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Overview

• Review of tool and framework
• Preliminary data highlights
• Small group discussion: Using the tool
• Application with national initiatives
• Closing and next steps
Pathways of Public Service and Civic Engagement

- Evolution and rationale
- Piloting and modifying a Pathways tool
- Broad applicability across higher education
- Relevance for students, faculty, and staff
Pathways of Public Service and Civic Engagement

**Community Engaged Learning and Research:** Connecting coursework and academic research to community-identified concerns to enrich knowledge and inform action on social issues.

**Community Organizing and Activism:** Involving, educating, and mobilizing individual or collective action to influence or persuade others.

**Direct Service:** Working to address the immediate needs of individuals or a community, often involving contact with the people or places being served.

**Philanthropy:** Donating or using private funds or charitable contributions from individuals or institutions to contribute to the public good.

**Policy and Governance:** Participating in political processes, policymaking, and public governance.

**Social Entrepreneurship and Corporate Social Responsibility:** Using ethical business or private sector approaches to create or expand market-oriented responses to social or environmental problems.
DIRECT SERVICE: Working to address the immediate needs of individuals or a community, often involving contact with the people or places being served.

Examples:
- Tutoring/Mentoring at an after-school program
- Gathering supplies for hurricane victims
- Sorting donations (i.e. food, clothes, or household items) at a community partner organization
- Providing pro bono expertise in nursing, auto mechanics, law, or cosmetology
- Serving on a nonprofit board
- Removing invasive plants from public parks
- Career options: Joining the armed forces, Peace Corps, AmeriCorps or a similar organization

Please respond to the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much experience do you have in this pathway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much interest do you have in exploring this pathway during college?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering your current strengths, how much impact do you think you personally could have through this pathway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, how much impact do you think this pathway has on social issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pathways Diagnostic Tool

Experience
- Activism
- Social E
- Policy
- Direct
- Philanthropy

Impact
- Activism
- Social E
- Policy
- Direct
- Philanthropy

Strength
- Activism
- Social E
- Policy
- Direct
- Philanthropy

Interest
- Activism
- Social E
- Policy
- Direct
- Philanthropy

Stanford University
Pathways 3.0 Vision

• Some options:
  • Examples tailored for different interests
  • Accompanied by activity
  • Compare student responses
• Pilot scheduled for spring/summer 2019
Past and Present Institutions

**Public Institutions**
- Bellevue College
- Dutchess Community College
- Gateway Technical College
- Oregon State University
- Palo Alto College
- Salt Lake Community College
- State University of New York at Binghamton
- University of California - Merced
- University of California - San Diego
- University of Delaware
- University of Maryland - Baltimore County
- University of Minnesota - Twin Cities
- University of Pittsburgh
- University of Texas at Austin
- University of Utah
- University of Wisconsin Colleges
- University of Wisconsin - Madison
- University of Wisconsin - Parkside
- University of Wisconsin – Stout
- Weber State University
- East China Normal University
- University of Western Australia

**Private Institutions**
- Brown University
- Cedar Crest College
- Duke University
- Duquesne University
- Edgewood College
- George Washington University
- Gonzaga University
- Juniata College
- Lawrence University
- Loyola University Chicago
- Pacific University
- Pepperdine University
- St. Mary’s College of California
- St. Norbert College
- Stanford University
- Tulane University
- University of Chicago
- University of San Francisco
- University of Southern California
- Whitworth University

**Campus Compacts**
- Iowa Campus Compact
- Utah Campus Compact
- Wisconsin Campus Compact
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Preliminary Data Highlights – Participating Institutions (2017-2018)

• Nine public institutions (n=320, 22%)
• Fifteen private institutions (n=1078, 74%)
• One state Campus Compact (n=57, 4%)
Profile of Respondents

Distribution by Gender, n=1455
- Female: 58%
- Male: 28%
- Decline to answer: 13%
- Nonbinary/Nonconforming: 1%

Distribution by Year, n=1455
- Freshman: 39%
- Sophomore: 23%
- Junior: 13%
- Senior: 13%
- Graduate Student: 3%
- (blank): 9%
- No: 36%
- Yes: 46%
- Decline to answer: 18%

Distribu'tion by Faith Tradition, n=1455
- Yes: 46%
- No: 36%
- Decline to answer: 13%
- (blank): 1%
Limitations

• Students’ perceptions – self-reported
  • Uniform exposure
  • Imperfect typology
• Multiple uses
• Non-random sample
• Not currently designed for pre and post (identifying students), focused on changes between cohort
• Snapshot of trends in time
Data Trends

- Gender: F (685), M (295)
  - Females more experienced in 3 Pathways
  - Females more interested except 1
  - Females perceived impact and expressed self-impact
Data Trends

• Faith: Y(665), N(531)
  • Y more interested and have more experience in Philanthropy than N

• First Generation: Y(395), N/A(1060)
  • Y recognize personal strengths in COA

• Pell Grant: Y(234), N/A(1221)
  • Y are more interested and consider COA more impactful
## Data Trends

### Interest, by Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Pathways</th>
<th>DS interest</th>
<th>CELR interest</th>
<th>COA interest</th>
<th>Phil interest</th>
<th>SECSR interest</th>
<th>PG interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>(n=337)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>(n=227)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>(n=165)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Interest in Pathways Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pathways</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=1455</td>
<td>n=1272</td>
<td>n=1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>DS interest</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil interest</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CELR interest</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COA interest</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECSR interest</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG interest</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Trends

### Perceived Impact, by Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Pathways</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary (n=337)</th>
<th>Natural Sciences (n=227)</th>
<th>Social Science (n=165)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DS impact</strong></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PG impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CELR impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>COA impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phil impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SECSR impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perceived Impact in Pathways Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pathways</th>
<th>2016 (n=1554)</th>
<th>2017 (n=1272)</th>
<th>2018 (n=1455)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS impact</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG impact</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil impact</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COA impact</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CELR impact</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECSR impact</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pathways Interest and Impact, 2017-2018

Interest 2017-2018
- DS interest: 3.26
- Phil interest: 2.96
- COA interest: 2.95
- CELR interest: 2.90
- SECSR interest: 2.65
- PG interest: 2.57

Mean (1-4): 2.85

Impact 2017-2018
- DS impact: 3.47
- PG impact: 3.37
- Phil impact: 3.34
- COA impact: 3.33
- CELR impact: 3.31
- SECSR impact: 3.20

Mean (1-4): 3.31
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### Interest in Pathways, 2018 Branner (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engaged Learning &amp; Research</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Activism</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Governance</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Entrepreneurship &amp; CSR</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engaged Learning &amp; Research</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Activism</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Governance</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Entrepreneurship &amp; CSR</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceived Impact of Pathways, 2018 Branner (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Governance</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Activism</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engaged Learning and Research</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Entrepreneurship &amp; CSR</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Governance</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Activism</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engaged Learning and Research</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Entrepreneurship &amp; CSR</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example of Use at Branner Residence Hall

### Issues / Concerns Facing *Your Campus* (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Concern</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion / Access to Opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault / Violence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issues / Concerns Facing *Your Local Region* (n=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Concern</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing / Gentrification</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Inequality</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Inequality / Racism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issues / Concerns Facing *the World* (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Concern</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Inequality</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment / Climate Change</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics / Apathy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

How do you think this framework might give students more agency?

How might you envision using this tool at your campus to prepare students for self-directed civic life?
Current and Potential Uses

- Student advising
- Program development
- Research
  - Cohort – pre/post
  - Demographic differences
  - Institutional types
  - Longitudinal
  - Others?
- Community partner perspectives
Pathways and National Initiatives

• AAC&U LEAP Initiative
• AAC&U Civic Prompts: Civic Learning in the Majors
• Campus Compact Civic Action Plans
• Carnegie Community Engagement Classification
Join the International Working Group!

Contact Annabel Wong
annabel.wong@stanford.edu
Questions?

• Gail Robinson: gail@gailrobinsonconsulting.com
• Tom Schnaubelt: thomas.schnaubelt@stanford.edu
• Annabel Wong: annabel.wong@stanford.edu
• Jo Wong: jowong@stanford.edu