, and Genevieve Tremblay, Assistant Professor, Cornish College of the Arts
• Julie Ziegler, Executive Director, Humanities Washington

External partners expressed interest and excitement in collaboration possibilities entailed by the regional hosting of Imagining America, such as:

• Convoking/organizing possibilities of a regional consortium
• Dialogue facilitation: cross-cultural, intergenerational, controversies
• Student/community organizing - tapping into students’ energy, and also better training students how to organize
• Pipeline development (diversity and access) and anchor institutions (community engagement)
They identified, variously, a number of themes and frameworks—part of the regional pulse with national implications—that could serve to focus collaborations and conversations. These included:

- Social innovation and social/economic inequality
- Development and displacement, gentrification and homelessness
- Environment, sustainability, bioregion
- Pacific rim, local/global, translocal/transnational
- Creative place-making and community histories

Free of the resource anxieties and competitions characteristic of campus conversations, these were enthusiastic and creative dialogues. Some of our external partners did, however, raise an important question for UW Bothell, as it develops its capacity for community engagement: What is UW Bothell’s strategic vision and plan for partnership development and community engagement? The new Director of Community Engagement and the Community Engagement Council will need to lead the campus in addressing this question in our next stage of work.

**Budget and Staffing Proposal**

In the next five years, UW Bothell needs to build operational infrastructure for community engagement. Our research has clarified the need for staffing, leadership, and a partnership plan with internal and external stakeholders. Partnership with IA would greatly enhance this development.

The opportunity here is for IA to have significant impact in shaping the development of community engagement efforts on the ground, and to help build (and benefit from) infrastructure that it will leave behind at the end of its tenure. At the same time, we believe that we can facilitate through this process, the further development of IA’s organizational capacity, and help it develop towards a more sustainable budget model that is less reliant on host institution patronage and more fully develops membership as a base for movement building.

**Organizing and Organizational Development**

Over the last several years, IA leadership has developed a community/cultural organizing framework and methodology that has been beneficial to the consortium in a number of ways. It has shifted IA discourse from a somewhat narrow (future-) faculty development and public scholarship focus to a more inclusive, coalitional, “organizing for social change and institutional transformation” emphasis that has invited participation across student, faculty, staff, partner lines. This move fit well with IA’s full participation agenda to bring together diversity and community engagement initiatives, among other objectives.

IA is also a young organization, with a staffing plan that appears to have evolved organically and opportunistically. Our conversations with IA staff members have pointed
toward a proliferation of activities, some grant funded with one member of staff as a PI or co-PI on them, and some supported by the generous sponsorship of Syracuse University. Job descriptions respond creatively to the talents and preferences of individual staff members, but can consequently also leave gaps exposed. Our “coaches” in this proposal development process (Bruce Burgett and David Scobey) have spoken of needing a more centralized “ED” or executive director function, for instance. There may also be ways that the university’s internal hierarchies lodge administrative oversight responsibilities where there is little experience, interest, or talent.

Currently the faculty (co-)director position reports to the host university administration for budget and personnel purposes, and the advisory board is a consultative body. If IA were a 501c3, it might still be hosted by a university, but it would likely have an Executive Director who reports to a governing board for organizational purposes, and to the host university for contracted purposes. (We recognize that 501c3 status might be a future organizational transition for IA, but are not considering it in the context of this proposal.)

We begin our staffing proposal with a redescription of the key functions we project as necessary to Imagining America’s development in the context of UW Bothell, by way of introducing a proposal for staffing that we hope will serve mutual development ends. In terms of funding (FY17-23), UW Bothell proposes to contribute $230,000 annually to support IA’s residency and development at UW Bothell, as well as covering the costs of office space. These investments would be complemented by our investments (at a level that matches or exceeds this amount) to develop infrastructure and capacity to support community engagement, including a national search for a Director of Community Engagement. We would seek to locate Imagining America staff within or adjacent to the Office of Community-Based Learning and Research to optimize opportunities for collaboration and shared development.

As a condition of this support, IA would need to agree to direct resources towards: (1) the position of a managing director and an associate director of membership relations and development; and (2) the development of targets and plans that move IA towards greater budget independence through revenue development over the first 5-10 years. In addition, our proposal sets the expectation that IA continues to focus 65% of its efforts nationally and 35% of its efforts locally.

Otherwise, the UW Bothell funding is flexible: together with other revenues, it can support existing or new initiatives, existing or shared staff positions (such as a communications specialist, an office manager, or conference/events coordinator position, some of which have precedence at IA and possible utility to our emerging CBLR office).

In the transition year, the managing director would be charged with learning all that is possible from current staff about work commitments, flows, and plans, and architecting, together with existing staff and advisory board members, a staffing plan that supports these strategic objectives in concert with the local build out of community engagement infrastructure.
Managing/Executive Director/Director for Strategic Operations. This professional staff position is responsible for budget oversight, strategic staffing development and management, integration of IA into UW Bothell systems and ecologies, organizational capacity building and oversight of membership development, National Advisory Board and local organizing/advisory board development. It has key accountability for IA’s commitment to the 65% national, 35% local balance of effort. In its responsibilities for strategic operations, this position could be analogized, in some respects and on a much smaller scale, to that of Rosemary Feal, Executive Director of the Modern Language Association (MLA) or John F. Stephens, Executive Director of the American Studies Association (ASA).

The person occupying this position would be familiar with IA as a membership-based national consortium and with UW Bothell, and would be responsible for developing IA’s organizational capacity to fulfill its mission, and for facilitating IA’s connection to local diversity and engagement initiatives in ways that enhance benefit to both organizations.

This position would report to UW Bothell’s Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs (who currently oversees parallel positions in Community-Based Learning and Research, Institutional Research, and Integrated Learning), with a dotted line to the leadership of IA’s National Advisory Board. It collaborates closely with the new Director of Community Engagement and with the Director of Diversity to ensure integration and articulation vis-à-vis local initiatives and development.

All other staff positions in the IA office would report to this position, or to a direct report of this position. This position would also be responsible for creating mechanisms for coordination and collaboration with the Faculty Director position(s).

Faculty Director(s). The essential function of this position is as a movement leader, recognized thought leader in the field, and organizational spokesperson. Because the movement involves institutions of higher education, and these organizations involve faculty governance, those occupying this position must be faculty members to be persuasive. This person’s job is persuasive representation and advocacy for IA and involves travel, speaking, writing for vehicles like AACU, CHE, and other venues. Qualified candidates bring visibility, credibility, intellectual gravitas and leadership, professional and/or policy access. This proposal suggests that if the executive director functions of strategic operations are covered by the Managing Director, this position might retain its faculty position at its home institution. The faculty director(s) would, in effect, be appointed by and accountable to the National Advisory Board. It hence might be a geographically distributed function, and it would benefit from (or could extend) the current co-director model. It could, imaginably, become something like a regional lead, with responsibilities for building regional networks/alliances/membership.

The assumption here is that at a senior level, individuals within the IA network may have both the freedom in research and service to be able to take on such a position, and that their institutions have an interest in furthering this, since they will be traveling and increasing their influence. If necessary, IA may decide to pay some summer salary, course buy-out,
and/or travel to supplement, with the understanding that we are looking to bring in new resources with this investment.

We would work with IA leadership to ensure that this position continues to be occupied by a movement leader, a thought leader in the field, and an organizational spokesperson. We would work closely with the National Advisory Board to craft a job description for a multi-year appointment and to recruit an appropriate person to occupy it, either locally or nationally. While it would be nice to have a title that was more descriptive of function, for the purposes of recruitment and historic continuity, it may be best to retain the title “faculty director(s).

We would propose to explore whether Tim Eatman and Scott Peters would be interested in staying on as faculty directors with such an arrangement. Imagining America could look into enlisting others in previous or existing IA leadership positions (such as past and current NAB chairs and vice chairs: David Scobey, George Sanchez, Bruce Burgett, and Lisa Lee), as well as other recent and emerging leaders within the IA consortium. If member institutions can be persuaded to invest in their faculty member’s development and IA’s development with some flexible leave/buyout for it, IA could consider the possibilities for proliferating these leadership positions in the longer term.

We envision the Managing Director/Faculty Director functioning as a fully collaborative oversight team of co-directors for the strategic direction and operation of Imagining Director, with accountability to each other, the National Advisory Board, and the host institution. This model has some precedence in Imagining America’s current co-director arrangement. We expect that owing to their different professional experiences and circuits, the faculty and managing directors will bring different insights and complementary perspectives to the development and management of IA strategic initiatives. To integrate the functioning of the faculty director position(s) with the rest of the IA staff, we would propose a number of different mechanisms, from the creation of activity plans (conferences, meetings, and other engagements) and activity reports that allow staff members to track and follow up with new contacts in timely and appropriate ways, to regular Skype-enabled staff meetings.

**The Director Team.** We expect that fully imagining and operationalizing the working relationship of the Managing Director and Faculty Director will need to be explored in more detail on all sides. Let us offer here some thoughts for discussion and consideration.

- So long as Imagining America is sustained organizationally through a non-contractual relationship with a host institution, formal budget and personnel responsibilities will need to be vested in a formal report within the host institution: here the managing director, as the agent of local integration, is proposed as that report, with the rest of the staff reporting through this line.

- In order to enable the full integration of the Faculty Director (who may not be local)/Managing Director team, we propose to engage the National Advisory Board (or a subcommittee thereof) in the development and finalization of full job descriptions for both directors. The partnership agreement between Imagining
America and UW Bothell may seek to have the NAB Chair and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs as co-signatories to both appointments.

- To support ongoing alignment, a member or subcommittee of the NAB could work with the directors and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs to design annual assessment mechanisms to provide feedback and review of the appointments. These mechanisms may include, among others, activities reporting and a stakeholders survey on the model of a “360 Degree Feedback Review.” The greater role of the NAB in hiring and evaluating the directors may provide one development pathway towards 501c3 status, if that is desired.

**Associate Director for Membership Relations and Development.** Together with the faculty director(s) positions, this position is responsible for outreach, and is the equivalent of a field organizer. Again, because this position is responsible for persuasive representation in a higher education context, significant experience in higher education, and advanced graduate study, is requisite. This experience is likely to be in the academic sector, with a familiarity with curriculum and research as it pertains to community engagement, but could be productively supplemented with knowledge from alumni and donor relations, student development and affairs, non-profit or government sectors, etc.

This position would be 100% supported by IA, and the aim would be for the IA directors, strategic and faculty, to support this position in expanding membership. In addition to researching membership models, we would seek to learn from models of cultivation from alumni and donor relations.

Historically, this position has been responsible for conference organizing. It would continue to be the lead for this, with significant support from the other IA staff positions. The aim would be to get conferences closer to breaking even, by strategic partnership with host institutions, and other member institutions.

This position would report to the Managing Director.

**Proposed Budget, Revenue:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>UWB Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td>$230,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Memberships</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Revenue</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell Funds</td>
<td>$230,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$509,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses proposed above:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total estimated salary + benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director for Membership Relations and Development</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$184,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For demonstration/consideration purposes, other possible expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA Travel</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (Journal)</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty co-director(s) summer salary or course-buys</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Specialist</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supervisor</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proposal Development Process Moving Forward

We deeply appreciate the spirit of partnership and dialogue with which Imagining America has engaged our proposal development, through the agency of the IA Transition Team and our campus coaches, David Scobey and Bruce Burgett. Hence we understand that the proposal we present here is not by any means a final proposal. As in most partnership work, it is open, subject to revision based on the feedback of key partners. While we can frame some broad outlines and intentions for the partnership between our campus and IA, there are many specifics that can only be drawn in dialogue with key stakeholders on both sides.

As we submit this proposal to Imagining America, our campus is in the process of reviewing, discussing, and commenting on the Community Engagement Task Force report and recommendations. In respect for the work of the Community Engagement Task Force, and to lay the ground for the IA@UW Bothell proposal, the task force report will receive exclusive and focused campus attention for the public comment period which extends until January 20. Given the strong investments in local development, members of the Community Engagement Task Force and IA Proposal Development working group agree that this course of action will serve to clarify campus commitments, plans, and timelines for implementation.

Subsequent to the close of public comment on the task force report on January 20, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will share this proposal with the campus for further discussion and comment. Members of the IA proposal development working group will convene individual and group opportunities to discuss the proposal for an IA partnership, on the model of the one-to-one and focus groups previously organized. We will also be engaging faculty, students, and alumni with knowledge of IA as interlocuters and advocates in this series of discussions. Through them, we seek to gain collective clarity about the campus’s vision, mission, and goals regarding community engagement and diversity, and how a partnership with IA could help advance them. We will also bring the proposal to a wider range of our community partners, in anticipation of a possible IA site visit this spring.
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# Appendix A: Timeline of the Development of the Office of CBLR at UW Bothell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>Faculty and staff develop and present a series of proposals for a Center for Community Engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Faculty constitute a CBLR fellows program as a faculty development/learning circle, with some funding. Continues to present to run as an annual fellowship program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS) program hires Michelle Cruver Alejano as Community Relations Coordinator; campus discusses possibility of an equivalent campus position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>IAS Community Relations Coordinator Michelle Cruver Alejano departs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td>Karen Ericson (Business) hired as a .8 FTE staff director of Office of CBLR on soft money; funding and position are renewed annually until 2012. Office housed within the Teaching and Learning Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Office of CBLR hires Kara Adams as Community Partnerships Coordinator, on soft money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>Kara leaves position for graduate study; Kelsen Caldwell hired to cover these responsibilities as a Graduate Staff Assistant (50%) while a student in the MA in Cultural Studies program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Office of CBLR benefits from a full-time MLK Vista positions sponsored by Solid Ground, to support the Bothell Youth Court and MATCH (Making Access to College Happen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Karen Ericson’s position as Director of CBLR is not renewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td>UW Bothell does a national search for a Director of the Office of CBLR; hires Paul Markham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Markham assumes position as Director of Office of CBLR, reporting to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Kara Adams hired as Assistant Director of Office of CBLR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2013</td>
<td>Office of CBLR moved to Student Success Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Markham position refigured as Director of Community Partnerships and Engagement, reporting to the Chancellor; Furco/Holland review and report commissioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Markham departs UW Bothell for a position at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; Adams becomes Interim Director of Office of CBLR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>Community Engagement Task Force convened and charged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Anticipated: Community Engagement Council charged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March/April 2016</td>
<td>Anticipated: Director of Community Engagement position advertised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Observations of Public Engagement
University of Washington, Bothell

Building a Forward Looking Agenda for Securing UWB’s Position as a Leading 21st Century Institution of Higher Education

Andrew Furco, University of Minnesota
Barbara Holland, Portland State University
February 10, 2014

The University of Washington, Bothell’s current mission, vision, and values position it to be a leading higher education institution in the 21st Century. Building on a mission of securing educational access for a diverse student body, this relatively young institution is emerging as a prominent player in addressing the needs of the local region through the institution’s research, teaching, and public service. The University’s current strategic plan lays out a contemporary framework that presents a set of forward-looking goals, which if achieved, will secure the institution’s position as leading exemplar of a 21st Century public university. In particular, the emphases on interdisciplinary work, community engagement, engaged scholarship, and access/success for a diverse student body all represent important directions that foreshadow success and leadership in the changing world of higher education.

What is needed most at this time of unprecedented growth and development is a declaration that describes, clarifies, and firmly anchors the institution’s identity and character, so that there is broad institutional understanding and excitement about a clear path going forward. New, bold strategic action initiatives that focus on advancing the broad goals of the current strategic plan will guide the shaping this more specific and clear identity. In considering the campus’s strategic plan, we recommend that public engagement not be presented as a separate initiative, but rather be woven into each of the strategic goals. Whatever new strategic action initiatives are implemented to revitalize the institution’s strategic plan, public engagement should be seen as integral strategy that has potential to optimize the initiatives’ goals along many dimensions.

As public engagement continues to play a more central role in advancing institutional priorities, the genuine and continued involvement of a broad mix of faculty in community engaged work will become increasingly essential to secure success. To garner a broad-based involvement of faculty, there will need to be a deepening of the understanding of the scholarly aspects of campus-community partnerships in ways that cut across the institution’s disciplines as well as research and teaching missions. This is not to say that all disciplines or faculty will be engaged scholars but that there is wide understanding that high quality engaged scholarship is essential to the mission and directions of the institution and offers
opportunity to build on the commitment to interdisciplinary work, to enhance student learning and outcomes, and to contribute intellectually to development in the region.

To date, the UW Bothell’s public engagement work has been impressive as it has begun to become more integrated into the colleges and schools core academic programming. However, the sustainability and deeper institutionalization of public engagement at UW Bothell remain precarious primarily because the public engagement appears under many guises, sometimes with unclear purposes and intentions, is highly dependent on individual interests and participation, and is operationalized quite haphazardly across the various academic and administrative units. These conditions limit the institution’s ability to capitalize on the collective power of public engagement to advance the institution’s priorities for research, teaching, learning, academic programs, and the external community.

The institution is fortunate to have uncommon, broad-based support from some key internal stakeholders, including senior management, faculty, staff and students. The distribution of the public engagement work is a bit uneven across the disciplines, with most of the visible engagement activities occurring within the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences units. However, several of the individuals with whom we spoke informed us that they came to work at UW Bothell specifically because of its strong commitment to student access, regional development, social justice, and the belief in having a balance between providing high quality teaching and conducting significant research. In many regards, these are the elements of the institution that give it its distinction and can help secure its status as a leading “engaged university” of the 21st Century. Higher education trends increasingly value these qualities, and UWB will be advantaged by adopting them now, rather than imitating academic cultures of the past.

All of our recommendations are influenced by the founding and ongoing expectations and purposes of the institution, and are intended for the institution to be successful on the local, state, and national levels. Our focus is to help the University position itself to be successful in capturing the emerging trends in higher education in ways that will lift its prominence, position it as a leading exemplar of the engaged university and contemporary academic culture, thus securing the institution’s full achievement of its mission.

Observations and Recommendations

Mission Alignment. The University’s founding commitment to student access, its stated mission, its espoused values, and current strategic priorities provide fertile ground for public engagement to thrive and play an important role in advancing the institution’s research, teaching, and public service agendas. However, our observations revealed that much more needs to be done to demonstrate and showcase the ways in which public engagement can serve as a strategy to advance
institutional goals. Too many in the campus community see public engagement as extra or optional activities that carry little reward or connection to teaching and research goals. Nothing could be further from the truth.

**RECOMMENDATION:** We recommend making overt and intentional connections between public engagement and University's mission and values by integrating goals and actions throughout the strategic plan as it is renewed and updated. Faculty and staff development, based on literature, research and practice examples from other institutions will enhance understanding of its quality and relevance to the goals of the institution.

**Institutional Identity.** The University is promoting various identities simultaneously. Our discussions with a broad representation of the campus community made it obvious that there are many different views of the institutional mission, identity, and direction. Some believe the institution is an access institution so that the teaching goals are of primary importance, especially as enrollments grow. Others believe that institution is a research institution that must adhere to the scholarship standards of the broader University of Washington, and the focus should be on raising the research profile of the university. Others feel that the University is a community-focused institution that has a strong commitment to the region, and needs to be more responsive to community issues. Given that the institution is in transition and continues to see rapid growth, there is much questioning among faculty and staff regarding what the University seeks to ultimately become and how they should best position their work.

This lack of clarity over institutional identity results in disagreement about what the goals, purposes, and role of public engagement should be, and about how it is assessed as academic work. A generational tension is emerging, with some senior faculty focused on traditional values and strategies and many younger faculty interested in scholarly approaches that align well with trends in higher education (interdisciplinary, engaged work that brings teaching, learning and research into closer interaction). For example, while the University touts engaged scholarship as an institution value, junior faculty shared concerns with us that their mentors are encouraging them to avoid community-engaged work and focus on a more traditional scholarly agenda. There is a need for a clear institutional identity regarding academic cultural values, aims and processes.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The proposed strategic plan progress assessment (Chancellor's suggestion that there will be an analysis of the progress made on the goals of the current strategic plan) should focus on clarifying and articulating the institution's identity. Given that growth goals create an intensive teaching load yet research is also important to progress, it will be useful to create a model that encourages a greater convergence of scholarly roles. We believe this is a ripe opportunity for UW Bothell to establish a cutting edge identity that values more integrated views of the connections between research and teaching, that incorporates new and forward looking
trends in higher education (online learning, interdisciplinary research and teaching, community-engaged pedagogy and scholarship, links between research and regional economic impact, the development of global sensibilities, etc.). Public engagement as a method of teaching and research is a key strategy to help the university learn and embrace these contemporary academic values. This approach will help UWB set itself up as a campus that upholds the expected standards of the University of Washington by operating in ways that emphasize innovative and cutting edge work that is different in method from Seattle. In this time of great change in higher education, we firmly believe that the more UW Bothell can distinguish itself as a high quality, high-performing cutting edge university (rather than relying on 20th Century strategies no longer available) the more it will succeed in achieving its goals and strengthening its overall stature as a leading institution of higher education. A robust public engagement agenda that integrates research and teaching with public engagement will make the university increasingly competitive and respected, while also addressing issues important to the region as one of the University’s distinguishing features.

**Public Engagement Agenda.** There was general consensus among interviewees that the UW Bothell would benefit from having an intentional public engagement institutionalization agenda. Currently, public engagement activities are diverse, unconnected, and reflect the interests of individual or groups of faculty. While such self-initiative is often valuable and successful, the lack of an overarching institutional agenda of engagement represents a lost opportunity to have both individual activity and broad, interdisciplinary and multi-faceted agendas of sustained public engagement that generates positive outcomes internally and externally over time. There is benefit to crafting a strategic agenda of public engagement that will invite broad faculty and student involvement, create sustained programs and initiatives, generate public and private resources, deepen campus-community relationships, and attract future faculty and students to UWB. An intentional agenda of work also facilitates capacity to monitor and measure the impacts and outcomes of these efforts.

**RECOMMENDATION:** We recommend establishing an agenda for public engagement, which lays out the diverse and complementary ways the university and external partners will work together to generate outcomes of benefit to both academia and the public. Given the university will soon update action initiatives for its strategic plan, the timing is good to study, in deep consultation with external partners, the alignment of UWB academic goals and strengths with regional community issues and opportunities; broad issues that will energize an array of activities involving diverse disciplines and multiple community connections. The development of the agenda between campus and community will, in and of itself, be a valuable opportunity to develop greater understanding of the potential role of engagement in developing UWB going forward. Such an agenda will help
inform new goals for engaged learning for students, policies for partnerships, structures and values that assess and reward faculty involvement in quality public engagement. This focus approach will also contribute to recruitment, retention, alumni involvement, grant-making and fundraising. In the context of experiencing the implementation of such an agenda, the institution will more naturally recognize solutions to the persistent confusion about scholarly values. This public engagement focused agenda should include goals and benchmarks for campus and community, informed by stakeholders internally and externally. Having a more strategic agenda to guide the institutionalization of public engagement will help UW Bothell be more intentional with the actions it takes and programs it implements regarding growth and reputation. The public engagement plan should be guided by the campus’s overall vision and values, as well as the goals presented in the University’s strategic plan. A focused agenda will generate strategic action steps that will optimize the institution’s available resources, time, and energy in ways that will enhance the campus’s research and teaching activities. To repeat, developing such an agenda does not restrict individual engagement or work on other community engaged issues. The agenda (perhaps one or two themes at first) will help, through experience, observation and experience, to clarify the role of public engagement in academic culture and as a method of teaching, learning and research based in partnerships.

Defining Public Engagement. Public engagement at UWB seems to have strong support in some quarters but less in others. Different units and individuals approach public engagement activities through different lenses; some appear to be high quality engagement and others may be closer to acts of charity (not a form of public engagement). Quality practices as a form of teaching and research, and the unique purposes and intentions that undergird forms of public engagement need to be better understood. Some of the resistance to public engagement is generated by observation of diverse projects which exhibit a wide array of models, purposes and intellectual quality.

RECOMMENDATION: Public Engagement, at its core, is a method of teaching, learning, and research that involves mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge in a context of partnership and reciprocity (see Carnegie definition). Traditional public service is still defined as it always has been in higher education and is not a form of public engagement unless it involves the characteristics mentioned above. The definition of public engagement is driven by the interaction of academic and external community entities to work together to create and exchange knowledge for mutual benefit. It involves doing work “with” communities as opposed to “to” or “for” communities.

Like all forms of scholarly work, public engagement can operate in different modes and forms, and address a wide array of topics and goals, all within a
context of quality practice and principles. This is the way universities organize research, teaching and learning; public engagement is no different. Whatever mode or purpose or outcome is chosen, quality practices and outcomes are expected and can be assessed. Research conducted by Battistoni and others suggest that different disciplines ascribe to different models or forms of public engagement. In general, we recommend that UW Bothell be open to a variety of modes and forms of public engagement. For example, much of the work of IAS focuses on activities meant to engage students and community working together on social justice issues. Other disciplines might be interested in other broad issues such as sustainability or economic development or health disparities – these might have some focus on social justice, but some may have other specific outcomes desired by the community. Aligning public engagement will only one particular lens or framework will only alienate those who, because of the norms and expectations of their disciplines, view public engagement through other lenses. In the context of the definition of public engagement offered above, UWB should ask each discipline (college, school, or department) to explore what public engagement means to the discipline and what might be the primary purposes, intentions, and goals are for community-engaged research, teaching, and public service. These goals could include, but not be limited to, goals such as increasing student recruitment and retention or increasing research activity on a particular topic. Such goals must then be aligned, through dialogue with community, issues and opportunities available in the region, which will lead toward partnership and program development. Public engagement is a scholarly method for teaching and research and is applied where it is appropriate for the questions and goals. Thus, public engagement is not suited to every faculty member’s agenda and expertise. More faculty development and constructive discourse are needed to build a campus-wide understanding that the engagement agenda is about expanding the kinds of scholarship that are produced at UWB and that for some questions and topics of work, engaged scholarship can enhance both the academic and the social impact of the scholarship that the University produces.

Public Engagement as a Strategy. Currently at UW Bothell, public engagement is seen primarily as a set of separate activities and programs, rather than as a strategy that can be used to accomplish major institutional goals. At the same time, there is a widespread sense that public engagement is something important and useful - something the University should do because it will help realize the mission and advance the institution’s academic performance and profile.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that conversations about public engagement shift from talking about public engagement as something the University should do to talking about the goals and priorities for students, faculty, units, the University, and the community and then explore how publicly-engaged research, teaching, and/or public service might help
achieve those goals. For example, the institution is heavily invested in interdisciplinary work. How can public engagement help strengthen the institution’s interdisciplinary goals? The University seeks to provide greater access to diverse students. How can public engagement help increase diverse students’ interest in choosing this University? Research shows that engaged learning strategies increase recruitment and retention – how much should community-engaged instruction be a hallmark of the UWB learner? How much community-based learning activity is enough to meet institutional goals for students? In what ways does engaged learning confer unique traits on UWB graduates? Ultimately, the goal is not “to do public engagement”. Rather, the goal is to advance the University’s priorities and goals by implementing a strategic agenda of public engagement in teaching, learning and research, and building the community partnerships to guide and frame that work. Public engagement is just one vehicle to achieve some of the goals, and consideration should be given to setting goals regarding when and where it can be best applied to advance these goals.

**Student Demographics.** The students we interviewed believe that public engagement experiences are an important and much-valued component of their educational experience at UW Bothell. They acknowledge however, that for some students, more intentional and accessible opportunities are needed and that more structures to support students’ community-engaged work need to be put in place. Current programming largely attracts traditional students, and the institution’s large and diverse student body with diverse characteristics is not as involved – this presents risks to the growth strategy. Research shows that students who are first generation, underrepresented, commuting and working are among those students who place the greatest value on community-based learning experiences. In addition, the students participating in public engagement were described as primarily traditional age students. This raised questions about how non-traditional age students are engaged in community-based learning.

**RECOMMENDATION:** We recommend developing a more complete and visible list of opportunities for students to participate in community engagement experiences (especially experiences that are connected to their academic work) and establishing a mechanism that informs all students about the opportunities. First and foremost, the university needs to map where all of its current community-based learning classes are in the curriculum, and aim for a more even and consistent level of access and opportunity across majors. An effective approach would be to conduct an analysis and map of ALL forms of experiential learning to students, which would identify gaps and opportunities to be strategic and more successful in reaching more and a more diverse mix of students. A critical institutional reflection question that must be asked regularly: “Which students are getting the benefits of community and experiential learning and which are not?” As
part of an access and recruitment strategy, the University might institute a community engagement scholarship program that awards scholarships based on students’ prior commitment to community engagement. Another scholarship might be given to students who commit to leadership and facilitation activities in support of community-based programming, and act as community ambassadors. Another scholarship might be earned while at UWB based on enrollment in community-based learning classes and co-curricular endeavors (any of these scholarships could be named/endowed). We also recommend that attention be given to providing professional development to faculty members and departmental leaders to increase their capacity to encourage and engage students in community-based experiences as an integrated component of the curriculum. The introduction of greater numbers of community-based learning classes need not require great investment (although it requires some infrastructure) because it is shifting teaching methods from one mode to another. The main questions are where should such learning occur to help students succeed and progress, and how do we ensure all students have access to such learning if they desire it?

In addition, given the expanding enrollments of underrepresented and non-traditional age students, we suggest that more careful consideration be given to how public engagement opportunities are dispersed across the curriculum, in required in elective courses (majors, general education), and in co-curricular opportunities. Equity of student participation will support institutional goals for growth, improvement and retention, visibility in the region, and alumni satisfaction. Having a data collection system in place will help provide the data that will be needed to make strategic decisions about public engagement offerings. In addition, we recommend holding discussions about opportunities for premajor students to use public engagement as a way to explore majors. In regards to commuter students, internal discussions and focus groups that explore ways to best engage and involve them would prove valuable in developing strategies that can better support their involvement. One option to engage commuter students is to expand opportunities for in-class engagement, and for students to do engagement work focused on campus needs and issues; this can help student stay on campus during the day and engage in meaningful, educational activities between classes, etc. We also recommend taking a look at similar institutions to explore strategies for involving commuter students.

**Accounting and Assessment.** The vast majority of key stakeholders we interviewed — faculty members, department leaders, central administrators, and important community partners — expressed support for developing a comprehensive system that can account for the scale and scope of the University’s community engagement efforts. An accounting and assessment system is essential for furthering the institutionalization of public engagement. Such a system is needed to ensure rigor, maintain high quality standards, and optimize the impact for all involved. In
particular, such a system can help ensure equity of opportunity for student involvement, inform the identification and recognition of community partners, provide data for donor and alumni involvement and cultivation, and identify areas for improvement, growth or change. Public engagement is a unifying activity for institutions that do it well – it can create a more common view of the mission and academic culture, create collaborations across the disciplines, link the university to new sources of revenue and funding, raise pride and satisfaction among students, and transform communities. All this requires program oversight, accounting and assessment data gathered in an ongoing and systematic manner.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Garnering campus-wide data on community engagement initiatives can be extremely challenging, especially when there is scattered activity and little motivation on the part of the units to share the data and information they hold. We recommend two employing two complementary strategies that can begin to build a database of community engagement programs, projects, and activities while also securing some buy-in from key stakeholders. The first strategy involves identifying existing campus-wide data collection systems (e.g., student enrollments, annual faculty activity reports, course descriptions, sponsored research proposal forms, campus events calendar, and others) and insert particular items or questions within those existing systems that can help provide data on public engagement issues of concern. This strategy avoids setting up a separate system for collecting community engagement data, which is likely to garner only modest responses at best. The second strategy is to convene representatives from units, offices, and programs that conduct community-partnered work to spend a day (or two) learning about each other’s public engagement work. As preparation for this gathering, ask each unit to provide some descriptive information about its public engagement work. These data can then be compiled and shared with the group; sharing and discourse can lead to new activities. In both strategies presented, the data collection has meaning and purpose for those who are to provide the data, and thus the likelihood of garnering more complete and robust data will be higher. Data from students can be collected through a few questions integrated into course evaluations or the creation of a unique evaluation for community-based learning courses. Co-curricular events can be evaluated using short surveys distributed at the event or using social media. In any case, the aim of the evaluations should be to capture the impact of the experience on student learning and development in line with UWB learning and graduate outcomes. Community descriptive and contact data can be collected using the faculty/staff strategies described above. Once partners are identified, best practice reveals that while surveys are simple and easy, response rates from partners are low; a better method is to convene partners in focus groups to discuss their views on impacts, benefits, areas for improvement, and their satisfaction or feedback information. All these data are useful not only for internal planning purposes, preparation for accreditation reports, and external relations, but also will facilitate the university’s successful
involvement in recognition programs such as the President’s Honor Roll and the Carnegie Elective Classification.

**Establishing a Central Campus Public Engagement Office.** Public engagement as a form of scholarly work needs some infrastructure. The work is based in relationships and is guided by principles of good practice. Partnerships can be time intensive, and community-based learning and research can involve considerable logistical matters that are best managed centrally. While faculty, staff and students are the primary deliverers of public engagement activities, there is need for an accountable, centralized function with academic and community credibility to facilitate these elements of the engagement agenda. The establishment of a dedicated central campus office that both supplements the work of existing outreach-focused units and connects community-engaged work more fully with University’s academic work and research mission has been an important step forward in advancing Bothell’s status as an engaged university. While the work of the current Community-Based Learning (CBL) Office has been effective and important, and it is (wisely) an office located within central campus administration, the office is associated primarily with public engagement in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences and is characterized by some faculty as promoting a social justice-oriented agenda for public engagement. Consequently, members in some units do not believe that the work of the CBL Office meets their definition of public engagement or is interested in working with them. As the public engagement agenda advances, it is important to have central campus public engagement office that has visibility, broad-based buy-in, academic credibility, community connections, and clout. The office should have the responsibility and authority to propose policies, set expectations for standards of practice, approve programs and institutional direction for public engagement (e.g., courses designated as community engagement, etc.), and set overall priorities for public engagement advancement.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Studies of institutionalization of public engagement have found that having a central campus office that builds and facilitates the policies, structures, and support systems to advance public engagement across units is essential. While the CBL Office has been and remains an important asset for advancing the institution’s public engagement agenda, we believe that a unit that is perceived to have a broader public engagement focus be named as a central campus administration unit to oversee the public engagement agenda. One option is to give the current CBL office a new, broader name and expand its focus and purview. Responsibilities of the central campus unit (perhaps called the Bothell Center for Public Engagement or named and endowed by a donor) might include: conducting interface with other administrative units to promote the integration of public engagement in their agendas; providing faculty development and partnership facilitation; overseeing the campus’s accounting and assessment system for public engagement; managing the work of the Engagement Council; running minigrant programs that support units or faculty interested in community-engaged work; serving as a first stop station for community
members interested in partnering with the campus; operating a fellows and scholarship program (focused on research and assessment of public engagement); convening multi-disciplinary representatives and community to encourage new endeavors; plan for recognition of successful projects; serve as arbitrator when conflicts arise; advise chairs and deans on public engagement matters; providing space to situate campus-wide interdisciplinary initiatives focused on community engagement; among other campus-wide responsibilities that will help advance the overall public engagement agenda. This is important for influencing all other strategies and will help garner information that will ensure the success of linking public engagement to student recruitment, alumni relations, and the overall profile of the institution. This new office can help the University tell its story about community involvement and bring more attention to the University’s work. The focus of the office needs to embrace the broad range of frameworks that define public engagement and support all forms of public engagement. Some additional authority and resources are going to be needed.

*Project-oriented Engagement.* The current engagement agenda is quite diffuse; it covers many topics addressed by different disciplines and is operationalized in many different ways and in different locales and communities. The current effort is focused primarily on running projects, led and managed by individual investigators or units, rather than focused on building broad-based, multi-unit partnerships. In addition, too many of the current engagement initiatives hold tenuous positions within the academic units; several initiatives are not owned by the academic programs and are led by and supported by units outside of academic departments. This structure poses challenges and some risk to faculty who wish to conduct community-engaged work. Given trends in higher education trends and expectations, it is important to involve more of the institution in public engagement scholarship. In addition, further integration of public engagement into research and teaching of the various academic programs and other units will strengthen the academic legitimacy of public engagement.

RECOMMENDATION: Partnership-focused community engagement, which is formed around a set of related projects and connected themes or topics, can be a way to promote more sustained and deeper engagement. One strategy to make this happen is to convene community and campus members to explore common areas of interest and identify one or two central issues around which different units and partners can coalesce to build joint engaged partnerships. This approach is about moving away from projects to building more interdisciplinary and broad based, sustained partnerships. It is suggested to start with one initiative, pilot it, and then build on it with other issue. One idea is to expand the Research Interest Group idea to include relevant external voices from government, business, industry from the community at large. This will help forge a multifaceted, interdisciplinary, intersegmental coalition to address complex issues through various projects.
that can promote collective action and impact. The goal is not to deepen understanding and explore potential points of alignment for campus/community partnerships.

**Strategic Hiring.** Among the faculty, there is some tension between individuals who want to conduct and promote engaged scholarship and their departmental colleagues (who are often more senior), who question the value and legitimacy of these engaged scholars’ work. We heard how some faculty came to Bothell with the promise of being able to do community-engaged work only to be encouraged to do more traditional scholarship. This scenario puts the institution at risk of losing the faculty who are actually living up to UW Bothell’s mission and values.

RECOMMENDATION: As this young institution builds out its faculty core, it is in an enviable position to hire a critical mass of faculty who will shape the institutional identity and culture. Most of the new faculty will come from Generation X and Y (see Cathy Trower’s paper on changes in faculty expectations and values in work and rewards). With exceptions, there is a difference between some senior faculty who hold on to familiar scholarship values and ways of working, and a more junior faculty whose interest align well with the emerging trends that foreshadow a new, emerging academic culture. Therefore, consideration should be given to developing a forward looking hiring plan that sets out goals for hiring scholars whose values and scholarly work align with Bothell’s values. Given the space to thrive and succeed, these scholars can help further shape UW Bothell’s identity and position the institution to play a leading role in academia. In this regard, public engagement should be included as key area of focus in job interviews, calls for positions, position criteria, etc. This will help attract the kind of faculty who will conduct and support engaged scholarship and the overall public engagement agenda.

**Engagement Council.** The current Engagement Council is composed of supportive individuals who serve as champions for Bothell’s public engagement agenda. Having such a Council provides an opportunity for members of the University community to build a strategy for advancing the institution’s public engagement agenda. Given the University’s current need to build an institutional identity and clarify the role of public engagement within that identity, the Council can play a key role in securing that the voices of important stakeholders are heard so that the institutional goals can align with the needs and expectations of those will be key to securing the future success of the institution. Members of the University community, especially faculty and institutional leaders, need to have opportunities to engage in dialog about how the trends and developments in higher education affect institutional decisions, and how these trends (including public engagement) will position the University in new directions that will meet the needs of growing student body and faculty.
**RECOMMENDATION.** We recommend that the Council be reconfigured and be given a more prominent role in advancing the institutional priorities. The Council should be charged as the institution’s official body for proposing policy, structural changes, and strategic goals for public engagement at UW Bothell. To be effective, the Council must have authority to establish norms, promote definitions, develop principles of good practice, establish metrics, offer recognition, and review of quality of the work. The Council should be composed of people with influence and decision-making roles who represent key administrative offices, colleges and schools, and constituency groups (faculty, staff, and students).

**Retaining Faculty.** Several of the junior faculty expressed some concern about their potential for success, despite the fact that they are conducting high quality scholarly work. Because their work is taking on different forms that are not always welcome or appreciated by their senior faculty advisers, they feel pressured to move in directions that are not compatible with their intellectual interests and desires. Attracting and retaining new faculty across disciplines will be increasingly difficulty as more of the new faculty seek to conduct scholarship in the public interest.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Consideration should be given to convening junior faculty members on a regular basis to have them explore their needs and expectations, and to develop partnerships. Faculty leaders should make attempts to be aware of current trends in scholarship and academic culture, and support junior faculty in efforts to build successful scholarly agendas. Similarly, both faculty leaders and ranked faculty need to be more aware of trends in higher education. Senior leadership can communicate views of contemporary developments and invite disciplinary and policy experts to campus (from relevant institutions) to raise awareness and provide examples. A framework or set of guidelines for reviewing engaged scholarship should be developed, perhaps drafted by the Engagement Council and faculty governance together. We note that the current guidelines and pathways for promotion and tenure review are not antithetical to the advancement of community-engaged scholarship; however, there needs to be discussions about how publicly-engaged scholarship should be presented and assessed within the established promotion and tenure guidelines.

**Professional Development.** Our conversations with faculty and staff revealed that they are hungry for opportunities to engage in professional development activities that can enhance their capacity to conduct community-engaged work. Some current practitioners and others who would like to take up engaged methods are hungry for insights into new and best practices and examples. Student affairs personnel would like to have opportunities to work more with faculty to discuss issues of student involvement in public engagement. Faculty would like to have more opportunities to build learning communities where they can share work with other engaged scholars.
and build collaborations across academic units and disciplines. Students need diverse curricular and co-curricular engagement opportunities that align with their diverse lives.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that consideration be given to reworking and reconfiguring the fellows program and perhaps using the funds to support some of the following developmental needs of the university: the building of cross-disciplinary teams that conduct community-engaged work on a thematic issue; support for professional development focused on high quality practice; research on the impact of public engagement on student learning and development, or funding for new department or college-level efforts to explore purposes and develop new public engagement strategies within their disciplines. These efforts could include invitations for engaged scholars from other institutions to come to UW Bothell as visiting scholar or consultants to examine how the various forms of public engagement are operationalized in different disciplines and community contexts.

**Interdisciplinary Engagement.** While interdisciplinary work is a hallmark of UW Bothell, much more can be done to use interdisciplinary work to promote public engagement teaching and scholarship, especially among units outside of IAS. Internationally, interdisciplinary work is taking the lead in strategies driving the most important research agendas. Given that major public and private funders are putting more emphasis on interdisciplinary work that is conducted in partnership with external entities, UW Bothell’s focus on interdisciplinary work can play an important role in leveraging external support and strengthening the institution’s reputation and prestige.

RECOMMENDATION: Given that societal issues are inherently interdisciplinary, public engagement can be an effective strategy for engaging units to participate in interdisciplinary work. As was noted earlier, we recommend identifying one or more societal issues or themes on which a set of interdisciplinary community-engaged projects can be cultivated and implemented, with community input at every stage. A theme-based approach can help form broad-based, sustained partnerships through the incorporation of various projects to which various units (faculty, students, and community partners) can contribute.

**Orientation.** We heard from the discussants that orientation is successful in helping students connect to curricular and co-curricular public engagement. However, as mentioned above, only some more traditional students are taking advantage of these opportunities. Now is the time for the institution to take time to make decisions about the goals for the degree to which experiential learning and public engagement will be a hallmark of their experiences at UW Bothell. It appears to
already be developing a reputation for students that UW Bothell is a place to conduct public engagement. This can help recruit and retain students.

RECOMMENDATION: Through the Engagement Council and other strategic conversations, public engagement curricular and co-curricular experiences, need to become more intentionally sequenced and visible to students and need to create clear strategies to recognize and celebrate student achievement in public engagement. A productive strategy is to analyze majors and courses associated with drop-outs and failure rates as well as classes that have obvious community partnership potential but are not engaged at this stage. CBL is a powerful tool for achieving learning goals through experience. We suggest the institution look at its total portrait of experiential learning and its accessibility to all students who want to partake. In such a diverse and growing institution, equity of access to experiential learning, which confers advantages, is an important issue and warrants the deliberate analysis and planning attention of leadership at every level.

The Broader Engagement Field. UW Bothell could benefit much from engaging in visits to other institutions that are developing their engagement agendas and that are struggling with similar issues. In addition, there are many national groups that can provide resources and support to campuses that are advancing their public engagement agendas.

RECOMMENDATION: There are two categories of institutions that can serve as guides for public engagement development. The first group is composed of institutions founded in 1960’s to 1980’s that had engagement as a central feature and have been successful in securing their status as engaged universities (e.g., IUPUI, South Florida, UM Baltimore, George Mason, Rutgers-Camden and Newark, campuses of Arizona State, etc.). The second category is composed of institutions that are relatively young and have community engagement as a central feature of their vision and mission. In this category there are 40+ institutions that were started about the same time as UW Bothell. It would be valuable to see how they are faring with public engagement and to explore what strategies have provided successful in their engagement efforts. We also recommend maintaining connections and showcasing UW Bothell’s engagement work with national and international engagement associations such as Campus Compact, Talloires Network, AAC&U initiatives and civic learning work, the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities, among others. We also encourage faculty to present their research at the annual meeting of the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, and at their disciplinary conferences, many of which support engaged scholarship.
Recognition and Awards. Rewards and recognition of public engagement work play an important role in raising the value and legitimacy of community-engaged teaching, research and scholarship.

RECOMMENDATION. Attention to should be given to acknowledging, honoring, etc. of all stakeholders involved in public engagement, including community partners. We recommend establishing a set of campus-wide awards that are part of a prestigious recognition event. In regards to honoring community partners, rewards can include something like: providing access to library, discounts at book store or campus events, sponsoring an award in the community, and having senior administrators attend community events to show their support, interest, and commitment to community issues. Attending and presenting scholarships at high school graduations is also powerful. Also, to help raise the legitimacy and importance of community-engaged scholarship, consideration might be given to revising the current “Distinguished Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Award” by adding “impact on community” or “addressing a societal issue” as a criterion for award eligibility.

Fundraising: There is a well-developed relationship between established public engagement agenda and fundraising success, and the following recommendation can help produce additional fundraising.

RECOMMENDATION: Initially, as the engagement profile gets underway, we recommend raising funds for scholarships to give to high schools graduates who demonstrate commitment to engagement to come to UW Bothell. Another option is to raise funds to support students who receive special recognition for engagement work (e.g., University ambassador, support campus engagement work, etc.), which students can apply for. Since 1990, dozens of universities have been able to get endowment gifts for naming engagement centers and for endowed chairs for engaged work on particular issues (e.g., achievement gap, small business viability, etc). One of the ways that public engagement has a day to day benefit to fundraising is that it links the University to donors who will give their money to community issues, but will not give funds to a university unless the university is doing something about community issues with which the funder is concerned. This reinforces the importance of having an intentional engagement agenda that demonstrates the University’s commitment to critical and important causes for the community, region, etc.
Thank you for the opportunity to engage in discussion and to make recommendations with respect to the future of community engagement as a signature value of the University of Washington Bothell.

In 2013 the University of Washington Bothell formally adopted a community engagement mission statement:

**Community Engagement Mission Statement**

As a regionally accountable public university, the University of Washington Bothell is committed to building and sustaining institutional and community partnerships designed to enhance student success and the well-being and prosperity of the North Puget Sound and Washington State. Through a wide and varied network, our diverse students, faculty, staff, and administrative leadership focus on the goal of increasing the capacity of our region to identify and address local, national, and global challenges.

As part of our commitment to achieving this goal, UW Bothell recognizes the definition of community engagement developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:

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.

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare an educated, engaged citizenry; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

This report—charged by Chancellor Yeigh—provides a road map for the next phase of making this mission a reality.

We divide our report into 7 sections: 1) Summary of Recommendations; 2) The Values and Purposes of Community Engagement; 3) Alignment with UW Bothell's Strategic Planning; 4) Community Engagement Committees; 5) Community Engagement in Action; 6) The Support Network; and 7) Next Steps.
Priorities; 4) Integration into UW Bothell’s Structure and Processes; 5) Institutional Metrics Requirements; 6) Community Engagement Professional Networks; 7) Alignment with Other UW Initiatives.

1) **Summary of Recommendations**

For reasons described below, we recommend the following 8 steps be taken to advance and realize University of Washington Bothell’s long-standing commitment to community engagement and institutional diversity.

1) **Carnegie Classification:** Pursue the Carnegie Classification as an end and a means of developing our community engagement infrastructure in a way that aligns with best practices. This recommendation requires that the campus charge a team/working group to implement, focusing largely on campus systems/priorities/etc. This will also require some further interaction with leadership at other Carnegie campuses.

2) **Director of Community Engagement:** Hire a Director for Community Engagement (Professional Staff position) who reports to the Director of Integrated Learning (Claire Fraczek) (see below) with close collaboration among Community Engagement and the offices of Diversity, Advancement, and Research. This arrangement maintains the campus-wide mission of community engagement while recognizing that its central engine lies within Academic Affairs as one of the 3 C’s that constitute our strategy for creating a distinctive student experience at UWB.

3) **Community Engagement Council:** Re-establish and re-charge the campus’ Community Engagement Council as a parallel and complementary body to the campus’s Diversity Council. The Council would report to the Chancellor and include key internal and external stakeholders. Its central liaison will be the Director of Community Engagement. The Council will establish policies, priorities and oversee quality assurance and help maintain a campus-community dialogue around the build out of community engagement.

4) **Make Engagement and Diversity Inseparable:** Build processes that ensure deep collaboration between diversity and community engagement efforts on campus beyond the Director roles and those of the Councils. Ensure that other groups, such as the one developing an international strategy, are in regular conversation with the Community Engagement and Diversity groups to maximize synergies.
5) Count What Matters: Establish metrics that will inform data collection with respect to community engagement and diversity programs, and that are aligned with overarching campus strategies. This recommendation will require learning from other institutions that have particular strengths in measurement to avoid reinventing the wheel. We have been advised to look at Seattle University, UNC Greensboro, and Cal State San Marcos. This task, shaped by the Carnegie requirements, will require additional resourcing (see below), but is work we should be doing regardless.

6) Build a Trans/Regional Network: Consult with a diverse set of community partners and organizations at all appropriate stages in this process, both to improve the process and to build a network of campus advocates.

7) Promotion and Tenure. Work with CCPTFA and the VCAA to articulate criteria and evidence for promotion and tenure related to CE faculty activities, in alignment with Chapter 24 and School criteria.

8) Advancement. Deepen work with Advancement to build a case for external support for community engagement, including the possibility of funding to host Imagining America and/or launch a robust center on campus. Note: Community engagement is currently central to each School's case for support.

2) The Values and Purposes of Community Engagement

For UW Bothell, the development of a robust infrastructure for community engagement (CE), including the pursuit of the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification as a regionally accountable institution, are both ends and means. CE is an end because the campus, as a public institution, has a mission that commits it to being an anchor institution, one that plays an integral role in the prosperity, sustainability, and equity of the region. This commitment includes the many global connections that shape our region. Our participation in our community and its global connections makes us who we are.

CE is also a means to achieve our core mission and to practice our deepest values. One of UW Bothell’s most notable accomplishments, although an incomplete and ongoing one, has been our work to create a campus that upholds diversity, equity, accessibility, and inclusivity. As the Holland/Furco report on engagement at UWB stated: “Research shows that students who are first generation, underrepresented, commuting and working are among those students who place the greatest value on community-based learning experiences.” Many of our high impact learning opportunities are birthed and sustained through engagement.
The success of first-generation students and students of color on campus is inseparable from an emphasis on community engagement. Generous and inclusive relationships on campus are sustained through deep partnerships off campus (and the reverse). The families and communities of our students need to trust that our campus environment will nurture and develop students who attend UW Bothell, and that we are invested in supporting the well-being and prosperity of the communities from which most of our undergraduate and graduate students come and to which they will return. This commitment is also instrumental to our ability to recruit and retain a diverse faculty and staff, many of whom have been attracted to us because of our commitment to diversity and engagement.

A Catalyst for Innovation

UW Bothell already has a well-deserved reputation for moving creativity to action. A continual exchange of people and ideas between campus and community is essential to sustaining innovative practices. Students, faculty members, and staff benefit from the wisdom and expertise of community members participating on our campus and from working with businesses, industries, and organizations throughout our region. These partnerships foster forms of learning, research, and scholarship that develop in dialogue with spheres of practice outside of the university, and make a difference there.

The prosperity and flourishing of UW Bothell and the communities within which we are nested are inseparable. CE enables and is focused on creating mutually beneficial partnerships with individuals, organizations, businesses and industries. In practice, these relationships are sometimes transactional -- exchanging student labor for professional mentorship. Ideally, they are more than that. These relationships can develop mutual, long-term commitments and support even when no immediate benefit is visible. As an anchor institution in the region, this is the goal we seek to attain.

3) Alignment with UW Bothell’s Strategic Priorities

In 2008, our campus developed the 21st Century Campus Initiative, outlined as seven prioritized areas to which our campus remains strategically focused. These priorities include: Growth, Resourcefulness, Diversity, Student-Centered, Community, Innovation, and Sustainability. Each of these themes inform and all are critical to our success in realizing the three highlighted by the UW Bothell Chancellor: Diversity, Achievement, and Growth that is Sustainable. In this context, it is important to emphasize that our diverse students, staff, and faculty come from diverse communities of which we are a part.
Community engagement is both a value within the 21st Century Campus Initiative and a methodology central to its realization. Along with complementary values and commitments identified by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (cross-disciplinarity and connected learning), community engagement provides a methodology that will enable us to foster the success of our students, faculty, and staff. This ongoing commitment to community engagement as one of the “3 Cs” dedicates us to focusing on developing regional partnerships that expand the impact of our work in four ways:

1) **Intellectually**, through community-engaged and applied research/creative practice and scholarship;
2) **Curricularly**, through internships, co-ops, project-based learning alliances, and community-engaged learning and research relationships with local businesses, industries and organizations;
3) **Fiscally**, through advancement activities, including grants and contracts, focused on our role as an anchor institution in the region;
4) **Politically**, through persuasive narratives about our status as a regionally accountable public institution and our responsibility to leverage our resources in ways that contribute to the sustainable and equitable prosperity of the region.

As a focal point for the global mission for the entire campus, CE engages all dimensions of our work, from research and teaching to external relations to supply chains. From a process perspective, all UW Bothell activities should be guided by a commitment to sustainable, equitable, and mutually-beneficial forms of CE as a core value.

### 4) Integration into UW Bothell’s Structure and Processes

Moving from generalities to specifics, the question is how to realize this mission-based commitment to community engagement and diversity. Over the past decade, CE has provided a point of convergence for a broad range of students, faculty, and staff interests. Looking forward, it must become more deeply integrated into all our campus priorities, including diversity, research, and community and governmental relations.

**Diversity**

One of UW Bothell’s most notable accomplishments, although an incomplete and ongoing one, has been our creation of a campus committed to realizing the values of diversity, equity, accessibility, and inclusivity. We see diversity as integral to CE – i.e. a true commitment to CE requires thoughtful attention to the diverse communities we serve or aim to serve, both internal and external to our campus. This means not only adding more groups to a list of stakeholders and constituents we acknowledge. Communicating and building relationships with diverse communities necessitates a
mindful recognition of alternative epistemological, pedagogical, leadership, and organizing frameworks. Moreover, it calls for us to be conscious of the language and discourses we use to represent ourselves, making clear that we are being transparent while appreciating the ways in which our messages will be/are received by members of diverse communities. To deepen the integration between these campus values and structures which are currently represented institutionally (via the Chancellor’s Office), and the operationalization of these values via CE methods (located within Academic Affairs), we emphasize the importance of a close working relationship with between the Director of Diversity and a Director of Community Engagement.

Community and Governmental Relations

These two offices, and their staff, are both engaged in the community and must be intimately involved with community engagement. The work of Advancement and External Relations is to build relationships on behalf of the institution that support the entirety of UW Bothell’s academic programs, initiatives as well as students, faculty, and staff. This work is most commonly dedicated to building brand awareness, growing alumni engagement, and stimulating economic and political support to the betterment of UW Bothell. There are many moments in which the two offices and their work are congruent and mutually reinforcing. So, for example, by mapping CE activity across legislative districts, we can gain political support. And businesses that benefit from CE can both directly contribute to UWB and advocate for us legislatively. Both of these examples imply robust CE activities and support for our capacity to map and measure.

The link between CE and Advancement is highlighted in Institutionalizing Community Engagement in Higher Education: The First Wave of Carnegie Classified Institutions: "Increasingly engagement has become-part of the identity of institutions, and the engagement brand has been leveraged to increase public support for these campuses. In particular, engagement as an institutional brand has been advanced to cultivate legislative support for higher education (Blanton, 2007). In addition, studies have shown a link between institutional commitment to outreach and engagement and increases in levels of state appropriations for research universities (Weerts and Ronca, 2006). Simply put, across all campus missions, engagement provides a platform to cultivate diverse revenue streams from private and public sources."

As a result, the need for deep coordination and collaboration are necessary. Therefore we suggest developing processes to closely link any offices engaged in advancement and community relations (these are currently being expanded and reconfigured). These processes would develop and sustain institutional alignment regarding prioritized learning and advancement initiatives, strategic partnerships, and tracking processes in a proposed Customer Relations Management database (outlined further below).
Within Academic Affairs, CE sits alongside Cross Disciplinarity and Connected Learning as one of the 3 Cs. As such, it constitutes the core academic strategy for integrative teaching, learning, and research/creative practice. While it is possible to think of the three separately, the synthesis of all three marks UWB as a distinctive learning environment. This environment serves as a foundation for integrative learning outcomes—key skills and dispositions for 21st century leadership and career success—and we propose a focused organizational design within AA to support this integrative mission.

Consequently, we are recommending formation of an Office of Integrative Learning run by our current Director of Integrated Learning (DIL). A Director of Community Engagement would report to the DIL (see below). The Director of Integrative Learning would be charged with helping all units within Academic Affairs engage the 3Cs, including the campus coordination of partnership development and alignment of strategic initiatives, and would sit as a voting member on the Academic Learning Council, along with the Director of CE and I² as non-voting members. The primary responsibility of the DIL would include building mechanisms for cross-unit collaborations between faculty and staff across these units, around the mission of 3Cs integration. Research, the Student Success Center, Global Initiatives, Admissions Outreach, Orientation and Transition Programs and Career Services would all have extensive collaborative relationships to the Office that support fulfilling these commitments. This Office would also serve to bridge successful I² initiatives from an innovation incubation unit into the operational fabric of existing units within AA, especially the Schools. There is a particularly apt alignment here: while structure is important, the key to success is well-crafted processes and communication which are central dimensions of Integrative Learning.

The Director of Community Engagement would be responsible creating and sustaining active collaboration with all the central offices (e.g. Research, Diversity, Advancement), supporting the Council for Community Engagement, leading the process of pursuing Carnegie classification, overseeing CBLR operations, and coordinating strategic partnership development for UWB in collaboration with the DIL.

5) Institutional Metrics Requirements

UW Bothell has made significant gains related to institutional research in recent years and the success of Community Engagement hinges on transparency of metrics so both internal and external stakeholders can see and assess our collaborations. For several
years, there has been a recognition that while we claim to be (and are) engaged with
our communities, these claims are not well documented even descriptively, much less in
terms of their impacts and values. We recommend using the Carnegie Classification as
a road map to identify the areas we need to measure in order to articulate outcomes. A
particular emphasis requiring attention is the alignment of the Community Engagement,
Diversity, and Integrative Learning campus agendas. We recommend creating specific
measurements that capture the integration of these three efforts.¹

*Campus-Wide Customer Relations Management System*

Beyond assessment and measurement data, we recommend collecting customer
relations data in order to increase our institutional ability to work with multiple external
stakeholders. A data management system would enable us to stay organized internally
by tracking and making visible the many partnerships that exist with external
constituents. The CRM system would be used by multiple units (Advancement, Career,
CBLR, Diversity, Alumni Engagement, Research, etc.).

There is an abundance of valuable community activities carried out by UW Bothell
students, faculty, and staff. We need to catalogue and recognize that work while
retaining a more precise definition for assessing community engagement that meets the
Carnegie criterion of “mutually beneficial.” This criterion is important not only for
measurement, but also enabling people to understand how their “community work”
maps onto and supports community engagement goals. John Saltmarsh, in a phone
conversation with the CE Task Force, made it clear that not all external relations work
will be nor needs to be defined as community-engaged, but that we should have clear
campus definitions in order to define the nuances for different types of community work.

*Peer Institutions*

As we move forward with metrics, it will be useful to consult comparable institutions that
have met the Carnegie classification. The Task Force initiated this work, but it will
require more development and considerable follow up. Among the institutions we
identified are public institutions (of the same approximate size as UW Bothell) that
achieved the Carnegie Community Engaged Classification in 2015, listed as follows:
Worcester State University, Massachusetts (Est. 1874, 5,563 undergrads, 787

¹ Here are a few provisional examples of suggestions for metrics that might be appropriate for UW
Bothell, but are not identified in the Carnegie process: a) Research joint grants/contracts with community
entities as an ‘in-flow’ measure of investment in us- not only an outcome; 2) Degree of interdisciplinary
integration in community engaged projects; 3) Alumni involvement as community engagement, as site
mentors/supervisors or their own engagement work with the institution; 4) Regular needs/ strengths
assessment from partners (sampling key stakeholders); 5) One fairly urgent task will be to identify and
prioritize metrics, a process that will require considerable discussion within campus and with our partners.
postgrads); Georgia College and State University (Est. 1889, 5,690 undergrads, 964 postgrads); California State University San Marcos (Est. 1990, 10,276 students). We recommend that UW Bothell seek consultation from these above schools, in addition to University of North Carolina at Greensboro (a leader and host institution in CE data management). We are not viewing these institutions as aspirational at the campus level but as having particular expertise and success in CE that we may benefit from.

Feasibility and Sustainability

Building out CE is no small undertaking and will need to be considered in the context of other campus commitments and priorities. To assist in this process, the Task Force created a metrics sub-group (headed by Kara Adams) to develop a provisional picture of what will be required. In order to (re)organize pre-existing data systems, set up new data tracking systems, institutionalize systems, and aggregate assessment data related to community engagement, we will require:

1. Dedicated staff time. This might include all or some of Community Engagement staff, Institutional Research staff, and leave time for a faculty member. This could be built into new work descriptions, or use existing staff time.
2. Infrastructure cost of software system(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff/Faculty Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two students workers (one graduate, one undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Software</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Customer Relations Management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Community Engagement tracking system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Community Engagement Professional Networks

As a campus, we have existing and emerging opportunities to learn from and provide leadership in networks focused on various forms of community engagement. These networks include:

- AACU
LEAP initiative, in particular, its findings about how high impact teaching practices such as community-engaged learning foster the retention and success of first generation students and students of color, to be led by Academic Affairs. (Note: Washington recently became a LEAP state through the advocacy of the Washington Consortium for the Liberal Arts, to which UW Bothell belongs.)

- Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life
  - Focus on practices of engagement across the cultural disciplines and, in particular, its research on the necessity of linking diversity and engagement on campuses that seek to foster the full participation of all. (Note: UW Bothell is member of the IA consortium and the Dean of IAS, Bruce Burgett, chairs its National Advisory Board.)

- Washington Campus Compact
  - Supports higher educational institutions in advancing community engagement through professional development and training for faculty and staff, participation in grant programs, advocacy to grant and policy-makers, research/assessment tools, and networking opportunities. WACC serves the role of connecting UW Bothell to state wide conversations on community engagement. (Note: The campus’s Office of CBLR is a leader in this organization.)

- AASCU (American Democracy Project)
  - Multi-campus initiative focused on public higher education's role in preparing the next generation of informed, engaged citizens for our democracy.

We are not necessarily recommending continuing any of the above nor is the list in any way comprehensive. One responsibility of the Office of Integrated Learning would be to prioritize, leverage and expand these resources and to make the strategic linkages among them more visible. Much of that work will be led, in turn, by the new CE Director.²

² Examples of other networks with which we might develop partnerships include:
  - Community Campus Partnerships for Health
    - Leverages the knowledge, wisdom and experience in communities and in academic institutions to solve pressing health, social, environmental and economic challenges.
  - Engagement Scholarship Consortium
    - Build strong university-community partnerships anchored in the rigor of scholarship, and designed to help build community capacity.
  - The Talloires Network
    - International association of institutions committed to strengthening the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education.
7) Alignment with Other UW Initiatives

As a campus, we have the opportunity to learn from and provide leadership in initiatives across the UW. In terms of the Carnegie CE Classification, each campus of the UW would need to apply individually, and each campus would have specific purposes and processes for community engagement that will be distinct from the other. Yet there are also benefits of coordinating across the campuses in more intentional and strategic ways:

- Shared geography
  - If we choose a regional approach to our community engagement strategy, then it is important to our local community that we are coordinated with UW Tacoma and UW Seattle.
- Benefits to the community
  - We hear from community partners that they appreciate when UW Seattle and UW Bothell are coordinated in their CBLR course-based work. This is especially true for partners that geographically serve the north King County region.
- Shared resources
  - There is potential for negotiating our association fees with different professional networks if all three campuses are members
  - Currently, we use a software called EXPO to track and support Community-Based Learning and Research courses. This software was created out of the Carlson Center for Leadership & Public Service at UW Seattle, and we were able to buy it from them to use five years ago. This saved us from investing in staff time and resources to recreate a similar tool. EXPO assists UW Seattle and UW Bothell to track and communicate about organizations in which we overlap.

Summary

The Community Engagement Task Force believes that aggressively and strategically developing our community engagement capacities in the ways we describe above will significantly advance our achievement of the 21st Century Campus Initiative, deepen our mutual affiliations with the diverse region in which we are located, strengthen our own internal community and improve campus climate, help to recruit and retain diverse

---

3 Examples of existing UW-wide initiatives where UW Bothell faculty and staff provide leadership include UW Urban (where IAS faculty member Christian Anderson serves on the steering committee); the UW graduate Certificate in Public Scholarship (a joint program of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, Graduate School, and the Simpson Center for the Humanities, co-directed by IAS dean Bruce Burgett and Director of Graduate Programs Miriam Bartha).
students, faculty, and staff; and create a distinctive environment for learning, research, and creative practice at UW Bothell. If done properly, this effort will position us as a national model for how to go about (re)building a university in and for the 21st century.
Appendices D, E, F: (from Phase 1 Proposal Development Research)

**Internal and External Stakeholders Engaged**

A. *highlights* indicate previous IA knowledge and interactions—conferences, institutes, or collaborations

B. Documentation of one-to-one and focus group discussions is available on the SharePoint site: [https://uwnetid-my.sharepoint.com/personal/uwbvcaa_uw.edu/IA](https://uwnetid-my.sharepoint.com/personal/uwbvcaa_uw.edu/IA)

Focus groups:

1. **Diversity Council reps**: Wayne Au (EDUC), Scott Kurashige (IAS/VCAA), Terryl Ross (Diversity)
2. **Community Engagement Task Force reps**: Claire Fraczek (VCAA), David Allen (NHS), Kara Adams (CBLR), Melissa Arias (Advancement)
3. **ASUWB**
4. **MA in Cultural Studies students**: Jeonghee Churches, Kelly George, Namita Paul, Asaya Plumly, Ruth Sawyer, Noir Soulin, Meshell Sturgis, Alison Schmidt
5. **Steering committee**: Miriam Bartha (IAS), Carolyn Brennan (Research), Pierre Mourad (STEM), Keith Nitta (IAS), Jason Pace (DFL), Valery Richardson (Student Affairs), Genevieve Tremblay (Cornish), Jane Van Galen (EDUC), Mayumi Willgerodt (NHS)
6. **Chief Diversity Officers, UW Tri-campus**: Sharon Parker (UWT), Gabriel Gallardo (UWS), Terryl Ross (UWB)
7. **CBLR Fellows**: Cheryl Cook (NHS), Shannon Cram (IAS), Claire Fraczek, David Goldstein(TLC/IAS), Deborah Jacoby Hathaway(FYPP/IAS), Bruce Kochis(IAS), Carrie Lanza (IAS), Selina Mohammed (NHS)
8. **Social Justice Organizers**: Jose Mariscal-Cruz, Michaella Rosner, Alejandra Perez

One-to-ones:

1. **Kara Adams**, Interim Director, CBLR
2. **Christian Anderson**, IAS Assistant Professor
3. **Melissa Arias**, Associate Vice Chancellor for Advancement
4. **Carolyn Brennan** Assistant Vice Chancellor for Advancement
5. **micha cardenas**, IAS Assistant Professor
6. **Diane Douglas**, Executive Director, Seattle CityClub
7. **Joshua Heim**, Arts Administrator, City of Redmond
8. **Jeanne Heuving**, IAS Professor and Director of the MFA in Creative Writing & Poetics
9. **Susan Jeffords**, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
10. **Kent Koch**, Director, Community Engagement, Seattle University
11. **Ron Krabill**, IAS Associate Professor
12. **Jared Leising**, Faculty and IA Campus Liaison, Cascadia College
13. **Keith Nitta**, IAS Associate Professor
14. **Valery Richardson**, Associate Director, Student Affairs
15. **Paul Schadewald**, Associate Director, Community Engagement, Macalester College and IA NAB member
16. **Keni Sturgeon**, Director, Pacific Science Center
17. **David Van Galen**, Integris Design, AIA
18. **Rachel Vaughn**, Director, Carlson Center for Public Service and Leadership, UW Seattle (CCPH)
19. **Meagan Walker**, Executive Director of External Relations, Cascadia College
20. **Kathy Woodward**, Simpson Center for the Humanities, UW Seattle
21. **Wolf Yeigh**, Chancellor
22. **Julie Ziegler**, Executive Director, Humanities Washington

**Other consultations:**

23. **Kevin Bott**, IA Associate Director
24. **David Scobey**, Chair, IA Transition Team
25. **Bruce Burgett**, Chair, IA National Advisory Board, and Dean, IAS
Name of Interviewee: ____________________________________________________________

Title/Organization: ___________________________ Email: ___________________________

Name of Interviewer: _________________________ Date of Interview: _________________

**Script for One-on-ones/focus groups (30 minutes)**

As you know, UW Bothell has expressed formal interest in becoming the next host institution for Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life, a national consortium of member institutions working to strengthen community-campus partnership through the cultural disciplines of arts, humanities, and design. Chancellor Yeigh has charged a working group and steering committee with the groundwork of developing a proposal, and we are doing one-on-one and focus group meetings with stakeholders to clarify how IA could support UW Bothell development goals around diversity and community engagement.

We have a set of structured questions we’re asking of all stakeholders, which should take about 20 minutes. I/we will share with you what we heard at the end.

1. What do you know about Imagining America? (Gauge knowledge/involvement)

2. From your position, what possibilities (if any) excite you about the prospect of partnering with Imagining America? What do you imagine would be the benefits for your interests and work? For the campus? For your partners or the region more generally?
3. What questions or concerns do you have about the possibility of hosting IA at UW Bothell?

4. How might you see yourself participating in the project of hosting IA? [Depending on what you heard in the previous questions, this might be short-term—eg, write a letter of support, talk with a colleague or partner, help convene a focus group—or longer-term (eg, co-develop a class, collaborate on a project etc).]

5. Lastly, are there other stakeholders that you think we should be talking to? Who are they?

6. Thank you for your input. Here, briefly, is what I heard in our conversation (summarize). Is this an accurate reflection? In follow up, I/we will share a written summary with you, that you can comment on if you like. Can we also ask you to follow up by…[see answers to #4 and 5].

ACTION: Interviewer to send written summary/answers to questions to interviewee, copying Brooke Graham Doyle, brookedoyle@yahoo.com. Brooke saves to Sharepoint, with any interviewee response.
Appendix F

**IA Proposal Development Steering Committee Members**

Brooke Graham Doyle, Project Manager
Kara Adams, Assistant Director, CBLR, UW Bothell
Melissa Arias, Associate Vice Chancellor of Advancement, UW Bothell
Miriam Bartha, Director of Graduate Programs, School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW Bothell
Carolyn Brennan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research, UW Bothell
Jonathan Cluts, Director, Strategic Initiatives, UW Bothell
Joshua Heim, Arts Administrator, City of Redmond
Scott Kurashige, Professor, School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, Senior Advisor on Diversity and Faculty Affairs, UW Bothell
Jared Leising, Faculty, Cascadia College
Pierre Mourad, Associate Professor, School of STEM, UW Bothell
Keith Nitta, Associate Professor, School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW Bothell
Jason Pace, Executive Director, Digital Future Lab, UW Bothell
Valery Richardson, Associate Dean, Student Affairs, UW Bothell
Terryl Ross, Diversity Director, UW Bothell
Genevieve Tremblay, Assistant Professor, Cornish College of the Arts
Jane Van Galen, Professor, School of Educational Studies, UW Bothell
Mayumi Willgerodt, Professor, School of Nursing and Health Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, UW Bothell
Kathleen Woodward, Director, Simpson Center for the Humanities and Professor, English, UW Seattle
Julie Ziegler, Executive Director, Humanities Washington
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It is with great joy that I present the Office of Community-Based Learning and Research’s 2014-2015 Annual Report, a testament to all of your hard work and collaboration.

With regard to three of the six University of Washington Bothell’s 21st Century Campus Initiatives, I reflect and look forward with particular focus on growth, community, and diversity.

**Growth**

In 2009, the Office of Community-Based Learning and Research (CBLR) started to use EXPO, an online database administered through the Seattle campus, to collect data more accurately. Data from EXPO indicates that in 2009-2010, the CBLR Office supported 45 CBLR course sections, and 694 students in CBLR courses.

Over the 2014-2015 academic year, the CBLR Office supported 73 CBLR course sections and 1,204 students, which indicates a 60% increase in CBLR course sections and a 57% increase in student participation over the past six years.

As UW Bothell continues to grow student enrollment, one challenge will be to provide equitable access for students in all majors and schools to benefit from CBLR pedagogy. A second challenge will be to scale with growth while continuing to provide quality community-based learning experiences for our students and community partners.

**Community**

In the 2014-2015 academic year, Community Engagement was named as a signature UW Bothell practice for Academic Affairs integrated with two other distinctive methods of Connected Learning and Scholarship and Cross Disciplinary Practices. Our ongoing commitment to community engagement encourages us to focus on developing regional partnerships that expand the impact of our work in four ways:

1. Intellectually, through community-based and applied research and scholarship.
2. Curricularly, through internships, co-ops, project-based learning alliances, and community-based learning and research relationships with local industries and organizations.
3. Fiscally, through advancement, grants, and research centers.
4. Politically, through recognition of and reflection on the ways in which we leverage our resources in contribution to the sustainable and equitable development of the region.

**Diversity**

Research indicates that the academic success of systematically and traditionally underserved students is enhanced by increased opportunities to participate in high-impact teaching and learning practices – those that are part of community-based learning and research pedagogy. (Strum, Eatman, Saltmarsh, Bush, 2011). Looking forward to 2016 and beyond, the Office of CBLR aims to build processes that ensure deep collaboration between diversity and community engagement efforts, with thoughtful attention to the diverse communities with whom we collaborate, both internal and external to our campus.

I hope that in reading this report you will see additional opportunities for how you and many others might connect to the Office of Community-Based Learning and Research, the University of Washington Bothell, and its wider community to promote a strong public service commitment.

With warm regards,

**Kara Adams**
Interim Director, Community-Based Learning and Research
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MISSION STATEMENT

As a regionally accountable public university, the University of Washington Bothell is committed to building and sustaining institutional and community partnerships designed to enhance student success and the well-being and prosperity of the North Puget Sound and Washington State. Through a wide and varied network, our diverse students, faculty, staff, and administrative leadership focus on the goal of increasing the capacity of our region to identify and address local, national, and global challenges.

As part of our commitment to achieving this goal, UW Bothell recognizes the definition of community engagement developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:

1. 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.

2. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare an educated, engaged citizenry; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Eileen Jowell, Northshore Community Schools, with Dr. Lauren Litchy at Collaboration with Strangers (CoLAB)

BEDUC 456: Adolescents in School and Society students facilitating “Believe in College” panel with Voyager Middle School
What are community-based learning and research courses?
A credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized activity (direct service, research, creative process, advocacy, consulting) in collaboration with a community entity (organization, industry, business, K-12 schools, local government) for the purpose of mutual beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (adapted from Bringle and Hatcher (1996), and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).
CBLR Courses by School

The Office of Community-Based Learning and Research makes multiple attempts to count all CBLR courses in every school on campus. Currently, an annual undergraduate “course count” is conducted during summer quarter through the Provost’s survey on undergraduate research, public service, and internships, which goes out to all faculty. We also use EXPO as a tool to track courses and partnerships. EXPO is an online database where community partners input community-based learning and research opportunities for pre-selected CBLR courses. EXPO allows students, faculty, and community partners to organize, disseminate information, and connect with each other. Through this process, we correspond with individual faculty. It is still likely that there are courses and partnerships missing from this data.

The Office of Community-Based Learning and Research asks faculty to draw upon the Community Engagement mission statement to determine whether their courses should be considered in the count.
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

We give thanks to our community partners (local government, non-profits, schools, businesses, and internal UW Bothell departments) that worked with CBLR course over the 2014-2015 academic year.

- 21 Acres
- A la Mode Pies
- ACT Theater
- ALS Evergreen Chapter Association
- ArtsWest
- Basel Action Network
- Bothell Library
- Bothell Municipal Court
- Bothell United Methodist Church—Bothell Community Kitchen
- Bothell-Kenmore-Kirkland Reporter
- Brown Paper Tickets
- Canyon Park Junior High
- Center for Human Services
- City of Bothell
- City of Kenmore
- City of Redmond Parks and Recreation Teen Programs
- COASST (Coastal Observation and Seabird Survey Team)
- Coding with Kids
- Community Alliance for Global Justice
- Community Economies Network
- Compass Housing Alliance
- Conservation Northwest
- Crystal Springs Elementary School
- Domestic Abuse Women’s Network (DAWN)
- Downtown Emergency Service Center
- EarthCorps
- Edmonds School District
- Einstein Middle School
- Entre Hermanos
- Everett High School
- Evergreen Hospice
- Forterra
- Friends of the North Creek Forest
- Friends of Youth
- Full Life Care
- Green Kirkland Partnership
- HaloSource
- Henry Jackson High School—AVID
- Highline Terrace Elementary School
- Ingersoll Gender Center
- Inspire Youth Project
- Inter IM Community Development Association
- International Examiner
- Jenson Motor Boat Company
- Juanita High School
- King County Medical Reserve Corps
- King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office
- La Raza del Noroeste
- Leading Age Washington
- LGBTQ Allyship
- Lifelong AIDS Alliance
- Looking into the Needs of Kids and Schools (LINKS)
- Lutheran Community Services Northwest
- Mary’s Place
- Meadowbrook Community Care
- MoreThanA Farm
- Mount Vernon Community Health Center
- Mountlake Terrace High School
- Neighborcare Health
- New Beginnings
- NewCastle News/SnoValley Start, Issaquah
- Northshore Community Schools
- Northshore Senior Center
- Northshore YMCA
- Northwest Film Forum
- Olympic Hills Elementary
- Parkwood Elementary School
- Planned Parenthood Votes Northwest
- Providence Institute
- Puget Sound Sage
- Planned Parenthood of Skagit County
- Puget Soundkeeper Alliance
- Real Change
- Redmond Reporter
- Refugee Women’s Alliance
- Ridgecrest Elementary
- SDK Bridge
- Seattle Against Slavery
- Seattle Children’s Hospital—Alyssa Burnett Adult Life Center
- Seattle Children’s Theater
- Seattle Repertory Theater
- Seattle Tilth Association
- Second Story Repertory
- Skagit Herald Printing Facility
- Snohomish County Department of Health and Human Services
- Snohomish County Medical Reserve Corps
- Snohomish County—Trinity Place Women’s Shelter
- Social Justice Fund NW
- Solid Ground
- Songaia Cohousing Community
- Sound Salmon Solutions
- Susan G. Komen
- Sustainable Agriculture Education Collaborative (SAGE)
- Sustainable Seattle
- Taproot Theater
- The North American Post
- The Seattle Globalist
- The Sophia Way
- United Way of King County Tax Campaign
- University Beyond Bars
- UW Farm
- UW Bothell/Cascadia Wetlands
- UW Bothell—Digital Futures Lab
- UW Bothell—CBLR Office
- UW Pacific Northwest Agriculture Safety and health (PNASH)
- UW School of Drama
- Village Volunteers
- Vincent De Paul
- Volunteer Chore Services, Catholic Community Services of Western Washington
- Voyager Middle School
- Washington Environmental Council
- Young Women Empowered
- Youth Tutoring Program
- YWCA of Snohomish County
- YWCA of Snohomish County—Somerset Women’s and Children’s Shelter/Transitional Housing
The University of Washington Bothell received a grant from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in 2010. A component of this study is a student post survey. The Office of Community-Based Learning and Research administers a survey to all of our students in CBLR courses at the end of each quarter. For the 2014-2015 year, 18% of students who received the survey responded to the survey. The data was collected via an online Catalyst survey distributed to CBLR students after the completion of a community-based learning course. Only students in CBLR courses using EXPO received the survey. Questions focus on four areas: Civic Engagement, Academic Learning, Psychological Well-Being, and Professional Development. The next four pages reflect the individual student survey responses.

“Our group not only created a partner survey, but collected valuable and useful data on social aspects of early childhood education. Then we analyzed the data we had received statewide to come to a comprehensive conclusion to report to the partner about the effectiveness of their non-profit organization. Our research project in class will hopefully change the way the organization deals with early childhood education; we as classes have the possibility to make a difference in some young child’s life for the better. In my opinion this is the most gratifying part of this entire research process.”

-Student enrolled in BIS 312
Approaches to Social Research

CSS 290: K-12 Computing Education students with Olympic Hills Elementary

BISCP 343: Community Psychology students with Jamilah Williams from Planned Parenthood Votes Northwest
Civic Engagement measured the extent to which students felt part of a larger collective and collaborative activity aimed to contribute to the larger society (as cited in Adler, 2005) was measured using 5 items ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Students were assessed on whether their CBLR experience influenced their sense of connectedness to their community and to other communities. These items also assessed the impact of their CBLR experience on their ability to understand other cultures and global issues. The goal of these items is to determine whether CBLR increased a sense of civic engagement among students (Carlisle, Gourd, Rajkhan, & Nitta, 2015).

Graph:
Due to my community-based learning experience:

"I was able to apply school concepts and class discussion while in the field and have a better understanding of my community
- Winter 2015 Student"
The construct Academic Learning contained 8 items that were designed to measure whether students acquired skills needed to be successful in class. Students were asked whether CBLR made it more likely that they would be open to new ideas, apply subject-specific knowledge to resolving problems, be creative and collaborative when solving problems, understand consequences to an action, systematically consider competing theories, revise approaches to solving problems, and better understand course material. All items were measured on a 4-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree (Carlisle, Gourd, Rajkhan, & Nitta, 2015).

Graph:
Due to my community-based learning experience, in the future I am more likely to:

- Better understand course readings, lectures, and discussions
- Try a solution, assess its effects, and revise my approach to solving the problem
- Compare competing theories
- Understand the consequences to an action
- Collaborate with others when solving problems
- Be creative when problem solving
- Apply subject specific knowledge to resolve a problem
- Be open to new ideas
PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Psychological Well-Being we defined as a measure of student satisfaction with themselves in the world and whether they find purpose and meaning in life. Under this 6-item construct, students were asked whether their CBLR experience increased the likelihood that they would help and encourage others, volunteer, participate in public affairs (very likely, somewhat likely, not likely). Additionally, psychological wellbeing measured whether respondents had a better understanding of themselves, sense of purpose, and greater satisfaction with life (yes definitely, somewhat, no not at all) (Carlisle, Gourd, Rajkhan, & Nitta, 2015).

Graphs:
Through the community-based work in this course:

My community-based learning experience has increased the likelihood that I will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in organizations and/or public affairs</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help and/or encourage others</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the community-based work in this course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Yes Definitely</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My sense of purpose in life has increased</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My satisfaction with life as a whole has increased</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I better understand myself</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Development measured the extent to which CBLR had an impact on professional skills needed in the workforce. This 11-item construct asked respondents whether their skills increased and whether they are more likely to use specific skill sets across a range of indicators, including problem solving, analyzing social issues, justifying their position through communication, considering multiple interpretations, reflecting on how they do their job (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree). Additionally, this construct asked respondents to reflect on whether their career opportunities have expanded, whether they take greater initiative, and whether they have developed greater dependability (yes, definitely, somewhat, no not at all) (Carlisle, Gourd, Rajkhan, & Nitta, 2015).

Graph:
My community-based learning and research experience improved my skills in the following areas:

“It was a wonderful experience that allowed me to explore my future career path while bonding with elementary students.”
-Student enrolled in BEDUC 220: Education and Society
Achieving Community Transformation is a student organization supported by the Office of Community-Based Learning and Research in partnership with Student Engagement and Activities. ACT student leaders initiate and support ongoing dialogues between students and organizations within the greater Bothell area to provide engaging service opportunities.

**2014-2015 ACT PROGRAMMING**

**Environmental Advocacy Workshop**
- Community organization: Forest Friends of North Creek Forest is a group comprised of science advisors, educators, parents, grandparents and students dedicated to preserving the North Creek Forest.
- Faculty partner: Dr. Amy Lambert
- # of students: 12

**MLK Jr. Programming**
- Community organizations: 21 Acers, Miracle League, Homeward Pet Adoption Center, Northshore YMCA, UWB/CC Wetlands, Riverside East Retirement Home.
- Partnered with: Associated Students of the University of Washington Bothell (ASUWB), Students Engagement and Activites (SEA), Student Philanthropy Education Program (SPEP), Social Justice Organizers (SJO’s), Cascadia Student Government, Cascadia Activities Board, Cascadia Office of Student Life
- # of students/staff/faculty: 99

**Threads & Treads Service Event**
- Community partner: Northshore Community Schools – Threads & Treads
- Threads & Treads provides Northshore families free, quality donated clothing for school-age youth, teens, young adults and parents. Student sort, organize and display clothes as part of service activities.
- # of students: 8
Jeffrey Brune - Speaker and Conversation

• Jeffrey Brune, visiting speaker from Gallaudet University. Focused conversation/presentation on disability and passing, myths and misunderstanding of disabilities, dominate normative vs. variation of body image.
• Faculty and staff partners: Dr. Heather Evans, Dr. Mo West, and Rosa Lundborg
• Partnered with: Recreation and Wellness and Health Educators Reaching Out Student Organization
• # of students: 13

Volunteer Local Fair

• Over 20 organizations table to bring awareness about their organization and recruit students as volunteer and interns at the Volunteer Local Fair.
• Community organizations: Catholic Community Services, Mercer Slough Environmental Education Center, Northshore Senior Center, Friends of Youth, Care Day, Volunteers of America Western Washington, City of Kenmore, The Sophia Way, Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council, Turning Point, Camp Korey, Bothell Lions Club, Bothell Lions, City of Kirkland, Northshore Community Schools, Northshore School District, Compass Housing Alliance, Bothell Community Kitchen, Sound Salmon Solutions, City of Bothell
• Partnered with: Student Philanthropy Education Program Philanthropy Fair, U-Wave Radio, and UW Bothell Career Center's Networking Night
• # of students: approx. 100

Alternative Spring Break (ASB)

• ASB is a student led initiative that gives students the opportunity to take part in educational service projects during their scheduled spring break. The ASB program encourages active citizenship by providing service opportunities addressing issues within the community.
• Community organizations: Youth Migrant Project, 21 Acres, MoreThanA Farm, Puget Sound keeper Alliance, Northwest Indian College Wetland Restoration - a Tulalip Reservation, Threads & Treads
• Partnered with: Student Engagement & Activities, Recreation and Wellness, UW Bothell Admissions, Cascadia Student Life
• # of students: 62
2015-2016 is the 10th year of the CBLR Fellowship for faculty and staff!

In 2006, the CBLR Fellowship was initiated by faculty, and since then, 55 faculty and 3 staff have gone through the CBLR Fellowship, with support from 11 faculty who have served on the Fellowship Steering Committee.

About the CBLR Fellowship Program:

The year long Community-Based Learning and Research Faculty and Staff Fellowship program is designed to promote and support faculty and staff development of community-based scholarship and creates pathways for students to deepen their community engagement within academic structures. The purpose of this program is to significantly enhance the capacity of UWB faculty and staff to offer courses, facilitate programs, and conduct research that directly engages the university with communities in ways that are valued by the academy. Fellows will have the opportunity to create or extend community-based work in courses or professional practice, conduct innovative research and participate in strategic planning for the next steps in support of community-based learning and research at UW Bothell.

"In my experience as a CBLR Faculty Fellow, I was able to work with faculty across disciplines and schools to collaborate on community partnership development. I appreciated the space to bounce ideas with other faculty who think through community-engaged teaching, research, and partnership work, and generate new ideas through the collaborative discussions and support."

-Jody Early, Ph.D., M.S., MCHES
Associate Professor
School of Nursing and Health Studies

Deborah Hathaway, 2014-2015 CBLR Fellow, presenting Creative Engagement Through Community-Based Learning, at the UW Teaching and Learning Symposium
Kara Adams, M.A.
Interim Director
Community-Based Learning and Research

Shauna Carlisle, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

Dhwani Vekaria
Interactive Media Design Student
CBLR Student Assistant
Credit: Graphic design for report

Daniel Murray
Biology Student
Student in Shauna Carlisle’s BIS 315: Understanding Statistics
Credit: Cleaned data and created graphs for report
CITATIONS


STUDENT SURVEY

The following questions attempt to understand your experiences with community-based learning. Please select the answer that best fits your experiences.

**Question 1: My community-based learning experience has increased the likelihood that I will...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>help and/or encourage others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteer</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in organizations and/or public affairs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursue more classes that have a community-based partnership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2: My community-based learning work...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>had mutual benefit to the community organization and me</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had adequate communication between the community organization and me</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3: Since my community-based learning experience my skills have increased in the following areas:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem solving</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying social issues</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating competing claims</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying my position</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicating with others</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering multiple interpretations</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4:** Due to my community-based learning experience, in the future I am more likely to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reflect on how I do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be open to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply subject-specific knowledge to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resolve a problem</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be creative when problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with others when solving problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the consequences to an action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare competing theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try a solution, assess its effects, and revise my approach to solving the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understand course readings, lectures, and discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions attempt to understand how community based learning has influenced your civic engagement, and how it has helped you grow as a person.

**Question 5: Due to my community-based learning experience...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am more connected to my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more connected to communities OTHER THAN my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to meet SOME of the needs of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have realized there are different perspectives on (global) international issues

I have developed a better "understanding" of cultures other than my own

I can consider multiple interpretations of ideas or events

Question 6. Through the community-based work in this course...

My career opportunities expanded

I have developed greater initiative

I have developed greater dependability

I better understand myself

My satisfaction with life as a whole has increased

My sense of purpose in life has increased

This final section asks some background information to help understand the many experiences of our diverse student population.
Question 7. Please select the category that best describes the number of hours per week that you worked on your community-based learning project outside the classroom.
- 0 hours per week
- 1-10 hours per week
- 11-15 hours per week
- 16-20 hours per week
- 21 or more hours per week

Question 8. Did you feel this was an adequate amount of time to complete your community-based work?
- I did not have enough time to complete quality work/service for the community partners
- It was hard to complete the required community-based learning hours
- Time was not something I was worried about

Question 9. Which racial background do you identify with?
- White (Non-Hispanic)
- Black/African American
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Asian American
- Hispanic/Latino American
- Bi-racial or Multi-racial
- Other

Question 10. What is your gender?
- Female
- Male
- Other

Question 11. What is your class level?
- First-year
- Second-year
- Third-year
- Fourth-year
- Graduate Student
Question 12. I have commitments outside of school (e.g., work, caring for children, caring for parents) that require (select one option below) hours a week.

- 1-10 hours per week
- 11-20 hours per week
- 21-30 hours per week
- 31-40 hours per week
- 40+ hours per week
- I do not have any commitments outside of school

Question 13. What would you like others to know about your community-based learning experience?
UW Bothell Community Partnership Highlights
(cross-campus participation; 5+ years)

Northshore Community Schools, Northshore School District. UW Bothell has been a key partner of Northshore Community Schools since its inception in 2010. A community school is both a place and a set of partnerships between a school and other community resources. Its integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development and community engagement leads to improved student learning, stronger families and healthier communities (Coalition for Community Schools: http://www.communityschools.org/aboutschools/what_is_a_community_school.aspx). Through CBLR education courses, UW Bothell has had over 200 undergraduate and graduate students support the Northshore Middle and High Schools as classroom mentors, tutors, and hang time coordinators.

Friends of North Creek Forest was started in 2011 by a group of science advisors, educators, parents, grandparents, and students dedicated to saving North Creek Forest, the last remaining forest in Bothell. The North Creek Forest is a 15-minute walk from the main UW Bothell campus, and is part of the larger ecosystem of the UW Bothell/Cascadia wetlands. Students and faculty from all disciplines engage with the forest through research and community-based learning. The UW Restoration and Ecology Network undergraduate capstone students spend a whole year planning, project managing, and restoring a site of the Forest every year. Public Art courses remove knotweed invasive species, and then create wind chimes with the dried knotweed. Students in GIS mapping courses map the wetlands in the Forest. Students in a water quality courses analyze water samples throughout the Forest, and general sustainability and environment courses participate in restoration projects throughout the year.

City of Bothell collaborates with community learning and research students and faculty. Two of the primary departmental partners at the city are the Public Works and Public Parks departments. Over the past five years, students in a GIS Mapping Communities course create multiple maps that are used by the City of Bothell: map of drainage systems that need repair, where residents can donate used items, natural public areas, map of walking and biking tails (movie of class: http://www.uwb.edu/ias-news/july-2015/ias-students-map-bothell-communities).

Bothell Youth Court. A partnership between UW Bothell, the Municipal Court of Bothell, and the Northshore School District, Bothell Youth Court is a community-based intervention and prevention program that provides an alternative response to adult municipal court for first-time, traffic infractions offenders. As judges, attorneys, and jury, community youth determine appropriate sanctions for their peers. The structure, focused on restorative justice and peer participation, facilitates learning, accountability, and community involvement among all participants. Youth courts reduce the costs and administrative burdens on courts, benefiting our partners in the city government and enabling more direct and positive interactions between court officials and teens than a more traditional punitive model. The court has heard over 45 cases and continues to work towards its goal of a safer community.
Farm Partners in Sammamish Valley. UW Bothell is adjacent to the Sammamish Valley, one of the five Agricultural Production Districts in King County. Two miles down the valley from UW Bothell, three farm partners work collaboratively with students and faculty: 21 Acres, MoreThanA Farm, and SAgE Farm. SAgE is a bioregion initiative growing food for local community colleges: Seattle, Edmonds, and Skagit Valley Community Colleges. MoreThanA Farm is farm partnership between Pacific Bamboo Resources, Antioch University Seattle, and SeaChar, providing food to local food banks. These farms provide community-based learning and research opportunities for our students in courses, such as Intro to Sustainable Practices, Ethics and Environment, Urban Agriculture and Food Studies. MoreThanA Farm and SAgE Farm recently partnered with a Mechanical Engineering course, where students are designing a rainwater capture and gravity system and a solar/wind powered cooler to store recently harvested food.

Making Access To College Happen (MATCH) connects UW Bothell students and local high school students in order to facilitate and increase access to college education. A leadership course connects college students to low income and first generation high school students through a curriculum centered on knowledge building, peer mentoring, and pre-academic college advising. This program develops college student leaders by providing training in educational inequalities and social issues that impact the student populations we work with.

Achieving Community Transformation (ACT) Student Organization is a student organization supported by the Office of Community-Based Learning and Research, as well as Student Engagement and Activities. ACT Student Leaders initiate and support ongoing dialogues between students and organizations within the Greater Bothell area to provide engaging service opportunities.