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Collecting Data about Community-Engaged Scholarship and University Outreach at MSU

For quite some time, Michigan State University has worked on defining, assessing, measuring, advocating, and supporting engaged scholarship and university outreach.

• Historical Context for Collecting Data
  • Definitions and Assessing Quality

• Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI)
  • Progress: OEMI and Complementary Data Collection at MSU

• Utilizing Data about Community-Engaged Scholarship and University Outreach
Defining Outreach and Engagement

“Outreach [and engagement] is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.”

Outreach and Engagement Takes Many Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engaged Research and Creative Activity</th>
<th>Engaged Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Engaged Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Community-based research</td>
<td>• Online and off-campus education</td>
<td>• Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applied research</td>
<td>• Continuing education</td>
<td>• Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contractual research</td>
<td>• Occupational short course, certificate, and licensure programs</td>
<td>• Policy analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstration projects</td>
<td>• Contract instructional programs</td>
<td>• Expert testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs and assets assessments</td>
<td>• Participatory curriculum development</td>
<td>• Knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program evaluations</td>
<td>• Non-credit classes and programs</td>
<td>• Commercialization of discoveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Translation of scholarship through presentations, publications, and web sites</td>
<td>• Conferences, seminars, and workshops</td>
<td>• Creation of new business ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exhibitions and performances</td>
<td>• Educational enrichment programs for the public and alumni</td>
<td>• Clinical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Service-learning</td>
<td>• Human and animal patient care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study abroad programs with engagement components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-college programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historical Context for Collecting this Data

1993 – 1996

• In its 1993 report, the Provost’s Committee on University Outreach formally recommended that MSU establish a system for measuring, monitoring, and evaluating outreach. This system should have sufficient standardization to permit aggregation at the unit, college, and University levels, and also offer sufficient flexibility to accommodate important differences across disciplines, professions, and units. (p. 14)

• Review and revisions are made to several university reporting forms
  – Faculty effort form (faculty time usage)
  – Professional accomplishments form (products/artifacts)
  – Contracts and grants transmittal documentation (proposed/received grants)

• New narrowly-focused reporting instruments are created and fielded
  – Annual off campus credit instruction report
  – Annual noncredit instruction report
  – Noncredit instruction module in the Course Load Instruction Funding and Modeling System (CLIFMS)
Defining Quality Outreach and Engagement

1993 – 1996

- **Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning and Evaluating Quality Outreach** (1996), building attention for assessing engaged scholarship
  - Quality is assessed across four dimensions:
    - Significance
    - Context
    - Scholarship
    - Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>SAMPLE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF QUALITATIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Importance of Issue/Opportunity to be Addressed</td>
<td>How serious are the issues to the scholarly community, specific stakeholders, and the public?</td>
<td>Documentation of issues and opportunities based on concrete information, e.g., opportunity assessment, social economic indicators, stakeholder testimony, previous work.</td>
<td>Indicators of demand/need. Number of citations; issue addressed in the literature. Financial and other resource contributions. Number of participants. Calculation of opportunity cost in terms of resources (i.e., people, projects, revenues).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals/Objectives of Consequence</td>
<td>Updated stakeholders agreed that the goals and objectives are valuable? If the goals are accomplished, will there be a significant consequence or impact? Will value be added?</td>
<td>Narrative discussing scope and potential impact. All stakeholders understand the goals and objectives as stated. Increased visibility in community or profession; new structures created; new skills developed and knowledge generated.</td>
<td>Projections of scope and potential impact. Degree of opportunity to change the situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Defining Quality Outreach and Engagement (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>SAMPLE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF QUALITATIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Consistency with University/Unit Values and Stakeholder Interests</td>
<td>To what extent is the project consistent with the university's/unit's mission? To what extent is the project a high priority among the external stakeholders? Does the plan recognize the relevance of ethical and professional standards for the initiative? Does the project demonstrate sensitivity to diverse audiences and interests? Is there an appropriate fit (consideration of the interests and well-being of all participants) between the target audiences and the goals and objectives?</td>
<td>Comparison with explicit mission statements and goals. Plans recognizing ethical issues and regulations/guidelines to assure compliance. Evidence of ability to work sensitively with external audiences and key groups. Interviews with those potentially affected by the project. Comparison with stakeholder reports, proposals, letters of inquiry.</td>
<td>Number of contacts and planning meetings of stakeholders. Resources/methods used to promote program. Profile of audience, i.e., demographic characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriateness of Expertise</td>
<td>To what extent does the project fit with the individual's and the unit's available expertise and research? To what extent does the project utilize appropriate expertise among the stakeholders and/or external sources?</td>
<td>Evidence of scholarship related to project or prior work in the field. Narrative showing degree of fit between project needs and expertise deployed. Relevant offices and organizations involved in the project.</td>
<td>Numbers and types of expertise involved; e.g., tenure-track faculty, academic staff, students, stakeholders, external consultants? Number of stakeholders in leadership roles. Related activities; e.g., years of experience, numbers of articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of Collaboration</td>
<td>To what extent do all the stakeholders participate in planning, defining impacts, implementing, and assessing the project? To what extent is communication and interaction open and multi-directional? Does the nature of the collaboration lead to timely and effective decision-making? What contribution does the collaboration make to capacity building and sustainability?</td>
<td>Language and structure of partnership agreements. Identification, participation, and retention of all stakeholders. Communication logs and minutes of meetings. Progress report from stakeholders.</td>
<td>Number of partners or collaborative arrangements. Number of intra-institutional linkages. Number of inter-institutional linkages. Number of planning meetings. Percentage of deadlines met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriateness of Methodological Approach</td>
<td>Is there an appropriate approach underlying the design; i.e., developmental, participatory? Does the project utilize an appropriate methodology? How does the project recognize and accommodate for the variety of learning styles, ways of decision-making and taking action, and education levels of the stakeholders? Does the project have a comprehensive and informative evaluation plan? Is there a plan to determine whether or not the project/collaboration will/should continue?</td>
<td>Evidence of scholarship on the application of the method to related issues. Evidence of adaptation during project implementation. Evidence that audience education level and learning style were considered. Process documentation by project director through journals, etc.</td>
<td>Number of instances of innovations in delivery; e.g., student involvement, use of technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficiency and Creative Use of Resources</td>
<td>Are available resources sufficient to the scope of the effort? To what extent are multiple sources and types of resources (i.e., human, financial, capital, volunteer, etc.) being utilized? Are the goals/objectives realistic considering the context and available resources?</td>
<td>Evidence of integration and creative use of multiple types and sources of resources. New funding sources identified and leveraged.</td>
<td>Amounts and types of the resources by source. Changes in extramural funding for outreach activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Defining Quality Outreach and Engagement (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DIMENSION</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMPONENTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>SAMPLE QUESTIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXAMPLES OF QUALITATIVE INDICATORS</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXAMPLES OF QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Scholarship    | Knowledge Resources | - To what extent is the project shaped by knowledge that is up-to-date, cross-disciplinary, and appropriate to the issue?  
- Is knowledge in the community or among the stakeholders utilized?  
- To what extent is there an awareness of competing methodologies, replicable models, expertise, and/or writing related to the project? | - Annotated narrative showing what sources of knowledge are used; i.e., community assessments, previous works, and applied theory.  
- Quality and fit of the citations, outside experts, or consultants.  
- Assessment of experience and accomplishments of major project participants external to the university. | - Number of cross-disciplinary resources utilized.  
- Number of years in positions.  
- Dates of citations.  
- Number of experts cited, participating. |
|               | Knowledge Application | - How well are the project and its objectives defined?  
- Is the project design appropriate to the context and does it recognize the scope, complexity, and diversity?  
- To what extent is there innovation in the application of knowledge and methodologies?  
- Does the plan foresee a potential new application of knowledge gained for use in specific settings?  
- Does the plan include provision for ongoing documentation of activities, evaluation, and possible midstream modification? | - Professional feedback on the clarity of the project.  
- Input from community, stakeholders, students, etc., attesting that the project plan is clear, appropriate, inclusive, and understandable.  
- Reflective narrative, rationale for project, and documentation of the design process. | - Number of in-house communications related to the project; e.g., in-house documents, interim reports, newsletters, e-mail messages, chat rooms, bulletin boards.  
- Number of citations from the literature circulated within the project. |
|               | Knowledge Generation | - Does the project plan pose a new model or hypothesis in addressing the issues?  
- Was new knowledge generated; i.e., program hypotheses confirmed or revised, outcomes creatively interpreted, new questions for scholarship asked?  
- Were unanticipated developments appropriately incorporated into the final interpretation of the results? | - Lessons learned documented.  
- Assessment of scholarly merit by internal peer review process.  
- External review of performance by stakeholders relative to innovation, satisfaction with approach and results.  
- Project garnered awards, honors, citations relative to its scholarship. | - Number of times project cited, recognized.  
- Number of acceptances for publications, speaking engagements.  
- Number of requests for consulting.  
- Number of programs, curricula influenced by scholarly results.  
- Publications in refereed journals.  
- Professional speaking engagements. |
|               | Knowledge Utilization | - Are the stakeholders and potential interest groups involved in understanding and interpreting the knowledge generated?  
- Is the knowledge generated by the project available for dissemination, utilization, and possible replication?  
- In what ways is the knowledge being recorded, recognized, and rewarded? | - Stakeholder feedback.  
- Project generated a replicable, innovative model.  
- Nature of groups or institutions applying knowledge generated.  
- Case studies or examples of utilization. | - Scope of involvement in interpretation and dissemination; e.g., numbers and types of participants.  
- Number of different avenues chosen to communicate results. |
Defining Quality Outreach and Engagement (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>SAMPLE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF QUALITATIVE INDICATORS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact on Issues, Institutions, and Individuals</td>
<td>- To what extent were the project goals and objectives met?</td>
<td>- Description of impacts (i.e., significance and scope of benefits) on the issue, stakeholders, and beneficiaries, to include: Needs fulfilled, issues addressed, population or group involved in process. Institutional processes changed. Replicable innovation developed.</td>
<td>- Changes from benchmark or baseline measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Did the products or deliverables meet the planning expectations?</td>
<td>- Inventory of new or developed skills.</td>
<td>- Number of appropriate products generated for practitioners and public (e.g., technical reports, bulletins, books, monographs, chapters, articles, presentations, public performances, testimony, training manuals, software, computer programs, instructional videos, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Were intended, unintended, and potential impacts documented and interpreted?</td>
<td>- Technology adopted and maintained.</td>
<td>- Number of products distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Was that documentation rigorous, thorough, understandable, and defensible?</td>
<td>- Surveys or reports of changed behaviors or attitudes.</td>
<td>- Number and percentage of beneficiaries reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Were stakeholders satisfied? Did they value the results and apply the knowledge?</td>
<td>- Assessments on outcomes by individuals, students, and stakeholders.</td>
<td>- Number of contracts, patents, copyrights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project develop mechanisms for sustainability?</td>
<td>- Benefits resulting from changes in practice; e.g., knowledge applied, processes or approaches more efficient, circumstances improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project broaden access to the university?</td>
<td>- Result of changes in institutional and/or public policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project leverage additional resources for any partners?</td>
<td>- Evidence that knowledge is used in subsequent research, projects, or public discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent were undesired dependencies eliminated?</td>
<td>- How effectively are the products or results reaching the intended interest group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent were the project goals and objectives met?</td>
<td>- How does the project increase cross-disciplinary collaborations within the university?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability and Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project build capacity for individuals, institutions, or social infrastructure, i.e., financial, technological, leadership, planning, technical, professional, collaborative, etc.?</td>
<td>- Co-authored reports and presentations.</td>
<td>- Number of new collaborations considered or established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project develop mechanisms for sustainability?</td>
<td>- Opportunities for new collaborations established.</td>
<td>- Number of off-campus courses offered with syllabus modifications to accommodate nontraditional students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project broaden access to the university?</td>
<td>- Testimonials from partners.</td>
<td>- Evidence of increased demand placed on the unit or faculty for outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent were undesired dependencies eliminated?</td>
<td>- Community partner participation in grading students, evaluating faculty/staff efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent was mutual satisfaction derived from the project?</td>
<td>- Expansion of university/unit constituency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project broaden access to the community?</td>
<td>- Role flexibility and changes that provide for greater university/community interaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the stakeholders come to understand and appreciate each others’ values, intentions, concerns, and resource base?</td>
<td>- Co-authored reports and presentations.</td>
<td>- Amount of increased student support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent was mutual satisfaction derived from the project?</td>
<td>- Opportunities for new collaborations established.</td>
<td>- Number of employment offers to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project broaden access to the university?</td>
<td>- Testimonials from partners.</td>
<td>- Number of new courses and programs approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent did the project broaden access to the community?</td>
<td>- Community partner participation in grading students, evaluating faculty/staff efforts.</td>
<td>- Number of new cross-disciplinary or inter-university collaborative efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to the University</td>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the project offer new opportunities for student learning and professional staff development?</td>
<td>Changes in quality or scope of student experiences.</td>
<td>- Increased engagement of faculty or students in outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the project lead to innovations in curriculum?</td>
<td>- Curricular changes (e.g., new syllabi, courses, curricular revisions).</td>
<td>- Amount of increased external or university support for outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the project inform other dimensions of the university mission?</td>
<td>- Teaching or research activities benefiting from outreach involvement, including cross-disciplinary research or program innovations.</td>
<td>- Revenue generated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the project increase cross-disciplinary collaborations within the university?</td>
<td>Changes in quality or scope of student experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the project increase collaboration with other institutions?</td>
<td>- Curricular changes (e.g., new syllabi, courses, curricular revisions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the project assist the unit’s or faculty member’s progress in developing outreach potential and in using that potential to improve the institution’s operations and visibility?</td>
<td>- Teaching or research activities benefiting from outreach involvement, including cross-disciplinary research or program innovations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Changes in quality or scope of student experiences.</td>
<td>- Enhanced unit reputation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLES OF QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS**

- Number of new collaborations considered or established.
- Number of off-campus courses offered with syllabus modifications to accommodate nontraditional students.
- Evidence of increased demand placed on the unit or faculty for outreach.
- Amount of increased student support.
- Number of employment offers to students.
- Number of new courses and programs approved.
- Number of new cross-disciplinary or inter-university collaborative efforts.
- Increased engagement of faculty or students in outreach.
- Amount of increased external or university support for outreach.
- Revenue generated.
Historical Context for Collecting this Data (continued)

1997 – 2005

• MSU received the University Continuing Education Association Innovations in Continuing Education Award for *Points of Distinction* (1998)

• UOE began developing a university-wide data collection instrument
  – Comprehensive reporting on outreach and engagement
  – Iterative development process drawing on findings from pilot tests with departments from different colleges, a whole college, faculty from across MSU working in Lansing, recipients of a national award for engaged scholarship

• MSU promotion and tenure guidelines were revised in 2001, aligning documentation requirements with *Points of Distinction*

• In 2002, MSU begins participating in national efforts aimed at identifying measures (CIC, APLU/NASULGC) which continue today

• The Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI), launched at MSU in 2004, has been used each year since
Historical Context for Collecting this Data (continued)

2005 - present

- MSU hosts representatives from over 60 universities in national invitational conference on Benchmarking University Engagement (2005)
- OEMI data used to support institution-wide self-studies for HLC/NCA accreditation and Carnegie classification in community engagement (2005)
- Research partnerships for use of the OEMI are developed
  - University of Connecticut (2005, pilot study only)
  - University of Kentucky (2005 – 2012)
  - University of Tennessee system (2006 – 2008)
  - Kansas State University (2007 – present)
  - Texas Tech University (2009 – present)
  - Texas A&M University – Central Texas (2012 – ?)
- OEMI receives the University Continuing Education Association Outreach and Engagement Community of Practice award for innovation (2007)
- Ongoing review of the Instrument and participation in national dialogue
Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI)

The OEMI is a survey that collects data on faculty and academic staff outreach and engagement activities

- **Process**
  - Conducted annually
  - Institution-wide
  - Online, open 24x7, January-March
  - Reporting on effort in the previous calendar year

- **Respondents**
  - Individuals, not units
  - Faculty and academic staff
Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI)

The OEMI is a survey that collects data on faculty and academic staff outreach and engagement activities:

- **Data on faculty effort**
  - Time spent
  - Societal issues addressed
  - University strategic imperatives
  - Forms of outreach and engagement
  - Location of intended impact
  - Non-university participants
  - External funding
  - In-kind support

- **Data on specific projects**
  - Purposes
  - Methods
  - Involvement of partners, units, and students
  - Impacts on external audiences
  - Impacts on scholarship
  - Creation of intellectual property
  - Duration
  - Evaluation
For help with the survey or how to complete it, see our Frequently Asked Questions. Contact us at oem@msu.edu or call 517-353-8977.

Michigan State University Survey 2012
Engagement Activities from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012

OEMI Main Menu

The buttons at the bottom of the page allow you to move from section to section. You will not be allowed to move to some sections until you respond to previous sections. For example, you must complete the Overall Effort section before proceeding with the survey.

Most questions in each section are required and must be answered before the section will be considered "completed." You may return to a completed section at any time prior to the close of the survey to change your responses; if this would have a significant impact on your other responses, the system will warn you about the impact.

If you are unable to complete a section you may return to it later after clicking the Logout link at the top of the page.

When you have completed all the required sections, a button will appear allowing you to submit your responses and provide feedback about the survey. Even after you've submitted your responses, you can still review, edit, or update them until the survey closes.

All responses must be completed by Saturday, March 30, 2013 when the survey will be closed.

Click the button below to begin.

Begin Survey >
Michigan State University Survey 2012
Engagement Activities from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012

Overall Effort

For this period, what percentage of your time did you expend in outreach/engagement work? Count all work that has an outreach/engagement component, namely, the portion of your teaching, research, and service that is conducted for the direct and immediate benefit of audiences external to the academy. Include your time spent in planning, advising, and assessing as it relates to outreach/engagement activity. Please enter the percentage of your time you spent in outreach/engagement work, not the percentage of your time that may have been formally assigned to this function by your department or college.

- I did not participate in any outreach/engagement activity during this period. To logout of the survey, select Next Section.
- I did participate in outreach/engagement activity from 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012.

What percentage of your professional effort was devoted to outreach/engagement during this period? 25%
Michigan State University Survey 2012
Engagement Activities from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012

Societal Issues

On what one or two societal issues did your outreach/engagement activities primarily focus? Select one or two issues from the list below. The term "societal issues" as used in this survey refers to issues confronting society, not to academic disciplines or methodologies. The survey results are meant to be used to report the scope of MSU academic staff's contributions to pressing societal issues: enhancing educational outcomes, improving the economy through strengthening business and industry, etc. One vital societal issue is increasing public understanding of how the findings of disciplinary study - in science, economics, cultural studies, communication - apply to people's lives. Outreach/engagement activities focused primarily on that goal should be listed under Public Understanding and Adult Learning or Education: PK-12, depending on the predominant age range of the audience.

Note: Urban and diversity focus is asked in the next section.

Please note that we have provided definitions for those societal issues that might need additional clarification. Use the ☐ icons to expand or collapse additional explanations of the issues.

- Business and Industrial Development
- Children, Youth, and Family (non-school related)
- Community and Economic Development
- Cultural Institutions and Programs
- Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade
- Food and Fiber Production and Safety
- Governance and Public Policy
- Health and Health Care
- Labor Relations, Training, and Workplace Safety
- Natural Resources, Land Use, and Environment
- Public Safety, Security, and Corrections
- Public Understanding and Adult Learning
- Science and Technology

Next Section >
Societal Issues

On what one or two societal issues did your outreach/engagement activities primarily focus? Select one or two issues from the list below. The term "societal issues" as used in this survey refers to issues confronting society, not to academic disciplines or methodologies. The survey results are meant to be used to report the scope of MSU academic staffs contributions to pressing societal issues: enhancing educational outcomes, improving the economy through strengthening business and industry, etc. One vital societal issue is increasing public understanding of how the findings of disciplinary study - in science, economics, cultural studies, communication - apply to people's lives. Outreach/engagement activities focused primarily on that goal should be listed under Public Understanding and Adult Learning or Education: PK-12, depending on the predominant age range of the audience.

Note: Urban and diversity focus is asked in the next section.

Please note that we have provided definitions for those societal issues that might need additional clarification. Use the icons to expand or collapse additional explanations of the issues.

- Business and Industrial Development
  - Engagement activities seeking to enhance business and economic development, including but not limited to managerial, financial, technological, marketing, advertising, and public relations capacity of businesses, industries, associations, and governmental agencies. Efforts to help firms adopt new technologies should be included here as should provision of education and training to support economic competitiveness. Work with firms and agencies located primarily within the agricultural industry should be classified under "Food and Fiber Production and Safety."

- Children, Youth, and Family (non-school related)
- Community and Economic Development
- Cultural Institutions and Programs
- Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade
- Food and Fiber Production and Safety
- Governance and Public Policy
- Health and Health Care
- Labor Relations, Training, and Workplace Safety
- Natural Resources, Land Use, and Environment
- Public Safety, Security, and Corrections
- Public Understanding and Adult Learning
- Science and Technology

Next Section >
### Details

What percentage of your total outreach/engagement effort was devoted to the social issues that you chose in the previous question? For example, if you spent 60% of your time in outreach activity, and of that 60%, three-quarters of that time is focused on Children, Youth, and Family (non-school related), enter 75% in that column, not 45%. If the social issues you chose do not include all your outreach/engagement effort, the total entered should be less than 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</th>
<th>Science and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the work contribute to achieving **Boldness By Design** imperatives? Use the icon next to each question to see a longer description of each imperative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhance the student experience</th>
<th>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</th>
<th>Science and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand international reach</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrich community, economic, and family life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase research opportunities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen stewardship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the work primarily focus on **urban issues**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</th>
<th>Science and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the work designed to **promote diversity**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</th>
<th>Science and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OEMI: Inside the Instrument (continued)

**What form(s) did your work take?** For each social issue, select the form(s) of your outreach/engagement. You can select multiple forms, if applicable. Use the icons to see examples of each form.

### Public Understanding and Adult Learning
- Outreach Research and Creative Activity
- Technical or Expert Assistance
- Outreach Instruction: Credit Courses and Programs
- Outreach Instruction: Non-Credit Classes and Programs
- Outreach Instruction: Public Events and Understanding
- Experiential / Service-Learning
- Clinical Service

After selecting one or more forms above, select one of them to be the primary form of engagement for this area of concern.

### Science and Technology
- Outreach Research and Creative Activity
- Technical or Expert Assistance
- Outreach Instruction: Credit Courses and Programs
- Outreach Instruction: Non-Credit Classes and Programs
- Outreach Instruction: Public Events and Understanding
- Experiential / Service-Learning
- Clinical Service

After selecting one or more forms above, select one of them to be the primary form of engagement for this area of concern.
What form(s) did your work take? For each social issue, select the form(s) of your outreach/engagement. You can select multiple forms, if applicable. Use the icons to see examples of each form.

### Public Understanding and Adult Learning

- **Outreach Research and Creative Activity**
  - May include applied research, capacity building, evaluation studies, policy analysis, and demonstration projects. Such activities are considered outreach when they are conducted in collaboration or partnership with schools, health organizations, nonprofit organizations, businesses, industries, government agencies, and other external constituents. Most generally they are intended to directly impact external entities or constituents while developing new knowledge. Research conducted specifically for academic purposes or that is shared solely with academic audiences does not constitute outreach research.

- **Technical or Expert Assistance**
  - Activities where MSU personnel respond to requests from individuals, programs, or agencies and organizations external to the university by sharing their knowledge, expertise, and skills in order to help those entities build capacity to achieve their goals. MSU personnel provide this assistance through direct interaction with the external constituency (as opposed to responding by delivering a pamphlet or reference to a Web site or the like). Activities may focus on using expertise to address or improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization or to improve knowledge and skills. This category includes such activities as consulting work that is performed for the benefit of the constituent, expert testimony and other forms of legal advice, and assisting agencies and other entities with management and operational tasks. Technical assistance includes, but is much broader than providing technology-based assistance.

### Outreach Instruction: Credit Courses and Programs

- Courses and instructional programs that offer student academic credit hours and are designed and marketed specifically to serve those who are neither traditional campus degree seekers nor campus staff. Such courses and programs are often scheduled at times and in places convenient to the working adult. Examples include: a weekend MBA program, an off-campus Master's program in Nursing offered in a rural area, an online certificate in medical technology for laboratory professionals, etc.

### Outreach Instruction: Non-Credit Classes and Programs

- Classes and instructional programs, marketed specifically to those who are neither degree seekers nor campus staff, that are designed to meet planned learning outcomes, but for which academic credit hours are not offered. In lieu of academic credit, these programs sometimes provide certificates of completion or continuing education units, or meet requirements of occupational licensure. Examples include: a short-course for engineers on the use of new composite materials, a summer writing camp for high school children, a personal enrichment program in gardening, leisure learning tours of Europe, etc. Programs designed for and targeted at MSU faculty and staff (such as professional development programs) or MSU degree-seeking students (such as career preparation or study skills classes) are not included.

### Outreach Instruction: Public Events and Understanding

- Resources designed for the public include managed learning environments (e.g., museums, libraries, gardens, galleries, exhibits); expositions, demonstrations, fairs, and performances; and educational materials and products (e.g., pamphlets, Web sites, educational broadcasting, and software). Most of these experiences are short-term and learner-directed.

### Experiential / Service-Learning

- Civic or community service that MSU students perform in conjunction with an academic course or program and that incorporates frequent, structured, and disciplined reflection on the linkages between the activity and the content of the academic experience. Other forms of experiential learning may include career-oriented practica and internships, or volunteer community service.

### Clinical Service

- All client and patient (human and animal) care provided by university faculty through unit-sponsored group practice or as part of clinical instruction and by medical and graduate students as part of their professional education. For example, this may include medical/veterinary clinical practice, counseling or crisis center services, and tax or legal clinic services.

After selecting one or more forms above, select one of them to be the primary form of engagement for this area of concern.
How many people were directly involved in or directly served by your outreach/engagement programs or activities? For example, count research partners; participants in your non-credit classes and programs and in your off-campus courses and programs; attendees at exhibits and performances; MSU students participating in experiential/service learning and those with whom they worked directly at their placements; clinical clients; and partner-organization staff and clients with whom you worked. Do not count those indirectly served such as those whom your client or partner served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</th>
<th>Science and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of people physically present at programs or activities:

Number of people not physically present but participating through technology (websites, etc.):
OEMI: Inside the Instrument (continued)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was your outreach/engagement directed specifically at institutions or individuals within Michigan?** Please specify the percentage of your overall outreach/engagement effort that was directed at Michigan by each of the social issues you selected.

If none of your work for an issue was directed at Michigan, please enter 0 as the percentage.

**Public Understanding and Adult Learning**

- List of Michigan cities
  - None of my work was directed at any of the listed cities in Michigan

**Science and Technology**

- List of Michigan cities
  - None of my work was directed at any of the listed cities in Michigan

**Was your outreach/engagement work directed at specific Michigan cities?** Indicate any of the cities from the list below by each of the social issues you selected.

**Public Understanding and Adult Learning**

- List of Michigan counties
  - None of my work was directed at any specific counties in Michigan

**Science and Technology**

- List of Michigan counties
  - None of my work was directed at any specific counties in Michigan
OEMI: Inside the Instrument (continued)

Was your outreach/engagement directed specifically at institutions or individuals within Michigan? Please specify the percentage of your overall outreach/engagement effort that was directed at Michigan by each of the social issues you selected.

If none of your work for an issue was directed at Michigan, please enter 0 as the percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was your outreach/engagement work directed at specific Michigan cities? Indicate any of the cities from the list below by each of the social issues you selected.

Public Understanding and Adult Learning
- [ ] None of my work was directed at any of the listed cities in Michigan

Science and Technology
- [ ] None of my work was directed at any of the listed cities in Michigan

List of Michigan cities
- Battle Creek
- Detroit
- East Lansing
- Flint
- Grand Rapids
- Jackson
- Kalamazoo
- Lansing
- Marquette
- Muskegon
- Traverse City
OEMI: Inside the Instrument (continued)

Was your outreach/engagement work directed at specific Michigan counties? Indicate any of the counties from the list below by each of the social issues you selected.

### Public Understanding and Adult Learning

| List of Michigan counties | None of my work was directed at any specific counties in Michigan |

### Science and Technology

| Close list of Michigan counties | None of my work was directed at any specific counties in Michigan |

Was your outreach/engagement directed specifically at institutions or individuals internationally? Indicate any of the countries from the list below by each of the social issues you selected. NOTE: By default only a list of the most populous countries is shown, but you can use "show longer list" to get a complete list.

### Public Understanding and Adult Learning

| List of countries | None of my work was directed internationally |

### Science and Technology

| Close list of countries | None of my work was directed internationally |

- Afghanistan
- Algeria
- Argentina
- Bangladesh
- Brazil
- Burma
- Canada
- China
- Colombia
- Dem Rep of Congo
- Egypt
- Ethiopia
- France
- Germany
- Ghana
- India
- Indonesia
- Iraq
- Italy
- Japan
- Kenya
- Korea, North
- Korea, South
- Malaysia
- Mexico
- Morocco
- Nepal
- Nigeria
- Pakistan
- Peru
- Philippines
- Poland
- Russia
- Saudi Arabia
- South Africa
- Spain
- Sudan
- Taiwan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- Turkey
- Uganda
- United Kingdom
- United States
- Uzbekistan
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Yemen
OEMI: Inside the Instrument (continued)

Did your outreach/engagement activity:

Bring into MSU any revenue from gifts, grants, contracts, tuition, or fees? If yes, specify how many contracts and estimate the dollar value of all gifts, grants, contracts, tuition, and fees. Include all monies contracted for during this period, even if they will be spent later.

To help us with our research, please list the MSU account numbers associated with the above-mentioned revenue, if any. Please omit punctuation, entering only digits, one per line (e.g., 21999).

Help your outreach partners generate any gifts, grants, contracts, tuition, or fees? If yes, estimate the dollar value.

Did your outreach/engagement activity benefit from in-kind contributions provided by off-campus groups and organizations involved with you in your outreach work? If yes, estimate the value of such contributions in the three areas below.

Partner staff time: Estimate the hours partner staff devoted to helping you in your work. A dollar value will be automatically calculated based on a standard rate of $35.00/hour. You have the option to change the estimated dollar value if you wish.

Volunteer time: Estimate the hours off-campus volunteers devoted to helping you in your work. A dollar value will be automatically calculated based on a standard rate of $18.50/hour. You have the option to change the estimated dollar value if you wish.

Other materials: Estimate the value of transportation, equipment, space, etc. provided by your partners.

NOTE: Please use the button below to save your data and proceed to the next section of the survey. If you do not use the button, the data you have entered will not be saved.

Next section
Michigan State University Survey 2012
Engagement Activities from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012

Describe a Project

1. **Project or activity title** (maximum 250 characters):

2. Please select the **Societal issue(s)** for this project or activity. Select all that apply:

- Business and Industrial Development
- Children, Youth, and Family (non-school related)
- Community and Economic Development
- Cultural Institutions and Programs
- Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade
- Food and Fiber Production and Safety
- Governance and Public Policy
- Health and Health Care
- Labor Relations, Training, and Workplace Safety
- Natural Resources, Land Use, and Environment
- Public Safety, Security, and Corrections
- Public Understanding and Adult Learning
- Science and Technology

3. **What actions did you take; for whom, about what issue, opportunity, or problem, and why?** Include research conducted, classes held, technology used, goals of the project, etc.
4. What was the length of this project or activity?
   (select a length from the list)

   In what year did the project start?
   
   In what year did the project end or do you expect it to end (if applicable)?
   
5. For this project, was your outreach/engagement directed at any specific counties within Michigan?
   List of Michigan counties
   None of my work was directed at any specific counties in Michigan

6. Were any of the following sponsors and/or participants involved in the work?
   University units other than your own
   Yes  No
   Graduate and/or professional students
   Yes  No
   Undergraduate students
   Yes  No

7. List the primary partners external to MSU that were involved in the work:
   
   OEMI: Inside the Instrument (continued)
8. If external collaborators and/or sponsors were involved, what were their roles? Select all that apply.

- Identified issues or problems addressed
- Assisted in planning and management
- Participated in research, evaluation or teaching
- Shared responsibility for the dissemination of products or practices
- Contributed to identifying resources to support the efforts
- Other, describe below:

9. Please classify the sources of funding for the project or activity. Select all that apply.

- Internal institutional grants
- Private industry
- Private foundations
- Governmental agencies (federal, state, and local)
- Nonprofit organizations (if not reflected by other categories)
- Other
- None

10. What types of formal evaluation did the project or activity include? Select all that apply.

- Summative
- Formative
- Other
- None

Provide description (optional):
11. What were the outcomes and impacts of the project or activity, or if the project has not ended what are the intended outcomes and impacts? For example, describe:

- External results or impacts (e.g., changes in public policy, organizational changes, environmental improvement, capacity building).
- Sustained or continued collaborative efforts resulting from this work.

12. What forms of intellectual property did the project or activity enable you to create? Select all that apply.

- Publications
- Software
- Presentations
- Reports
- Performances/exhibitions
- Training materials
- Web sites
- Inventions/patents
- Other
- None

Provide description (optional):
13. Did the project or activity have any impact on your own scholarly or teaching practices (such as new areas of research or inquiry and new pedagogical practices)? If yes, please describe.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

14. Have you created any scholarly work that assesses or describes how you went about your outreach work? If yes, please describe.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

15. Please provide any additional comments you have about this project or activity.

Note: Please use either button to save your data. Use the first if you wish to describe another project, and the second if you are finished with this survey. If you do not use one of the buttons, the data you have entered will not be saved.

Add another project  Submit survey and provide feedback.
OEMI: Inside the Instrument (continued)

Michigan State University Survey 2012
Engagement Activities from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012

Submit Survey and Provide Feedback

☑ I am finished with this survey.

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your feedback will help us to improve this survey for the future. Please provide any comments you have about this survey and how it works.

Comments (optional)

Submit

You can obtain a printable copy of your responses using the link on the main menu at any time, even after the deadline for survey submissions. Until that deadline, you can change your responses, including entering additional projects.

University Outreach and Engagement
National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement
University Outreach and Engagement • Michigan State University
Kellogg Center • 219 S. Harrison Road, Room 93 • East Lansing, MI 48824
Phone: 517.353.8977 • Fax: 517.432.9541 • E-mail: oemi@msu.edu
© 2013 Michigan State University Board of Trustees
MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity employer.
Data Collection with the OEMI at MSU: 2004-2011

- 2,942 distinct (non-duplicative) respondents have completed the survey
  - During this period the size of the faculty and academic staff has remained relatively stable (approximately 4,900 in 2011)
- 82.8% of respondents report that they have participated in some form of outreach and engagement
- The work reported by these respondents represents a collective investment by Michigan State University of $137,242,656 in faculty and academic staff time devoted to addressing the concerns of the state, nation, and world through engaged scholarship (based on the actual salary value of time spent, as reported by respondents)
- Respondents have submitted 7,126 project reports
Data Collection with the OEMI at MSU: 2011

816 = Faculty and academic staff survey respondents

$12,962,951 = Collective investment by Michigan State University in faculty and academic staff time devoted to addressing the concerns of the state, nation, and world through engaged scholarship (based on the actual salary value of time spent, as reported by respondents)

95.6% = Respondents whose outreach contributed to achieving Boldness by Design (BBD) imperatives:

75.3% = Enhanced the student experience

73.4% = Enriched community, economic, and family life

43.9% = Expanded international reach

66.9% = Increased research opportunities

55.7% = Strengthened stewardship

Data Collection with the OEMI at MSU: 2011 (continued)

Forms of Engagement Reported by MSU Faculty and Academic Staff in 2011

- Outreach Research and Creative Activity: 30%
- Technical or Expert Assistance: 24%
- Clinical Service: 3%
- Experiential/Service-Learning: 6%
- Public Events and Understanding: 16%
- Non-credit Classes and Programs: 17%
- Credit Classes and Programs: 5%

Note: The number of "responses" is greater than the number of "respondents." Respondents were given the opportunity to describe their engagement activities for up to two areas of social concern; each description was counted as a separate response.

Data Collection with the OEMI at MSU: 2011 (continued)

Forms of Outreach Cross-Tabulated with Societal Concerns for 2011

Note: The number of "responses" is greater than the number of "respondents." Respondents were given the opportunity to describe their engagement activities for up to two areas of social concern; each description was counted as a separate response.

Complementary Data Collected by MSU: Service-Learning & Civic Engagement Registration

Number of Student Registrations for Service-Learning Received and Accommodated (2002-2012)

Utilizing Data about Community-Engaged Scholarship and University Outreach

Centralized data can serve a variety of purposes

- Describing the university's outreach and engagement activity (telling the engagement story)
  - Communicating examples across disciplines and sectors
    - Helping faculty develop better understandings of what community-engaged scholarship might look like in their field
    - Helping stakeholders see the many ways in which the University partners with communities, businesses, government agencies, schools, and NGO’s
  - Recognizing exemplars
    - Helping the institution represent what it considers to be high quality community-engaged scholarship
    - Helping the public understand that the University values engagement
Utilizing Data about Community-Engaged Scholarship and University Outreach (continued)

• Responding to accreditation and other institutional self-studies

• Benchmarking and exploring cross-institutional analyses

• Conducting assessments and strategic planning

• Documenting the salary investment of a university’s contributions of scholarship for the public good

• Mapping the locations of partnerships

• Assisting faculty networking efforts in particular communities and/or around specific topics

• Supporting faculty development efforts

• Cataloging engagement opportunities and outreach programs to promote public access

• Source of data for original research studies

#1a: University-wide Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Academic staff time committed to outreach</th>
<th>Number of respondents/number of responses</th>
<th>Boldness by Design: # of responses indicating outreach contributed to...</th>
<th># responses indicating activity focused on...</th>
<th>Attendees or Participants</th>
<th>Activity helped generate revenue for</th>
<th>Value of partners' in-kind contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; HUMANITIES, RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE IN</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Salary Value</td>
<td>4 / 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE &amp; NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>$4,006,941</td>
<td>132 / 220</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>$644,296</td>
<td>56 / 85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION ARTS AND SCIENCES</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>$540,373</td>
<td>25 / 43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>$477,834</td>
<td>13 / 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>$467,710</td>
<td>26 / 41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF HUMAN MEDICINE</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>$468,267</td>
<td>15 / 23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF MUSIC</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>$205,211</td>
<td>7 / 11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>$376,621</td>
<td>35 / 59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF NURSING</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>$371,783</td>
<td>14 / 20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>$680,603</td>
<td>19 / 29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>$2,360,119</td>
<td>85 / 135</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>$691,421</td>
<td>27 / 43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU BROAD COLLEGE OF BUSINESS</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>$1,010,067</td>
<td>29 / 43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONORS COLLEGE</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>$23,985</td>
<td>3 / 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>$103,357</td>
<td>3 / 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES MADISON COLLEGE</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>$41,672</td>
<td>7 / 11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYMAN BRIGGS COLLEGE</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>$63,413</td>
<td>11 / 21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$382,620</td>
<td>9 / 18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATL. SUPERCONDUCTING CYCLOTRON LABORATORY</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>$13,020</td>
<td>3 / 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVOST AND OTHER CENTRAL OFFICES</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>$1,959,991</td>
<td>52 / 80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 173.50 | $14,876,003 | 575 / 925 | 726 | 669 | 401 | 598 | 548 | 191 | 419 | 1,863,502 | $111,814,472 | $205,712,406 | $15,349,447

*The number of "responses" may be greater than the number of "respondents," since each respondent who indicated involvement in outreach and engagement had the opportunity to describe those activities in either one or two Areas of Concern -- each such description is counted as a separate response. Therefore, there may be more "responses" than "respondents."
### #1b: University-wide Summary by Area of Concern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Academic staff time committed to outreach</th>
<th>Number of responses*</th>
<th>Boldness by Design: # of responses indicating outreach contributed to...</th>
<th># responses indicating activity focused on...</th>
<th>Attendees or Participants</th>
<th>Activity helped generate revenue for</th>
<th>Value of partners’ in-kind contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Salary Value</td>
<td>Community Economic &amp; Family Issues</td>
<td>Student Experience</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Research Opps</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>$1,421,620</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth, and Family (non-school related)</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>$1,202,776</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Economic Development</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>$1,026,077</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Institutions and Programs</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>$776,616</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>$1,537,981</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Fiber Production, and Safety</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>$1,560,715</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Public Policy</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>$548,432</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Health Care</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>$1,710,741</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations, Training, and Workplace Safety</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>$228,558</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources, Land Use, and Environment</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>$1,227,506</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Security, and Corrections</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>$409,114</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>$1,010,085</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>$836,662</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>157.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,493,252</strong></td>
<td><strong>925</strong></td>
<td><strong>726</strong></td>
<td><strong>669</strong></td>
<td><strong>401</strong></td>
<td><strong>598</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of “responses” may be greater than the number of “respondents” since each respondent who indicated involvement in outreach and engagement had the opportunity to describe those activities as addressing up to two Areas of Concern; each such description is counted as a separate response. Therefore, there may be more “responses” than “respondents,” and data from a particular respondent may be counted under two Areas of Concern.*
### College-level Data Summaries

Institutional Reports (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Social Science</th>
<th>Academic Staff Time Committed to Outreach</th>
<th>Number of Respondents / Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Boldness by Design: # of Responses Indicating Outreach Contributed to...</th>
<th># Responses Indicating Activity Focused on...</th>
<th>Attendees or Participants</th>
<th>Activity Helped Generate Revenue For</th>
<th>Value of Partners’ In-kind Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Salary Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engagement &amp; Family Issues</td>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Outreach Reach</td>
<td>Research Opps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology Social Science</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>$149,951</td>
<td>12 / 20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>$421,541</td>
<td>8 / 13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR for Adv Study of Int'l Development - CSS</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>$21,098</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>$38,916</td>
<td>3 / 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Ecology - CSS</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>$208,817</td>
<td>0 / 14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>$115,638</td>
<td>3 / 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Urban Studies</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>$29,728</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>$43,991</td>
<td>3 / 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst for Public Policy and Social Research</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>$65,659</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>$27,546</td>
<td>2 / 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Social Science</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>$39,430</td>
<td>5 / 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities Institute</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$139,016</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Planning, Design &amp; Construction - CSS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$39,778</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Dean</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$40,092</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>$63,347</td>
<td>32 / 47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology Social Science</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>$78,490</td>
<td>2 / 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,360,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>85 / 135</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of "responses" may be greater than the number of "respondents," since each respondent who indicated involvement in outreach and engagement had the opportunity to describe those activities in either one or two Areas of Concern -- each such description is counted as a separate response. Therefore, there may be more "responses" than "respondents."
# Institutional Reports (continued)

## Outreach & Engagement Measurement Instrument (OMEI)

**Michigan State University Survey 2011**

_Engagement Activities from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011_

### Summary reports by geographic areas

Reports on this page include responses based on effort and projects.

### Summary for Geography for College Of Natural Science

_Outreach and Engagement conducted between 1/1/2011 and 12/31/2011_

**College Of Natural Science**

**Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Cns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>1 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofmann-Benning, Susanne</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biological Science Program**

No users in this group reported any outreach directed at any geographic locations.

**Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities or other places of interest</th>
<th>2 responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbach, John Adam</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbach, John Adam</td>
<td>Health and Health Care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>2 responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbach, John Adam</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbach, John Adam</td>
<td>Health and Health Care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chemistry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities or other places of interest</th>
<th>3 responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denius, Marcos</td>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissey, David J</td>
<td>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severtin, Kathryn G</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>1 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severtin, Kathryn G</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>1 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severtin, Kathryn G</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>1 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severtin, Kathryn G</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>1 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severtin, Kathryn G</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>6 responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denius, Marcos</td>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissey, David J</td>
<td>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissey, David J</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severtin, Kathryn G</td>
<td>Project: High School On-site examiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severtin, Kathryn G</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>2 responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissey, David J</td>
<td>Public Understanding and Adult Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissey, David J</td>
<td>Science Cafe presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>1 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denius, Marcos</td>
<td>Education, Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>1 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Reports (continued)

Future: Mapping Geographic Data about Community-Engaged Scholarship
Institutional Reports (continued)

Faculty Respondent Reports

Tailored Briefing Materials

MSU Activities in SE Michigan
(Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw, and Wayne Counties)
For President Simon’s Presentation in Detroit on February 24, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OME Issue(s)</th>
<th>Project Title Description</th>
<th>Project Duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
<td>Brand Consultation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>21 counties including Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw and Wayne</td>
<td>Kellogg, Achatz PC Company, Veterinary Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company Usability Workshop</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
<td>Internship Development</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>9 counties including Macomb, Oakland, and Washtenaw</td>
<td>Kohls, Target, Macy’s, JCPenney, and Sears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industrial Development</td>
<td>Interorganizational Information Systems Integration Through Industry-Wide IS Standardization</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>AIAG, NIST, and GM for automotive; EPIC for retail; MBSMO for mortgage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Data Collected through the Outreach Measurement Instrument

September, 2003

Pilot Test of the Outreach Measurement Instrument (OMI)

The Office of University Outreach and Engagement has developed a survey instrument called the Outreach Measurement Instrument (OMI) to provide feedback on how faculty and staff engage with external organizations to address pressing issues facing them in Michigan and beyond. The survey measures the degree to which the University’s outreach efforts are connected to the needs of its stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, and the broader community.

Results of the Pilot Survey

Return on Investment

Respondents to the spring 2003 pilot survey indicated that in nearly 32% of their overall outreach efforts, they were engaged in activities that addressed community needs. The OMI provides a valuable tool for measuring the impact of outreach efforts and demonstrating the return on investment for these initiatives.
Institutional Reports (continued)

Accreditation and Institutional Self-studies
Communication

The Engaged Scholar Magazine
engagedscholar.msu.edu

• Published annually
  – Distributed to MSU faculty and academic staff, community leaders, legislators, and others (local through international subscribers)

• Goals of the publication:
  – Encourage faculty to do outreach/engagement work, with emphasis on community-engaged research
  – Provide examples of what community-engaged scholarship can look like across disciplines
  – Provide information about resources available to support this work
  – Explore/elucidate theories and models (scholarly basis for the work)
Data Visualizations for MSU Publications
Communication (continued)

The Engaged Scholar E-Newsletter

- Published four times during the academic year to supplement *The Engaged Scholar Magazine*
  - More frequent publication schedule allows for timely stories and announcements, and updates about upcoming events, partnership and funding opportunities
- Each issue contains:
  - Two MSU engaged scholar stories
  - A story about MSU's priority for community and economic development in the 21st century
  - Announcements and events
- *Engaged Scholar* stories are now also linked through social networks
Recognition Programs

**Michigan State University Outreach Scholarship Community Partnership Award**

- Recognition of a faculty member and his/her partner
- Joint presentation and shared stipend
- Conferred annually since 2006
Recognition Programs (continued)

Outreach Scholarship W.K. Kellogg Foundation Engagement Award

- Competitive recognition program organized by the Association for Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU)
- Awarded annually since 2007
- MSU projects recognized in 2009 and 2011
- Recipients compete for the C. Peter Magrath Community Engagement Award

The Adolescent Diversion Project
William S. Davidson, Jr.
University Distinguished Professor,
Department of Psychology
College of Social Science

Working Together to Improve the Lives of People Affected by Epilepsy in Zambia
Gretchen L. Birbeck
Associate Professor and Director,
International Neurologic and Psychiatric Epidemiology Program
College of Human Medicine and College of Osteopathic Medicine
Public Access

Catalog Websites of Opportunities and Resources for the Public

- **MSU Statewide Resource Network**
  - Developed for working professionals
  - Catalog of MSU expert assistance and information continuing professional education programs
  - Searchable by topic, geography, program type, and keyword

- **Spartan Youth Programs**
  - Developed for the parents of pre-k through middle school children and high school students
  - Catalog of MSU precollege programs, camps, activities, and other resources for children and youth
  - Searchable by topic and grade level

[Links: msustatewide.msu.edu, spartanyouth.msu.edu]
OEMI Demo

Guest accounts for a fully functioning demonstration version of the OEMI are available. To request one, visit http://oemi.msu.edu/requestguestaccount.aspx and complete the form.

Contact Information

Burton A. Bargerstock  
E-mail: bargerst@msu.edu

University Outreach and Engagement  
Michigan State University  
Kellogg Center  
219 S. Harrison Rd., Rm. 93  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
Phone: (517) 353-8977  
Fax: (517) 432-9541  
E-mail: outreach@msu.edu  
Web: outreach.msu.edu