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Introduction:

A goal of the University’s strategic plan is to “engage in external collaborations that extend and deepen Notre Dame’s impact.”1 As a step toward the fulfillment of this goal, and in light of its mission “to create a sense of human solidarity and concern for the common good that will bear fruit as learning becomes service to justice,”2 the University created its first-ever community engagement strategic plan in 2012.3

The Community Engagement Coordinating Council (CECC) was established to guide the fulfillment of the plan, with leadership from a small steering committee and a Director of Academic Community Engagement (DACE). The CECC helps to coordinate, communicate, and support the work of the many units across campus that, as part of the fulfillment of their own strategic plans, engage with communities and community organizations to foster student learning, knowledge creation, service, and economic and community development.

The first plan addressed four key areas: infrastructure, partnerships for economic development and K-12 education, student development, and communication. Select accomplishments on each goal are included in Table 1.
Table 1. Goal Areas and Select Accomplishments, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>Select Accomplishments and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Infrastructure** | • CECC and Steering Committee (>25 participants) met regularly to drive progress on goals  
• Addition of community partners from Memorial Hospital, City of South Bend, Bridges Out of Poverty, and South Bend School Corporation, bringing community perspectives to the effort |
| **Partnerships**   | • Bowman Creek Signature Project builds the foundation for engaged teaching, research, and local community development opportunities  
• Perley Elementary hosts Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistants from ND Center for Languages and Culture |
| **Student Development** | • Graduate Certificate in Community Engagement and Public Scholarship workshops attended by students from 14 departments  
• Contribution to Engaged Learning Proposal prior to submission to Core Curriculum Committee |
| **Communication**  | • Development and launch of Community Engagement website  
• Co-hosted TRUCEN (Teaching and Research Universities Community Engagement Network) annual meeting, welcoming 35 colleagues from peer and aspirational peer institutions |

While progress has been made since 2012, many involved in the work of community engagement have recognized a need for new goals based on changes in the environment and progress already made. These would:

- reflect more explicitly engagement with geographic communities or issue areas as well as K-12 education and economic development;
- attend to outcomes in communities to a greater extent, as well as to outcomes in student learning and faculty academic production; and
- promulgate a deeper understanding of what community engagement is and can be within and across the disciplines.

Committed to continuous improvement, and convinced that we need to frequently re-engage both partners on campus and beyond in defining our strategic priorities, in 2016 the CECC commissioned a sub-committee to update the University’s community engagement plan. The animating goal of this second strategic plan is the following:

1. Community-University Collaborations: Build and sustain active partnerships that are focused on effectively addressing areas of mutually beneficial interest.

   The second, third, and fourth goals of the plan, though important in their own right, are oriented toward increasing our overall effectiveness in executing goal one.

2. Faculty, Staff, and Student Development: Enhance and expand academic community engagement of faculty, staff, and students.

3. Communication: Use creative strategies to more effectively communicate engagement opportunities and impacts with internal and external audiences.

4. Infrastructure: Deepen and expand University infrastructure to support and coordinate academic community engagement.
What follows uses the strategic planning rubric common to individual colleges and departments across campus. It begins with definitions of community engagement. It then provides an orienting problem statement, a mission statement, a vision statement, and most importantly, each of the four strategic goals. Each goal is delineated by describing the tactics necessary for reaching the goal, points of integration with various University units and key stakeholders, indicators for measuring progress, and pertinent financial implications.6

I. Definitions:
As defined by the Carnegie Foundation,7 community engagement refers to the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. Academic community engagement, also referred to as engaged scholarship, is a specific conception of community engagement that connects the intellectual assets of the institution (e.g., faculty expertise) to a host of public issues such as advancing human and environmental health, enhancing educational opportunities, and promoting social, cultural, and economic development.8

Community engagement takes a myriad of forms across the domains of teaching, research, and service, and among non-academic units of the University as well as academic. These include, in the realm of scholarship, internally and externally funded research, such as National Science Foundation (NSF) efforts that involve a “broader impact” component, translational research in the sciences and social sciences, public scholarship carried out in the humanities, and community-based research across the disciplines. In the realm of teaching, community-based learning exemplifies this work, as do other programs that take students into the community to learn, perform, research, and serve. Engagement also includes performances and presentations within local communities, and many diverse service activities on the part of every University constituency.

II. Problem Statement:
Many institutions of higher education—in this country and abroad—are explicitly and powerfully re-committing to scholarship, teaching, and learning enhanced by community engagement.9 Increasing numbers have taken action to incorporate such efforts into the hiring and rewards structures of their institutions.10 A central thread of this commitment focuses on their surrounding communities, with which universities often exist in great interdependence. This strategic plan responds to such local concerns. It has been carefully informed by an expansive and data-driven process. Between 2009 and 2016, three separate inquiries into community engagement provided diverse stakeholder input.11 Five findings emerged with regularity across these data sources.

• First, Notre Dame is perceived as somewhat removed from the local community, and members of the community at large at times feel unwelcome.
• Second, Notre Dame’s community engagement efforts are viewed as not regularly coordinated or organized, with unclear portals of entry into the University.
• Third, an opportune area for robust engagement must be with K-12 education, and Notre Dame should strive to do more in that domain.
• Fourth, local and regional economic and community development are additional prominent areas in which the University can and should do more.
• Finally, the data sources uniformly noted that engagement efforts at Notre Dame are not publicized as clearly, broadly, and directly as needed both internally and externally.
Beyond our particular local area, funding and technologically driven forces encourage institutions of higher education to engage with community partners, often across disciplines, as an important way to address intractable social challenges that face our world. The National Institutes of Health (NIH), for example, seeks community partner input into the design of research, so as to assure useful, appropriately disseminated results. It is to such concerns as these that this plan is also important for our University, particularly in light of our mission as a Catholic institution.

These problem statements should not obscure the fact that community engagement at the University of Notre Dame is in many ways impressive and far-reaching, both in scope and depth. The receipt of the 2010 Community Engagement Classification from the Carnegie Foundation was an important marker of our progress. But it is an accolade best received simultaneously as an honor and a challenge. At our institution, many would agree that there has been growing internal awareness that we can do better.

III. Mission Statement:
The University of Notre Dame’s Community Engagement Strategic Plan seeks to establish and deepen a culture of community engagement at the University of Notre Dame.

IV. Vision Statement:
Animated by its unique identity as a preeminent Catholic research institution, the University of Notre Dame embraces and values engagement with communities and community organizations—local, regional, national, and international—as a powerful means for advancing the principles of Catholic Social Tradition (CST) upon which it rests, among those, human dignity, solidarity, and the common good. Notre Dame’s approach to engagement values citizens and organizations as resources for learning and collaborators. Such engagement builds on the rich assets of its students, faculty, staff, and non-academic partners, local and across the globe. It stresses the importance of measurable, sustained, efficiently communicated efforts that exhibit long-term impact both within the academy and in the world.
Goal One

Community-University Collaborations:
Build and sustain active partnerships that are focused on effectively addressing areas of mutually beneficial interest.

Rationale:
Institutions of higher education are increasingly devoting resources to research, teaching, and learning that affect economic and community development. More and more, such engagement occurs in partnerships between academic and non-academic expertise and perspectives in local communities. As a Catholic university whose mission calls it to foster solidarity and the common good, we must be particularly committed to such partnerships.

Tactics:
Community-university collaborations focus on critical topics, including environmental and human health, as well as in geographic areas, for example, Bowman Creek in South Bend, Indiana and Haiti. New partnerships regularly emerge from faculty scholarship agendas, community need, strategic interests, and the like. Fulfillment of this goal on partnerships entails the following tactics.

1. Support partnerships that foster respectful listening and discourse to recognize mutually beneficial areas of interest
2. Assist potential and existing partnerships in selecting strategic focus, effective partnering, attention to outcomes in communities, and assuring values of Catholic social tradition (CST) are fostered through University engagement

Points of Integration:
The CECC, through subcommittees, its steering committee, and the DACE, will have primary responsibility for this goal. Points of integration exist with every unit of the University involved in community partnerships.

Indicators of Success:
1. Relevant subcommittees active through CECC to assist in fulfillment of goal
2. Establishment and tracking of measurable criteria for successful practices in partnering
3. Evidence of partnership goals attained (e.g., documented outcomes in the community)
4. Approaches in place to assist partnerships in effective partnering, reaching community outcomes, and reflection of CST values
5. Recognition for faculty, staff, students, and community partner efforts

Financial Implications:
1. Support for DACE to address this goal
2. Support for individuals and units that provide staff time, including community partners
3. Funds for measurement, data collection, and analysis
4. Funds for various forms of recognition
Goal Two

Faculty, Staff, and Student Development:
Enhance and expand academic community engagement of faculty, staff, and students.

Rationale:
The Fall 2011 SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis conducted by the CECC indicated that community engagement was not strongly valued at the University. Some have suggested that the ways community engagement is and can be manifested in academic life is not widely understood. The CECC full committee stressed the need for senior academic leadership to address these concerns. The 2016 perception survey reinforced this interest.

Tactics:
1. Foster greater understanding across the University of the ways academic community engagement can be expressed
2. Increase the number of faculty, students, and staff involved in community engagement annually
3. Increase funding and other types of recognition (e.g., grants, prizes, awards) for faculty, staff, and student initiatives, across all colleges and non-academic units, as well as forms of acknowledgement for such work
4. Document participation of University constituents in community engagement and the outcomes of this work (e.g., academic publications, fulfillment of department student learning goals, contributions in off campus communities)

Points of Integration:
Most colleges and schools, as well as many non-academic units, address community engagement as part of their strategic plans and other organizational guidelines and will continue to do so. The Center for Social Concerns in conjunction with the provost’s office will take the primary responsibility for overseeing that this goal is furthered.
Indicators of Success:

1. Increased involvement of faculty, students, and staff
2. Increased University acknowledgement of faculty, students, and staff
3. Documentation of increases and results
4. Increased funding and other incentives for the work that fulfills this goal

Financial Implications:

1. Increased funding for faculty in the form of course development grants, engaged research support, awards, prizes, etc., to further and recognize engaged work
2. Enhanced funding to:
   a) integrate engagement with undergraduate research, in particular within the new core curriculum initiatives;
   b) support the involvement of first year students, under-represented students, and students of limited means;
   c) support graduate student involvement; and
   d) foster staff involvement and recognition.
3. Support for further development of a baseline of involved faculty, students and staff and for tracking of future related efforts.
Goal Three

Communication:
Use creative strategies to more effectively communicate engagement opportunities and impacts with internal and external audiences. Use stories and collected data to enhance the coordination and impact of Notre Dame’s activities.

Rationale:
Office of Public Affairs’ research originally conducted in 2009, the Spring 2011 WorldStudio report, and the Fall 2011 CECC internal SWOT analysis, all indicated a need for improved communication and documentation of community engagement activity. These data sources cited inefficiencies, lack of accessibility, and concerns about sustainability. These concerns were reiterated in a 2016 Community Perception Study, as well as in an internal survey of CECC members in May 2016.

Tactics:
1. Solicit language from University leadership that demonstrates to internal and external audiences an enduring commitment to and investment in community engagement
2. Consolidate/coordinate internal and external campus engagement websites (engage.nd.edu; community.nd.edu; impact.nd.edu; publicaffairs.nd.edu; socialconcerns.nd.edu; etc.)
3. Refine and publicize web-based survey instrument (EngageND) for use by engaged members of Notre Dame community to improve awareness, communication and reporting
4. Enlist communications staff from across the University to develop creative and consistent media (newsletters, press releases, blogs, videos, websites, etc.) to document and disseminate community engagement stories
5. Develop consistent but flexible platforms for Notre Dame engagement message (for external audiences) through adbooks, programs, print material, annual reports, etc.
6. Identify and implement consistent mechanism to ease community access to engagement contacts at Notre Dame, one that either advertises or responds to community inquiries electronically or by phone

Points of Integration:
The CECC Steering Committee, the DACE, and the Director of Community Engagement in the Office of Public Affairs will provide leadership and accountability for this goal, but points of integration and interdependence exist among campus communicators, and within most colleges, as referenced in their strategic plans. Potential also exists for collaboration with the Office of Human Resources.23
**Indicators of Success:**

1. A statement from President John Jenkins, CSC, Provost Tom Burish, and Executive Vice President, John Affleck-Graves will be solicited by August 2017. It will be requested that the statement introduces the University’s engagement.nd.edu website, along with the mission, vision, values statement of the CECC.

2. Engagement.nd.edu webpage is maintained and updated weekly. A cross-unit team of the CECC is developed to monitor Google analytics on site traffic, and who is accessing which content, measured quarterly, and reported to CECC annually.

3. Web-based instrument “EngageND” is used by 30% of faculty and staff by 2017.

4. By July 2017, a consistent message is developed with input of ND Strategic Communications and CECC membership.

**Financial Implications:**

1. Developing an engagement portal on nd.edu was accomplished through an internal contribution from the Vice President of the Office of Public Affairs and Communications. EngageND was created by OIT and financed by Public Affairs. Additional costs may include:
   a) EngageND enhancements to include “predictive text” for entries into the community partner category to improve efficiency (est. $15,000);
   b) cost for writing content (free-lance) for websites (est. $7,500); and
   c) marketing costs to promote engagement efforts in social/print media (est. $15,000).
Goal Four

Infrastructure:
Deepen and expand University infrastructure to support and coordinate academic community engagement.

Rationale:
In 2016, the CECC full committee reiterated a preeminent need identified in the Fall 2011 SWOT analysis conducted by the CECC steering committee for senior academic leadership to support academic community engagement, and to build sustainable means to support and integrate engagement efforts.

Tactics:
1. Develop and implement a set of policies and procedures for the CECC and move to incorporate them into the Academic Articles.
2. Determine priority tactics to be addressed each year; track, document, and evaluate fulfillment of these tactics and facilitate revision of activities as needed.
3. Pursue stable sources of support and funding for academic community engagement.

Points of Integration:
The DACE will have primary responsibility for assuring the tactics are implemented. The Steering Committee and Chair of the CECC will provide overall leadership and accountability.

Indicators of Success:
1. CECC instantiated in Academic Articles
2. Attainment of Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2020
3. CECC policies and procedures followed each year
4. Evidence of tactics addressed each year and revised for next year
5. Increases in support for academic community engagement

Financial Implications:
1. Appropriate compensation for the individual in the DACE role, with administrative assistance and budget for events and material
2. Support for institutes and other units that provide staff time
3. Funds for faculty institutes, workshops, etc.; for faculty awards; and to support signature projects. Modest funds are already accessible, generally on a competitive basis, through the Center for Social Concerns, The Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts (ISLA), and other Notre Dame sources, and through some local community sources (e.g., Community Foundation); these should be enhanced based on the specific objectives taken on as the fulfillment of the plan unfolds.
This University Community Engagement Strategic Plan seeks to catalyze engagement not only in response to goal five, but in each of the goals of the University Strategic Plan.

Goal I. Catholic Character
Ensure that our Catholic character informs all our endeavors

Goal II. Undergraduate Education
Offer an unsurpassed undergraduate education that nurtures the formation of mind, body, and spirit

Goal III. Research and Scholarship
Advance human understanding through scholarship, research, and post-baccalaureate programs that seek to heal, unify, and enlighten

Goal IV. Stewardship
Foster the University’s mission through superb stewardship of its human, physical, and financial resources

Goal V. External Engagement
Engage in external collaborations that extend and deepen Notre Dame’s impact

4 The items delineated in Table 1 were led as follows: Bowman Creek Project - College of Engineering; Perley initiative and the Community Engagement Website - Office of Public Affairs; Facilitation of Engaged Learning Proposal, Graduate Student Certificate, and the hosting of TRUCEN - Center for Social Concerns.

5 Eckel et al. (1998) argue that institutions attend to two key elements in considering institutional change: pervasiveness and depth. The CECC strategic plan attempts to foster both broad integration of engagement, and opportunities for depth and complexity.

6 This strategic plan emanates from a broadly informed and systematically conducted process that has unfolded over the past six years. The plan represents the expertise, insight, and input of many individuals, including faculty, staff, administrators, and community members.

7 Founded in 1905, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is an independent policy and research center that boasts many achievements for U.S. higher education. For example, it was a leader in the effort to provide federal aid to low- and middle-income students. Its definition of community engagement can be found at: http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=241&Itemid=92. For more information on the Carnegie Foundation, see: https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/who-we-are/foundation-history/.

8 A substantial literature on community engagement and higher education has evolved over the last few decades. Relevant overviews are provided by Welch (2011) and Post, Ward, Longo, and Saltmarsh (2016). See also the Research University Engaged Scholarship Toolkit developed by TRUCEN.

9 In a comprehensive statement entitled A Crucible Moment, 2015 a national task has suggested that we are at critical juncture with respect to civic health, calling for institutions of higher learning to “advance a 21st century vision of college learning” that will promote democratic engagement and civic inquiry.

10 See Cavallaro, 2016. Cavallaro was guest editor of a volume for the journal of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities that focused on issues pertaining to the integration of engaged scholarship into the incentive and reward structures of higher education institutions. This is one of an increasing number of publications with this focus in recent years.

11 The inquiries are discussed in the following: The Task Force on Community Engagement in St. Joseph County (2009), an external evaluation of Local Community Engagement (World-Studio, 2011); and the Community Engagement Coordinating Council’s Strategic Planning Pre-Assessment (SWOT Analysis, 2011). Together these investigations tapped over 400 campus and community-based individuals, providing explicit evidence for problem articulation (see Appendix A). In 2016, the office of Public Affairs conducted a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the community’s perception of University engagement activity (2016).

12 Because community engagement had become core to the missions of many higher education institutions, the Carnegie Foundation developed a system to recognize them early in this century. Notre Dame attained the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2010, and must reapply in 2019 to maintain this status (Jana and Earwicker, 2015, 33-34).

13 See http://www.crs.org/about/guiding-principles for a listing of the commonly referred to principles.

14 Non-University constituents may include business, civic, and non-profit leaders. Networks and partnerships include, as examples, the Regional Economic Development Authority, Community-Based Learning Coordinators, and Eck Institute for Global Health international partners.

15 Examples of mechanisms for respectful listening include communication tools such as websites, newsletters, annual reports, interactive social media, etc. supported by a database of engagement activity (EngageND) that facilitate connections between campus and community.

16 Public education, public health, and support for business start-ups/relocations are examples of strategic areas of community/economic development.

17 Values embodied in Catholic social tradition include, for example, efforts that further the common good, that is, structures and systems that create the environment for upholding human dignity.

18 Specifications of Points of Integration
a) Office of Provost (support for faculty); Associate Provost (monitor progress of strategic plan and the work of the DACE)

b) Deans, department chairs, center and institute leadership, non-academic unit leadership (contribute to strategic plan, identify members for CECC, take responsibility for the fulfillment of the plan in their units as it relates to the strategic plan of each unit)

Endnotes
c) Notre Dame faculty and staff (participate on CECC, take on subcommittee roles in fulfilling the strategic plan)
d) Center for Social Concerns (prepare and support faculty; facilitate partnerships with community stakeholders; facilitate undergraduate and graduate student involvement)
e) local community organizations (contribute to development of partnerships and other community engagement activities in which ND constituents are involved)
f) ISLA, the Center for Social Concerns, the Center for Undergraduate Scholarly Engagement (CUSE), and the Office of Development (provide sources of funding)
g) Notre Dame Research (partnering on funding opportunities)
h) University Relations (Public Affairs assistance with communications and Office of Development assistance with funding)
i) key staff from the Office of Public Affairs in collaboration with the Office of Executive Vice President, the Director of Engineering, Science & Technology Entrepreneurship Excellence Master’s Program (ESTEEM) and the Office of Treasury Services (to improve effectiveness of this strategy internally)

19 Particular attention will be paid to increasing numbers of first year students, students from underrepresented groups, students of limited means, and graduate students.

20 This will be accomplished by:
a) presenting and/or formalizing, engagement opportunities through better communication of established programs, consultations, incentives, etc.;
b) offering professional development for faculty and staff through workshops, and other opportunities, for example for acquisition of internal and external grants for building research programs and teaching that involve communities;
c) developing formal platforms for recognition of involvement, such as a community engagement awards; and
d) providing related student leadership and public service training opportunities.

21 Improving recognition and valuing of community engaged work will include considering the role of academic community engagement in faculty promotion and tenure.

22 This will be done in the following manner.
a) Establish a comprehensive baseline for:
   • the numbers of faculty, students and staff participating in engaged work,
   • the forms this work takes,
   • the number and types of resulting academic contributions,
   • incentives provided through the University, and
   • numbers and forms of recognition.
b) Annually update the information collected in (a). A baseline exists partially at this time. As it is developed, it will be possible to specify the increases that are desirable and feasible.

23 Specification of Points of Integration
a) Dozens of units across campus already engage the community in a myriad of ways. Many of these units have communicators or outreach staff already. These workgroups have been convened periodically through Marketing and Communications as well as Public Affairs for continuing education and coordination. These will be important constituents to convene and discuss common language, coordination of data collection, and publicizing efforts.
b) Data collection could be woven into the strategic planning of units that have integrated community engagement into their plans. Using the “EngageND” platform, reports can be generated by college or unit if deans, department heads, and supervisors encourage staff to enter their engagement efforts into this university-wide database. Data can also be disaggregated by student organization, so data entry and retrieval will need to be coordinated with Student Activities and the Department of Athletics.
c) For Human Resources purposes of assessing performance related to university values, departments can encourage staff to enter engagement activity to support/demonstrate performance goals related to Catholic character, leadership, etc.

24 These will further the work of the CECC as a standing committee to advise the University, in particular the Office of the Provost and the Office of Public Affairs and Communications, on community engagement. Guidelines will include and elaborate the following.
a) The CECC will continue as an entity broadly representative of University units, especially those with primary relevance to engagement efforts, and will include off-campus community partners.
b) The CECC will continue to be chaired by the Executive Director of the Center for Social Concerns, who will hold regular meetings of the Council to ensure broad and strategic representation from pertinent campus constituencies toward fulfillment of the strategic plan.
c) A steering committee, comprised of a subset of members of the CECC membership, will assist the work of the CECC.
d) A Director of Academic Community Engagement (DACE) will be appointed by the Provost, ideally selected from regular faculty.

25 Points of integration and interdependence exist with the Office of the Provost, and each College/School/Institute/Center, and related non-academic units, especially with regard to community engaged activity outlined in their respective strategic plans.


## Appendix A

### Problem Articulation and Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem/Issue</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The community at large feels unwelcome or excluded; Notre Dame is perceived as somewhat isolated from the community</td>
<td>Strategic Planning SWOT Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement efforts are not regularly coordinated or organized; there is a lack of clear, accessible community engagement information, and a clear portal of entry. Uncoordinated, inconsistent effort are seen as the main barriers to collaborating with ND</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with K-12 education is a critical area for partnership and ND does not do enough in this domain</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More community engagement should come in the form of additional, focused business/economic development</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement efforts at ND are not publicized as clearly, broadly, and directly as needed</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources, broadly construed, are in short supply, making it difficult to foster community engagement</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External stakeholders have very limited understanding of the depth and extent of ND’s current community involvement</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement is not highly valued as a scholarly endeavor and is infrequently accorded status in faculty review processes</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of leadership is a barrier to engagement</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access is a barrier to engagement</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A low quality of life in the local area will be a detriment to a healthy, vital university</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. During Fall 2011, the Steering Committee of the Community Engagement Coordinating Council conducted a SWOT analysis on community engagement to inform strategic planning. 195 Notre Dame faculty, staff, and administrators completed the online survey.
2. In 2009, the Task Force on Community Engagement in St. Joseph County in collaboration with the ND Office of Public Affairs and Communications summarized the findings of 113 internal interviews and ten community focus groups drawing upon 102 attendees.
3. In May 2011, WorldStudio submitted a report entitled “Local Community Engagement: Research, Findings + Recommendations,” which was based on focus groups and interviews with 48 participants (29 external, 19 internal).
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