

MCSLHE Steering Committee Minutes  
June 14, 2005  
Metropolitan Community College  
10AM- 3PM

**Attendance:** Jacquie Lonning (USD), Linda Moody (UNL), Cynthia Gooch (MCC), Linda Major (UNL), Penny boykins (Creighton), Gary Heusel (MCSLHE), Christine Haney (MCSLHE), Kathryn Ballobin (CCC), Geraldine Stirtz (UNK), Jean Karlen (Wayne), Nora Bacon (UNO)

**Review Agenda:** Upon review, Cynthia made a movement to approve the agenda. Penny seconded. The movement to approve the minutes was passed unanimously.

**Review of Minutes:** There is a review of the minutes for the last meeting in April at Wayne. Gary suggested that there is an issue pertaining to Steering Committee term lengths. Currently it is stated that UNL has a two year term ending this year (2005), though there seems to be an un-spoken understanding that UNL will have a standing position throughout the duration of the grant. Gerry, also mentioned that she had sent revisions to the MCSLHE office to the minutes from April. Gerry moves to table to approval of the minutes pending the addition of her revisions as well as clarification of the term limit issue. The movement is approved unanimously.

**Review of Sub-grants:** Christie suggests that any corrections to individual institution sub-grant reports be given to her directly following the meeting rather than during the meeting. Gary notes that the MCSLHE currently has \$38,000.00 remaining from years 1 & 2 funds for all sub-grants. There will be an additional \$250,000 for all year 3 sub-grants. The \$38,000 is remaining after the following schools submit their proposals: Wayne, UNK, UNL (each at \$20,000) and Chadron (\$15,000).

There is still an issue with institutions not sending their invoices to the UNL granting office. The office needs to receive the invoices directly and in a timely fashion. All sub-grantees are instructed to send their invoices immediately following expenditure rather than annually, or even quarterly. Without proof of expenditure, the federal office may question the Consortium's need for further funding. This understood, the Consortium was granted third year funding.

Jean requested a clarification for the situation in years 2 and 3 regarding invoices. Penny suggested not granting institutions who have not sent in invoices or reports during year three (at least until they righted their situation). Gary noted that as per the last Consortium meeting, there is a November 1, 2005 deadline for submission of ALL sub-grants. This deadline is necessary due to the restrictions on time for the primary grant. By November 1, 2005, the MCSLHE office would also like to be fully righted with all invoices and reports for all sub-grantees.

Regarding the additional funds (\$38,000), Gary wondered if we should open faculty sub-grants again. Cynthia suggests that this may be too confusing and appear as though the MCSLHE does not stick to its deadlines. Jean suggested a MCSLHE-level research project. Gary reminded everyone that Scott Chadwick would be coming to the meeting later on and may assist with the idea of a MCSLHE research project.

Jean suggested many ideas for research among the Consortium institutions.

Penny suggests that we could still set aside the money for new faculty sub-grants rather than funding previously funded faculty. Cynthia, again reminds that we should stop waffling on deadlines or refrain from having deadlines. Gary mentioned that the fiscal years do not match up between UNL

and the MCSLHE, but that \$38,000 is available through November 1, 2005. Gerry asked once to clarify, that faculty sub-grants are in fact closed. Gary confirmed this. Jacquie suggested that we open the sub-grants until June 30<sup>th</sup> and then move any remaining funds to Year 3 and close until that point. This would enable those who had not yet applied for funding, UNK, UNL, USD, CCC, etc. to apply and receive funding.

Jean submitted her LASSIE but mentioned that the numbers are too flexible and can easily be manipulated. She stated that we need some continuity when asking people to report so that we might have real numbers. She also suggested using some of the MCSLHE money to hire someone to create this tool. Gary mentioned that we had hired someone to create such a tool but the tool was not appropriate thus has not been utilized.

Gary agreed to leave the money through until June 30<sup>th</sup> and then roll the remaining funds over into Year 3 funding.

Jacquie brought up the Alternative Spring Break issues of learning objectives and academic credit. She wanted to know if other institutions were offering credit for their trips. It was suggested that she contact representatives at NWU, Midland (J-term and Spring Break). Gerry was also wondering about the amount of service for these trips. She was wondering if some of the trips did not require as much service for their students as other trips. Jacquie explained USD's very rigorous program. Linda Moody suggested possibly using ASB funds as faculty sub-grants to take students out into the field for academic and service purposes. It was mentioned that everyone needs to be exposed to the basics, ie: "what is service-learning" vs. an "internship" vs "work study" vs. "Co-op."s. Linda Moody and Cynthia both wondered if we could bump up the amount of money for faculty sub-grants, to \$3,000. There was much discussion on this topic. Jean mentioned that several people say that the \$2000 is not enough for writing the grant, others use even smaller grants with high levels of success. Jean suggested that new faculty (or those new to S-L) may need greater funding for course development than those who are established and need only small funds to assist their efforts. Jacquie agrees with this statement. Gerry suggests use of institutional sub-grants money for transporting students (via reimbursement) for S-L projects in other areas (her example was students traveling from UNK to Grand Island).

Linda Moody asked if everyone felt the most recent faculty RFP was workable. Jacquie said her faculty thought the RFP was fine in length. Nora said she also did not hear anything negative. Someone asked if the new faculty reporting guidelines have page guidelines as some previous reports have been very long. Christie confirmed that the guidelines do have page limitations. Gerry suggested that if institutions can not reimburse students for travel then the institution can funnel some of the funding through to the non-profit agency that may then reimburse the students in cash. Jacquie also reminded folks to account for taxes, etc. when considering stipends and per diem with a contract (between a student and the agency). She also suggested that alternative weekends provide money for mileage with proof of travel.

Gary mentioned that most faculty requests are for faculty time or conference travel to assist in developing new courses. Linda Moody moved to increase faculty sub-grants to \$3000 from \$2000 and to include student travel as an allowable expense (this needs to be made explicit in the RFP) for NEW course development only. Gerry seconded the motion. There was unanimous approval. Nora added that there be additional "small" sub-grants for former recipients or "update money". Jean suggested some of the institutional sub-grant money goes to "celebrations" for sub-sub-grant

recipients. These celebrations afford the S-L office the opportunity to gather surveys and other data-oriented information from S-L participants and organizers. Jean also mentioned that these gatherings offer a sense of credibility or validation to those who are including S-L in their courses.

**Set Dates:** Again, November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005 is the deadline for submission of proposals for all sub-grants. Linda brought up the issue of Alternative Break learning outcomes again. Gerry was concerned with the amount of service on these trips. Gary brought up the conversation he had with Cara Patrick mentioning that the ASB sub-grants are on their way out as the Corporation questions their utility and adherence to the requirements of L&S grants and outcomes. Penny mentioned that there were no adults participating in the Creighton ASB this year and that she wondered how we could be sure that the ASB students involved were, in fact, performing service at all. Gary assured her that there are letters of support from the agencies to be involved as well as reflection pieces later on. Jean mentioned that the Habitat for Humanity that Wayne students worked with worked with the students, sans adult, but that there was agency documentation. Gary also mentioned that few if any ASB trips were related to a specific course (NWU, exception). He did say, however, that a learning objective and reflection component were required for granting. Linda requested that the RFP list examples of learning objectives and reflection pieces (and contacts for previous successful grantees). Jacquie suggested that all ASB sub-grantees use same reflection survey. Gary asked if we could set a standard reflection. Jacquie suggested one from Breakaway and Penny, Jean and others mentioned that there were several models available. At this point Gary suggested that we create sub-committees similar to those of last year to revisit and make any necessary changes to the RFPs for the various sub-grants. The following sub-committees have been set:

ASB- Jacquie, Cynthia  
Faculty- Gerry, Penny  
Research- Jean, Linda (Dianne Nagy?)  
Institutional- Linda, Jean

These committees will include all sub-grant report guidelines with the RFPs. Jean suggested that all RFPs also have page limitations and all appendices or “extra” pieces (Assurances and Certifications, Cover pages, etc) in hand with the RFP.

**Scott Chadwick Visit:** Scott visited with the group to discuss an assessment with particular regard paid to the research agenda. He has looked at the Performance measures and FURCO tool. Creighton will be using their institutional sub-grant to request funding for organizing a Consortium-wide research project. This will include matching one faculty person from each institution with an agency representative. The Consortium member will assist with the long range outcome; models of assessment and outcome development. Also, one person from each institution should cross-mentor at another member institution.

Scott proposes to use the Fall to identify people teaching in the Spring and to train those people. Additionally, Creighton will have a symposium in late March or early April (open and inclusive-focused on S-L). This will be used to promote the scholarship of teach and learning- there could be credit for scholarship dissemination rather than some direct tenure-related incentive. The learning objective of courses could be similar to the original course objective, only slightly “tweaked”. There will be an increased importance placed on linking students’ outcomes with Institutional expectations for students (Accreditation). This is important for direct measurement of faculty flexibility and there is an imbedded assessment in the classroom. One thing to consider are direct versus indirect measurements, ie. Critical thinking- thematic assessment (direct). What measurements exist

(standardized)? Scott mentioned that it is less important to be “normed” than to be measured against your original rubric. Cross-Consortium-wide variation will offer a series of models for use. Qualitative research is the way to go. Scott also suggests that this training be for all pairs in the Consortium.

There is some additional funding available from the Consortium for an assessment. This will be open to all Service-Learning courses/faculty. There will be additional assessment from the IRB process (training) and most assessments are exempt (1 shot case study). Detailed, streamlined plan for great assistance to agency/organization. Course goals should not be independent from S-L goals- thus there should not be additional assessment.

Jean- agency piece better than teacher assessment piece. Possibly use 3<sup>rd</sup> year agency focus to bring agency people to one place. Build your travel money into the institutional sub-grants.

Geri- books on S-L and research assessment readily available from her office.

Scott- he will summarize all ideas and send out a draft proposal for review.

Jacque- will be out of work all summer (technically) so please send the information as soon as possible.

Gary- Scott and Gary were working on the idea of a FURCO revision using different categories- an improvement to his tool. Revisions not this third year, but for the next time around.

It was suggested that some research be done to determine whether all those who have completed FURCOs are on the same page. Ie. Are all ‘7s’ in the same place? Is the FURCO data helping or not?

Linda- look at FURCO for Washington Campus Compact (Linda will get the information to Christie).

The gathering for agency or consortium reps could be held in Wayne during the Fall. Otherwise there will be a Symposium in the Spring at Creighton. This is not yet formalized time-wise.

Cynthia- for the sake of new members could we compile a Power point or some other teaching aid for all of the S-L acronyms? There is so much to know and it is very difficult to follow the process and conversation with so much foreign language. Jacque has a cheat sheet she can get to Christie and then Christie can pass on to all others. The MCSLHE and mentors can work with new members to guide them through this learning.

**Annual Colloquium/Conference:** Jacque- there are currently twice as many applications/proposals as available spaces.

**Consortium Membership:** If our recruiting efforts continue at the pace they have been going, the Consortium will meet its suggested quota for membership very shortly. The Consortium pledged to 24 members by the end of year three. If all interested parties commit we will meet that goal by the end of the summer. There are other institutions the Consortium would like to bring on board including community colleges and tribal colleges. The Consortium will need to discuss how many members they would like to “top out” at. Would the Consortium like to continue to build its membership regardless of how many institutions are members or would they like to stop after a certain point?

Jacquie- SDSU has powerful connections to the tribal schools as they are already working with them and have been for some time.

If anyone is interested in recruiting please go through Gary so that we are not recruiting or promising too much in the way of funding or crossing paths.

**VISTA Update:** Central Community College, Chadron, College of Saint Mary, Creighton, university of Nebraska-Kearney, and metropolitan Community College have all already completed their work plans and have their VISTA numbers to recruit VISTA members. The College of Saint Mary is sending their Consortium representative to the July training so that they are prepared for the hiring process.

Gary suggested that you try to find local people who may be interested in becoming a VISTA before relying on a national search. You will be more inclined to find people who have vested interests in the community than those who are coming into a new community sight unseen. This is especially true for a smaller community in the Midwest.

**North Platte S-L Conference:** UNK has some pre-service people attending. They have dropped the price for students who wish to attend to \$25 to cover meal costs. Please encourage your teacher education people to attend. Chadron State is also sending people.

**International Conference in SD:** They have reduced the rate for Consortium members to \$450. Jacquie also mentioned the the DC conference in August for the “Points of Light” is giving breaks to all L&S institutions at \$500.

**Review of the Director:** There was a pre-Steering Committee meeting with Linda Major to assess Gary Heusel’s performance for the past several months he has held his position. Gary, Linda Major, Geri and Penny will meet about this review at a later date.

**Other Business:** Jean, Linda, Gary and Scott – discuss overarching research for the Consortium, the FURCO piece and analyzing differences between various types of institutions and data on gender differences (Where are the men?).

There is a UNO person who does assessments (Barb Dewy) who should also be a part of this meeting.

**Next Meeting:** August 22<sup>nd</sup> or July 29<sup>th</sup> ?