
SMSU Civic Engagement 2004-2014: Insights from Multiple Data Sources
FACULTY PERSPECTIVE

October 15, 2014

Draft#1 – Submitted by Christine Olson for HLC Review

Question	Campus-wide Surveys of Civic Engagement: 2004 and 2009	NSSE 2008, 2011, 2013	HERI Faculty Survey 2005-2006	CMG Survey 2008- 2014	Service- Learning Course Outcome s (2010- 2012)
FACULTY					
<p><i>In what ways do faculty say they encourage civic engagement at SMSU?</i></p>	<p><i>-Most frequent ways faculty encourage civic engagement - i.e., specific forms of civic engagement faculty encourage (55-85% of faculty surveyed in 2009, in descending order):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Talking about current events -Becoming active member of gp/assn -Voting -Using variety of media sources to become aware of current events -Following govt and public affairs <p><i>-Moderately frequent ways faculty encourage civic engagement (25-54% of faculty surveyed in 2009, in descending order):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Enhancing awareness of sustainable living practices -Community problem solving -Listening to news on radio, TV, Internet - Knowledgeable about electoral processes - Reading newspapers as “text” in classroom - Volunteering 		<p>-Service to Community Overall, SMSU indicated greater % faculty involved in service themselves than comparable institutions and committed to instilling a commitment to service in students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal involvement in community or public service work, 1 or more hrs/wk (SMSU 79% vs. 67%) - Taught service-learning course (SMSU is similar to other institutions, with about 20% have incorporated service into course instruction in 2005) -Advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work (SMSU 60% vs. 41%) -Have published op-ed pieces or editorials (29% vs. 21%) HERI cont.... -Becoming involved with programs to clean up environment (39% vs. 32%) -Been involved with exhibitions or performances fine or applied arts (28% vs. 21%) 		

<p><i>In what ways do faculty say they encourage civic engagement at SMSU? (cont.)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encouraging day-to-day awareness of decisions made re sustainable living - Participating in social justice/human rights events - Taking service-learning courses - Not buying something because of conditions under which it was made <p><i>Infrequent ways faculty encourage civic engagement (fewer than 25% of faculty surveyed, in descending order):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encouraging students to initiate sustainable living project - Contacting print media - Signing a petition - Buying products because of approval of values of company that produces it - Displaying buttons, signs, etc. for candidates - Taking part in protest march or demonstration - Making campaign contributions 				
---	--	--	--	--	--

<p>In what ways do faculty involve students in the community, including service-learning?</p>	<p>From Faculty Civic Engagement Survey (2009, n= 65)</p> <p>General engagement with community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure to community through guest speaker (65%) • Internship/practicum (63%) • Collaboration with P-12 (59%) • Research with community partners (39%) • Working with not-for profit entity (39%) • Student teaching (31%) <p>Have taught service-learning course:</p> <p>-Total courses with service component (~ 35 in 2009, up from 23 in 2004</p>	<p>-SMSU have collaborated with local community in research or teaching to a slightly <u>greater extent</u> than faculty at comparable institutions (54% vs. 50%)</p> <p>-Have used scholarship to address community needs (62%)</p>	
<p>Do faculty value service and service-learning?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Service-learning is viewed as valuable pedagogy by faculty at SMSU In 2009, 8.6/10 scale 1-10, 10 “strongly agree”—slight increase from 8/10 in 2004. - Faculty currently involved OR interested in incorporating service into instruction – 77% in 2009, up from 68% in 2004 (high valuing/interest) 	<p>-SMSU faculty place <u>higher value</u> than comparable institutions on the following:</p> <p>n= 70 (52% female, 48% male); Comparisons made to public 4-year colleges</p> <p>-“preparing students for responsible citizenship” (71% at SMSU vs. 62%)</p> <p>-“instilling a commitment to community service” (49% vs. 35%)</p> <p>-“enhance students’ self-understanding” (68% vs. 59%)</p> <p>-“develop moral character” (67% vs. 59%)</p> <p>-“facilitate search for meaning and purpose” (49% vs. 35%)</p>	

<p>Do faculty value service and service-learning? (cont.)</p>		<p>-SMSU Faculty beliefs related to service and higher education in general --% strong agreement with following statements— (generally indicates <u>high value placed on service to community/region</u>):</p> <p>-Colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems (70%)</p> <p>-Colleges should encourage students to be involved in community service (87%)</p> <p>-Colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address social issues (90%)</p>		
<p>Why do faculty teach service-learning courses ?</p>	<p>Motives for teaching service-learning courses (2009)</p> <p>- % indicating following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve student learning (90%) - Richer classroom environment (72%) - Prepare students for lifelong commitment to community engagement (60%) - To produce knowledge (50%) - To improve teaching (45%) - To receive monetary resources (10%) - Professional recognition (2%) 			

<p>What keeps faculty from teaching service-learning courses?</p>	<p>Faculty noted the following primary barriers to service learning, in descending order (2009): -Lack of time (49%) -Relevance to discipline (39%, down from 43% in 2004) - Lack of knowledge (22%, down from 28% in 2004)</p> <p>Need for more greater infrastructure of support for service learning: Percent of faculty agreement with – “SMSU offers adequate infrastructure to support faculty efforts to incorporate service into academic and co-curricular activities” (5.4 /10 in 2009, up from 4.8 in 2004.... Need for improvement.)</p>	<p>-In 2006, fewer SMSU faculty believed administration is willing to provide resources for faculty to engage in community based learning than comparable public institutions (27% SMSU faculty vs. 34 % at comparable institutions believe admin is willing to provide resources for faculty to engage in community based learning)</p>	
--	---	--	--

CONCLUSIONS: FACULTY AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

- Faculty place a high value on community service as pedagogy and high value on helping students think of themselves as engaged citizens--higher than similar public 4-year institutions.
 - Civic Engagement Survey results of graduating seniors from 2008-2013 indicate the best predictor of increased “civic mindedness” is number of “service-learning” courses taken.
- Faculty engage in -and encourage students to engage in- a variety of types of civic engagement, including service, but many other forms of civic engagement as well (writing letters to editor, voting, joining clubs/organizations, becoming involved with electoral processes).
- For several forms of civic engagement, faculty indicate higher degree of encouragement than is actually reported by SMSU students, specifically: awareness of current events; active group membership; voting; following and becoming involved with government affairs, contacting public officials; and community problem solving.

- A greater number of faculty indicate valuing service learning as pedagogy than actually teach service learning courses (a majority, about four out of five, faculty indicate high valuing of service learning pedagogy, while about one third have recently taught a course that includes community service). Among those who teach service-learning courses, several teach more than one course, which helps to account the fact that over half of graduating seniors from 2009-2013 indicate that they have taken at 1-2 courses that include service or community-based learning experiences, with about 15% indicating they have taken three or more of these types of courses.
 - May be important to note that (in 2006 HERI Faculty Survey) SMSU faculty spent more time teaching, preparing for teaching and engaging in committee work than faculty at comparable institutions. They also made more frequent use of the following grading intensive modes of instruction than comparable institutions: have essay format mid-term or final exams; allow multiple drafts of work; and make use of reflective writing/journaling assignments). In addition, SMSU faculty worked with undergraduates on research projects to greater extent than comparable institutions (79% vs. 60%). Moreover, frequency of working in time intensive way with students on research projects has most likely increased with the increased faculty/student involvement in the Annual Undergraduate Research Conference in recent years.
 - Also it is important to note that 2010-2013 greater than 80% of graduating seniors reported having been involved with some form of civic engagement, and course based civic engagement accounts for an average of 8% of that involvement. (Though a majority of seniors report some involvement in civic engagement, “frequent” involvement is somewhat rare.)
- Primary barriers to teaching service-learning courses include time constraints and logistics of setting up service-learning courses, tracking progress and evaluating outcomes. (Very small percentage of faculty – 4%- indicate “lack of interest” as reason for not teaching service-learning course.)

Changes made from 2010-2014 in response to review of assessment data:

- Recognizing limited human resources in the form of not having continuous staff at the Center for Civic Engagement (i.e., the Center is staffed by part-time undergraduate and graduate students who are supervised by faculty co-coordinators (with 3 credits reassigned time/year, combined), primary attention has been given to enhancing the Center for Civic Engagement website to make it a more useful resource for faculty, students and staff (development of an online database of service sites, online forms for tracking various forms of civic involvement by campus groups –e.g. clubs, residential life halls, athletics, online forms for tracking ways in which faculty incorporate a civic component to classroom instruction). See SMSU Center for Civic Engagement website for more detail.
- Membership in both Minnesota Campus Compact and American Association of State Colleges and Universities has been recently renewed by President Gores 2013-2014. This once again makes it possible to access resources such as grants, consultation services, regional/national conferences, etc.

