Outreach and Engagement Council  
Minutes: Wednesday, October 30, 2013  
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
138 Animal Bioscience Building  

Kim Obbink  Diane Dorgan  Shelley McKamey  Julie Kipfer (Guest)  
Kregg Aytes  Eric Hyppa  Jeanne Wilkinson  Mandy St. Aubyn (Guest)  
Jill Martz  Lindsay Murdock  Kathy Tanner  Shelby Rogala (Guest)  

I. Call to order  

II. Approval of Minutes of September 25, 2013 meeting  
   a. Lindsay Murdock motioned to approve minutes, Kathy Tanner seconded, and minutes were approved.  

III. Information Items  
   a. Introduce Jeanne Wilkinson as a new member replacing Donna Negaard as professional employee representative  
   b. Shannon Moreaux has asked to step down as a faculty senate representation. Members were asked to contact Kim if there are suggestions for a replacement from the faculty.  
   c. President’s Commission on the Status of University Women (Julie Kipfer)  
      - Commission was created to improve climate on campus for women.  
      - There is a process that will review policies that may have bias towards woman. If someone would like to submit a policy for review there is a link on the website.  
      - Equity advocates are trained to be an intermediary to talk.  
         1. Goal is to have one in every building on campus.  
         2. The advocates are listed on the website.  
         3. If you are interested in becoming an advocate please contact Diane Letendre.  
   d. Celebrating Engagement plan update (Suzi Taylor)  
      - First piece is with communications, waiting to be approved.  
   e. Update regarding metrics for engagement for the new faculty activity database (Digital Measures) with Chris Fastnow and reinstated planning group (Kregg, Kathy, other?)  
      - Kregg and Kathy reported on the one meeting they attended.  
         1. Still answering questions on what engagement is.  
            a. Is consultant work engagement? Does it depend on whether they get paid?  
            b. Lindsay offered to send definitions that Council created to Chris Fastnow for distribution to the group.  
            c. Everything is driven by Role & Scope documents, which many define as on campus service work.  
         2. Kregg thinks there are 2 approaches that can be taken.  
            a. Very clearly agreed upon criteria; start there and add as appropriate.  
            b. Gather all info and possibilities and criteria. Information come from evaluation process. Then decide what will be allowed and not.  
   f. Update regarding Provost’s Excellence in Outreach Award(s)  
      - A separate meeting is scheduled to review applicants.  
      - Sarah R. will send out information on how to access applicants as soon as we receive it.  

IV. New Business  
   a. SCOPE (Shelby Rogala)
- Student based organization which is about a year old.
- Goals are to:
  1. Support students who take research out to communities both local and statewide.
  2. Encourage more student based community research.
- Current projects include:
  1. Carter County renovation of County Museum.
  2. Nursing & inmate project – received grant to prepare inmates for their health options upon release.
- Interested in finding a University sponsorship.
  1. Would like a location on campus for office.
  2. Would like volunteers for an informal advisory board.
      a. Kim, Jill & Kregg all volunteered. Shelby will be in touch.
  3. Looking to put together a statewide advisory board.
- Committee was invited to a presentation on Carter County project. Information will be sent out as soon as it is set.
  b. Software for student engagement (Kathy Tanner)
     - Mandy St. Aubyn is researching of software for student engagement.
     - What purpose is this trying to solve?
       1. Meet strategic goals.
       2. Want to track engagement
       3. Eager to facilitate move to help all involved. (students, staff & faculty)
     - Tools allow students to not only report engagement but also helps them reflect on the experience.
     - All products offer co-curricular transcripts
       1. Allows students to display what they did outside the classroom and what they gained from it.
       2. Students self-administer.
     - Discussion of the attributes of the three products which filtered to the top during research project:
       1. OrgSync
       2. Collegiate Link
       3. Symplicity
     - How would we benefit from these products?
       1. Diane showed how multiple constituents would benefit individually.
       2. In general staff, faculty & students would be able to set up an account and identify with several groups.
       3. Organizers would be able to send out targeted emails to promote upcoming outreach opportunities. These can be sent by portals or by demographics.
       4. Deans/Administrators would be able to get a bird’s eye view of what their students, staff & faculty were doing in terms of engagement.
       5. Registration can be done entirely online for activities and engagement opportunities.
       6. All electronic so printing costs go down considerably.
       7. Integrates with Banner.
       8. Cloud based, so does not take up IT space.
       9. Has social media integration as well.
     - Kregg asked about approximate costs.
1. OrgSync - $21,200 startup plus annual fee
2. Collegiate Link - $22,400 yearly
3. Symplicity - $16,500 startup plus annual fee.

- Lindsay wanted to assure everyone that Staff Senate was in favor of getting a product for student engagement reporting purposes.

- Next steps – Where the project currently is?
  1. Will start presenting at campus committees to provide information
  2. Will be asking for support.
  3. Informal proposal being worked on for alumni association.
  4. Will be looking at other investment proposals for which to apply.

  c. Report from Engagement Scholarship Conference (Obbink, Martz, Murdock, Taylor)
     - This agenda item was moved to the December meeting.

V. Next Meeting – need to change?
   a. Wednesday, November 27, 2:30 – 4:00pm in Reid 415
      - Sarah will send out doodle poll to reschedule November & December meetings due to holidays.