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“We will support a culture that engages the university beyond the borders of the campus, promoting partnerships that catalyze discovery, innovation, and economic development, while concurrently improving the quality of life and individual well being.”
“Maturing the rapidly evolving graduate education, research, and creative activities of the institution combined with a new outreach and engaged scholarship initiative, will be hallmarks of the next decade.”

Provost’s Comments: Texas Tech University: A foundation for the next century: A pathway to 2025/Strategic Plan. p. 4
TTU: STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Educate and empower a diverse student body

Enable innovative research and creative activities

Outreach and Engagement
On the next three slides, we’ll present a description of a project for you to read.

Decide whether the project is an example of outreach or engagement.

When it’s time, vote by raising your hand.
Outreach or Engagement?

Marketing Great Lakes Whitefish
- Help fishing businesses along MI coastlines to establish stringent guidelines for the industry to assure high quality product and a speedy trip from lakes to market.

Partners
- MI Sea Grant, NOAA (funder), MSU Product Center, tribal and fishing industry leaders, local chefs, restaurants, Northern MI University’s culinary arts program
Outreach or Engagement?

Hurley’s Partners in Heart

• Local pastors approach medical school to collaborate in a healthy heart initiative.
• Health professionals and MSU College of Human Medicine students train church members to screen for high blood pressure with the goal of reaching those with high blood pressure gain information about cardiovascular risks and, if necessary, to seek treatment.
Outreach or Engagement?

WRA 417 Multimedia Writing (with the Cherokee nation)

• Three year service-learning partnership couples MSU undergraduates and graduates with members of the Cherokee nation to develop website’s audio, video, interactive technologies to document various era’s of Cherokee history.
Foster an engaged campus that recognizes O & E scholarship as an essential component of institutional activity.

Achieve a sustainable O & E program through diverse funding streams and long-term campus-community partnerships.

Increase and strengthen collaborative, mutually beneficial community partnerships that stimulate creativity, innovation, and social and economic development.

Enhance recognition of faculty and staff who contribute to O and E activities that impact local, state, national and global communities.
Foundations Seminar Overview Part 1

• Community-Engaged Scholarship Movement
  – Outreach, Engagement, Service
  – Outreach to Engagement Continuum

• Evolving Institutional Definitions and Characteristics

• Key CES Concepts
  – Foundational Scholarship
  – Community
  – Knowledge Traditions and Ways of Knowing

• Types of Community-Engaged Scholarship
  – Community-Engaged Research and Creative Activities
  – Community-Engaged Teaching and Learning
  – Community-Engaged Service and Practice
  – Community-Engaged Commercialized Activities
Outreach refers to

- Academic work done for the public.
- Applying existing knowledge.
- Unidirectional flow of knowledge (e.g., from the university to the public).
- Distinction between knowledge producers & knowledge consumers (e.g., universities produce knowledge & public consumes it).
- Primacy of academic knowledge.
- University as center of public problem solving. (adapted from Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, pg. 22).
Engagement refers to

- Academic work done with the public.
- Inclusive, collaborative, problem-orientated
- Multi-directional flow of knowledge
- Co-creation of knowledge (e.g., both universities and communities together create solutions)
- Shared authority for knowledge creation (e.g., both universities and communities have relevant knowledge)
- University as part of an ecosystem of knowledge production addressing public problem solving
- Community change that results from the co-creation of knowledge (adapted from Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, pg. 22)
COMMUNITY ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

EVOLVING DEFINITIONS
Re-defining Faculty Work

Beginning of the Movement

Boyer challenged higher education to extend “scholarship” beyond its discovery mission to include teaching and application (1990).

- Scholarship of discovery
- Scholarship of teaching
- Scholarship of application
- Scholarship of integration

In 1996, he called on higher education to embrace the “scholarship of engagement” to deal with critical societal issues.

- Scholarship of engagement
What Do We Mean By Community?

Geographic

- Shared physical space such as a neighborhood or region
More Definitions of Community

**Identity**
shared race, gender, or other characteristics

**Affiliation or interest**
shared a common set of values or concerns

**Circumstances**
shared a common experience such as surviving a natural disaster or managing a particular disease

**Profession or practice**
shared specific knowledge to occupation, skill, or trade

**Faith**
shared belief system, customs, and religious or spiritual practice

**Family/Kin**
shared relationships through family and/or marriage

(Based on Fraser, 2005; Gilchrist, 2009; Ife, 1995; Marsh, 1996, Mattessich & Monsey, 1997; Wenger, Pea, & Brown, 1990)
Community Engagement Scholarship is...

- Scholarship-focused
- Goal oriented toward change
- Community-based
- Systems oriented
- Mutually beneficial
- Capacity-building
- Sustainable
- As a public good
Kellogg Commission on Engagement (1999)

Seven Guiding Characteristics

1. Responsiveness
2. Respect for partners
3. Academic neutrality
4. Accessibility
5. Integration
6. Coordination
7. Resource partnerships
Four Distinguishing Characteristics of Engagement

It is *scholarly*. A scholarship-based model of engagement embraces both the act of engaging (bringing universities and communities together) and the product of engagement (the spread of scholarship focused, evidence-based practices in communities).

It *cuts across the missions* of teaching, research (knowledge of discovery and knowledge of application), and service, rather than being a separate activity, engaged scholarship is a particular approach to campus-community collaboration.

It is *reciprocal and mutually beneficial*; university and community partners engage in mutual planning, implementation, and assessment of programs and activities.

It embraces the processes and values of a *civil democracy*.

Defining Engagement: Big Ten Academic Alliance

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Big Ten Academic Alliance

Indiana University
Michigan State University
Ohio State University
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
Rutgers University
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Maryland
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Nebraska
University of Northwestern
University of Wisconsin


Carnegie Foundation (2006)

“(T)he term “community engagement” was defined broadly as “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” (Driscoll, 2008).

Key concepts
• Collaboration
• Mutually Beneficial
• Partnerships
• Reciprocity
What Is Foundational Scholarship?

Foundational Scholarship is the body of knowledge that informs and guides your engaged work.

1. Scholarship about the issue being addressed
2. Scholarship from your discipline or field
3. Scholarship of Engagement
4. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (called SoTL)
5. Scholarship related to the population affected by the issue
6. Scholarship related to the paradigm, method, or approach
7. Scholarship related to the collaboration or engagement process used
8. Scholarship related to reflection, evaluation, assessment, or lessons learned
9. Or any combination
Local Indigenous Knowledge

*Indigenous Knowledge* is similar to local knowledge, because it is based on practices specific to a place society. However, unlike local knowledge, indigenous knowledge is the result of sustained interaction between indigenous peoples and their environment, passed down over generations. It has significant historical, cultural, and social dimensions (Argawal, 1995).

**Indigenous knowledge**
- represents a holistic, inclusive way of knowing
- embodied in indigenous and Native cultures
- distinct and separate from dominant cultures
Tacit and Tacit Knowledge


**Explicit Knowledge**: can be transmitted in formal, systematic language. Definitions, equations, published theories, textbooks, etc.

Engaged scholars value, surface, and incorporate the tacit knowledge of community members and practitioners into their community engaged work.
Each set of “decision-makers has their own goals, accepts certain types of evidence (and discounts other types), and its own language. In other words, we find we are dealing with different knowledge cultures, each with its own interests” (Brown & Lambert, 2013, pg. 40-41)

- Key individuals
- Affected communities
- Specialist advisers
- Influential organizations
- Holistic thinkers
“Engaged” Incorporates Community Knowledge

In Collaboration with Community Partners
(including local, indigenous, or practitioner knowledge)

Scholarship informs your understanding and guides... …your experiences with community engagement, which, then in turn... …generate new scholarship and practice for both...

academic audiences

public audiences.
“...a priori existence of knowledge in non-academic groups and communities. However, these alternative forms of knowledge have been so long suppressed and marginalized that they may be difficult to bring to the surface.”

“University researchers have methods for and experience elucidating such hidden knowledge. Rather than extracting that knowledge as ‘data,’ universities can help communities to recognize, own and mobilize their own untapped knowledge reserves as a means of catalyzing social change from within communities” (Gaventa & Bivens, 2014, pg. 73).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expert-Centered</th>
<th>Democratic-Centered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Partnerships and mutuality</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deficit-based understanding of community</td>
<td>Asset-based understanding of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic work done <em>for</em> the public</td>
<td>Academic work done <em>with</em> the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Production/Research</strong></td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Inclusive, collaborative, problem-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidirectional flow of knowledge</td>
<td>Multidirectional flow of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positivist/scientific/technocratic</td>
<td>Relational, localized, contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>Distinction between knowledge producers and knowledge consumers</td>
<td>Co-creation of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primacy of academic knowledge</td>
<td>Shared authority for knowledge creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University as center of public problem solving</td>
<td>University as a part of an ecosystem of knowledge production addressing public problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Dimension</strong></td>
<td>Apolitical engagement</td>
<td>Facilitating an inclusive, collaborative, and deliberative democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• CES RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES
Community-Engaged Research

Definition

“Engaged research and creative activities are associated with the discovery of new knowledge, the development of new insights, and the creation of new artistic or literary performances and expressions—in collaboration with community partners” (Doberneck, Glass, Schweitzer, 2010).
Engaged Research and Creative Activity

Scholarly Approaches

- Use-inspired basic research
- Community-based research
- Community-based participatory research
- Applied research
- Contractual research (funded by government, non-governmental organizations, or businesses)
- Demonstration projects
- Needs and assets assessments
- Program evaluations
- Translation of scholarship through presentations, publications, and web sites
- Exhibitions, performances, and other creative activities
Logic Model for Community-Engaged Translational Research

Source: Eder et al., 2013
NSF Broader Impacts and Community Engagement Scholarship

Benefits to society
- Co-creation of knowledge
- Sustainable transfer of knowledge
- Generates true empowerment approaches to community development
- Creates mutually beneficial outcomes
- Creates public support for solution-focused partnerships
- Creates public support for PreK/12 educational improvements
- Potentially involves (impacts) whole community (diffusion)
- Creates transdisciplinary partnerships
- Creates startup companies, product improvements, innovation, and workforce development programs
- Enhances quality of research and evaluation
  - Implementation and fidelity
  - Reliability and validity
  - Diffusion and dissemination
CES TEACHING AND LEARNING
Community-Engaged Teaching and Learning

Definition

Engaged teaching (and learning) is organized around sharing (existing) knowledge with various audiences through either formal or informal arrangements.

Types of engaged teaching (and learning) vary by relationship among the teacher, the learner, and the learning context. Engaged teaching may be for-credit or not-for-credit, guided by a teacher or self-directed (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010).
CE Teaching and Learning
For Credit Examples

For-Credit
• Service-learning
• Community-engaged research as part of university classes
• Study abroad programs with community engagement components
• Online and off-campus education
Creating the T-Shaped Student for a 21st Century Workforce

**Collaborate Across Disciplines**

**Apply Knowledge from Other Disciplines**

**Connections to Community Contexts**

**Critical Reflection**

Students

Challenges

▪ Professional experience and community networks
▪ Stronger grasp of subject matter
▪ Understanding of social needs
▪ Civic engagement
▪ Personal efficacy
▪ Critical thinking skills

Benefits

▪ Managing time commitment
▪ New learning environment
▪ Expectation of professionalism
▪ Application of learning to real problems
## Community

**Challenges**

- Management capacity
- Operational capacity
- Pedagogical demands

**Benefits**

- Improved client services
- Volunteer assistance and capacity
- Town-gown links
- Networking
- New expertise, technologies, and research
- Resources
- Agency visibility
Institution

**Challenges**
- Scheduling
- Resources
- Time and oversight required to maintain relationships
- Staff’s ability to develop meaningful projects
- Mentoring and supervision

**Benefits**
- Pedagogical excellence
- Bridge building and town-gown links
- Student preparation and placement
- Living lab for research
- Scholarly publications
- Applied research support
Outcomes for CE TEACHING

Faculty Outcomes
• Higher satisfaction with student learning

Student Outcomes
• Improved student performance
• Increase student interest in the subject
• Improved problem solving skills
• Increased civic engagement
• Increased volunteering
• Increased political participation
• Improved intergroup relations

(Bringle, 2005; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Eyler et al, 2001)
Growth in Service Learning/Civic Engagement through CES

Registrations of Students Who Participated in Community-Engaged Learning and/or Community Service (2002-2014)

- 2002: 7,073
- 2003: 8,474
- 2004: 10,039
- 2005: 11,235
- 2006: 13,826
- 2007: 14,511
- 2008: 15,221
- 2009: 16,043
- 2010: 17,892
- 2011: 18,899
- 2012: 20,739
- 2013: 20,781
- 2014: 26,127

# Student Service-Learning Registrations
110 SPARTAN YEARLONG SERVICE CHALLENGE

On January 20, 2014, in honor of Martin Luther King Jr. and to commemorate the anniversary years recognized by the Michigan State University’s Project 60/50, the Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement and community partners launched *What’s Your 110? A Yearlong Spartan Service Challenge*. All Spartans were encouraged to honor each anniversary year of Project 60/50 with one hour of personal service/engagement by serving 110 hours over the next year.

THE GOAL:

IF 1,000 SPARTANS MET THE CHALLENGE, THE MSU COMMUNITY WOULD SERVE AT LEAST 110,000 HOURS OVER THE YEAR

60 years ago, in 1954, a Supreme Court decision made it illegal to segregate public schools based on a person’s race

50 years ago, in 1964, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Civil Rights Act, which outlawed major forms of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, national origin, and religion

110 years of civil rights activism to be commemorated by one hour of service each

1,000 Spartans participating

= 110,000 hours of service/engagement
THE RESULTS:

141,015 HOURS WERE SERVED

2508 SPARTANS TOOK THE CHALLENGE

44 SERVICE PROJECTS AND EVENTS

46 COMMUNITY ENGAGED LEARNING COURSES WERE OFFERED

141,015 service hours by Spartans

$22.13 hourly value for volunteer time in the state of Michigan*

141,015 x $22.13 = $3,120,661

in volunteer time contributed to communities in Michigan and around the world

Spartans Will. SERVE.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement
Aligning Undergraduate Education: Tools of Engagement Online Learning Modules

- Increase student competency and understanding of outreach and engagement
- Cover the scholarly, community-based, collaborative, responsive, capacity-building aspects of outreach and engagement
- Are delivered at introductory, intermediate, and advanced levels
- Contain background information; pre-class, in-class, and post-class lesson plans; lecture notes; and background materials
- Employ multiple learning techniques
Graduate Certificate in Community Engagement: 14 Core competencies, 2 cross-cutting themes

- Foundations of community engaged scholarship
- Variations in community engaged scholarship
- Initiating community partnerships
- Navigating community partnerships
- Techniques for community engagement
- Community engaged research and creative activities
- Community engaged teaching and learning
- Capacity building for sustained change
- Systems approaches to community change
- Evaluation of engaged partnerships
- Critical reflections on identity and culture
- Communicating with public audiences
- Scholarly skills—grant-writing and peer reviewed publishing
- Strategies for successful engagement careers
- Ethics and community engaged scholarship (cross-cutting seminar theme)
- Working with diverse communities (cross-cutting seminar theme)

Diane Doberneck (2014). Assistant Director, National Center for the Study of University Engagement. Michigan State University O&E.
• CES SERVICE AND PRACTICE
Community-Engaged Service and Practice

Definition

Engaged service is associated with the use of university expertise to address specific issues (ad hoc or long-term) identified by individuals, organizations, or communities.

This type of engagement is not primarily driven by a research question, though a research question may be of secondary interest in the activity (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010).
CE Service and Practice Examples

- Technical assistance
- Consulting
- Policy analysis
- Expert testimony
- Legal advice
- Diagnostic and clinical services
- Human and animal patient care
- Advisory boards and other disciplinary-related service to community organizations
CES COMMERCIALIZED ACTIVITIES
Community-Engaged Commercialized Activities

Definition

Commercialized activities are associated with a variety of projects in which university-generated knowledge is translated into practical or commercial applications for the benefit of individuals, organizations, or communities (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2011).
CE Commercialized Activities Examples

- Copyrights
- Patents
- Licenses for commercial use
- Innovation and entrepreneurship activities
- University-managed or supported business ventures, such as business parks or incubators
- New business ventures
- Technology Transfer
- Inventions
- Social entrepreneurship
PART TWO
Foundations Seminar Overview Part 2

1. University-Community Partnerships

2. Methodological Considerations

3. Systems Perspectives

4. Institutional Support for CES

5. Metrics

6. Economic Impact

7. Case Examples
   1. Institutional
   2. Individual
• CES PARTNERSHIPS
Ten Principles of Successful Partnerships

Initiating Partnerships.
1. Share a worldview or common vision.
2. Agree about goals and strategies.
3. Have trust and mutual respect.

Sustaining Partnerships.
4. Share power and responsibility.
5. Communicate clearly and listen carefully.
6. Understand and empathize with each other.
7. Remain flexible.

Outcomes of Partnerships.
8. Satisfy each other’s interests—mutual benefit.
9. Have their organizational capacities enhanced.
10. Adopt long-range social change perspectives.
Scholarship informs your understanding and guides...

...your experiences with community engagement, which, then in turn...

...generate new scholarship and practice for both...

In Collaboration with Community Partners (including local, indigenous, or practitioner knowledge)

academic audiences

public audiences.
Framework for an action-oriented approach to establishing a partnership

Respect → Adapting Styles of Communication → Equitable Parameters → Establish an Agenda & Parameters

Respect → Adapting Styles of Communication → Gathering Information

Respect → Adapting Styles of Communication → Exchanging Knowledge

Respect → Adapting Styles of Communication → Negotiating and Establishing Roles

Respect → Adapting Styles of Communication → Resolving Differences

Respect → Adapting Styles of Communication → Gaining Acceptance and Trust

Partnering Across Sectors: Triple to Quad Helix (2011)

“[I]n the new knowledge society, the forms of knowledge held by civil society groups - and also their voices - need to become part of the processes that give shape to the form and direction of the new society as it develops.

The triad of [university-industry-government] involves restricted forms of knowledge and restricted voices, which need the addition of the concerns and perspectives of civil society groups and organisations if the broad public good is to be achieved” (Cooper, 2011, p. 112).
“[E]xtending the new entrepreneurial university from its anchor in technology and industry to the activities and objectives of civil society requires a fully integrated Quad Helix of university-industry-government-civil society so that innovation, economic growth, and societal change are part of the discourse in which all elements of complex systems are working toward alignment and thereby optimizing sustainability” (Fitzgerald & Bargerstock, 2013, p.132).
Transdisciplinary Approaches

- Focus on complexity in science and in problems
- Accept local contexts and uncertainty
- Assume intercommunicative action: result of inter-subjectivity
- Are action oriented: linking knowledge from research with societal decision-making processes
- Embrace knowledge generation and knowledge application research

Characteristics of Community-University Collaborations

# Spectrum of Collaboration: What is the Participation Goal?

*Increasing Levels of Public Impact and Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Participation Goal</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities, and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that the public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of preferred outcomes.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degree of Engagement in Community Engaged Research & Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in Engaged R/E</th>
<th>Degree of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher Controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify issue of importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on research question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select research design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop instrument/process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate of findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create academic products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create public products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Stanton, 2008
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS: CBPR
Community-Based Participatory Research

- “A collaborative approach to research that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings. CBPR begins with a research topic of importance to the community and has the aim of combining knowledge with action and achieving social change...”

- WK Kellogg Foundation Community Health Scholars Program
CBPR: Learning Provides Connectivity between University and Community

• Learning:
  – About each other’s capacity and limitations
  – About each other’s goals, culture, expectations
  – To develop students as active citizens
  – To exchange expertise, ideas, fears, concerns
  – To share control and direction
  – To share results and apply them in different ways
  – To adapt based on evaluation and documentation
  – To experiment; to fail; to try again. To Trust

CBPR Conceptual Logic Model: 2013

Contexts
- SES, Culture, Education, Place, Environment
- Policy Trends: Funding/Governance/Institutions
- Historic Collaboration: Trust & Mistrust
- Community Capacity & Readiness
- University Capacity & Readiness
- Health Issue Importance

Group Dynamics & Equitable Partnerships
- Structural Dynamics:
  - Diversity
  - Complexity
  - Formal Agreements
  - Real power/resource sharing
  - Alignment with CBPR principles
  - Length of time in partnership
- Individual Dynamics:
  - Core values
  - Motivations for participating
  - Personal relationships
  - Cultural identities/humility
  - Bridge people on research team
- Personal belief: Spirituality
- Community reputation of PI

Relational Dynamics:
- Safety: Community voice/community language
- Trust
- Dialogue, listening & mutual learning as Flexibility
- Leadership/influence
- Power dynamics/Stewardship
- Self & collective reflection
- Particpatoriy decision-making & negotiation
- Integration of local beliefs to group process
- Task roles & communication

Intervention & Research
- Fits Local/Cultural Beliefs, Norms & Practices
- Co-Learning/Partnership Synergy
- Appropriate Research Design

Outcomes
- System & Capacity Changes:
  - Policies/Practices
  - Sustained Interventions
  - Changes in Power Relations
  - Cultural Renewal
  - Personal Benefits/Capacities
- Improved Health
- Disparities
- Social Justice

Health Outcomes:
- Transformed social/economic conditions
- Reduced health disparities
THINKING SYSTEMICALLY
"A system is a set of components (subsystems, units) which when coupled together form a functional whole. The study of systems requires:

- (1) identifying the subunits of the total system,
- (2) identifying the structural connections of subunits,
- (3) identifying and assessing the functional connections of subunits,
  and
- (4) assessing the properties that emerge when this collection of components are coupled over together into a specific dynamic structure and allowed to change over time."

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY SYSTEM REACH
Stimulating Collaboration, Co-creation, and Interdisciplinary Teaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular, Non-Developmental Approach</th>
<th>Singular but Developmental Approach</th>
<th>Systemic and Developmental Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on single individual representative from the community agency in the partnership</td>
<td>Involve multiple individuals from a single level of influence (all managers or all case workers) in the partnership</td>
<td>Involve multiple individuals from multiple levels of influence in the partnership &amp; determine boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on single community agency</td>
<td>Focus on single community agency while involving in periphery other community agencies</td>
<td>Focus on multiple community agencies as equal partners within the scope of desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on single community sector/university department</td>
<td>Focus on single community sector/university department while involving in periphery influencing sectors/departments</td>
<td>Focus on multiple community sectors/university departments as primary in partnership with shared risks and benefits for systems change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on primary outcome only</td>
<td>Focus on primary outcome while including other variables in model as “extraneous”</td>
<td>Focus on primary and other variables to more fully understand the complexity of promoting the primary outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYSTEMIC ENGAGEMENT for Systems of Complex Problems

**Systems Thinking**: Complex problems cannot be solved by isolated-impact approaches

**Collaborative Inquiry**: participatory approaches to research and evaluation

**Support for Ongoing Learning**: Lifelong or long-term strategic planning

**Emergent Design**: Co-constructive processes

**Multiple Strands of Inquiry and Action**: Tacit and Explicit Knowledge

**Transdisciplinarity**: researchers and community partners working jointly on a common problem using a shared conceptual framework that draws from multiple disciplines.

SYSTEMS CHANGE, PROGRAM PROJECTS, BUILDING IMPACT, AND EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE: From isolated-incident approach, to systems approach

Messes:

- Systems of Complex Interacting Problems
- INFANCY to 25 EDUCATION
- REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- INTERMODAL TRANSPORTION
- HEALTH AND WELL BEING
- ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
- WALKABLE NEIGHBORHOODS
- SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE
- FOOD DISTRIBUTION
- WATER QUALITY
- RACIAL AND SOCIAL INEQUITIES

Isolated-incident approaches to problem solving

- Individual Project Change
- Program Change

Systemic approaches

- Systems Project Change
- Will it Work Again?
- What worked for Whom?

Intentional Approaches to Spread of Effects: Diffusion and Dissemination Science

- **Diffusion:** Process used to communicate innovation over time among members of a social system. Diffusion occurs through (a) need for individuals to reduce uncertainty, (b) need for individuals to respond to their perception of what others are thinking, and (c) general perceived social pressure to do as others have done.

- **Dissemination Science.** Study of how effectiveness-based practices, programs, and policies can best be communicated to an interorganizational societal sector of potential adopters and implementers to produce effective results. (Dearing, 2009)

- Societal sector: collection of focal organizations operating in the same topical domain without respect to proximity together with organizations that critically influence the performance of the focal organization. (Dearing, 2008).

The Concept of a Learning City (Region) has its Origins in Reports Advanced by the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2002). Pascal International Observatory Agenda

A learning city (region) was envisioned as a city where all segments of society shared a commitment to, “promote inclusive learning from basic to higher education, re-vitalize learning in families and communities, facilitate learning for and in the workplace, extend the use of modern learning technologies, enhance quality and excellence in learning; and foster a culture of learning throughout life” (Conference Report: International Conference on Learning Cities, 2014, p. 27).

Commonalities and Differences in Key Aspects of Community Engagement Scholarship (CES) and Learning Cities/Regions (LC/Rs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CES</th>
<th>LC/Rs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life span</td>
<td>Life span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence based</td>
<td>Place based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic partnerships</td>
<td>Individual and organization learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Change (Systems focus)</td>
<td>Systems Change (Economic focus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems change</td>
<td>Systems and network creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creation of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data driven decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery: new knowledge</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application: scaling up</td>
<td>Dissemination outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Learning</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination Science</td>
<td>Democratization of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratization of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INPUTS:
Institutional Support for CES
Support for Community Participation and Partnerships

Institution has established Reciprocal Relationships with Diverse Individuals and Communities

- Proportion of faculty/staff/administrators that serve on external advisory, community, business boards & panels.

- Proportion of faculty/staff/administrators that are engaged with national, state, and local government officials.

- Systematic efforts are made to assess community needs (locally, nationally, internationally).

- There are established mechanisms for the public to contact the institution with requests for assistance.

- The institution documents resources generated for the public as a result of Engagement and Outreach activities

Institutional Financial Support for CES

Metrics:

• Proportion of total institutional funds directed to Engagement/Outreach activities.

• Proportion of all full-time faculty and staff with significant Engagement/Outreach assignments.

• Amount of any awards or seed grants that support/recognize Engagement/Outreach activities & innovations.

Methods: Budget analysis, review of personnel records, review of grant awards.
CES that Promotes the Well-Being of Individuals and Communities

**Metrics:**

- Proportion of faculty/academic staff involved in activities that promote **social, economic, physical and environmental well-being of communities**.

- Proportion of faculty/academic staff involved in activities that promote **civic engagement**.

- Proportion of faculty/academic staff involved with **technology transfer**.

**Methods:** Faculty self-report; Community partner surveys

# Community Outcomes for CE RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate →</th>
<th>Short-term →</th>
<th>Intermediate →</th>
<th>Long-Term</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased grant funding</td>
<td>Increased relevance of research to community concerns</td>
<td>Improved understanding of issues</td>
<td>Improved status or conditions for population of concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>Improved accuracy and cultural sensitivity of research</td>
<td>Increased use of research findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased relevance and effectiveness of interventions</td>
<td>Improved quality, reach, and effectiveness of services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased community capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTIVITIES
Faculty and Staff Involvement in CES
Faculty/Staff involvement in CES

**Metrics:**

- Proportion of faculty/academic staff engaged in **collaborative research programs that are community-based.**
- Proportion of faculty/academic staff that teach **credit courses that contain a community-based or service learning component.**
- Proportion of faculty who **include engagement/outreach activities in tenure and promotion portfolios.**
- Proportion of faculty/academic staff who participate in **clinical, field-based, or professional training programs.**

**Methods:** Faculty self-report; Review of portfolios; Training documentation.
Faculty and Staff Reward Structures

**Metrics:**
- Engagement/Outreach is a clearly identified component of the criteria for **promotion and tenure**
- Engagement/Outreach is clearly identified component of **annual faculty performance review**.

**Methods:** Document/website review, interviews
Assessing Excellence:
Promotion, Tenure, Merit Awards & Rewards

Four Dimensions of Quality Outreach and Engagement

Significance
- Importance of issue/opportunity to be addressed
- Goals/objectives of consequence

Context
- Consistency with university/unit values and stakeholder interests
- Appropriateness of expertise
- Degree of collaboration
- Appropriateness of methodological approach
- Sufficiency and creative use of resources

Scholarship
- Knowledge resources
- Knowledge application
- Knowledge generation
- Knowledge utilization

Impact
- Impact on issues, institutions, and individuals
- Sustainability and capacity building
- University-community relations
- Benefit to the university
- Benefit to the community (partner)

METRICS:
OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES & IMPACTS
INPUT: CES OUTCOMES & IMPACTS ARE ASSESSED

Metrics:

• The institution has assessment plans and tools that are developed in collaboration with external partners for demonstrating outcomes and impacts of engagement.

• There are annual reporting requirements and performance standards for documenting the effectiveness of university-community partnerships.

• The outcomes and impacts of Continuing Education and Extension activities are evaluated.

Methods:

• Document/Website review; interviews
## Outcomes/Impacts: Different Levels and Time Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Initial Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Skills, Values, Attitudes, Beliefs, Opinions</td>
<td>Understanding, Emotions, Self-expression, Spiritual Awareness</td>
<td>Individual practice and behavior, Spiritual practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group or Family</td>
<td>Shared Group/Family: culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views</td>
<td>Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>Group/Family relationships, Group/Family practices, Group/Family interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Shared agency culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views</td>
<td>Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>Inter-departmental relationships, Agency management practices, Service delivery practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery System or Neighborhood</td>
<td>Shared system culture, norms, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views</td>
<td>Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>System member relationships, System member interaction, System practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Shared community social norms, culture, values, beliefs, morals, ethics, world views</td>
<td>Community interests, Mutual understanding, Mutual agreement</td>
<td>Relationships among groups, neighborhoods, Civic action, Community dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Return on Investment (ROI) in CES 7:1

CE Research, Teaching and Service reported by:
• 3,100 of 4,950 tenured and non-tenured faculty
• over 7,200 projects
2010-2012 (Source: OEMI and CGA data bases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>ROI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>611.82 FTEs</td>
<td>6.98:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$56,924,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extramural Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$397,209,452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forms of Engagement Reported by MSU Faculty and Academic Staff in 2014

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES**

- Outreach Research and Creative Activity: **32.6%**
- Technical or Expert Assistance: **21.8%**
- Public Events and Understanding: **18.6%**
- Non-credit Classes and Programs: **12.4%**
- Credit Classes and Programs: **3.7%**
- Experiential/Service-Learning: **6%**
- Clinical Service: **4.9%**

OEMI 2014
Forms of Outreach Cross-Tabulated with Societal Concerns for 2014

The number of “responses” is greater than the number of “respondents.” Respondents were given the opportunity to describe their engagement activities for up to two areas of social concern; each description was counted as a separate response.
OEMI results for 2014 include the following:

**$15,824,766**
Value of salary investment by MSU faculty and academic staff in addressing issues of public concern (data from those reporting outreach activities on the OEMI)

**98.0%**
Respondents whose outreach contributed to achieving Bolder by Design (BBD) imperatives:

- **76.7%** Enhanced the student experience
- **81.9%** Enriched community, economic, and family life
- **45.6%** Expanded international reach
- **59.8%** Increased research opportunities
- **49.9%** Strengthened stewardship
- **66.3%** Advanced our culture of high performance

**721**
Number of specific projects/activities reported
Of the respondents who described specific projects/activities:

- **80.8%** Reported working with external partners
- **69.1%** Reported having created intellectual property and scholarly outcomes
- **61.6%** Reported that their outreach work impacted their scholarly or teaching practices
## Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inputs →</strong></th>
<th><strong>Activities →</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outputs →</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcomes →</strong> (1-6 Years)</th>
<th><strong>Impacts →</strong> (7-10 Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human, financial, org., and community resources</td>
<td>What the program or initiative <em>does</em> with the Inputs</td>
<td>Direct <em>products</em> of the Activities</td>
<td>Specific <em>changes</em> in people or communities that occur as a result of the activity</td>
<td>Intended or unintended <em>changes</em> in organization, system, or community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Impact of CES
### Types of University Impact on Economic Development

| **Direct Economic Support** | • Institutional employment  
• Purchasing  
• Resource sharing |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Human Capital Development** | • Faculty and staff hiring  
• Student, faculty, and staff training |
| **Knowledge Transfer** | • Faculty consultation services  
• Faculty research serving the community (e.g., governmental bodies, local businesses and nonprofit organizations) |

Institutional Economic impact (2014)

Table 2. Selected Sample of Public and Land Grant University Reports on Annual Economic Impact (in billions of dollars), Number of Employees, and Full Time Students. Individual refers to single institution impacts; System refers to state university system impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Employees Individual</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>22,196</td>
<td>139,263</td>
<td>309,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>24,393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>98,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,193</td>
<td>52,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>50,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Madison</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,924</td>
<td>43,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>73,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,508</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria determining economic impact varies from one institution to another. Wisconsin’s impact includes its hospital/medical school. Arizona State’s impact is based on its connection to the city of Phoenix only.

Aligning to State Priorities

“United States public universities have been building global perspectives in support of state efforts to globalize their economies to produce local benefits. In order to find and develop new markets to grow the value of its $60 billion exports, Michigan established trade centers in Brazil, Canada, China, and Mexico. In concert, state public higher education has increased enrollments of students from these countries, provided more opportunities for study aboard, established or expanded partnerships with other universities, and broadened collaborations in research and creative programs.”

“Michigan’s public universities also contribute directly to Michigan’s economy. For example, in 2012, Michigan’s 15 public universities had an aggregate state-wide economic impact of $24 billion including nearly $10 billion in employee wages, $6.5 billion in non-wage expenditures, and $7 billion in student spending. The nearly 1.3 million alumni residing in Michigan generated $47 billion in salaries and wages (Horwitz & Superstine, 2013).”
The Movement Today

Growing Momentum Nationally and Internationally

• National and international organizations and associations promote community engaged scholarship.

• Numerous peer-review journals disseminate community engaged scholarship.
# Academic Outputs at UOE

## Awards and Recognitions

Between 2002 and 2014, MSU and UOE received:  
**10** INSTITUTIONAL AWARDS AND HONORS  
**42** INDIVIDUAL RECOGNITIONS AND HONORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Recognitions</th>
<th>Granting Organization</th>
<th>Year Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Award for General Community Service</td>
<td>Corporation for National and Community Service</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll with Distinction</td>
<td>Corporation for National and Community Service</td>
<td>2008, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Awards and Honors</th>
<th>Granting Organization</th>
<th>Year Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-Engaged University designation</td>
<td>Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching</td>
<td>2007, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross Award</td>
<td>ARC Mid-Michigan Chapter and St. Vincent Catholic Charities - Refugee Services</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Peter Magrath/W. K. Kellogg Foundation Engagement Regional Award</td>
<td>Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) and the Engagement Scholarship Consortium (ESC), with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards of Excellence Finalist</td>
<td>University Economic Development Association</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. Seeley Friend of Evaluation Award</td>
<td>Michigan Association for Evaluation</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford College Community Challenge</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Engaged Campus of the Year</td>
<td>Michigan Campus Compact</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revenues from External Sources

External Grants to UOE Departments by Grantor Type
June 22, 2001 - June 17, 2015

- Association: $833,516 (19%)
- Federal: $6,741,300 ($6,741,300) (26%)
- Foundation: $1,141,114 (5%)
- Industry: $59,925 (3%)
- Other: $4,958,023 (26%)

External Grants to UOE Departments by Year (Cumulative)
June 22, 2001 - June 17, 2015

- 2001: $154,790
- 2002: $469,907
- 2003: $35,000
- 2004: $793,589
- 2005: $1,457,135
- 2006: $3,947,112
- 2007: $1,135,760
- 2008: $1,545,949
- 2009: $2,616,206
- 2010: $1,971,004
- 2011: $3,363,399
- 2012: $2,632,708
- 2013: $3,341,677
- 2014: $1,449,175
- 2015: $835,997

2001-2015
- Revenues from contracts and grants: $25,749,408
- Revenues from community engagement and consulting: $3,606,320
- Revenues from cultural and educational endowments: $8,541,054
Academic Outputs at UOE

Publications and Presentations

Between 2002 and 2015, UOE staff members published or placed in press:

- Abstracts: 66
- Book chapters/contributions: 129
- Books: 44
- Journal articles: 191
- Contributions to proceedings: 65
- Research briefs: 14
- Research posters: 158
- Technical posters: 447

And presented:

- Invited seminars/colloquia and conference presentations: 542

For a total of 1,656 PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Case Example: A 51 year Journey from Laboratory Scientist to Community Engagement Scholar
1967 Michigan State University
Infant Psychophysiology Laboratory
HEF Scholarship Pathways: Transition to Community Engagement Scholarship
**Scholarly Record:**  
**HEF Transition to Community Engagement Scholarship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CAREER</th>
<th>NON-CES PERIOD</th>
<th>CES PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal Articles</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Chapters</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Abstracts</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Instruments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Guides</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Presentations</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Presentations</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor: Special Issues IMHJ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor: Special Issue CPPAHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor: Special Issue ADS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor: Special Issue Fam. Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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