Community Based Learning Advisory Board Meeting - Minutes
Tutorial Project (Levering #200)
November 22, 2013
3:00 pm-5:00 pm

Attendance: Lee Bone, Bill Smedick, Eric Rice, Phil Leaf, Elizabeth Doer, Mindi Levin, Mieka Smart, Lisa Folda, Katie Lima, Rollin Johnson, Gia Grier McGinnis

I. Introductions
Opening Update: Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF) Conference – December 10, 2013 – Please contact Gia Grier McGinnis or Rollin Johnson if you or a colleague would like to get involved and/or attend. CSC will be sending out an invitation to faculty who attended an HCPI presentation last winter in conjunction with the President's Office.

II. Update on Data Collection Activities

a. <u>**Preliminary data on faculty and staff survey**</u>
- About 138 people have taken the survey, the data pulled in your packets is from Tuesday reflecting about 133 respondents
- We have just figured out the proper channels through which to send the survey around to Carey and Peabody and are beginning that process in the coming days
- There were also a lot of write-in responses
- About 87 people responded to question 2, more information was wanted for help with databases and connection to others
- The database idea has come up in the past—as a place to post common information
- About 18 people wanted assistance with grant program identification and 14 (not mutually exclusive) also responded that they would like help with grant-writing
- Question 3: Tall peaks are on the absence of a coordinating body on campus, help with logistics, and help with finding the right opportunities
- "Other" here: people were getting very specific
- Attached to your packet is a list of affiliations, which was generated from the final question asking if they wanted to be connected
- School of Education allowed it to go to all faculty and staff en-masse
- People have been circulating it, the survey is still open, so feel free to continue sending it around

b. <u>**Key points from student and community agency focus groups:**</u>
- CBL focus groups took place earlier this week
- The notes included in your packets represent a snapshot of important points that were raised
- Having a moderator run the focus groups was to ensure objectivity and that the participants could respond freely
- The moderator was very interested in marketing, so she included questions about that.

Student focus group re-cap:

- Students seemed to have made strong connections to Baltimore through their engagement activities.
- The moderator felt that students are overwhelmed with the amount of e-mails and newsletters – perhaps a way to frame it would be that they need more structured guidance or direct access
- In the de-brief session, the focus group moderator remarked that students don't really seem to be making a direct connection between their service and applying it back to majors and career goals. It seems that they are not seeing it as part of a bigger picture; maybe some work to be done in making the connections to career paths, maybe some work to be done with academic advising
- Rigor should perhaps also be considered as part of the experience and not just on the academic side, which is how students seem to perceive it (lecture=rigor; out of classroom= just an experience).

Community partner focus group re-cap:

- Some mixed experience with the students, students coming from different programmatic sources, at times, they were comparing and contrasting the experience of how students came to them through a course versus a student group, internship, or Federal Work Study.
- Faculty supervision and guidance seemed to be absent (at times)
- Community partners assume that JHU students will come in with technical skills, but would also like them to come with a particular disposition and be a bit more prepared for work in difficult communities, etc.
- Community partners also said that they do enjoy being asked for help by students (for example, recommendation letters), the see themselves as forming a real partnership with students and as co-educators in the process of the internship/work

CBL Board discussion points on focus group results:

- We can begin by trying to recognize and include the community partners, to make them feel more integrated with the university, that may be a demand that is missing, and you might even ask those with whom we have strong relationships what we can do to improve.
- As a center, recognize faculty, staff, and community partners who are doing some great work, perhaps offer some baseline information on how to interact with the community, we might be able to get them prepared internally
- Faculty member could invite their community partners to have more say in which students they are sending
- The CSC may need to create an appropriate mechanism for community partners to speak to the faculty members and to deal with issues constructively
- SOURCE meets the community partners, faculty members, and students and serves as a connector for all three parties. She and other staff at the office make sure the

community partners know to contact them right away if there is any problem, and they conduct initial interview. This is a benefit of being a formal SOURCE partner.
- The CSC has very limited staffing capacity to support CBL, may not have the capacity to be more hands-on with faculty-community relationships
- Student TAs serving as a mediator/course support would be great; having a cohort of capable teaching assistants would be helpful to keep building up
- Having a competitive graduate fellowship that offers compensation equivalent to a stipend would draw a lot of competitive candidates from the Homewood doctoral programs
- "Rising to the Challenge" campaign, could get funding through Institute of American Cities initiative, etc., to fund TA-ships that are relevant

c. **Next steps in connecting with those faculty/staff who indicated interest in community engagement:**

- The CSC will follow up with those interested in connecting. Offices with multiple staff interested may warrant a meeting with staff.
- Sheridan Libraries was working on a technical framework for creating a faculty-project database based on a Canadian model; if we can compile a collection of resources via the Sheridan Libraries, it would be great to collaborate with them if they are interested
- Collaboration with UPenn to see what students across universities are doing, talked about creating a joint course across several universities, can co-teach courses—diverse faculty, student, and community populations in this way
- Students would be doing that and posting the sites, students are much more interested in doing that than something else, if you want more information, you can come to the site

III. Check-in on 2013-2014 Work Plan (Three sections to be highlighted)

a. **Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR):**
- CBPR is, ideally, community-driven research with the university supporting and providing technical expertise
- We have not touched this part of the work plan yet,
- Fits in the conversation at the Institute for the American City, been some thoughts from the administration of weaving together a comprehensive plan, leverage that opportunity to see where we fit in, how we interact with these other spaces and initiatives that are coming along, what is the environment around this scene, we will take a look at what is going to happen with CSC
- There is a separate set of faculty really interested in the research agendas that may not be interested in coursework.
- Framework of CBPR could change to "Community Engaged Research," wider umbrella and more would identify and attract a broader range of people

- Part of this is to develop really good principles and collaborations similar concept to what SOURCE has done, though some situations are different with the undergraduates.

b. Scale of CBL Report Shifting

- Will think more about how CSC's CBL work fits in with other institutional priorities (ex. HCPI, Institute for the American City). A report would now include how HCPI, our office, and centers like the Institute for the American City weave together. The administration wants some overarching status on how these all connect so things can be coordinated. Our office has a role to play in support of several things.

IV. CSC Future Plans

a. Programmatic re-structure (Health, Public Education and Urban Youth, Non-Profit Theme):

- Last winter, CSC started to think about how to better align our student group activities, we may have overgrown, 70 groups, there is definitely some duplication, they don't always communicate or work together. So, we're trying to theme service activities in three categories – 1. Health; 2. Public Education and Youth; 3. Community development/local government/non-profit/social entrepreneurship…need better framing for what this category is! Federal Work Study already supporting non-profits; would also cover the area of CIIP.
- CS FWS a certain percentage has to be used out into the community
- about 30 FWS students placed in agencies right now (per year); Gia will send board a list of agencies
- Faculty on the medical campus – working on a project to better serve communities and strengthen what they are doing, help with their infrastructure, done in partnership with the two hospitals and the School of Public Health, that kind of project is really a non-for-profit, there may be other areas on this campus that look at the non-profit sector (maybe the Carey School or Institute for Policy Studies)
- We want to be cautious with naming the third category, so that it can encompass a lot of different groups, you leave out a lot of things if you just call it "non-profits," make it a broad enough umbrella to attract rather than restrict, idea is to amplify the impact that these groups are having, been doing it by trying to reward them for collaborating, students have been fairly receptive to this
- Reason CSC picked the health groups to re-align first is that there are only 15 of them, we also saw a duplication of their efforts, have bucketed them into two groups: 1) preventative care; 2) groups that make clinical site visits. These groups have been meeting to talk about what they have been doing in loosely affiliated groups called affinity groups, but now we are telling them to meet regularly with their affinity groups and to work as a unit. Used to get up to $2K each, but now the total is, for example, $15K with pooled budgets. Two concerns we have to negotiate with students—1) they have to share money; 2) and, there has to be oversight; they are worried about losing leadership roles/autonomy

- Next year, CSC will see how this model is going and then move the other groups, next year will do the education – about 25/30 groups, a lot of external factors – Whiting's CEO has the STEM activity, Education has a lot of things going on, activities, etc…beyond our office, building cohesion around these issues
- It's important to talk about efficiency and effectiveness for the campus as a whole when it comes to education; could maybe develop common curricula/methods for student-school engagement programs
- Shifting to course evaluations – faculty should all be having one of those optional three end of term evaluations to ask CBL questions of students, maybe ask about lectures and their work in the community, we have to be much more purposeful and specific
- Questions would have to be developed this weekend!
- SOURCE has a separate evaluation, faculty administer it and assign five points to it, faculty have leeway about questions around the subject matter; then follow-up to let them know which students did not take it.
- Approaching deadline to ask three questions to ask to this
- Some of the faculty might not have had time to think of questions, some faculty are not adding questions, but most would be glad to receive some prepared questions ahead of time

b. **Quick Re-cap of initial 5-year planning:**

- HSA Academic Services offices are undergoing a 5-year benchmarking activity for a report
- Rollin is working on this
- Initial thoughts: CSC is very light on the staff side – other institutions benchmarked have about 20 full-time staff for similar levels of work– CSC has about 7 (plus AmeriCorps member)
- Potential idea is using strong faculty who can serve as liaisons, establishing a very strong base is really important. May be a solution as there are limited growth options without more staff
- Loyola University of Maryland could be used as one of your benchmark models
- CSC has also looked at Loyola in Chicago (woven into the institutional culture); JHU is trying to head in that direction

****Next Meeting: Friday, February 21, 2014 3:00-5:00 pm (tent.)****