

Community Based Learning Advisory Board Meeting
February 21, 2014
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM
Little Theater in the Tutorial Project Office (Levering 200)

Attendees: Elizabeth Doerr, Eric Rice, Gia Grier, Jim Goodyear, Joshua McIntosh, Katie Igrac Lima, Lisa Folda, Margaret Hart, Mieka Smart, Mindi Levin, Rohini Chakravarthy, Rollin Johnson, Jr., William Smedick

I. Introductions

II. CBL Faculty Handbook Update

-we are currently looking for help with the logistics of setting up a new course and the timeframe involved

-most confusion arises from figuring out when course descriptions are due to departments and the Registrar

-course description needs to be submitted well in advance (up to a year in advance), confirmation of sites after course description

-deadline for posting a new or standing course deadline was February 21, 2014 for Fall courses and approximately October 1 for the Spring semester (usually around the fourth or fifth week for the subsequent semester)

-timeline can be compressed if the class is an existing course

-Suggestions: take the teaching assistant action item out of the sheet - could be misleading, as it suggests that the CSC can help with obtaining TAs for courses, what are the actual options?

-this could be an opening for CBL advocacy - if the departmental threshold for TAs is too low, then maybe CSC could work on getting them TAs

-community engagement faculty fellows grants - TAs included in the budget

-difference between *teaching assistant* (graduate student, can grade papers) and *course assistant* (undergraduate student, cannot grade papers)

III. CBL Lecture Update

-Sociology has agreed to co-sponsor

-we are beginning to disseminate information and post announcements

-please RSVP to Mariam (mariam.banahi@jhu.edu) if you plan on attending the Brown Bag, as space is limited

IV. Follow-up: Standard Evaluation Questions for Spring 2014 Evaluations

-come up with a docket of questions and perhaps faculty can include one into their surveys out of the three additional questions they are allotted

-use two questions at most, so that faculty can have one optional question remaining for themselves

-Random survey, interviewing students a possibility?

-SOURCE - uses a separate course evaluation related to the community work, standard set of questions and the faculty member can add them as supplemental questions to the end of the separate evaluation, it is a required part of the course, so students have to complete them (identified, but then de-identified when the results are given to the faculty and graduate student)

-At Homewood we may not want to add to the number of independent evaluations students are given; need to somehow work with the existing evaluation form given.

-if we feel that every CBL course should have these few questions, there might be a way to include the questions w/in CBL course evaluations automatically - change the electronic form to add the additional questions to anything that is labeled by the registrar as a "Community Based Learning" course

-if you could only ask them one question, what would you find most valuable? Helpful?

-What did students feel they gained from the course?

-If they were able to take the class again, would they?

-More likely to continue to be involved in service as a result of this course?

-We also want to learn about the impact of the community component, how are the community groups responding, is it mutually beneficial (not just for the students, but also for the community partners and the communities they serve)

-assessing community impact - tying it directly to CBL, a perceived benefit to the community organization and members, are there features or models that ensure success?

-there is an assumption that it is helping the community, or are we just taking up organizational resources

-Currently advocating for CBL, but without any actual course data, so something we could look at over the Spring and Summer in preparation for the Fall

-Next step: Gia/Rollin will pull out some broad themes and come up with some questions for them in preparation for the Spring courses until we can find out about automating it

-Next Step: Dean McIntosh/Rollin could facilitate conversations about extending the evaluation form for CBL

V. **Discussion: MOU Agreements for CBL Courses**

-General Counsel is recommending that CBL courses have MOUs for participating agencies; rationale: the activities happening on-site are similar to those occurring in internships and other engagement activities that currently have MOUs attached to them. Also protection for the students and the institution and the agencies we work with. The only things that can be changed around are sections II, III, and IX; the rest needs to stay in place.

-Rationale for MOUs: risk management end, connecting with partners and making sure that there is at least a baseline of understanding, as we've been going about this - courses - making sure that the same baseline is there, making sure that our students and our partners are covered

-The preamble is a bit stark as an opening ("Whereas" language). Language is different there than in the rest of the document.

-Perhaps we should edit the preamble to temper the legalistic language...but MOUs are needed to ensure there is a conversation about expectations

-Some programs already have expectation documents that are written without legal jargon.

-Can the CSC facilitate this process?

-Does CSC have to create another MOU for courses or can we just add an addendum or a rider to CSC's existing agency MOUs? If you work with an organization that CSC doesn't already work with, then you might need to go through this process and have an MOU attached to it. Should CSC offer it as a service to help decrease the amount of time faculty spend on this?

-General Counsel told SOURCE not to go in the direction of MOUs in the past, organizations might not have the legal resources to go through something like this and sign it, so they would just pull out, only time we have an MOU is with direct clinical experience, Project-based (8-week to 16-week projects)

-format of expectations, when it comes to the CBL courses, we should ask General Counsel - do we need a separate MOU for sites that CSC already works with or do we just need to e-mail or write-up a list of expectations because it is a course and does not need an MOU?

-Can we balance it out - so far has ben an employee talking with our partners, we don't want this to be a hurdle for the faculty that discourages them from running a CBL course

-Current CSC MOUs are three-year agreements and agencies have been signing

-Suggestions: 1. Include a preamble; 2. How do we balance it out? A lot about what we expect from community partners, but not much about what they should expect from the University and the students

VI. General Updates

- President's Community Service Honor Roll

-a designation out of the executive branch, recognizes higher education institutions that are exemplars of community engagement, institutionally, we are going to apply for it, doing a broad sweep of it (grad and undergrad), may be contacting you for statistical information

-even if we don't get the designation, a good way to start compiling the information and data, an institutional and strategic priority

-CSC and SOURCE attempted an application in 2006

-how do we become a more engaged campus, how challenging is it to get this information across the campus, there has to be a mechanism to prove that we are an engaged campus,

are we making an impact, not only to join the honor roll, but to get information across offices, how do we share information, how do we interact with community organizations, are we communicating well?

-helps us with thinking of these various initiatives that are going on – the university is going to hire people to do stuff we are already doing, very confusing for community partners

- Any announcements?

VII. Crenson-Hertz Award Selection

-Do we want to think of setting up a long-term rubric for the award? Something to think about in the future

- Partnerships are an important element (in the award description)

-Student impact? Partnerships? Impact? Does the nominator factor in?

-Offer two awards or alternate years – one year on longevity, one year on innovation

- 2014 winners: Bill Smedick and Claude Guillemard

****Next Meeting: Friday, April 11th, 3:00-5:00 pm****