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**LEP OUTCOME:**

**Practice responsible citizenship in their local and global communities.**

1. Develop the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions necessary to make a difference in local and global communities.
2. Recognize themselves as part of a larger social fabric, with public lives and personal ownership of social problems.
3. Explore the nature and use of power and authority in various contexts.

4) Engage in democracy as a life-enhancing, everyday practice of skills such as:

• Attentiveness to public affairs and current events

• Regular volunteering

• Creative use of conflict

• Active group membership

1. **Introduction and articulation of guiding parameters**
2. We have taken an incremental approach to gathering and analyzing data related to the “practice responsible citizenship” outcome, building on data gathered and analyzed from several sources thus far, while identifying additional sources of data.
   1. We have reviewed and summarized efforts to assess civic engagement and develop an infrastructure of support for civic engagement at SMSU as context for our current assessment processes (see Appendix A: Historical Timeline: SMSU Center for Civic Engagement and other infrastructure support documents).
   2. With regard to previous campus-wide assessment processes, we have reviewed two comprehensive, campus-wide assessment efforts, one conducted in 2004 and one conducted in 2009. The 2009 report includes summary of insights from 2004 for baseline point of comparison (see Appendix B: Campus-wide Surveys of Civic Engagement, 2004;2009).
   3. Prior to this current Ad Hoc Assessment Committee evaluation process, insights from these two previous campus-wide civic engagement assessment processes have been reviewed and discussed in a variety of campus-wide venues (e.g. All University Conversations, Professional Development Day events, and Strategic Planning Day events). In addition, members of the Center for Civic Engagement Faculty Advisory Group, representing nine academic disciplines, have discussed insights from these campus-wide assessment initiatives. Meetings have also been held with administrative staff in all Student Services areas and with members of the Presidents’ Cabinet to discuss results. (See examples of presentations and campus-wide review and discussion of insights gained in Appendix C, including an overview of the AHA Practice Responsible Citizenship process and key insights gained.)
3. We have assumed a broad conceptualization of civic engagement, and one informed by national initiatives related to promotion and measurement of civic engagement outcomes in higher education contexts

e.g., AACU - Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) (Launched the *Crucible Moment* report in January 2012, commissioned by Department of Education AACU and Global Perspective Institute—national call to action designed to make civic and democratic learning an expected outcome for every college student). See AACU website for description of other relevant, recent initiatives of this kind along with *Civic Learning and Democratic Engagements: A Review of the Literature on Civic Engagement in Post-Secondary Education, which informed A Crucible Moment's.)*

1. We have made use of relevant rubrics (or portions of rubrics) available through American Association for Colleges and Universities (AACU), Campus Compact (CC) , and American Association of State Colleges and University (AASCU-American Democracy Project)

e.g., AACU VALUE Civic Engagement Rubric

1. We have started with assessment of selected indicators of overall “practice responsible citizenship” outcome noted below. (i.e., We decided to not try to address all sub-outcomes at the outset.)

Outcome 8: Practice responsible citizenship in their local and global communities.

* Develop the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions necessary to make a difference in local and global communities.
* Recognize themselves as part of a larger social fabric, with public lives and personal ownership of social problems.
* Explore the nature and use of power and authority in various contexts.
* Engage in democracy as a life-enhancing, everyday practice of skills such as:
* Attentiveness to public affairs and current events
* Regular volunteering
* Creative use of conflict
* Active group membership

1. We have assumed that this outcome, of the seven LEP outcomes, is particularly conducive to “bridging” academic and student affairs realms, therefore we have gathered and analyzed data we have collaborated with student affairs units throughout this assessment process.
2. We have attempted to identify measures that are both useful and not very time or logistics intensive so that may be easily incorporated into a variety of courses related to the outcome.
3. **Summary chart of data gathered thus far and insights gained (2009-2015)**

A chart summarizing assessment of civic engagement processes over the past six years is provided below. Following is a more detailed description of data gathered and analyzed (or in process), along with an articulation of initial conclusions drawn across these various sources.

(See chart below.)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Civic Engagement Assessment Report:**  **General Summary 2009-2015** | | | | |
| **Assessment Measure/Process** | | **Data Collected and Analyzed**  **(note timeframe)** | **Review of Results:**  **Key Insights** | **Examples of how insights have been used to guide instruction and program development** |
| **LEP: Evaluation Fr 🡪 Sr**  **CES- Civic  Engagement Survey (Graduating Seniors)**  **CES – R - Revised for use with LEP 100 sections (Freshman)** | | Administered annually to graduating seniors (2009-2014)  Administered to LEP 100 sections in Fall 2014 (in process of analyzing) | PROCESS:   * Review of data done by multiple entities: Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement; All University and Lunch & Learn discussions; Center for CE student staff and faculty supervisors; selected academic disciplines active with service-learning; LEP Ad Hoc (AHA) - Civic Engagement Committee   KEY INSIGHTS:   * SMSU similar to comparable NSSE institutions in service involvement * Very small percentage OF students “regularly involved” (i.e. monthly) in volunteering * Tracking of data from *Let Us Know f*orms used with Res Life, Student Clubs, and Athletics not in sync with CMG findings – more civic engagement involvement than reflected in CMG (possibly due to student not interpreting certain forms of civic behavior as “civic engagement” ) * Need for efficiently getting word out about service and other forms of civic engagement opportunities * Need for education about multi-faceted nature of civic engagement * Service-learning participation indicating subjective gains in personal development, skill/knowledge of discipline, and career development, along with increased motivation for further involvement with service, enhanced motivation to stay at SMSU and enhanced relationships with faculty. * Service-learning experience main predictor of civic mindedness | * Intentional about orienting students to broad range of civic activities in selected LEP 400 classes * Updated Center for CE website to get word out about civic engagement opportunities * Created online forms for gathering information and getting word out about service opportunities * Created online tracking forms for Res Life, Student Clubs, Athletics and other student groups involved with service * Created *How to Make a Difference* with... (insert particular social problem such as hunger) to orient students to broad variety of forms of CE for selected social problems |
| **LEP: Mode of evaluation for use with courses addressing“ Engaged Citizen” outcome &**  **LEP 100/LEP 400 courses**  ***CES: What does civic engagement mean to you?***   * Qualitative (coded themes) * In process of developing Likert Scales | | Administered Sp2013, Fall 2013, & Sp 2014 to the following classes:  Contemporary Issues (4 sections)  Developmental Psychology (2 sections) |
| **Additional data gathering/analysis of**  **civic engagement/SL** | | |
| **Campus-wide Survey of Civic Engagement** | Administered 2009  (previous administration in 2004) | |
|  | -Administered to selected service-learning courses (piloting use w/ 3 courses 2012-13) | |
| **Service-Learning Outcomes: Student Questionnaire** | Administered to selected service-learning courses (piloting use w/ 3 courses 2012-13) | |
| **NSSE Reports (reviewed)** | -Reviewed three recent admin (most recent 2013) | |
| ***Let Us Know* CE Tracking Forms** | -2013-2014 Data gathered for Res Life, Student Clubs, and Athletics in progress | |

1. **Detailed description of data gathered and insights gained**
2. **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE-2008, 2011, and 2013): Process and Insights Gained** 
   * 1. SMSU has administered the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) four times (2004, 2008, 2011, and 2013), the team primarily focused review of NSSE data from 2008, 2011 and 2013 in particular.
     2. Themes most relevant to “practice responsible citizenship” 2008 and 2011 Reports:
        1. “Active and Collaborative Learning Experiences”

* Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)
* Participated in a community (based project (e.g.,

service- learning) as part of a regular course

* + - 1. “Enriching Educational Experiences”
* Hours spent participating in co-curricular activities (clubs, organizations)

● Community service or volunteer work

● Serious conversations with students of different religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values

3. Slight trend upward with civic engagement themes noted above (and other NSEE themes) from 2004- 2011 (See multi-year benchmark report at SMSU Data Management and Institutional Research website.)

* + 1. Sub-Committee of Committee for Institutional Assessment met to review data from 2013 NSSE, including civic engagement indicators. See initial insights below.

**Summary of Key Insights from NSSE 2008, ’11 and ’13:**

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) has been administered to first-year and senior-year students at SMSU three times in the last six years (2008, 2011, and 2013). The NSSE attempts to assess, in forty-seven questions, four themes related to students’ experiences in college: Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty, and Campus Environment. The responses are compared within SMSU between the two different age groups and outside of SMSU with other students in Minnesota and in other institutions throughout the U.S.

The NSSE results indicate that, with some exceptions, students at SMSU generally increase their learning and practicing of “responsible citizenship” within the university between their first and senior years, and that overall results have improved since 2008.

Although the surveys examine the same outcomes, the reports and question groupings changed between 2011 and 2013. For the 2013 survey, we can analyze according to question, while in the 2008 and 2011 surveys, we only have data from broad categories of questions.

The 2013 survey will be considered first in order to get a sense of the kind of questions related to responsible citizenship that are answered by students. The mean averages of the general categories of the questions will then be compared among the three years.

**2013 NSSE Survey (Selected Questions) Percentage Response of “Very Much” or “Quite a Bit” First Year Senior**

4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical

problems or new situations 69 78

4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning

in depth by examining its parts 73 73

*These questions fall under the category of “Higher-Order Learning” within the broader category of “Academic Challenge.”*

2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues 53 61

2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic,

gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments 42 47

2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own

views on a topic or issue 58 65

2e. Tried to better understand someone else’s views by

imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective 63 68

2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an

issue or concept 66 64

*These questions fall under the category of “Reflective & Integrative Learning” within the broader category of “Academic Challenge.”*

14d. Encouraging contact among students from different

backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.) 43 43

14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially 72 57

14i. Attending events that address important social, economic,

or political issues 49 33

*These questions fall under the category of “Supportive Environment” within the broader category of “Campus Environment.”*

The responses show that there is an improvement between the first and senior years in most questions, or at least no decrease. However, it is interesting to note where students actually decreased. The responses to questions 14e and 14i indicate that by their senior years, students experience SMSU as providing opportunities for social involvement to lesser extent than experienced earlier on in their time at SMSU. Also, students indicate a decline in “attending events at address important social, economic, or political issues, over time at SMSU. The responses to 14e and 14i were also very low for the seniors when compared to other universities. In addition, importantly, when compared to other colleges, both first-year and seniors at SMSU were more than 5 percentage points lower for questions 2c (encountering diverse perspectives) and 14d (contact with students from different backgrounds). The responses to these questions may reflect the relatively low diversity among students attending SMSU. For almost all other questions, SMSU students were within 5 percentage points of undergraduates at other institutions.

Based on the mean response average (and not on positive responses to questions), there was a relative improvement in the broader categories between 2008 and 2013 for both first-year and senior students. For 2008 and 2011, the number was based on 100 being the highest, while for 2013, 60 was the highest score. The numbers for 2013 are recalculated to base 100 for comparison.

**2008 2011 2013**

1st Yr. Sr. 1st Yr. Sr. 1st Yr. Sr.

**Level of Academic Challenge**  48.5 54.3 51.4 55.5 62.7 65.8

(*In 2013: “Higher-Order Learning”*)

**Active and Collaborative Learning** 37.9 47.3 41.0 52.0 56.2 60.8

(*In 2013: “Reflective and Integrative*

*Learning”*)

**Enriching Educational Experience** 23.2 35.2 23.7 40.3 56.8 49.5

(*In 2013: “Supportive Environment”*)

These figures are encouraging and show a clear improvement in the broader categories relating to responsible citizenship since 2008. Since 2011, all numbers are approximately five points of all other universities.

1. **Campus-wide Assessment Surveys, 2004 and 2009: Process and Insights Gained** 
   1. We have conducted two campus-wide surveys of civic engagement at SMSU, sponsored by Minnesota campus compact (2004 & 2009).
      1. Campus-wide Surveys of Civic Engagement (2004; 2009) (See Appendix B, including the 2009 report that insights from 2004.)
      2. Key insights from these reports are noted below.

Key Insights:

**Civic Engagement 2009 Campus-wide Survey Summary of Insights: Student Perspective** (See Appendix C for more detail, Engagement-Multiple Assessment Measures: Insights from STUDENT Perspective)

* Students at SMSU are involved with a variety of forms of civic engagement, with voting, awareness of current events, being a member/leader of a group or organization, and volunteering being the most frequent types reported. Among those who volunteer, a substantial amount of volunteering happens within group settings (e.g., student clubs/organizations, residential halls, and athletic teams).
* If considering whether students volunteer “at least one time” every year, a large majority of SMSU students indicate that they have engaged in service of some kind (~85%). However, if considered with respect to ‘frequent or regular volunteering”, the percentage of students who indicate volunteering at least one time per month or weekly drops to 15%. This could be improved.

* With lower division students enrolled in First Year Experience *Making a Difference* courses (2008) and, more recently, upper division students enrolled in LEP 400 courses, it seems most students have a global and general knowledge of the nature of civic engagement versus having a differentiated view (see Appendix \_\_\_ *What does civic engagement mean to you?* Pre vs. Post-test from sample LEP 400 course). However, preliminary review of post-test responses indicate that having an intentional focus on forms, dispositions, etc. of civic engagement within the classroom context (often coupled with applied service/community-based learning experiences), students appear to readily grasp the multi-faceted nature of civic engagement. This suggests that critical reflection and intentional, explicit discussion of what it means to be an “engaged citizen” is important.
  + - Along these lines, this awareness that students may not be able to spontaneously describe the notion of civic engagement may help explain the gap between senior responses in the Civic Engagement Survey suggesting relatively low levels of civic engagement, while frequency data from residential life, student clubs, and athletics indicate substantially larger numbers of students are civically engaged. In other words, students may be asked to help with a Saturday city-wide leaf raking event or they may agree to assume a leadership role in a club/organization, yet not consider both of those activities as forms of civic engagement. This indicates a need for the campus—both in academic and student services spheres--to be more intentional about explicitly discussing what it means to be an engaged citizen. For example, training could be done with RAs, student club leaders and Assistant Coaches to help prepare them for facilitating reflection discussions after a civic engagement activity has occurred.
* Student involvement with service-learning SMSU is on par with comparable NSSE and Carnegie institutions, though lower than Minnesota campuses as a whole. Students place a high value on service-learning as pedagogy, with approximately 90% of students who have taken a service-learning course expressing enthusiasm about taking another course that includes service/community engagement. A key challenge to increasing the number of service-learning courses offered remains the time-intensive nature of setting up, tracking, and evaluating these experiences. SMSU is one of few MnSCU campuses that does not have a dedicated staff position to assist with coordinating civic engagement efforts, which means both campus and community members are not able to benefit from the continuity and logistical assistance that would come with that. This is a loss for the campus and Marshall area communities, especially given the high level of intrinsic motivation on the part of students and faculty.
* There is a need for making adjustments to selected measures, such as the Survey of Civic Engagement. (This has occurred. Specifically, revisions of the Civic Engagement Survey have included: 1) removal of items that are duplicated on other surveys as part of an effort to streamline the entire collection of surveys to be taken by graduating seniors, 2) update of the list of First Year Experience events that appear on the survey, and 3) other minor improvements in wording and formatting. In addition, the CES-R has been revised for use in LEP 100 courses as means of evaluating change over time from enrollment in LEP 100 to enrollment in LEP 400.)
* This first round of evaluating service-learning has been provided useful data, particularly with regarding to highlighting a high degree of enthusiasm for enrolling in additional courses that have a service component. In addition, students’ qualitative comments indicate growth in skill development, knowledge of course content, career development, efficacy for effecting change, and increased understand of needs groups served. Going forward, it will be important to establish an annual evaluation process that would involve evaluation of learning outcomes for all service learning courses taught in a given year. There is also a need for more systematic evaluation of what students are gaining from civic experiences done outside the classroom setting. While substantially improved, there is a continuing need for coordinating evaluation efforts across student activities, residential life, athletics and academic affairs. There is also a need for more regular and formal assessment of community sites and their experience with SMSU students, faculty and staff.

**Civic Engagement 2009 Campus-wide Survey Summary of Insights: Faculty Perspective** (See Appendix C for more detail, Engagement-Multiple Assessment Measures: Insights from FACULTY Perspective)

* 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.
  + - * Maybe 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.)

1. **Civic Engagement Survey CES (2008 – 2014) and Civic Engagement Survey CES-R (2014-15): Process and Insights Gained**
   * 1. We have administered the Civic Engagement Survey to all graduating Seniors since 2008 (deployed in April 2008, updated in July 2009 to maintain consistency with IUPUI scale). This has been a collaborative effort between Registration and Records Office and Center for Civic Engagement.
     2. Yearly reports of Civic Engagement Survey data gathering and analysis have been compiled by Scott Peterson and student research assistants. These are available on the Center for Civic Engagement website.
     3. SMSU Civic Engagement Survey has three components:
        + 1. Demographics
          2. Civic Participation
          3. Student self-reported participation in volunteerism and other civic-oriented activities while attending SMSU
     4. Civic Mindedness
        + 1. Measured by the Civic Minded Graduate Scale (IUPUI)

“designed to measure the capacity and desire of college students to work with others in a democratic way to improve their community or to achieve public good” (Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI)

* + - * 1. 30 Likert-style items grouped into four subscales:

Knowledge (awareness of opportunities, preparation, training)

Skills (listening, diversity, consensus-building)

Dispositions (values, efficacy, sense of responsibility)

Behavioral Intentions (post-graduation plans)

* + 1. The CES was adapted for use with Freshmen level students in LEP 100 sections and is called the CES-R. This was distributed to LEP 100 sections in Fall 2014.
    2. Sample Summary PowerPoint presentations are available in Appendix D for more detail, with key insights noted below.

Key Insights:

* We have means of measuring change over time Fr🡪Sr (LEP100- LEP 400 and those in between 200 & 300 level courses).
  + CES- R (LEP 100 and those in between 200/300 level courses)
* Initial comparison of LEP 100 section responses to the CES-R with graduating senior responses to CES indicate improvements over time.
* Significant increase in Civic-mindedness (CMG) from LEP 100 to LEP 400, including all subscales and most component measures
* Significant increase in Integrity from LEP 100 to LEP 400, but most of the effect was among males
* Non-significant increase in Community service self-efficacy (CSSES); significantly higher scores among females than males overall
  + Remaining questions include, for example:
    - What factors account for the observed increases in civic-mindedness, integrity, and community service self-efficacy from freshman to senior year?
    - How can we produce a more civic-minded SMSU graduate?
    - More specifically, how can we foster students’ sense of themselves as engaged global citizens?
* Trend analysis of the CES indicates having had one or more service-learning courses predicts “civic mindedness”.
* Analysis of CES data over time indicates need for more information about service opportunities.
* Implications for possible actions to take in response to insights gained:
  + Make students more aware of opportunities for becoming civically engaged (local and global)
  + Create more service-learning courses and make students more aware of the availability of these courses

(NOTE: SL main predictor of civic mindedness (critical reflection already built into structure of these courses.)

1. **Summary of initial analysis of one question qualitative measure- *“What does civic engagement mean to you?”* for possible use in LEP courses**

**LEP 400 Courses and “What does civic engagement mean to you?” (See Appendix E for more detail.)**

1. A one item pre-post qualitative question was asked of members of an LEP 400 course that had an applied, civic engagement component--- LEP 400: Self as Citizen- Action and Reflection on “Making a Difference”
2. This question, “*What does civic engagement mean to you?”* was also distributed in two other LEP 400 sections, one taught in-class and one taught online, both of which addressed civic engagement in a more didactic format (versus applied). In addition the question was asked of two sections of a 300 level course titled Developmental Psychology, one with a service-learning component and one without a service-learning component.
3. Preliminary results from this qualitative measure were discussed during Assessment Day 2014.
4. We plan to distribute a second time to LEP 100 course next
5. Once themes are formally identified from qualitative comments, we plan on developing quantitative, Likert scale items to measure identified themes (e.g., “differentiated view of civic engagement” “efficacy for civic engagement”)
6. This measure may then be used to assess pre/post change on identified dimensions of civic engagement in LEP 100/ 400 and the broader LEP/MTC curriculum courses.

Key Insights:

* We have means of measuring students’ understanding of the notion of civic engagement in LEP 100 and 400 courses, as well as those in between in the LEP/MTC structure.
  + Have means of measuring pre/post *“What does civic engagement mean for you?”* for courses that address LEP Outcome #8 – Practice Responsible Citizenship.
  + This could be adapted to more specifically address content of a given course –e.g. “How does knowledge of American government relate to being an engaged citizen?”.
* Preliminary review of data suggest that we are able to make distinctions between engaged citizen outcomes based upon how civic engagement is addressed in a given course:
  + Courses that address civic engagement generally in lecture/discussion format
  + Courses that address civic engagement in lecture/discussion + service-learning
  + Courses that have primary CE lecture/discussion focus + application/ SL assignments (e.g. LEP 400 Self as Citizen course)
* In others areas of campus---Student Clubs, Res Life, Athletics—we could measure more than just WHAT students are doing? We could measure what they gain from the experience.
  + e.g. “What does volunteering mean w/ regard to view of yourself as engaged citizen?”
* Could train RAs, student club leaders, and student athlete leaders to help fellow students reflect upon services/civic engagement experiences in this way.
  + Build in opportunities for critical reflection in student services and athletics
* Could train of student club leaders, assistant coaches and team leaders, and residential life staff in facilitation of critical reflection

(NOTE: Addresses gap we have noticed in reported level of civic engagement and actual amount of civic engagement occurring.)

* Broaden students’ understanding of nature/forms of civic engagement
* Develop more classes where there is explicit discussion of (and use of) variety of forms of civic engagement to address local/global problems e.g., LEP 400 Self-as-Citizen course
* LEP 100 (FYS) and LEP 400 graduation requirements could be good locations for courses such as these
  + Continue refining Likert Scale measures that correspond with themes identified in “*What does civic engagement mean to you?”* qualitative assessment (e.g. increased self-efficacy for civic engagement, increased differentiated view of civic engagement)
  + Consider use of NY Times as common text for LEP 100 (FYS), with intentional focus on consideration of local problems in global context

* + - * NY Times Collegiate Readership updates make this easier to do (e.g. <http://www.forumea.org/nyt> )
      * Templates/Resources available for adding global context to consideration of local problems (e.g., immigration)

E.g. Global Village assignment included in ADP Seven Revolutions Sample Course

(Denny Falk at [dfalk@d.umn.edu](mailto:dfalk@d.umn.edu) )

* Consider community-base learning/research structure for LEP 400 course
  + Continuous, sustained campus-community partnerships
  + Qualitative SL outcome data indicate students are eager to enroll in these types of course and seem to benefit in terms of growth with “civic-mindedness”

1. **Assessment of Service-Learning Outcomes: Processes and Insights Gained**
   1. Have made use of common measure for service-learning outcomes across several courses that incorporate a service component over past few years (qualitative and quantitative data gathered and evaluated through Center for Civic Engagement)
   2. Process and key insights:
      1. Process and key insights for Quantitative Analysis of SL Outcomes. We have analyzed quantitative data for total of six service-learning courses as pilot effort to identify common service-learning outcome measure for use by all service-learning courses. Key insight included over 90 percent of students who enrolled in these service-learning courses indicated a desire to take additional service-learning courses.
      2. Process and key insights for Qualitative Analysis of SL Outcomes. We have identified themes related to what students gain from their service learning experiences (e.g., clarification of career goals, skill enhancement, deepened understanding of content of course, and increased efficacy for constructive action to address social problem(s), enjoyed process of learning in applied way).
2. **Identification of Practice Responsible Citizenship Courses in LEP/MTC Structure (within which measures such the qualitative measure noted above could be used)**

Professors have been asked to complete the *Courses that Support the LEP Form* (available at the LEP website, along with adapted version available here today) to ascertain means by which faculty are currently address and measure the “practice responsible citizenship” outcome.

(e.g., courses identified thus far, for example, that include civic engagement content and/or applied civic experiences--- ENVS 180 Environmental Science; HIST 221 Early America; HIST 222 Modern America; POL 117 Introduction to Politics and Government; POL 120 American National Government; SOCI 101 Introduction to Sociology)

1. **Collaboration with other campus units to gather data related to current civic engagement activities.**

Online forms available at the Center for Civic Engagement website are being used to gather data about civic engagement activities, primarily service/volunteer activities, from the following areas:

* + 1. **Residence Life**

Residence Life Assistants are required to involve students in one civic engagement/service activity in Spring 2014. RAs have been asked to report on the nature of the service activity, how many students were involved, serving what capacity, addressing what campus/community need(s), etc. Information about year 2012-13 Residence Life civic engagement activities has been gathered as well.

* + 1. **Student Activities**

Student Club leaders have been asked to complete an online questionnaire EACH time they are involved as a group with some form of civic engagement to the online form has been incorporated into SALink and its use has been encouraged by Assistant Director of Student Activities.

* + 1. **Athletics**

Assistant Coaches have been asked to use common form (noted above) to document civic engagement activities done by all athletic teams throughout the year (will orient coaching staff to process of completing forms beginning of this semester)

1. **“Closing the Loop”: Changes made thus far and implications for further change based on review and discussion of key insights**
2. **“CLOSING THE LOOP”: CHANGES MADE THUS FAR IN CENTER FOR CIVIC**

**ENGAGEMENT IN RESPONSE TO INSIGHTS GAINED**

* Substantial restructuring of website in 2014 to enhance its value as resource for the campus and community (specifically to get the word out about service opportunities and create an efficient means of collecting assessment data, for example)
* Strengthened relationships between Center for Civic Engagement and Residential Life, Student Activities, and Athletics for assessment gathering purposes
* In process of training civic engagement interns to raise awareness of website as resource via in class presentations, participation in staff (e.g. RA) trainings, visits to student clubs, visits to community partners, etc.
* Creating internships with 5 hrs/week commitment for ONE YEAR versus one semester to address problem of not having continuity of staff in Center for Civic Engagement
* Have requested additional staffing for Center for Civic Engagement each year for past seven years (i.e., Staff Coordinator for Civic Engagement)
* Considering making use of Campus Connect-Get Connected platform (for annual fee) as means of more efficiently getting word out about service opportunities and gathering data for annual reports related to civic engagement (would partner with Marshall United Way)
* Considering various means of building in opportunities for critical reflection in student services and athletics to address gap we have noticed in reported level of civic engagement and actual amount of civic engagement occurring.

1. **“CLOSING THE LOOP” : IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULUM STRUCTURE**

* Use CES-R Survey in LEP 100 and LEP 400 courses
* Use “*What does civic engagement mean to you?”* as pre/post measure in “engaged citizen” courses and LEP 100/LEP 400 courses
  + Continue developing Likert Scale measures that correspond with themes identified in “*What does civic engagement mean to you?”* qualitative assessment (e.g. increased self-efficacy for civic engagement, increased differentiated view of civic engagement)
* Retain LEP 400 as part of LEP requirements -- critical opportunity for creating sustained, community problem-solving efforts because it serves as capstone experience and is and interdisciplinary in nature (similar to Portland State model)
  + Could consider community-base learning/research structure for some sections of LEP 400 course (Service-learning outcome data indicate students are eager to enroll in these types of course and seem to benefit in terms of growth with “civic-mindedness”. )
* Create more service-learning courses and make students more aware of the availability of these courses, knowing that service-learning is main predictor of civic mindedness
* Broaden students’ understanding of nature/forms of civic engagement

-Develop more classes where there is explicit discussion of (and use of) variety of forms of civic engagement to address local/global problems e.g., LEP 400 Self-as-Citizen course

- LEP 100 (FYS) and LEP 400 graduation requirements could be good locations for courses such as these

* Consider use of NY Times as common text for LEP 100 (FYS), with intentional focus on consideration of local problems in global context

* + - * NY Times Collegiate Readership updates make this easier to do (e.g. <http://www.forumea.org/nyt> )
      * Templates/Resources available for adding global context to consideration of local problems (e.g., immigration)
        + E.g. Global Village assignment included in ADP Seven Revolutions Sample Course (Denny Falk at [dfalk@d.umn.edu](mailto:dfalk@d.umn.edu) )

1. **“CLOSING THE LOOP”: IMPLICATIONS FOR ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES**

* Consider SMSU –Practice Responsible Citizenship - in national context of civic engagement in higher education:
  + - National Campus Compact Annual Survey 2014 indicates that SMSU ranks in bottom tier--approximately10th percentile -compared to other Campus Compact member institutions with respect to availability of staffing resources for center(s) responsible for service-learning/volunteerism
    - Gallup 2014 Make a Difference - Show You Care Report clearly indicates that sustained community engagement opportunities, working with faculty, is experienced by students as significant form of “caring” and is key predictor of retention.
* Recognizing need for additional staffing to allow for making civic engagement more integral to students’ learning experiences (vs basic maintenance functions and heavy reliance on website as resource), request full-time Staff Coordinator position for the Center for Civic Engagement.
* Invest in platform (e.g. Get Connected) that allows for more efficient means of making students aware of service opportunities and efficient means of gathering data for annual reports that relate to civic engagement.
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**APPENDIX A:**

**Historical Timeline: SMSU Center for Civic Engagement and other infrastructure support documents**

**HISTORICAL TIMELINE:**

**SMSU CENTER FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

**RECENT STRUCTURAL CHANGES AT SMSU THAT SUPPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

* ***SMSU Mission (approved 2008) includes explicit statement related to promotion of civic engagement*** 
  + ***“***Southwest Minnesota State University prepares students to meet the complex challenges of this century as engaged citizens in their local and global communities…” <http://www.smsu.edu/administration/strategicplanning/missionvisiongoals.pdf>
* **Brown & Gold Task Force Goals (approved 2008) reference civic and community engagement several times**

5. We are committed to being good stewards of our resources through demonstrating environmental and fiscal responsibility. Moreover, as responsible citizens and good stewards of our resources, we foster actions, programs, and scholarship that will lead to a sustainable future.

7. We believe in the integration of campus and community. We are committed to being responsive to the needs of southwestern Minnesota and recognize that partnerships with community entities provide us with valuable talents and expertise.

13. We believe that the southwestern Minnesota region provides rich opportunities for learning that go beyond the traditional classroom and lab setting to community-based learning experiences. Therefore, we are committed to creating a variety of applied learning experiences that enhance students’ practical problem-solving skills and strengthen their commitment to civic engagement.

* **“Engaged Citizen” LEP Learning Outcomes :** Inclusion of “practice of responsible citizenship in (their) local and global communities” as one of ten LEP learning outcomes
* **Liberal Education Program Structure:** Established structure that allows for incorporation of applied civic engagement experiences at the outset of the education experience at SMSU (i.e., LEP 100) and the conclusion of their time at SMSU (ie..g, LEP 400)
* **Strategic Direction: Community Partnership (SP 2012) - Goal 3 – “**Identify community based projects and prioritize projects annually that can be completed in partnership between the identified community and SMSU through Service Learning or other campus based programs. “
* **Campus-Wide Assessment of Civic Engagement Studies (2004 and 2009**) – Have comprehensive evaluations of civic engagement at SMSU for use as benchmarks for evaluating civic engagement
* **Annual Evaluation of Civic Minded Graduate Scale (2009- 2014):** Mechanism for annual evaluation of civic engagement attitudes, values, and skills via the completion of the Civic Minded Graduate scale by all graduating seniors (collaboration between Center for Civic Engagement and SMSU Registration Office)
* **Center for Civic Engagement Website based mechanisms for gathering civic engagement data in an integrated and efficient manner to track the following**:
  + Civic engagement activities of campus groups---student clubs, residence life halls, athletics, and other groups
  + Service-learning and other forms of “civic engagement in the classroom”
  + Service-learning outcomes (in-process)
  + Needs of community entities (social services, faith-based organizations, advocacy coalitions, etc.)
* **Center for Civic Engagement administrative location that “bridges” Academic Affairs and Student Affairs**
  + Center for Civic Engagement is structurally accountable to the Provost (thus, serves interests of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs)

**SELECTED INITIATIVES COORDINATED BY THE CENTER FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

* **Community Volunteer and Service-Learning Fair (April 2014)**
* **ELECTION 2012 (Aug-Nov 2012)**
* **FreeRiceCHALLENGE - Anti-Hunger Initiative** (Feb-March 2012)
* **MECLA - SMSU Career Development Mentoring Partnership** (2007-2010)
* **LYND – SMSU After School Tutoring Program** (2007-2012)
* **FYE INTERDISCIPLINARY LEARNING THEMES:** Coordination of all First Year Experience Keynote Addresses, theme-based follow-up events and evaluation of outcomes of these events:
  + **2005** **Dennis Donovan (Topic: Public Achievement/Grass Roots Change**), Center for

Citizenship and Democracy at the University of Minnesota’s Humphrey Institute

* + **2006**  Former Senator **George McGovern** (Topic: Ending Hunger in Our Time)
  + **2007**  **Paul Loeb** (Topic: Soul of a Citizen ), social activist/author, Seattle Center

for Ethical Leadership <http://www.paulloeb.org/>

* **2008** **Winona LaDuke** (Topic: indigenous Perspectives on Sustainability) <http://marshallindependent.com/page/content.detail/id/504428/speaking-on-sustainability.html>
* **Civic Engagement Forum: Showcasing Innovative Community Solutions through Civic Engagement and Campus-Community Partnerships** (2008, Nov)

**SMSU PARTICIPATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS and INITIATIVES AIMED AT PROMOTING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

* **Campus Compact** [**http://www.compact.org/**](http://www.compact.org/)
  + Member of Minnesota Campus Compact Organization – 2002-2009, administration commitment to renewal of membership in 2013-14
* **AASCU *American Democracy Project*** – 2003-2009 [**http://www.aascu.org/programs/ADP/**](http://www.aascu.org/programs/ADP/)
  + Several SMSU faculty and Center for Civic Engagement staff have attended and presented at annual ADP meetings (while SMSU was participant campus)
* **AACU – Core Commitments: Education for Personal and Social Responsibility** [**https://www.aacu.org/core\_commitments/index.cfm**](https://www.aacu.org/core_commitments/index.cfm)2007--2013
  + SMSU Faculty and Administration have been actively involved with numerous conferences, workshops, trainings, etc. related to the AACU Core Commitments: Education for Personal and Social Responsibility initiative
  + Core Commitments Timeline <https://www.aacu.org/core_commitments/previousevents.cfm#Launch>

**EXAMPLES OF SERVICE-LEARNING AND OTHER FORMS OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN THE CLASSROOM**

* **Dr. Scott Peterson - PSYCHOLOGY** - Students enrolled in a Developmental Psychology may opt to volunteer area sites for 20 hours as a means of adding depth to their understanding of developmental constructs, while addressing area needs.
* **Dr. Tom Williford** - **HISTORY -** Students subscribe to The New York Times at a discounted rate through SMSU's participation in the *NY Times inCOLLEGE Program* and bring their newspapers to class to discuss contemporary global issues.
* **Dr. Will Thomas** -**ACCOUNTING**- Students serve on local boards and assist with tax preparation.
* **Dr. Rick Robinson and Dr. Donna Niekula – SOCIAL WORK** – Students assisted with Election 2012 get out the vote efforts and community-based homelessness awareness initiative
* **Dr. David Sturrock - POLITICAL SCIENCE** - Students conduct exit polls during election years.
* **Dr. Emily Deaver** - **ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE** - SMSU students work collaboratively with Marshall High School students to gather data related to water quality/ecosystem status of the Redwood River through the now multi-year Redwood River Monitoring Project.
* **Dr. Kerry Livingston - SOCIOLOGY** - Students enrolled in an online Social Problems course may opt to locate service opportunities in the Marshall area or broader SW Minnesota region as a means of increasing their understanding of factors that contribute to a variety of social problems covered in this course.
* **Dr. Christine Olson - PSYCHOLOGY** - Students enrolled in General Psychology and Psychology Seminar could, for extra credit, become involved in 15-20 hours of Election 2012 processes (e.g., assisting with voter registration, canvassing, assisting with coordination of public forums for local candidates) as a means of gaining a better understanding "efficacy/motivation for social change".
* **Dr. Rick Herder, Dr. Christine Olson, and Dr. Will Thomas** - **CONTEMPORARY ISSUES** --Faculty include consideration of various forms of civic engagement to address social problems such as human trafficking, addressing the needs of single-parent households in the area, assisting with prevention of irresponsible driving, and addressing the needs of new immigrant members of Marshall area communities (to name a few).

**HUMAN AND FISCAL RESOURCES**

* **VISTA Staff Coordinator for Civic Engagement** (2003-2006, 2008-09\*) – 40 hrs/week
  + VISTA funded by AmeriCORPS ViSTA Program via the Minnesota Literacy Council
  + Sustainability Learning Community Coordinator (2009-10)- Primary focus on sustainability programming and less focus on civic engagement in general\*
  + No VISTA Staff Coordinator *primarily* focused on civic engagement programming (2009 – 2013)
* **Student Staff** – interns, scholarship mentees, work study students, and graduate assistant
  + Graduate Assistant (1/year) – 2008-13) – 14 hrs/wk
  + Student Staff (avg of 6/yr – 2008-13) – Range of 5-15 hrs/wk
* **Faculty Coordinator(s) for Civic Engagement**
  + **Faculty Coordinator** (2003-2012) - allocated 3 cr reassigned time several years, followed by two years of 6 credits reassigned time, then 3 credits/yr past few years
  + **Faculty Co-Coordinators** (2012-13) Currently 3 credits/yr shared by Co-Chairs for the Center for Civic Engagement (1 cr/yr for assessment role and 2 cr/year for Student Staff Orientation, Training, Supervision and Program Development)
* **Proposed Staff Coordinator Position: Annual request to SMSU administration for support of ¼ time, ½ time or full time Staff Coordinator position since 2007** (declined)
  + Staff Coordinator position description articulated and approved by MnSCU
  + Need for year-to-year continuity in staffing (even if just ¼ time Staff Coordinator position) to free up use of faculty and student staff resources for tasks other than orientation/training of new student staff each semester/year
  + Enhanced capacity for ongoing assessment data collection, data entry and analysis with Staff Coordinator position
  + Enhanced capacity for faculty development and overall new program development with Staff Coordinator position
* **Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement** (interdisciplinary group of faculty guiding civic engagement programming and evaluation)
  + **2003- 2005: Faculty Advisory Committee for ADP (**SMSU’s involvement with AASCU’s American Democracy Project)
  + **2005 - 2009:** **Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement and the First Year Experience** 
    - Both the FYE and Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement advised on Center for CE/FYE activities.
    - VISTA and Student Staff responsible for logistical implementation of civic engagement and First Year Experience programs.
    - Expanded budget from $2000/yr to approximately $8000 during this timeframe(plus additional funding for keynote speakers –George McGovern, Paul Loeb, and Winona LaDuke)
  + **2009 - 2013: Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement**
* **Student Affairs Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement**
* Student Affairs Advisory Group for Civic Engagement (2004-2007)
* Faculty Coordinator for Civic Engagement meets individually with Student Affairs Units (2007-2013)

**RESOURCES ACQUIRED BY SMSU FACULTY C0-CORDINATORS and OTHER FACULTY INCORPORATING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT INTO INSTRUCTION (**need more information)

The following acquisition of grants to support integration and evaluation of civic engagement in course instruction is a concrete indication of the intrinsic faculty motivation to support fostering of students’ sense of themselves and as “engaged citizens”. Recent campus-wide assessments of civic engagement in 2004 and 2009 corroborate this high valuing of valuing of civic engagement pedagogy.

**Sample Grant Resources Acquired by SMSU Faculty that Support Civic Engagement Programming and Evaluation**

Post-Secondary Service-learning and Campus-Compact Collaboration Grant ($10,000) *Bridging*

*academic and student affairs through campus-wide assessment of civic engagement.*

Mn Campus Compact – Acquired June 2008 -CMO

VISTA Position Grant (~$15, 500 salary/ed award per year---renewable over five years, assuming incremental

match by SMSU) Minnesota Literacy Council – Acquired March 2008 -CMO

MNSCU, IPESL Grant ($25,000)Integrating civic engagement learning outcomes with

liberal arts core learning outcomes **–** Acquired October 2006 - CMO

VISTA Position Grant (approx $45,000 salary/ed award over three year period) Minnesota

Literacy Council – Acquired March 2003-2006 -CMO

MNSCU Learning that Lasts Grant ($13,500). Promoting and assessing engaged learning at Southwest

Minnesota State University. Minnesota State College and University System – Acquired March 2003-

CMO

Marshall United Way ($3,000) After-school literacy program for new immigrant children Acquired March

2004 – Co-authored with Christine Bendel - CMO

MNSCU Learning by Doing Grant ($4000). Minnesota State College and University System – Acquired March

2000- CMO

Minnesota Campus Compact Civic Engagement Mini-Grant ($750) – Acquired October 2002-CMO

FIG Grants - Several members of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement awarded SMSU

Faculty Improvement Grants that and MnSCU grants that have enhanced their capacity to incorporate service and other forms of civic engagement into their instruction

**FORMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT (2003-2013)**

* **First Year Experience funds for Keynote Lectures** (2006-09) – Increase in allocation of funds for Center for CE Budget and Foundation resources for First Year Experience/Civic Engagement keynote lectures and related events
* **Conference support** (2003-2009)- Provost and Dean’s Offices supported the participation of SMSU faculty involved with civic engagement in five of seven AASCU American Democracy Project Annual Meetings, along with involvement in other relevant conferences, such as AACU’s *Civic learning at the intersections* (Oct 2007)
* Several members of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement awarded **SMSU Faculty Improvement Grants that and MnSCU grants** that have enhanced their capacity to incorporate service and other forms of civic engagement into their instruction (see examples of resources acquired above)
* **Student staff**—There has been an increase in access to student resources- specifically, Mentor Scholarship students, interns, student workers, and graduate assistant- assigned to Center for CE
* **Physical Space** - Have relocated Office of Civic Engagement/FYE to a larger, centrally located site on SMSU Campus
* **Operating Budget –** Current annual allocation $2000 (plus upcoming funds to restore membership in Mn Campus Compact membership 2013-2014)

**SAMPLE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and CAMPUS-WIDE PRESENTATIONS/WORKSHOPS**

* Several faculty who serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement have been actively involved with committees over the past ten years that have created an SMSU infrastructure of support for civic engagement, serving on committees/taskforces such as the following (for example):
  + - * Brown and Gold Taskforce: Mission, Vision, and Goals
      * LEP Planning Committees (focused upon articulating outcomes and implementing LEP)
      * Strategic Planning Day Events (active participants)]
      * Assessment Day Events (actively involved with identifying means of evaluating LEP outcomes, including “engaged citizen” outcomes)
* SMSU Strategic Planning Day: Campus-wide Assessment of Civic Engagement (Jan 2009)
* *Faculty orientation to IDST Making a Difference Course* (FYE course) (May 2008)
* *Civic learning outcomes: Interdisciplinary perspectives. New Work* panel involving four faculty who had participated in the IPESL workshop (April 2008)
* Interdisciplinary workshops – IPESL Grant Funded - *Integrating civic engagement learning outcomes with liberal arts core learning outcomes* (Summer 2007)
* *All University Meetings* focusing on First Year Experience and Civic Engagement (2003-2009, upcoming 2013 Lunch and Learn)
* *Use of NY Times in the Classroom* (Faculty Development Day, Fall 2005)
* *Nuts and Bolts of Service-Learning* (Faculty Development Day, Fall 2004)
* *Community-Based Learning: Lessons Learned* (New Work Presentation, Sept 2004)

**EXAMPLE PRESENTATIONS/PUBLICATIONS** (\* Need additional information from faculty other than Co-Coordinator for Civic Engagement, Christine Olson.)

Professional

Olson, C., Redig, N., & Heggesth, N. (2009). *Campus inventory of civic engagement: Springboard*

*for enhancing civic engagement and First Year Experience “sustainability “ theme*

*program.* Presentation at 7th Annual Meeting of the American Democracy Project,

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Baltimore, MD.

Olson, C., Heggesth, N., Redig, N., Deaver, E., Peterson, S., Schultz, M., & Pagel, A. (2009).

*SMSU Campus-wide inventory of civic engagement: Process and outcomes.* Poster

presentation at 7th Annual Meeting of the American Democracy Project, American

Association of State Colleges and Universities, Baltimore, MD.

Olson, C. (2007*). SMSU Civic engagement and learning theme-based First Year Experience.* Poster

presentation at 7th Annual Meeting of the American Democracy Project, American Association of

State Colleges and Universities, Baltimore, MD.

Olson, C. (2006) *Interdisciplinary hunger theme based approach to First Year Experience: Structure and*

*challenges*. Presentation at the 3rd Annual Meeting of the American Democracy Project, American

Association of State Colleges and Universities, Snowbird, UT.

Olson, C. & Nielson, P. (2005) *Creating an infrastructure for civic engagement with a limited budget.*

Presentation at MnSCU Center for Teaching and Learning/MN Campus Compact, Saint Paul, MN

Olson, C. & Nielson, P. (2006). Involving students in campus-wide assessment of civic Engagement. Chapter in Jones and Perry (Eds.) *Quick Hits in Civic Engagement,* Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press.

Olson, C. (2004). *Assessment of campus civic engagement at Southwest Minnesota State University*. Poster

Session at the 2nd Annual Meeting of the American Democracy Project, American Association of State

Colleges and Universities, Albuquerque, NM.

Olson, C. (March, 1990). *Enhancing college student activism: Implications of self- efficacy theory*. Paper

presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Counseling and Development,

Cincinnati, OH.

Campus/Community Presentations

Olson, C. (April, 2008). *Civic engagement at Southwest Minnesota State University*. Presentation

for the Marshall area Sunrise Rotary Club, Marshall, MN.

Olson, C. (January, 2008). *Self-efficacy perspective on activism and global climate change.* Panel

presentation on topic of Global Climate Change, Southwest Minnesota State University,

Marshall, MN.

Olson, C., Deaver, E., Thomas, W., and Williford, T. (April 2008). *Civic learning outcomes: Interdisciplinary*

*perspectives. Moderated New Work panel involving four faculty who had participated in the IPESL*

*workshop*, SMSU, Marshall, MN.

Olson, C. (June, 2007). *Development of civic engagement learning outcomes.* IPESL funded workshop

involving nine SMSU faculty from cross-section of disciplines, SMSU, Marshall, MN.)

**SUPERVISED STUDENT RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS**

Nielson, B., Schultz, D., Anderson, D., Thullien, T., & Bendel, C. (2004). *Quantitative and qualitative*

*assessment of student services based civic* *engagement activities, attitudes, and resources at rural,*

*public liberal arts university*. Poster presentation at the Minnesota Undergraduate Research

Conference, St. Paul, MN.

Schultz, D. & Bendel, C. (2004*). Quantitative and qualitative analysis of faculty attitudes,*

*needs, and resources related to civic engagement.* Poster presentation at the Minnesota Undergraduate Research Conference, St. Paul, MN.

Schultz, D. Anderson, D., Mars, R., Trautman, C. Schneider, C. Pivec, M., & Robinson, K., (2004).

*Assessment of student civic engagement attitudes, activities, and resources at a rural, public liberal*

*arts university.* Poster presentation at the Minnesota Undergraduate Research Conference,

St. Paul, MN.

Trautman, C., Schneider, C., Schulz, D., Thullien, T., Pivec, M., Maras, R. (2004). *Structured interview study*

*of faculty civic engagement perceptions and activities at a rural, public liberal arts university*. Poster

presentation at the Minnesota Undergraduate Research Conference, St. Paul, MN.

**Civic and Community Engagement**

**SMSU 2004-2014**

**EVIDENCE OF INTENTIONAL EFFORT TO CREATE CAMPUS INFRASTRUCTURE OF SUPPORT FOR**

**CIVIC AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

* **Have maintained regional and national references point while intentionally considering SMSU efforts to foster sense of “Engaged Citizen” in students while serving regional needs**
* Maintained membership in relevant national organizations –AACU, AASCU, and MN Campus Compact ---- allowing for participation in initiatives noted below and access to grant and workshop/consultation resources provided by these entities, which has been actively used by faculty, staff and administration
  + - Lead role in sponsoring regional discussion in collaboration with Mn Campus Compact (see below)
    - Lead campus member in Mn Campus Compact with respect to being awarded grant funding for two comprehensive campus-wise assessments of civic and community engagement programming (2004 and 2009—insert links to reports)
* Active administration/faculty involvement in numerous national higher education initiatives related to promotion of civic engagement in higher education, through membership in higher education associations noted above
* Note specific involvement with:
  + - **AASCU American Democracy Project – 2003-2009** (founding member campus of American Democracy Project, sponsored by American Association of State Colleges and Universities <http://www.aascu.org/programs/ADP/> )

-Several SMSU faculty and Center for Civic Engagement staff have attended and presented at annual ADP meetings (while SMSU was participant campus) ; initiated by Provost and involving active interdisciplinary group of faculty committed to thoughtful integration of civic engagement in course instruction--- collectively, numerous grants acquired, presentations and publications attest to this commitment

-Membership not renewed in 2009 (budgetary constraints noted).

-Membership renewed in 2013 with arrival of President Gores. Participating campus in American Democracy Project

* + - **AACU – Core Commitments: Education for Personal and Social Responsibility** (participating campus from 2007-2013 <https://www.aacu.org/core_commitments/index.cfm)-> Faculty, administration and staff involved with national conferences, campus-based webinars, and use of AACU Personal and Social Responsibility related rubrics in assessment of civic engagement.
      * Increased activity by SMSU faculty in AACU conference related to civic engagement after membership was discontinued with AASCU/American Democracy Project.
    - **Mn Campus Compact Member** campus for majority of past ten years (i.e., Member of Minnesota Campus Compact Organization – 2002-2009, [www.campuscompact.org](http://www.campuscompact.org) ); made extensive use of their resources from 2003-2009---assistance with setting up infrastructure of support for civic and community engagement; development of broad conceptualization of civic engagement; structure for ongoing assessment of process and outcomes related to civic engagement programming in academic and student service spheres.
      * Membership not renewed in 2009-2013 (budgetary constraints noted)
      * Membership renewed 2013-2014 with arrival of President Gores.
    - **Regular participation by faculty, staff and administrators in campus-based webinars, regional conferences, and national conferences** related to civic engagement in higher education to draw from national reference point
* Allocation of funds for SMSU participation in assessment efforts – NSSE and HERI surveys
  + - Administration of NSSE (2004, 2008, 2011 and 2013), along with Campus-Community Inventory of Civic Engagement (2004, 2009), and HERI Faculty Survey (2006), providing us with national reference point for how we are doing as campus with civic and community engagement
* **SMSU’s Assumption of lead role in coordinating MnSCU regional discussions about civic engagement in higher education**
* Hosting of regional forums related to civic engagement in higher education. For example, SMSU hosted *Civic Engagement Forum: Showcasing Innovative Community Solutions through Civic Engagement and Campus-Community Partnerships (2008, Nov)* involving faculty, staff, students, community members, Presidents of other private and public 2 yr and 4yr campuses in region, and co-coordinated with MN Campus Compact
* Have drawn insights from other model programs nationally and regionally while coordinating these events (e.g., recent Keynote Address by Judith Ramaley, nationally recognized leader regarding civic and community engagement in higher education, on our campus where she outlined national trends for civic engagement in higher ed)
  + - SMSU’s intentional programming and infrastructure change related to civic and community engagement has been in sync with national trends (see Ramaley and MnCampus Compact depictions of the “engaged campus”)
* **Broad conceptualization of civic and community engagement (consistent with national trend)**
* Broad conceptualization of Civic and Community Engagement(see <http://www.smsu.edu/campuslife/civicengagement/?id=8476>) is in sync with---growth over past ten years parallels--- national trends (insert link to Ramaley report and Mn Campus Compact Model of the Engaged Campus)
* Examples from Academic and Student Affairs of creating variety of forms of civic engagement opportunities for students:
  + - BEING INFORMED –SMSU has been member of NYTimes Readership Program most of last ten years, initiated by President Danahar (eg. Faculty have made use of NYTimes as text in history and psychology courses; in recent campus wide surveys, fostering “informed citizenry” form of civic engagement is one of main ways faculty promote civic engagement in their course instruction
    - VOLUNTEERING—See examples in Student Services, Residential Life, and Athletics noted above
    - SERVICE-LEARNING—See examples from various disciplines noted above, including LEP 100 and LEP 400 that require student to address issues of concern using multiple forms of civic engagement
    - CIVIC DISCOURSE—See hosting of regional forums noted above; faculty requiring students to express views in form of writing letters to editors; serving on local non-profit boards
    - VOTING—Active involvement of student government, volunteers in student clubs, and service-learning students from courses in multiple disciplines in Election 2012 (and 2004; 2008)
    - LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS—reference Scott Ewing’s Leadership -----;
    - CLUB/ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP – get information from Scott Ewing on number of clubs/organizations; encouragement of service through SAFAC funding process; recent (past year) incorporation of co-curricular transcript in conjunction with Registrar’s Office
    - SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS/PROGRAMMING – note Sustainability Learning Community; collaboration with regional AmeriCorps GreenCorps by hosting GreenCorps Member in SMSU residential life

(See SMSU Center for Civic Engagement for additional examples and resources <http://www.smsu.edu/campuslife/civicengagement/>)

* **Recent (2003-2013) structural changes at SMSU to support civic and community engagement**
  + SMSU Mission (approved 2008) includes explicit statement related to promotion of civic engagement

“Southwest Minnesota State University prepares students to meet the complex challenges of this century as engaged citizens in their local and global communities…” http://www.smsu.edu/administration/strategicplanning/missionvisiongoals.pdf

* + Brown & Gold Task Force Goals (approved 2008) reference civic and community engagement several times

5. We are committed to being good stewards of our resources through demonstrating environmental and fiscal responsibility. Moreover, as responsible citizens and good stewards of our resources, we foster actions, programs, and scholarship that will lead to a sustainable future.

7. We believe in the integration of campus and community. We are committed to being responsive to the needs of southwestern Minnesota and recognize that partnerships with community entities provide us with valuable talents and expertise.

13. We believe that the southwestern Minnesota region provides rich opportunities for learning that go beyond the traditional classroom and lab setting to community-based learning experiences. Therefore, we are committed to creating a variety of applied learning experiences that enhance students’ practical problem-solving skills and strengthen their commitment to civic engagement.

* + “Engaged Citizen” LEP Learning Outcome: Inclusion of “practice of responsible citizenship in (their) local and global communities” as one of ten LEP learning outcomes
  + Liberal Education Program Structure: Established structure that allows for incorporation of applied civic engagement experiences at the outset of the education experience at SMSU (i.e., LEP 100) and the conclusion of their time at SMSU (ie..g, LEP 400)
  + Strategic Direction: Community Partnership (SP 2012) - Goal 3 – “Identify community based projects and prioritize projects annually that can be completed in partnership between the identified community and SMSU through Service Learning or other campus based programs…. Multiple discussions related to valuing of civic and community engagement through strategic planning days (e.g. primary focus of 2009 Strategic Planning Day, used as means of gathering data from Academic, Student Affairs and Athletics for 2009 Campus-Wide Assessment of Civic Engagement – insert link to report)
  + Campus-Wide Assessment of Civic Engagement Studies (2004 and 2009) – Have comprehensive evaluations of civic engagement at SMSU for use as benchmarks for evaluating civic engagement
    - Augmented with national reference point provide by administration of NSSE and HERI surveys noted above
* **Maintained assessment priority for gauging nature of civic and community engagement programming, frequency of involvement in various forms, assessment of outcomes related to fostering student’s sense of self as “engaged citizen” and serving regional needs**
  + Annual Evaluation of Civic Minded Graduate Scale (2009- 2012): Mechanism for annual evaluation of civic engagement attitudes, values, and skills via the completion of the Civic Minded Graduate scale by all graduating seniors (collaboration between Center for Civic Engagement and SMSU Registration Office)
  + Center for Civic Engagement Website based mechanisms for gathering civic engagement data in an integrated and efficient manner to track the following:
* Civic engagement activities of campus groups---student clubs, residence life halls, athletics, and other groups
* Service-learning and other forms of “civic engagement in the classroom”
* Service-learning outcomes (in-process)
* Needs of community entities (social services, faith-based organizations, advocacy coalitions, etc.)
* “Engaged Citizen” as assessment focus this year 2013-14 for collaborative Committee for Institutional Assessment and Liberal Education Program Committee “AHA” Committee, including broad representation from members of curricular and co-curricular campus spheres.
* Pilot evaluation of outcomes of incorporating civic engagement at front and back ends of student learning at SMSU through sections of LEP 100-First Year Seminar and LEP 400-Contemporary Issues in 2013-14.
* **Systematic efforts to “bridge” Academic Affairs and Student Affairs while developing programs, collaborative program development, shared use of funding sources, and and gathering/evaluating assessment data related to civic and community engagement**
* Center for Civic Engagement is structurally accountable to the Provost (thus, serves interests

of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs)

* LEP “Engaged Citizen” learning outcome, as noted above, is priority for CIA/LEP assessment efforts this academic year, with evaluation mechanisms and resources being used from both curricular and co-curricular areas
* Recent multi-year First Year Experience Inter-disciplinary Learning Themes, that incorporated civic engagement focus in annual Keynote Address, followed by variety of related civic engagement events and programs throughout the year.

-The process of initiating this Interdisciplinary Civic Engagement Theme based First Year Experience was collaboration between curricular (i.e. Interdisciplinary Faculty Advisory Committee for Civic Engagement) and co-curricular committees (i.e., First Year Experience Committee, with membership from both academic and student services units). In addition, for logistical programming and outcome assessment needs, a VISTA Coordinator for Civic Engagement was used as a full-time staffing resource made possible through a SMSU-Minnesota Literacy Council partnership. Funding for FYE Learning Themes noted below came from pools came from President’s Office, student service units, and faculty acquisition of relevant grants.

* + **FYE/CIVIC ENGAGEMENT INTERDISCIPLINARY LEARNING THEMES:**
* **2005-Dennis Donovan (Topic: Public Achievement/Grass Roots Change),** Center for Citizenship and Democracy at the University of Minnesota’s Humphrey Institute
* **2006 -Former Senator George McGovern** **(Topic: Ending Hunger in Our Time)**
* **2007 Paul** Loeb (Topic: Soul of a Citizen ), social activist/author, Seattle Center for Ethical Leadership
* **2008 Winona LaDuke** **(Topic: indigenous Perspectives on Sustainability)**
* Current LEP 100 First Year Seminar collaboration with Mustang Mentor Program and Office of Student Success, with student mentors assisting pilot group of faculty instructors of the First Year Seminar with incorporating civic component into course instruction

**APPENDIX B:**

**Campus-wide Surveys of Civic Engagement (2009; including insights from 2004)**

**NEED TO INSERT COPY OF REPORT**

**APPENDIX C:**

**Example summary presentations (e.g. campus Assessment Day meetings, American Democracy Project national conferences, and Minnesota Campus Compact regional conferences)**

**NEED TO INSERT RECENT SUMMARY PRESENTATIONS FOR ADP AND MCC**

**AHA Committee: Practice Responsible Citizenship**

Christine Olson

Scott Peterson

Rick Robinson

Tom Williford

Assessment Day Summary Presentation - Spring 2015

* **What have we done? (our process)**
* **What have we found?**
* **Implications- What could we do from here?**

**We reminded ourselves what we were measuring?**

**Practice responsible citizenship in their**

**local and global communities**

* Develop the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions necessary to make a difference in local and global communities
* Recognize themselves as part of a larger social fabric, with public lives and personal ownership of social problems
* Explore the nature and use of power and authority in various contexts
* Engage in democracy as a life-enhancing, every day practice of skills such as attentiveness to public affairs and current events, regular volunteering, creative use of conflict, active group membership and collective problem solving
* Express their voices through informed citizenship and participation in civic and political processes
* Confidently engage in civic discourse, self-reflection, and consideration of other points of view

**What are we reasonably able to assess at this point?**

* **Develop the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions necessary to make a difference in local and global communities**
* **Recognize themselves as part of a larger social fabric, with public lives and personal ownership of social problems**
* Explore the nature and use of power and authority in various contexts
* **Engage in democracy as a life-enhancing, every day practice of skills such as attentiveness to public affairs and current events, regular volunteering, creative use of conflict, active group membership and collective problem solving**
* **Express their voices through informed citizenship and participation in civic and political processes**
* **Confidently engage in civic discourse, self-reflection, and consideration of other points of view**

**What sources of data and possible assessment measures do we have that are relevant to these sub-outcomes?**

**Local data and resources- SMSU:**

* Civic Engagement Survey (CES) and Civic Engagement Survey-Revised (CES – R)
* NSSE (2008, 2011, 2013)
* Campus-wide Survey of Civic Engagement (2009; previously in 2004)
* Service-Learning Outcomes
* Data about service activities done in groups in three areas of campus:
  + Student Clubs
  + Athletics
  + Residential Life
* Review of relevant rubrics and assessment measures

**Identification/review of resources from relevant national and regional organizations:**

* AACU Civic Engagement rubric
* Measures available through AASCU American Democracy Project
* Rubrics/measures available via National Campus Compact, Minnesota Campus Compact, AASCU Corporation for National and Community Service

🡪(SCOTT PETERSON– Review of CES Insights)

**What do we know from what we have gathered thus far? (selected insights)**

* Noticed gap between what graduating seniors were saying they had done with respect to civic engagement and what we knew students were doing via athletics, student clubs and residence life
* Asked ourselves why this might be the case?...... Maybe as students do various forms of civic engagement --- vote, volunteer, sit on local boards, write letters to the editor, stay up on current events—they are not connecting those activities to ….

**“I am an engaged citizen in these ways.”**

* Decided to start there….
  + - How might we measure students’ spontaneous sense of themselves as engaged citizens?
    - What is their understanding of the notion of “civic engagement”?

**Recognized need to develop new measures and processes…kept certain considerations in mind**

* What rubrics or parts of rubrics might we use?
* Time efficient
  + - With regard to administration
    - With regard to time needed to evaluate
* Exportable—i.e., could be used relatively easily across different LEP courses/disciplines
* What makes sense developmentally as a campus (i.e. Where are we now as a campus?)

**Made use of one open-ended question:**

***What does civic engagement mean to you?***

* **Initially 3 sections of LEP 400 (2012, 2013):**
  + One had a primary focus upon civic engagement and applied civic engagement assignments (on campus)
  + One discussed civic engagement in more general terms (on campus)
  + One considered civic engagement (online)
* **Pre/Post**
* **Reviewed and coded for themes, for example:**
  + Multi-faceted, differentiated vs general view of civic engagement
  + Sense of efficacy… Can I do this?
  + Sense of motivation…Desire to do more civic engagement?
  + In addition word count…. How much can they spontaneously say?
* **Followed up by administered to lower division courses – Development Psychology (one included SL, other did not)**
* **Now in process of developing Likert scales for selected themes to quantify change over time**

**Made adjustments to other measures of civic engagement:**

* **CES- R-** May use with both LEP 100 and LEP 400 courses (in process of gathering data from LEP 100/LEP 400 courses)
* **Service-Learning Outcomes** – Piloted use SL outcome measure by any faculty interested in quantitative/qualitative assessment of what students gain from SL experiences (have completed pilot analysis; in process of encouraging SL faculty to make use of common form)

**IMPLICATIONS**

* **Have means of measuring change over time Fr🡪Sr** 
  + CES- R (LEP 100-🡪LEP 400…and those in between 200/300 level courses)
  + *What does civic engagement mean to you?* (LEP 100—LEP 400)
* **Have means of measuring pre/post “***What does civic engagement mean for you?”***for courses that address LEP Outcome #8 – Practice Responsible Citizenship**
  + **Could be adapted to more specifically address content of a given course –e.g. “**How does knowledge of American government relate to being an engaged citizen?”
* **Able to make distinctions between engaged citizen outcomes based upon how civic engagement is addressed in a given course:**
  + Courses that address CE generally in lecture/discussion format
  + Courses that address CE in lecture/discussion + service-learning
  + Courses that have primary CE lecture/discussion focus + application/ SL assignments (e.g. LEP 400 *Self as Citizen* course)
* **In others areas of campus---Student Clubs, Res Life, Athletics—need means of measuring more than just WHAT students are doing?..........**

Could also measure e.g. “What does volunteering mean with regard to view of yourself as engaged citizen?”

* Could train RAs, student club leaders, and student athlete leaders to help fellow students reflect upon services/civic engagement experiences in this way.

**APPENDIX D:**

**Civic Engagement Campus-wide Survey of Civic Engagement Insights (Chart) – Student Perspective and Faculty Perspective**

**NEED TO INSERT CHARTS**

**APPENDIX E: What does civic engagement mean to you? Summary of Qualitative Measure- Preliminary insights**

LEP AHA Committee for Civic Engagement

**Qualitative Assessment of Student Understanding of Responsible Citizenship**

**(2013-2014)**

**October 12, 2014**

**Overview:**

Based upon review of campus wide assessments of civic engagement (2004 and 2009) and review of results from the Civic Engagement Survey completed annually by SMSU graduating seniors, it was clear that students’ conceptualizations of civic engagement vary widely, with many students indicating only a minimal understanding of the notion. With this in mind, along with an intent to identify an efficient and not time intensive means of measuring change in students understanding of “civic engagement” , the committee determined to make use of a one question qualitative item “*What does civic engagement mean to you?*” in several LEP 400 course and a few lower division courses from Spring 2013-Fall 2014. This qualitative data is currently being analyzed, including coding for common themes in pre/post responses, running a word count to measure how much students are able to describe in a 10-minute timeframe, and finally developing a Likert scale coding system for identifying themes for use with future pre/post assessment of students’ understanding of the nature of civic engagement.

Found below is data from ONE sample course, LEP 400, taught in Spring 2013 and involving junior and senior level students. This course was title Self-as-Citizen and made use of a text that summarized the research of Harvard social psychologist, Ellen Lange on “mindfulness” as it relates creative thinking and problem solving processes. Students read and discussed this body of research, along with working in groups to address a social problem of their choosing (e.g., sex trafficking, inhumane treatment of animals, water quality in rural, impoverished regions of the world, access to rural healthcare, driving while fatigued). The project included an information literacy component covered by SMSU librarians and required students to make use of at least four different forms of civic engagement to address their particular social problem (e.g., sign a petition, volunteer, assume an advocacy role of some sort, contact government leaders, write a letter to the editor).

**General Findings:**

At post-test (i.e., at the end of a semester long course taught in a traditional in-class, seminar format), students were able to speak at much greater length about the topic and were able to describe their understanding in a more differentiated versus global or general manner. Specifically, their understanding of civic engagement was not limited to one or two forms (e.g. volunteering and voting), but to a broader variety of forms. In addition, at post-test, students were able to note concrete examples of various types of civic engagement and speak to attitudes, values and skills that characterize being a an “engaged citizen” .

**Question Protocol:**

Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Professor of Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: For the next ten (10) minutes, please respond to the following question with the first thoughts that come to mind. Do not worry about being grammatically correct. Simply write in a free form way. (If you are not in a group setting, please time yourself, no longer writing after ten minutes. )

Thank you!

**QUESTION: What does civic engagement mean to you?**

**PRE- TEST – CIVIC ENGAGEMENT QUESTION-Spring 2013**

**Olson LEP 400 Spring 2013 CE? (Pre)**

* Well, considering I’m not exactly sure what “civically engaged” means, I would have to say that what being civically engaged means to me is that…well, I don’t know. I guess to be civically engaged is to care about and actually do something about global and local issues. I personally will listen and hear about it but I don’t really do anything about it, except maybe learn about it more or try to understand it better.
* I’m not exactly sure what civic engagement means but if I had to guess I would say it means helping in the community around you whether it’s helping an elderly lady with her groceries or helping clean the ditches; anything in that order.
* I don’t feel like I can define “civically engaged” well enough to give a good answer. At the moment, I would say it means to have an active role in the community and playing a part in helping to better those around you. Going along with that definition, my personal level of civil engagement is low.
* Being civically engaged means involving yourself civically. It can range from doing a lot of things. Taking part in your community, picking litter off the ground, raising money to feed the hungry, and being involved in politics are all examples of actions of being civically engaged. It is involving, engaging in, and caring for our society and humanity as a whole.
* Participating in conversations during a class period, being open-minded towards other’s opinions to see how many different opinions there are out there other than yours, discussing a certain topic without purposely hurting someone’s feelings, willing to learn new information in order to better understand your major.
* Civically engaged means understanding the individual’s values and norms, finding significant connection with other individuals, society and the world. Also, as being part of the society, helping community and society to make it a better place for all.
* It means a lot to me because if kept me alert of what others are doing around the world. It makes people be together and know each other.
* Civic engagement, by definition, means working to make a difference in the civic life and our communities. So what do I do? For the first part I stay involved in the community by participating in pen pals with middle school kids. I also am part of a Christian organization that meets at the high school and middle school campuses. I find myself always looking for an opportunity to be civically engaged. During the Christmas holiday I spend some time helping at a mattress giveaway for families that have children sleeping on the floor.
* It means to me that I am willing to be/get involved in the community I live in. To help others and myself understand people and their views. The will to put aside negative ideas and work with others to be more positive in the thought of improving our society, and making your community and our world a healthier environment.
* To me, being civically engaged means to be actively involved in the community such that our own actions benefit everyone locally and/or globally and make people aware of the current issues and find a solution to these issues.
* To be civically engaged to me means going out of your way to help others in need. You are not thinking about how it will look on your resume. You are helping the world become a better place because you want to. The only benefit you get from it is the enjoyment that you help others. It does not have to be anything big. You could do anything from visiting the elderly to packaging meals to send overseas. If you are helping others who you do not know, to make them feel better, you are being civically involved.
* When I hear civically engaged, I think of just being engaged, aware, and involved in event happening around you.
* Being civically engaged means voicing your opinion if you feel that individuals and government are wrong.
* Always on the lookout for someone who can use my help, guidance, skills, opinions, rational thought, a listening ear, anything to help a person on an as needed basis. I am an Eagle Scout and assistant scoutmaster and I am going to be a personal trainer.
* Being civically engaged means to be active in your community socially and physically whether if it’s helping in schools, centers, shelters just simply means being involved and helping others in your community.
* As far as I’m concerned, I am a very creative person, get a long with everyone whom I live with. I always do the things the way I want without any doubt.
* Being civically engaged means being involved in things to help local businesses or organizations. I think that by being on the volunteer fire department is an example of being civically engaged.

**POST- TEST – CIVIC ENGAGEMENT QUESTION-Spring 2013**

**Olson LEP 400 Spring 2013 CE (Post)**

* Issues that arise/occur currently in your area, national or/and international. Some examples are animal cruelty, animal hoarding, not enough awareness on pet therapy, obesity, food hunger, children concerns/nutrition, lack of healthy water, businesses taking our money, waste of energy, etc. Civic engagement is similar to environmental issues but doesn’t have to be environmental. Engage in interactions with others to make someone’s life better whether it’s a person or animal. Caring, fixing, loving, support, donate, adopt, import/export, civic rights, civic duties, helping. Keep the world here, be alert/aware of others who need help.
* Civic engagement means mindfully being aware of the issues around you and being able to distinguish what is important to you. After becoming aware, civic engagement means taking action. This action can be done to somehow make a difference and better the world in some way, whether big or small. The civic engagement I always think of is volunteering, also donating. Civic engagement is something everyone can get involved with. Civic engagement is making a difference in the world.
* Civic engagement means stepping outside of your normal comfort zone and doing things to make yourself along with others better people. It is about finding out who you really are and if you want to stay or change in some way. There are many issues in the world that need attention. We can help in some of the smallest ways possible. It can be as simple as signing a petition or as complex as going to Africa and feeding the children. By civically engaging ourselves, we are able to help others even if we don’t believe we are making a change. If we stop thinking of ourselves and start thinking of others, we will be better off.
* It means acting and doing something for a cause. We all have beliefs that things should change. In order for that change to happen, we need to stay active. Get out there in the world and do something positive that will change the world, a little at a time. Let the world know what we can do to work as a team and help make the world a better place to live in. I believe the civic engaging part should be something we need to keep up with. It doesn’t change overnight. We need patience and determination to see changes happening. Giving up is always an easy option, but if we don’t have values that we don’t want to work hard for, changes won’t happen. Sometimes, we have to be the leader in order for changes to start happening.
* Civic engagement means to me that one is involved in their house, community, country and world. Any of these could fall under civic engagement. It is the desire to make changes for the better in whatever way possible. It is also selfless actions, putting others before you, and aiding those in need. In the future I want to have a strong family and be involved with a church. Those are the main ways I can see myself being civically engaged, by being a good example to those around me, and raising children that are good examples for those they are around.
* Civic engagement to me is the process of thinking mindfully to the daily activities and social issues in our society. It is about putting some effort back to the society, as being thankful of how society has shaped us to be the civil citizen. Civic engagement is being creative and authentic of who we are and how we present to the rest of the world. It is also exploring ourselves as we move along life and giving back to the society and world as a whole. Civic engagement is helping the humanity in a small or big way so that our future generation can have more opportunity and better lives.
* To me, civic engagement means being civically engaged via an organization or individually. To be engaged in helping others, making people aware of issues in our society/world. Actively participating in events or projects that help spread awareness of the issue or work towards eradicating it. While there are organizations that are civically engaged on a bigger scale, it is possible to be civically engaged by doing simple things like playing “Free Rice,” bake sale/fundraising and donating money to charity, free education, free services to public. Civic engagement is something that unties a group of people for a good cause, whether it be to end hunger, or to end abuse or end poverty or what not. Civic engagement is GREAT! It makes us great citizens of the world.
* Civic engagement means a lot to me because I have learned a lot from the project I did and from my classmates. If I had never taken this class, I would not have known what civic engagement meant.
* Activism, checking out perspectives, see where people are coming from, what their thoughts, dreams and ambitions are. It means standing up for your morals, values, beliefs but also respecting others as long as they’re not displaying violent or unethical ways to obtain their goals. I think it should be noted the civic engagement website on SMSU tends to lean liberal. I think something like this should be balanced and if politics involved should have information from both parties, an issue such as prolife vs. prochoice should have organizations from both sides. The main thing people should be able to make a decision after seeing and hearing both sides of an issue. Civic engagement is a good thing, makes you aware and better informed. Feels good to state your opinion and point of view either to others or to legislations.
* Civic engagement covers such a broad area. To me personally it means helping others in your community, state, nation, and world. Giving of yourself to show the meaning of connection and care. We all have our own special talents and gifts that can shower over into our lives and other’s and make this world a happier and safer place. We don’t need to conquer the world. Think of all the little things that can show appreciation and make a difference. Engage, immerse, jump in and do something with the life you have been given. Langer and Loeb (?) both spoke well on ideas that we can work with.
* It means to put yourself out there to help in any form, shape, means, or way, in what you believe needs to be changed, or promoted, or cared about, or made aware, doing it in a way you’re passionate about, and it makes a difference in a community, at school, in a state, in the nation, across nations, any way or means to experience a difference. It includes getting out there and doing something, making it known what you care about, finding ways to execute what you care about and doing it, not just once but for life and the more you do it the more new things you care about will come your way and the cycle repeats or someone new is inspired to do the same. It is aware of good wills and deeds to try and make a difference and it makes people feel good.
* To me civic engagement means several things. First and foremost, it means becoming aware of situations or events that are happening in the world. After becoming aware, a person should take steps and develop goals to help change a situation in the world that bothers them. There are many forms of civic engagement that even the busiest of people can fit into their life. Freerice.org is a wonderful example of something small that a person can do to make a difference in the world. Civic engagement means that a person contributes themselves to a cause, for the best of humanity. This can be small or big. It can be as simple as asking questions, wondering why something is the way it is. Civic engagement requires a person to give back to the community. As humans civic engagement is the best way we can give everyone an opportunity to get “a slice of the good life.”
* Civic engagement means (to me) to be active in the community, to be helping out even in the most simple way. Volunteering to help out at an animal shelter or to give lessons of some sort to children for free when you have free time. To be civically engaged is just to help out, to inform yourself and others about something going on in your own community or just nationally that affects everyone. To inform and to help out in some way is to be civically engaged. It can mean a great deal to one person or a lot of people. But for me certain issues like animals are the most important.
* Civic engagement means helping out in the community and trying to make the world a better place. It could be anything from trying to stop animal cruelty to addressing the world hunger problem. It could be something as simple as writing a letter to something along the lines of signing a petition or protesting. Civic engagement is engaging in the community and civically trying to improve any aspects you feel need to be addressed. It also includes trying to help educate people about the problem at hand. Better awareness will lead to better efforts to help.
* In my three years at SMSU, I have never known about the civic engagement center. Now it seems to be part of everyone’s activities. I am glad to be in this class to hear about civic engagement. So, I am aware of these activities from now on. It helps individuals and it helps the community around us.
* Civic engagement to me means getting involved within the society. This could mean anything from volunteering to cleaning ditches to working at a post office. Anything that gets a person involved in the local businesses. It can also mean helping for a specific cause like abortion, child obesity, hunger, and many other things. By being civically engaged a person is aware or mindful of all the amazing things they can do to help this region, state, and even country to be the best that they can be. If I knew how easy it was to go online and sign petitions and join clubs that help change different ongoing issues. I would have done it a long time ago. By being civically engaged we are contributing our thought to make this world a better place. We not only get to voice our opinion but we get to see we are not the ones who think that the issue needs more thought and push behind it to change the ongoing problems.