

Inventory of Tools for Assessing University Capacity, Support for, and Outcomes of Community/Civic Engagement and Community-Engaged Scholarship

Prepared by Lisa Wenger and Ashley MacInnis

June 29, 2011

This inventory is designed as a resource for those interested in assessing university capacity, support, and outcomes for community engagement and community-engaged scholarship (CE/CES). Developed through a search of primarily quantitative assessment tools identified within the grey literature and peer-reviewed articles, this inventory is presented to the CES Partnership work group charged with analyzing these instruments and developing a standardized assessment tool for the purposes of the partnership. As this is an evolving area of practice and scholarship, this inventory should be treated as a starting point for discussion. In addition, it should be noted that this inventory is not focused on tools designed to assess specific CE programs, service-learning courses or community-campus partnerships.

Table 1: Summary of Key Domains	2
<i>Overview of domains most commonly identified within selected tools/ frameworks</i>	
Notes on Tools/ Frameworks Included in Table 1	3
Table 2: Inventory of tools/ models/ frameworks	5
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement + Service Learning	5
<i>Documents detailing efforts to assess levels of institutional support for CE and Service Learning as a combined effort</i>	
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement	6
<i>Documents detailing efforts to assess levels institutional support for CE as separate from Service Learning</i>	
Assessing institutional support for Service Learning	14
<i>Documents detailing efforts to assess levels of institutional support for Service Learning as separate from CE</i>	
Assessing stakeholder (i.e. community, student, faculty) perspectives on SL, Engagement, Partnership	17
<i>Documents detailing institutional efforts to gather feedback from stakeholders (community, faculty) on SL or CE initiatives as well as broader partnership. NOTE: Other tools might include this, but these tools are specifically and explicitly focused on these populations.</i>	
Assessing impact/ contribution	22
<i>Documents detailing efforts to measure institutional or faculty level impact on the local/ regional community (economically, socially)</i>	
Other tools/ articles of possible relevance	28
<i>Documents that do not speak to a explicitly related tool, but detail evaluation efforts/ strategies, accreditation, or discuss measurement of social enterprises</i>	
Table 3: Sample of articles referencing tool identified in Table 1	30

Table 1: Summary of Key Domains	CCPH (#12)	Furco (#7)	Holland (#11)	Beacon (#4)	CC (#1)	Carnegie (#8)	Minnesota (#19)	CIC (#15)	TTN (#16)
Mission/ Purpose									
Clarity: Clear and consistent definition of terms (used consistently and known by administration, faculty & students)	X	X				X			
Commitment: Identified in institutional mission docs/ strategies; Promoted as an institutional priority; Updated as necessary	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Integration: Integrated with other mission elements (student/ faculty recruitment, teaching, partnerships); Connected to funding, activities	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Leadership support									
Appreciation: Senior leaders understand importance and value of CE to institution's agenda	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Performance: Visible support by senior leaders – word and act	X	X	X		X	X			
Infrastructure									
Specific plan: Clear plan for strengthening CE (including short and long-term goals, success indicators)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Supportive policy: For rewarding/ engaging faculty (reward, hiring, appoint.); support commitment to local agencies/ business, SR, Environ.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Coordinating body: Coordinating structure/ committee focused on CE implementation, advancement, record-keeping	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Dedicated staff: Dedicated, permanent staff with decision-making authority	X	X	X	X	X		X		X
Sufficient resources: Adequate & on-going physical and financial resources (departmental, institutional) – internal and external budget	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Comprehensive access: CE opp. provided across programs/ departments – not dependent on individual faculty		X	X		X	X	X		X
Flexibility: The institution enables student and faculty through flexible scheduling options, as necessitated by community-based work					X				
Faculty engagement									
Awareness: Faculty are aware of CE priorities of institution (linked to communication)	X	X			X	X			
Opportunities: Faculty have opportunities for involvement as part of formal duties (not just volunteer)	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Encouragement: Faculty are encouraged to participate/ produce (high priority)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Participation: Faculty actively participate in CE through teaching, service, research	X	X			X	X		X	X
Development: Faculty have access to development opportunities	X			X	X	X	X	X	
Reward: Faculty are rewarded for participation and knowledge distribution (e.g. T & P, grants, awards, sabbaticals, etc.)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Leadership: Faculty act as leaders/ advocates	X	X				X	X	X	
Student engagement									
Awareness: Students are aware of CE opportunities (linked to communication)	X	X			X	X		X	
Opportunities: Students have options for co-curricular and curricular CE participation (including capstone courses)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Participation: Students actively participate in opportunities	X					X		X	X
Development: Students develop skills related to CE work (more explicit than indications of relevant courses)	X			X	X	X	X	X	
Rewards: Student are rewarded for participation (e.g. credits, certification, formal and informal recognition)	X	X			X	X	X		X
Leadership: Students serve in leadership roles and as ambassadors	X	X			X	X	X		
Community engagement									
Strong partnerships: Trust; Communication around needs, timelines, resources, capacities, goals, etc.; Relationship maintained & valued	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Access: Community has clear access to university-based knowledge/ resources/ facilities/ activities	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Voice: Systematic process for soliciting community feedback and involvement and facilitating dialogue around public issues; Opportunities for community involvement in T & P processes and/ or institutional committees	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rewards/ Compensation: Incentives & rewards offered to community for involvement; Financial compensation offered for participation	X				X				
Impact: Community experiences social and/or economic benefits for community (and institution) – not just value it, but measure it					X			X	
Diversity: Commitment to engaging a diversity of communities				X			X	X	X
Leadership: Opportunities for community leadership; Integration of community expertise	X	X	X		X		X		X
Communications									
Internal: Formal communication around CE activities within institution (curricular & co-curricular) – include attention to value/ resources	X			X	X	X	X		X
External: Dissemination of information around research & partnerships beyond the institution (academic & broader community)	X	X	X			X	X		X
Evaluation mechanisms									
Development: Community involved in developing assessment tools			X					X	
Collection: Structure in place for on-going, systemic evaluation of CE activities – number, quality, impact on multiple stakeholders	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Use: Collected data are used, communicated within and outside institution	X					X	X		

Notes on Tools/ Frameworks Included in Table 1

Selection process. *Table includes only a subsection of the tools listed in the full inventory (workgroup may want to examine those in complete set). Emphasis here was on tools/ frameworks that:*

1. Are oriented toward institutional assessments of community engagement
2. Have influenced the development of other tools and are more widely cited (Furco, Holland, See table at end of document for details)
3. Are informed by foundational tools, but go beyond them (CCPH, Beacon)
4. Are particularly detailed (CCPH, Furco, Campus Compact, Carnegie)
5. Are nationally recognized or designed to support a network of universities committed to CE (Carnegie, Talloires/Tufts Network)
6. Offer some unique elements not included in the other tools (CIC, Beacon, Talloires/ Tufts Network)
7. Have been examined for strength of specific indicators (Minnesota)
8. Are designed to facilitate a specific response (not just broad indicators)
9. Are focused on CE (over SL)

Focus

- Emphasis is often on auditing or benchmarking – less on evaluation or measuring actual impact on communities and stakeholders (including institutions, faculty, and students)*

Comprehensiveness

- While these domains are those most commonly included, no single tool solicits feedback on *all* the identified sub-items.
- As demonstrated, some are more comprehensive than others and some offer significantly more detail than others (e.g. CCPH, Furco, Carnegie are significantly more detailed than Holland, Beacon)
- Individual tools may capture different nuances within a single subcategory – some more directly and explicitly than others

Unit of analysis

- Primarily focused on institutional-level assessment – i.e. policies, structures, statements, funding directions, etc., though could be modified for colleges/ faculties/ departments
- Most tools highlighted here offer institutions opportunity to evaluate systems/ commitment across a scale of 3-4 levels (Campus Compact, Carnegie, & CIC ask yes/no questions, HLC lists criteria)

Who completes?

- Tools profiled here are primarily broad institutional assessments of CE – i.e. designed for completion by knowledgeable representatives within the organization

Moving beyond/ obtaining more detailed assessment

- More specific accounts of economic and social impact require integration of additional measures (see relevant inventory sections)
- Interest in faculty, community, student perspectives require integration of additional measures (see relevant inventory sections)
- Specific focus on T and P offered by Mikkelsen, Gelmon, Seifer & Kauper-Brown (#12)
- Guides on implementing change offered elsewhere (e.g. #20)
- These tools will not tell you how to get there. See discussion in Weerts & Sandmann (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(6), 702-727.

Consider: What kind of exercise is this: Audit, Benchmark, or Evaluation?

	Audit	Benchmarking	Evaluation
Aim	Measures what is being done	Identifies problem areas and areas of excellence	Assesses the value of what is being done
Process	A cyclical series of reviews	An ongoing process	A series of individual assessments over time
Data collection	Collects routine data	Collects data for comparative purposes	Collected routine and complex data
Methodology	Review of what is actually being done	Review of best practice in the organization or sector	Evaluative research and methodology not necessarily for external comparison purposes
Purpose	Not possible to generalize from the findings	Possible to make comparisons across a process or sector	Often possible to generalize the findings

Hart (2009), Adapted from the PDP Toolkit: see www.pdptoolkit.co.uk)

“If you design assessment with purpose in mind, you design a different assessment than just a summary of ‘what is happening.’ Accreditation wants to know what is being done with it.” – Driscoll in Sandmann (2006), Building a Higher Education Network for Community Engagement, *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 11, Number 4, p. 41, (2006)

Table 2: Inventory of tools/ models/ frameworks

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement + Service Learning				
1	<p>Campus Compact/ AACC (no date)</p> <p>Campus Engagement Survey http://www.compact.org/resources/service-learning-resources/indicators-of-engagement-project/campus-compactaacc-campus-engagement-survey/3520/</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Civic Engagement/ Service Learning</p> <p>Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measuring impact of SL and civic engagement initiatives on students, faculty, the institution, and the community Providing comparison of assessment methods, as well as sample assessment tools ranging from surveys to interviews to syllabus analysis guides <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>Survey consists of 13 'indicators of engagement', signs that a campus has a strong commitment to engagement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mission and Purpose Academic and Administrative Leadership Disciplines, Depts. & Interdisciplinary work Teaching and Learning Faculty development Faculty roles and rewards Support structures and resources Internal budget and resource allocations Community voice External Resource Allocation Coordination of community-based activities Forums for fostering public dialogue Student voice <p>Responses: Yes/ No with opportunity to provide detail</p>	<p>For the purposes of the survey, exemplary practices include any or all of the following characteristics: innovative, sustained, sustainable, replicable, transforming, institutionalized, accepted, widespread, in practice, publicized/ acknowledged/ recognized, significant, deliberate, planned, intentional, and unique or special.</p> <p>Questions include a series of closed and open-ended questions on each indicator.</p> <p>Nice detail on domains, but survey structure not ideal for comparing particulars across institutions.</p>
2	<p>Pigza & Troppe (2003)</p> <p>Developing an Infrastructure for Service-Learning and Community Engagement</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement and Service Learning</p> <p>Based on models dev by Campus Compact funded project: Establishing Benchmarks for the Engaged Campus</p>	<p>Nine benchmarks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional mission (support SL and CE) Internal and external points of access (individual and institutional responsibilities for knowledge utilization) Co curricular opportunities (promotion of student involvement in activities/orgs that promote university-community partnerships, foster culture of CE) Curriculum infusion (opportunity for students to make connections between academic pursuits and real-world issues, community viewed as rich partner in learning) Authentic community partnerships (acknowledgment of assets of community partners as well as those of institution, mutual understanding of interaction, priority setting, action) Faculty: teaching, research, service in balance (var types of research, curricular infusion, SL, & collab efforts encouraged validated in T & P) Need book to access remainder 	<p>3 concepts presented as key to using benchmarks as an assessment tool: impact, intentionality, and visibility.</p> <p>Institution must be prepared to specific (concrete and intangible) impacts that SL and CE create in relation to each benchmark. Intentionality challenges the university to determine extent to which programs and policies result from a specific desire for connection between university and community partners. Visibility implies the extent to which those inside and outside the institution are aware of the university's engaged activities and can understand/ access information and resources.</p>
3	<p>Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring & Kerrigan (2001)</p> <p>Assessing Service-Learning and Civic Engagement: Principles and Techniques http://www.e2e-store.com/compact/compact-product.cgi?category_id=10&product_id=131</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Civic Engagement and Service Learning</p> <p>This definitive volume offers a broad overview of issues related to assessment in higher education, with specific application for measuring the impact of SL and CE initiatives on students, faculty, the institution, and the community.</p>	<p>Requires purchase</p>	<p>This revised edition provides a comparison of assessment methods, as well as sample assessment tools ranging from surveys to interviews to syllabus analysis guides.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement				
4	<p>Beacons for public engagement (no date) http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/support/planning-change/support</p> <p>Draft self-assessment tool: https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Draft%20self%20assessment%20tool%20for%20July%20workshop%201.pdf</p> <p>Edge tool: https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/The%20EDGE%20tool.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Public Engagement</p> <p>Identify following areas as key to supporting high quality, effective PE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investment in expert support 2. Effective networks and co-ordination 3. Providing opportunities for staff and students to get involved 4. Evaluation and evidence gathering 5. Brokerage and partnership working 	<p>Offer a matrix (Edge tool) for University to assess current support for engagement (integrates various other tools, including Holland matrix):</p> <p>Focus points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission 2. Leadership 3. Communication 4. Support 5. Learning 6. Reward 7. Staff 8. Students 9. Public <p>Each focus (divided into sub components) measured along 4 levels: 1. Erratic, 2. Developing, 3. Gripping or 4. Embedded</p>	<p>Focal points for embedding PE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purpose: Embedding a commitment to PE in institutional mission & strategy, and championing commitment at all levels, focused on: Mission, Leadership, Communication 2. People: Involving staff, students, and representatives of the public and using their energy, expertise, and feedback to shape the strategy and its delivery, focusing on: staff, students, public <p>Process: Investing in systems & processes that facilitate involvement, maximize impact, & help ensure quality & value for money, focused on: support, learning, reward and recognition.</p>
5	<p>Higher Learning Commission (no date)</p> <p>Criteria for accreditation http://www.ncahlc.org/information-for-institutions/criteria-for-accreditation.html</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement and Service</p> <p>Note: The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) is an independent corporation & 1 of 2 commission members of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), which is one of six regional institutional accreditors in the US. The HLC accredits degree-granting post-secondary educational institutions in the North Central region.</p>	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission & Integrity: Org operates with integrity to ensure fulfillment of mission through structures & processes that involve board, administration, faculty, staff, and students. 2. Preparing for the future: Org's allocation of resources and processes for evaluation & planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill mission, improve quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. 3. Student Learning and Effective Teaching: Org provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission. 4. Acquisition, discovery & application of knowledge: Org promotes life of learning for faculty, admin, staff, & students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, & SR in ways consistent with mission. 5. Engagement & Service: As called for by mission, the org identifies constituencies & serves them in ways both value 	<p>These standards require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Org learns from constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations. • Org has capacity & commitment to engage with identified constituencies & communities. • Org demonstrates responsiveness to dependent constituencies. <p>Internal & external constituencies value services org provides.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
---	--------------------	-------	------------------	-------

Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement

6	<p>Hart et al (2009, 2010)</p> <p>Hart & Northmore (2010) <i>Audition and Evaluating University-Community Engagement: Lessons from a UK case study</i>, Higher Education Quarterly, DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-273.2010.00466.x http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cup/images/stories/Static/materials_and_resources/angie_simon_article.pdf</p> <p>Hart, A., Northmore, S. and Gerhardt, C. (2009) <i>Auditing, Benchmarking & Evaluating Public Engagement</i>. Bristol: National Co-ordinating Centre for PE https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/our-research/literature-reviews-and-research</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>In Hart (2009) 7 dimensions of public engagement were presented and assessed for relevance, specific purposes, of current UK and international approaches. Framework proposed as tool to assist those involved in evaluating university–community engagement activities to decide which tools or approaches might be more useful</p>	<p>Dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public access to facilities 2. Public access to knowledge 3. Student engagement 4. Faculty engagement 5. Widening participation (equalities & diversity) 6. Encouraging economic regeneration and enterprise in social engagement 7. Institutional relationship and partnership building <p>Breakdown of each with examples of engagement and possible outcomes</p>	<p>2009 article includes inventory of tools, integrated into this table.</p> <p>Abstract from 2010: The growing importance of community and PE activities in universities has led to an increasing emphasis on auditing & evaluating university–community partnerships. However, the development of effective audit and evaluation tools is still at a formative stage. This article presents a case study of the Univ of Brighton’s experience of evaluating such partnerships. Drawing on this experience, a review of the literature and an analysis of published measurement frameworks, the challenges of measuring community and PE are discussed and a typology of dimensions for university PE presented. A critique of the Brighton case study and the lessons learned provides a basis for clarifying the activities that universities might want to measure and the key questions they need to ask when determining which tools are appropriate.</p>
7	<p>Furco et al (2009)</p> <p><i>Assessment Rubric for Institutionalizing Community Engagement in Higher Education</i> http://engagement.umn.edu/community/documents/FurcoetalCEInstRubric.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p>	<p>Five dimensions (consistent with what Furco did with SL):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Philosophy and Mission of CE (Def, strategic planning, alignment with mission, alignment with ed. reform efforts) 2. Faculty support/ involvement (knowledge/ awareness, involvement/ support, leadership, incentives/rewards) 3. Student support/ Involvement (awareness, opportunities, leadership, incentives/ rewards) 4. Community participation and partnerships (awareness, mutual understanding, voice & leadership) 5. Institutional support (coordinating entity, policy making entity, staffing, funding, admin support, departmental support, evaluation & assessment) 	<p>Similar to what he did with SL – see details there</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement				
8	<p>Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2008)</p> <p>Classification in Community Engagement</p> <p>http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>Curricular Engagement (2006 & 2008) includes institutions where teaching, learning & scholarship engage faculty, students, & community in mutually beneficial & respectful collaboration. Interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic & academic learning, enhance community well-being, & enrich scholarship.</p> <p>Outreach & Partnerships (2006 & 2008) includes institutions providing compelling evidence of one or both of 2 approaches to CE. Outreach focuses on appl & provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. Partnerships focus on collaborative interactions with community & related scholarship for mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, & application of knowledge, info, & resources (research, capacity building, economic dev, etc.).</p> <p>Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships (2006, 2008, & 2010) includes institutions with substantial commitments in both areas described above.</p> <p>Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing guidance to universities wishing to dev/ document CE efforts • Finding out whether a university has institutionalised CE in its identity, culture, & commitments • Setting clear framework & comprehensive indicator sets for: institutional identity & culture, institutional commitment, curricular engagement, outreach & partnership • Comparing international approaches <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>Foundational indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional identity and culture (CE in mission statement and formally recognized, systematically assess community perceptions and use data, CE emphasized in marketing, promoted by leadership) • Institutional commitment (have a coordinating infrastructure, internal and external budgetary allocations, fundraising directed to CE, systematic track and use data on CE activities, systematic collected and use data on impact – on students, faculty, community, and institution, part of strategic plan, professional development for faculty/ staff, community has a voice in institutional planning) • Supplemental documentation (search/ recruitment policies encouraging hiring of those with CE expertise, P & T policies reward CE or moving toward this, students involved in leadership in CE, CE noted on transcripts, faculty gov committee with responsibilities for CE) <p>Categories of Community Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricular engagement (institution has def/ process for identifying service learning (SL) courses, formal SL courses offered – including details, institutional & departmental learning outcomes for CE defined, assessed & data used, CE integrated into student research/ leadership /co-ops/ study abroad, CE integrated in curriculum on institution-wide level, faculty scholarship associated with curricular engagement activities) • Outreach and Partnerships (Outreach programs dev'd, institutional resources provided as outreach, representative partnerships, promotion of mutuality & reciprocity partnerships, mechanisms to systematically provide feedback & assessment to community partners & institution, eg. of faculty scholarship assoc. with outreach/ partnership) 	<p>Classification for Community Engagement is elective - based on voluntary participation by institutions. Whereas the Foundation's all-inclusive classifications involve secondary analysis of existing national data sources available for all institutions, elective classifications involve additional data collection & documentation, with substantial effort invested by participating institutions. Elective classifications enable the Foundation's classification system to recognize important aspects of institutional mission & action that are not represented in the national data.</p> <p>Because of voluntary nature, elective classifications are not a comprehensive national assessment: an institution's absence from the CE classification should not be interpreted as reflecting a judgment about institution's commitment to its community.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement				
9	<p>Kecskes, K. (2008). Creating community-engaged departments: self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of community engagement in academic departments</p> <p>http://www.uky.edu/UE/KEC2008/Presentations/Engaged_Department_RUBRIC - Kecskes_2008-9.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing <u>departmental</u> support for CE</p> <p>Draws on CCPH, Furco and Campus Compact</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission and culture supporting CE 2. Faculty support and CE 3. Student support and CE 4. Organizational support for CE 5. Leadership for CE 	<p><i>Creating CE Departments</i> (hereafter referred to as the <i>Rubric</i>) is designed to assess the capacity of a higher ed. academic dept for CE and to help its members identify various opportunities for engagement. Builds upon existing and/or validated prior work (Furco, 2000, 2003; Gelmon & Seifer et al., 2005; Kecskes & Muyliaert, 1997; Kecskes, 2006). While many of these instruments have been dev primarily for institution-wide application, & some have been applied to academic units including colleges, schools, departments and programs, this <i>Rubric</i> has been developed solely for use in academic departments. This approach is based on advice from key informant interviews and the recognition of the importance of the role of academic departments in the overall institutionalization of CE in higher education (Battistoni et al., 2003; Furco, 2002; Holland, 2000; Morreale & Applegate, 2006; Saltmarsh & Gelmon, 2006; Zlotkowski & Saltmarsh, 2006).</p>
10	<p>Garlick & Langworthy (2008)</p> <p>Benchmarking university community engagement: Developing a national approach in Australia</p> <p>http://www.lilydale.swinburne.edu.au/crd/documents/GAR_1577.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>Comprised of an institutional questionnaire, a partner perceptions survey, and a 'good practice' template</p> <p>Instruments were tested in pilot of 12 AUCEA member universities and (planned) to be implemented in all 33 AUCEA member universities in 2008.</p>	<p>Institutional questionnaire:</p> <p>Questions broadly equated with the goals outlined in the framework document, including questions on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structural support, 2. Support for dialogue & partnership among staff and students 3. Support provided through university governance & mgmt arrangements 4. University accessibility 5. Role of teaching prog. & research in fostering engagement 	<p>Five overarching CE goals identified as common to all Univ, regardless of structural diversity & development stage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To facilitate informed debate and dialogue in community on issues of local and global importance; 2. To ensure that univ governance, management & admin processes support effective CE 3. To ensure university is accessible, outward reaching & responsive to 4. To ensure social, environmental, cultural & economic value of research to comm 5. To design & deliver high quality teaching & learning responsive to comm needs and produces graduates who are ethical, employable & engaged citizens. <p>18 strategies & supporting perform. measures aligned to 5 goals (above) Qualitative measures populated through a convergence of qualitative measures in instit. questionnaire & partner perception survey.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement				
11	<p>Holland (1987, updated in 2006)</p> <p>Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors (<i>Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning</i>, 30-41.)</p> <p>(AKA Holland matrix)</p> <p>http://www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/pdf/holland-all.pdf</p> <p>http://www.henceonline.org/resources/institutional.php</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>From case studies and the literature, especially Crosson (1983), the proposed matrix was developed to explain the interrelationship of levels of commitment to service with key organizational factors that illustrate and characterize each level.</p>	<p>Matrix includes 7 org factors representing important aspects of infrastructure, policy, communication, & participation typically affected by efforts to define and implement service as a reflection of campus mission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission 2. Leadership (presidents, VP, deans, chairs) 3. Promotion, Tenure, Hiring 4. Organizational Structure and Funding 5. Student Involvement and curriculum 6. Faculty Involvement 7. Community Involvement 8. External communications/ fundraising <p>Measured along four levels of commitment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low relevance (not specifically encouraged/ rewarded) 2. Medium relevance (encouraged, but not fully integrated) 3. High relevance (more integrated, but segmented and more one-way, focused on outreach or expert model) 4. Full integration (community involved in setting & conducting scholarly agenda) 	<p>There is no intention in the matrix to judge "correctness" or "goodness" regarding an institution's choice of level of commitment. Rather, the intent is solely to provide a framework that may be useful to an institution in comparing where it ideally seeks to be positioned on the matrix and its assessment of its current location, all in the service of coherent institutional planning and decision-making.</p>
12	<p>Gelmon, Seifer, Kauper-Brown, & Mikkelsen (2005)</p> <p>Building Capacity for CE: Institutional Self-Assessment</p> <p>AKA Gelmon rubric</p> <p>http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/self-assessment-copyright.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>Designed to assess capacity of higher ed institut. (or unit therein) for community engagement (CE) and community-engaged scholarship (CES), and to identify opportunities for action.</p> <p>Builds upon existing & validated prior work. Intended to serve as baseline for follow-up assess, enabling institutions to track progress & focus work, while simultaneously enabling them to develop a longitudinal profile of their developing capacity for CE and CES over time.</p>	<p>The self-assessment is constructed around six dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Definition & Vision of CE (8 parts) 2. Faculty Support For and Involvement in CE (6 parts) 3. Student Support For and Involvement in CE (3 parts) 4. Community Support For & Involvement in CE (6 parts) 5. Institutional Leadership and Support For CE (9 parts) 6. Community-engaged scholarship (12 parts) <p>Measured along four levels representing increasing degrees of institutional commitment to CE/ CES</p>	<p>Not expected institution would align on same level across entire self-assessment. Results can offer a profile of where institution is at presently, and where opportunities exist.</p> <p>Completed by team ref. diverse institutional constituencies. Ideally in 2-parts. 1st, review assessment independently & complete draft format. Then, come together & complete actual assessment through conversation & discussion. Provides opportunity to think through issues about CE as a team, and help build team knowledge about school & institutional contexts & practices.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
---	--------------------	-------	------------------	-------

Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement

13	<p>Mikkelsen, Gelmon, Seifer & Kauper-Brown (2005)</p> <p>Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative Review, Promotion, and Tenure Analysis Protocol. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/RPT%20Analysis%20Protocol.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement (T & P specific)</p> <p>To be compared with criteria established by the commission on CES in the health professional</p> <p>The goals of this analysis are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess the school/university RPT guidelines against the set of criteria established by the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions To monitor changes in school/university guidelines over the three years of the Collaborative against the same set of criteria; To identify promising practices among members of the Collaborative; and To inform Collaborative team actions around RPT policy revisions. 	<p>Collected data on whether:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> RPT policies cite or use Boyer framework or similar approach that broadly defines scholarship CES recognized & valued for all appointments, regardless of tenure and/or clinical, teaching/ practice emphasis. CES explicit in review, T & P policies/ procedures. Review, T &P policies support, encourage & value dissemination of scholarship through multiple venues. The review, T & P process actively supports & encourages collaborative interdisciplinary scholarship. The review, T & P policies recognize and value funding of CES from a wide variety of sources. There is mandatory training for members of review, T & P committees to ensure a broad understanding of the definition, nature, documentation and assessment of CES. Community partners are regularly invited to participate in the review, T & P processes that go beyond writing letters of support (e.g., serving on faculty review committee). Community impact of CES valued/rewarded in review, T & P process, with at least equal emphasis on local impact as on regional, national and/or international impact. 	<p>Supports monitoring of changes in guidelines, indentifying promising practices, and informing collaborative action</p> <p>Process for completion of analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locate RPT policies for the school participating in Collaborative (use university policies as a default if school policies do not exist). Where possible these will be located online. When necessary, the team will be contacted in order to obtain the policies. <p>Review the policies specifically for those terms and concepts that are relevant to the work of the Collaborative.</p>
14	<p>Mikkelsen, Gelmon Seifer, Kauper-Brown (2005).</p> <p>Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: Website Analysis Protocol. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Website%20Analysis%20Protocol.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing strategies by which institutions represent their CE and CES on their Websites</p> <p>Goals of analysis for the Collaborative are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine the strategies by which institutions represent their community engagement and CES on their websites; Monitor changes in the websites over the three years of the Collaborative; Identify potential promising practices among members of the Collaborative. 	<p>Dimensions measured</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition and vision of CE Faculty support for and involvement in CE Student support for and involvement in CE Community support for and involvement in institutional CE Institutional leadership and support for CE CE Scholarship <p>Each dimension has multiple assessment points (see document for details)</p>	<p>Process for completion of analysis is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the institution's home page. Review President's message, Dean's message and/or relevant statements by other University leaders. Search links to initiatives, programs and/or structures using term of CE/CES. Search entire website using key terms such as "community engagement", "community-engaged scholarship", "service-learning", & related concepts. Review the home page and related pages of the individual school participating in the Collaborative. <p>The process is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather to highlight strengths and areas where info on school/university website could more explicitly illustrate the institution's commitment to CE and CES</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement				
15	<p>Committee on Institutional Cooperation (2005)</p> <p>Resource Guide & Recommendations for Defining and Benchmarking Engagement</p> <p>http://apa.wisc.edu/communityengagement/CIC_EngagementReportREV2-22-05.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement and Service</p>	<p>Identify 7 categories of engagement indicators: Evidence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Of institutional commitment to engagement 2. Of institutional resource commitments 3. That students are involved in engagement & outreach 4. That faculty & staff engaged with external constituents 5. That institutions are engaged with communities 6. Of assessing impact & outcomes of engagement 7. Of revenue opportunities generated through engagement <p>Full details on indicators, and sub components, on pp 5-6</p>	<p>Other benefits of assessment activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asses institution's fulfillment of engagement/ public service mission • Mgmt & planning tool for ensuring academic units contribute to institution's overall engag. commitment; • Evidence of org support for engagement • Economic dev & tech transfer data; • Basis for telling engagement story & building support for higher ed. among legislators, donors, & public; • New engagement rubric for comparing peer institutions nationally • Means of assessing student awareness of civic responsibility • Criteria for T & P <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reward systems include eng, ○ Curricular impacts of student eng. ○ Applications of dissem. of research & KT ○ Meaningful eng. with communities <p>Applications of evidence of partnership satisfaction.</p>
16	<p>Talioires/Tufts Network (2004)</p> <p>Inventory Tool for Higher Ed. Civic Engagement</p> <p>http://www.tufts.edu/talioiresnetwork/downloads/InventoryToolHigherEdCivicEngagement.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Civic Engagement</p> <p>Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmarking against these 5 sets of issues • Providing a framework to drive a more detailed institutional baseline audit • Comparing univ achievements internationally • Becoming part of a network with a specific program of activity committed to CE <p>Hart (2009)</p> <p>Based on Watson's assessment tool outlined in the book Managing Civic and Community Engagement</p>	<p>Inventory includes questions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission and history (origin & dev of instit. to incorporate commitments to development of region & locality) • Balance of activities (how institutional patterns of activities reflect a CE & SR agenda) • Organization (how instit. organizes self & deploys resources (incl. human) to meet civic objectives) • People (how policies & practices involve members of institution including staff, students & formal partners in achieving goals related to CE and SR) • Monitoring, evaluation & Communication (how instit. sets objectives & targets for CE & SR, monitors and eval achievement & communicates intentions & related activities) 	<p>Final step in inventory asks institutions to highlight institution's top two contributions to the global inventory of higher education CE and social responsibility.</p> <p>These highlights intended for sharing with membership of the Talloires Network to share experiences of successes and create a portfolio of best practices.</p>
17	<p>Garth & Felicetti (2004), Council of Independent Colleges</p> <p>Engaging Communities and Campuses: Building College and University Capacity to Engage with Communities Working Paper</p> <p>http://www.cic.edu/projects_services/epe/engaging_paper.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>Not specifically an assessment tool, but working paper outlines key capacities required within an institution – categories that could inform an assessment tool.</p>	<p>Key institutional capacities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty knowledge and skills (faculty development, viewed as a 'lynchpin') 2. Institutional infrastructure (integration into strategic plan, coordinating body with staff, student leadership) 3. Academic culture (faculty rewards, development of credit-bearing courses, recognition of value of co-curricular offerings for students) 4. Partner relationships (programs based in mutually and reciprocity, advisory boards, comm. structures, evaluation) 	<p>These four areas support each other in powerful ways. Thus individuals working to enhance institutional capacity in one of these areas should be cognizant of the implications for other aspects of the institution.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Community/ Civic Engagement				
18	<p>Council of Independent Colleges (CIC, 2004)</p> <p>Key Indicators Toolkit http://www.cic.edu/projects_services/infoservices/kit.asp</p> <p>Fact sheet on engagement www.cic.edu/projects_services/epe/cic_initiatives_summary.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>CIC serves more than 580 independent US colleges & universities, including liberal arts, comprehensive, 4-year, 2-year, and international institutions. In addition, > 60 national, state, and regional organizations are Affiliate Members. Has Committee on Engagement. Council works to support college & university leadership, advance excellence & enhance institutions' contributions to society. Provides seminars, workshops, & services to assist institutional perform/ visibility (Hart, 2008)</p> <p>Relevant to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing institutional effectiveness Analysis of benchmarking progress in context of CIC member universities (Hart, 2008) 	<p>20 indicators in four key areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Student enrollment and progression Faculty Tuition revenue and financial aid Financial resources and expenditures <p>Need to subscribe to access full details</p>	<p>Not relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing or defining partnership activity from a community perspective Understanding micro-dynamics of public engagement between individual univ personnel, students, community groups & community members <p>Hart (2009)</p>
19	<p>Minnesota Higher Ed. Services Office (2003)</p> <p>Minnesota Campus Civic Engagement Study www1.umn.edu/civic/img/assets/4760/MCC.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Civic Engagement</p> <p>Indicators indicate ways campus might be considered civically engaged. This set of indicators is unique to this study; created after review of 20 other measurement systems for campus CE. Indicators divided into 6 categories. Each includes sub-indicators. Should be assumed that outcomes for students, communities, and institutions are subsumed in different ways under all categories. Collectively, the indicators strive to consider both "campus as civil society" and "campus as connected to greater civil society."</p>	<p>CE indicators and Sub-Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Culture: Campus culture nurtures & encourages CE. Leadership: Civic leadership dev. & support at all levels. Power and Policy: Campus supports participatory decision-making, & campus policies support engagement. Accessibility: Campus resources are available & open to "outsiders" (e.g., prospective students, comm. partners). Enabling Mechanisms: Campus structures, systems, & resource allocation support engagement. Breadth and Depth of Programs: Campus supports multiple high-quality forms of engagement. <p>Full details on the sub indicators is included in pp. 9-11</p>	<p>Information collected from 45 institutions through interviews, observation & doc review was analyzed using a consistent set of indicators of campus CE.</p> <p>Includes: Details on strongest/ weakest indicators, indicators that were best 'predictors' of CE, differences among institutional systems, etc.</p>
20	<p>London (2002) for Kellogg</p> <p>Practical Strategies for Instit. Civic Engagement & Institutional Leadership that Reflect & Shape Covenant between Higher Education & Society. A Report from Natl Leadership Dialogue Series, Monticello, MN www.thenationalforum.org/Docs/PDF/monticello_dialogue3.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Community Engagement</p> <p>Report is much broader and does not specifically outline a tool, but does offer 10 key dimension of engagement that might be useful to the process of developing/ evaluating tools.</p>	<p>Dimensions of Engagement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Access to learning Enhanced diversity Civic learning Public Scholarship Social Well-being Trusted Voice Public Spaces Community partnership Self governance Public accountability 	<p>Engagement dimensions originally reported in: Civic Engagement: Renewing The Land Grant Mission," the final report of the University of Minnesota's Civic Engagement Task Force</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Service Learning				
21	<p>Washington Campus Compact (no date)</p> <p>Strategic Planning Worksheet for Institutionalizing SL in Higher Ed. http://www.hawaii.edu/servicelearning/hipicc/downloads/files/strategicPlanningWorksheet.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Service Learning</p> <p>Follows Furco's rubric (see Furco's document later in the inventory)</p>	<p>Records information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic planning committee composition • Institutional definition of SL • Statement of values/ guiding principles • Vision for SL on campus • Mission statement for institutionalization of SL • Institutional culture • Key stakeholders • Process (by which strategic plan developed, committee selected, meeting, etc.) • SWOT • Goals • Monitoring plan • Resources • Executive narrative 	<p>Filled out after the Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education has been completed.</p>
22	<p>California State University (no date)</p> <p>SL Assessment Plan Rubric http://www.calstate.edu/cce/initiatives/servlearn_planrubric.shtml</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Service Learning</p> <p>Designed by and for California State University. Prepared by Office of Community Service Learning (CSL) at the Office of the Chancellor developed this rubric</p> <p>Builds on Furco's "Self-Assessment Rubric for Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education"</p>	<p>Measurements focused on progress re: 3 goals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutionalization of SL (questions on: whether there is office of CSL, integration into campus mission/ strategic plan, a CSL strategic plan with clear goals/ timelines, an instrument to collect data about university & community needs & resources, an information management system to support efficient communication among partners) 2. To build faculty support for CSL (questions on: faculty training, curriculum dev funds, recog. of faculty involv in retention, T & P policies, campus awards for faculty & students, workshops for faculty, a CSL committee with representatives across instit. regular reports on CSL to academic senate & other campus bodies, workload credits for those designing/ offering CSL courses) 3. Design student & community-based programs (questions on: whether students & community involved at beginning of planning & developing CSL program/policies, established community adv. panel, student & community org handbooks on CSL, workshops with comm orgs & neighbourhood groups to dev partnerships, CSL demonstration projects to encourage collaboration, assess. techniques to evaluate partnership outcomes & disseminate findings among members of university and communities, work with campus student orgs to develop ways to increase faculty/ student collaboration. 	<p>Each question is evaluated according to the degree of progress: undeveloped, in process, or accomplished</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Service Learning				
23	<p>Furco, A. (1999/ 2006)</p> <p>Self-Assessment rubric for Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education http://www.servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/4774_S ELF-ASSESSMENT_RUBRIC.pdf</p> <p>Self-assessment rubric for institutionalization of SL in higher ed (Revised) http://www.utm.edu/tnccl/files/urco-rubric-info.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Service Learning</p> <p>Designed to assist higher ed. community. Measurement at single point in time can inform an action plan to advance SL. Over multiple measurement points, growth of each component can be evaluated</p> <p>Updated in 2006 Originally piloted on 8 campuses & revised in 1999. The 1999 version became part of series of regional SL Institutionalization Institutes offered by Campus Compact. In 2000, a planning guide was developed to provide step-by-step process for campuses' use of rubric. Feedback incorporated into new versions of the rubric, with slightly revised & updated versions in 2002 & 2003.</p>	<p>Five dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Philosophy & Mission of Service Learning (SL definition, strategic planning, alignment with mission, alignment with ed. reform efforts) Faculty support for involv. in SL (faculty awareness, involvement & support, leadership, incentives & rewards) Student support for and involvement in SL (student awareness, opportunities, leadership, incentives & rewards) Community participation & partnerships (community partner awareness, mutual understanding, agency leadership/ voice) Institutional support for SL (Coordinating entity, Dept. Support, policy making entity, staffing, funding, admin support, evaluation & assessment) 	<p>For each component, three stages of development are identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Critical Mass Building (campuses beginning to recognize SL & starting to build a campus-wide constituency). Quality Building (campus focused on ensuring dev. of quality SL activities). Sustained Institutionalization (campus fully institutionalized SL into fabric of institution) <p>Some components may take many years to develop (poss. 5-7 yrs)</p> <p>Based on work by Kecskes & Muyliaert of Wst. Reg. Campus Compact Consort. <i>Continuums of Service</i> program. 3-stage dev continuum & most dimensions from Kecskes/ Muyliaert <i>Continuums of Service</i> benchmark worksheet. Other dimensions derived from lit. sources discussing critical elements for institutionalizing SL in higher ed.</p>
24	<p>Campus Community Partnerships for Health (2001)</p> <p>Self-Assessment Tool for Service-Learning Sustainability http://www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork/downloads/servicelearning-sustainabilitytool.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional support for Service Learning</p> <p>Can be used at a variety of levels: departments/ division, school/ college, university</p> <p>Builds on Furco's rubric as well as a variety of other sources.</p>	<p>Five dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Def. & application of SL (SL def, app, strategic planning, alignment with mission, alignment of SL with strategic goals & initiatives) Faculty support for involvement in SL (faculty awareness, involvement/ support, leadership, dev, incentives, rewards) Student support for involvement in SL (student awareness, opportunities, leadership, incentives, rewards) Community support & involvement in SL (community awareness, mutual understand. partner voice/ leadership, nature & extent of partnership, dev., incentives, rewards) Institutional leadership & support for SL (coordinating structures for SL, policy support, staff support, funding support, admin support, evaluation) <p>For each component, 3 stages of dev are identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Critical mass building Quality building Sustained institutionalization. (See Furco tool) 	<p>Completion process: Encouraged to consult colleagues, students & community partners in process of completion.</p> <p>Based on work by Kecskes & Muyliaert of Wst. Reg. Campus Compact Consortium & Furco, Campus Compact Engaged Scholar at University of California-Berkeley SL R & D Center. Framework, 3-stage dev. continuum and most dimensions der from benchmark worksheet by Kecskes & Muyliaert, <i>Continuums of Service</i> Program. Additional dimensions drawn from Furco's rubric and the Health Prof Schools in Service to Nation eval. led by Gelmon, & Holland's analyzing institutional commitment.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing institutional support for Service Learning				
25	<p>Shumer, Duttweiler, Furco, Hengel & Willems (2000)</p> <p>Shumer's Self-Assessment for Service-Learning http://www.servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/3/shumasses.pdf</p>	Assessing institutional support for Service Learning	<p>Divided into five sections, with multiple questions in each:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Culture and context (social and personal climate as well as larger setting in which SL is planned/ implemented) Philosophy and purpose (ideas, reasons, intentions and rationale guiding SL practice) Policy and parameters (formal elements that define SL through admin policies and support, etc.) Practice and pedagogy (what teachers, students, and administrators do to implement SL) Assessment and Accountability (evidence SL initiative meeting goal & the process & results are reported) <p>Individual elements evaluated as Weak (barrier), Needs work, or Strong (asset)</p>	<p>Purpose of self-assessment is formative and summative - designed to gather information to improve SL initiative, report on it, publicize it, secure support for it, or seek funding for it.</p> <p>Can be used in a variety of ways: at different levels (class, grade, school, district, etc.) and times.</p>
26	<p>Bringle & Hatcher (1996)</p> <p>Implementing SL in higher education http://www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/pdf/bringle-all.pdf</p>	Assessing institutional support for Service Learning	<p>Key areas of institutional development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Planning (key advocates, advisory cmmt, action plan) Awareness (informing key admin/ faculty groups, joining national orgs, attending conferences) Prototype (consult with exemplary programs) Resources (obtain commitment for office, develop means for coordinating with other programs, apply for grants) Expansion (discuss with broader admin/ staff, support attendance at SL conferences, collaborate on programming, grants, arrange campus speakers/ forums) Recognition (publicize SL activities outside university, participant in conferences, publish research) Monitoring (collect relevant data at institution) Evaluation (annual report, SL in institutional assessment) Research (research on SL within/across institutions) Institutionalization (in mission, courses, budget, etc.) 	<p>Includes specific reflections on activities at faculty, student, and community level</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing stakeholder (i.e. community, student, faculty) perspectives on SL, Engagement, Partnership				
27	<p>Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Unpacking Faculty Engagement: The Types of Activities Faculty Members Report as Publicly Engaged Scholarship During Promotion and Tenure. <i>Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement</i>, 15(1), 7-30. Link: http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/index</p>	<p>Assessing faculty involvement in CE</p> <p>In this study, the researchers conducted a quantitative content analysis to systematically code and analyze promotion and tenure documents to identify the types of publicly engaged scholarship that faculty members reported during promotion and tenure review.</p>	<p>Types & Definitions of PE Scholarship: A Typology Developed by Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer (2009):</p> <p>Publicly Engaged Research and Creative Activities: <i>Type 1. Research—business, industry, commodity group funded; Type 2. Research—nonprofit, foundation, government funded; Type 3. Research—unfunded or intramurally funded applied research; Type 4. Creative activities.</i></p> <p>Publicly Engaged Instruction: <i>Type 5. Instruction - for credit - nontraditional audiences; Type 6. Instruction - for credit - curricular, CE learning; Type 7. Instruction – noncredit - classes & programs; Type 8. Instruction – noncredit - managed learning environments; Type 9. Instruction – noncredit - public understanding, events, & media.</i></p> <p>Publicly Engaged Service: <i>Type 10. Service—technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice; Type 11. Service—co curricular SL; Type 12. Service—patient, clinical, and diagnostic services; Type 13. Service—advisory boards and other discipline-related service.</i></p> <p>Publicly Engaged Commercialized Activities: <i>Type 14. Commercialized activities.</i></p>	<p>Collection and analysis of this data.</p>
28	<p>Bergen, Brown & Hawkins (2009)</p> <p>Faculty involvement in community engaged activities questionnaire. University of Guelph. http://www.theresearchshop.ca/Resources</p>	<p>Assessing faculty involvement in CE, including faculty perceptions of institutional support for this work.</p> <p>The intention of this survey is to document current involvement, identify important facilitators to CE in research, teaching and service efforts, and to build on current successful practice.</p>	<p>Respondents invited to provide information on work in CE, pertaining to (a) teaching, (b) research, and (c) service:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Current level of participation Goals: Ideal level of engagement in these three areas Capability beliefs: Current level of knowledge and skills for doing CE work Context beliefs: Level of perceive support for faculty participation in CE work from their department, college/ faculty and institution <p>Questionnaire has been implemented at University of Guelph. See report here: http://www.theresearchshop.ca/Resources</p>	<p>Questionnaire may be adapted.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing stakeholder (i.e. community, student, faculty) perspectives on SL, Engagement, Partnership				
29	<p>Garlick & Langworthy (2008)</p> <p>Benchmarking university community engagement: Developing a national approach in Australia http://www.lilydale.swinburne.edu.au/crd/documents/GAR_1577.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing partnership perceptions</p> <p>Comprised of an institutional questionnaire, a partner perceptions survey, and a 'good practice' template</p> <p>Instruments were tested in pilot of 12 AUCEA member universities and (planned) to be implemented in all 33 AUCEA member universities in 2008.</p>	<p>Partnership perceptions survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale on rel. with univ re: accessibility, communication, stewardship, participation, relevance & leadership Open-ended questions asking for an overall assessment of the value of the relationship with the university. <p>Good practice template: Each univ completed template for 3 best partnerships, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proj. description, benefits, partner roles, comm. strategies, lessons learned, performance measures, success factors 	<p>5 CE goals identified as common to all Univ, regardless of structural diversity & development stage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate informed debate/ dialogue in community on issues of local & global importance; Ensure univ governance, management & admin processes support effective CE Ensure university is accessible, outward reaching & responsive to Ensure social, environmental, cultural & economic value of research to comm Design & deliver high quality teaching & learning responsive to comm needs and produces graduates who are ethical, employable & engaged citizens. <p>18 strategies & supporting performance measures aligned to 5 goals. Qualitative measures populated through a convergence of qual. measures in institutional questionnaire & partner perception survey.</p>
30	<p>Sandy with Ilkeda, Cruz, Holland, Rice, and Sandy (2007).</p> <p>Community voices: a California Campus Compact Study of Partnerships http://www.cacampuscompact.org/html/publications/communityVoices.html</p>	<p>Assessing community perceptions of University-Community Partnerships.</p> <p>This was a qualitative study, but it produced several participant themes that may prove useful in developing assessment tools.</p>	<p>Characteristics of Effective Partnerships (as identified by community partners):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships are essential Communication—clear and ongoing Understanding one another's organizations—mutual goals Planning, training, orientation, and preparation Shared leadership, accountability Access to, and support of, higher education Constant evaluation and reflection Focus on students—placement fit 	<p>Compare these to best practices as identified within the higher education context (as paraphrased by Holland, 2005):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Explore and expand separate and common goals and interests Understand capacity, resources and expectations of all partners Evidence of mutual benefit through careful planning and shared benefit For partnerships to be sustained, the relationship itself is partnership activity Shared control of directions <p>Continuous assess of partnership process & outcomes</p>
31	<p>Miron and Moely (2006)</p> <p>Community agency voice and benefit in service learning. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12(2), 27-37. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgj/p/pod/dod-idx?c=mjcs;idno=3239521.0012.203</p>	<p>Assessing community agency perception of Service Learning</p> <p>Based constructs on those developed by: Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan (1996); Schmidt and Robby (2002); Gelmon, Holland, Seifer, Shinnamon, & Connors (1998), Vernon & Ward (1999), Ferrari & Worrall (2000), Jones & Hill (2001)</p>	<p>Assessment of community agency perceptions, based on four constructs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Agency voice Agency benefit Perception of University Interpersonal relations (not including diversity items / including diversity items) <p>Each construct includes multiple assessment questions</p>	<p>Article looks at relationship between constructs.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing stakeholder (i.e. community, student, faculty) perspectives on SL, Engagement, Partnership				
32	Tannenbaum, S. C. & Berrett, R. D. (2005). Relevance of Service-Learning in College Courses. <i>Academic Exchange Quarterly</i>, 9(1). http://www.rapidintellect.com/AEQweb/5jul2922w5.htm	Assessing student perspectives on SL	Students were asked to respond to 15 statements relating to their service-learning experience using a five-point Likert scale. This instrument was designed by one of the authors by compiling common elements from prior service-learning studies (Driscoll et al., 1998; Furco, 2000; Shumer, Duttweiler, & Furco, 2000). Questions include: 1. SL assignment helped me to see how the content of this course can be applied in everyday life 2. better understand the lectures and readings in the course 3. SL assign. expanded understanding of people in general 4. SL assign. showed me how I can become more involved in my community 5. SL assign. enabled me to learn more about diversity 6. the SL assign. helped me become more aware of needs in my community 7. SL should be used in more classes 8. the SL assignment positively impacted [their] self-esteem	This study analyzed student perceptions of the academic and social relevance of service-learning pedagogy, and how teacher adherence to best practices in SL may influence those perceptions.
33	Bringle, R.G., Phillips, M.A., and Hudson, M. (2004). Measure of student learning: Research scales to assess student experiences. <i>American Psychological Association</i>. http://www.servicelearning.org/library/resource/5516	Assessing student perspectives on SL This book is a resource for program evaluators and researchers who want to inform the practice of service learning. It provides an extensive compilation of scales for use in studying students in service learning classes.	The scales measure a variety of constructs, such as: Attitudes, moral development, and critical thinking.	In addition, the text includes a primer on measurement theory. The authors advocate the use of multiple-item scales, present the rationale for their use, and explain how readers can evaluate them for reliability and validity. Contents: "Service Learning", "Overview of Scientific Research and Measurement", "The Use of Scales in Service Learning Research", "Motives and Values", "Moral Development", "Self and Self-concept", "Student Development", "Attitudes", and "Critical Thinking".
34	Birdsall (2005) Community Voice: Community partners reflect on Service Learning. <i>Journal for Civic Commitment</i>, 5. http://www.servicelearning.org/library/resource/7077	Assessing impact of SL on community, as evaluated by community partners	Partner questionnaire included (Likert scales): 1. Coordination 2. Input and Planning 3. Goals Set 4. Set Goals With Community Partners 5. Community Goals Explained 6. Student Objectives Explained 7. Volunteers Trained 8. Ongoing Training Provided 9. Students Supervised 10. Goals and Objectives Met 11. Evaluation Conducted 12. Reflection Conducted 13. Effectiveness of Partnership 14. Effectiveness of Networking 15. Satisfaction of services received 16. Impact of service	Open-ended and focus group comments organized into following themes: 1. Networking & relationships within the community 2. Networking & relationships with college; 3. SL Components (Coordination & coordinators, input, planning, assess, & goal setting, orientation & training, placement of vols, service projects or activities, & reflection & evaluation) 4. Volunteers 5. Impact of SL Additional Comments

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing stakeholder (i.e. community, student, faculty) perspectives on SL, Engagement, Partnership				
35	<p>Shinnamon, Gelmon & Holland (1999)</p> <p>Methods and Strategies for Faculty/ Student/ Community Partner Assessment and Reflection. From Methods & Strategies for Assessing SL in the Health Professions. San Francisco, CA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 1999.</p> <p>http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/servicelearningres.htm</p>	<p>Assessing faculty perspectives on involvement in SL</p> <p>The “End-of-Program Survey” for faculty/ students/ community partners is intended to describe the perspectives and attitudes on several issues related to their experience(s). Topics assessed by the survey include perceived impact, motivation for participation, satisfaction with roles/ responsibilities, etc.</p>	<p>The faculty survey is based on two scales. The first is a 5-point Likert scale asking faculty their level of agreement with statements regarding their service-learning experience. The second section contains a scale for ranking information based on perceived importance related to the process of teaching a service-learning course.</p> <p>The student survey provides demographic data profiling the students’ racial background, age, gender, academic discipline, and employment. In addition, the survey uses a 5-point Likert scale asking students their level of agreement with statements regarding their service-learning experience.</p> <p>The community partner survey is based on three scales. There are two 5-point Likert scales. They ask the partners their level of agreement or satisfaction with statements regarding their service-learning experience. The remaining scale allows the partners to rank, in order of importance, items regarding the process of participating in a service-learning partnership.</p>	<p>Instrument designed as a post-test tool to assess perspectives after stakeholders have participated in a SL initiative. As a post-test, the instrument serves to describe the profile of stakeholders involved in SL. The tool, however, has broader applications; by modifying the survey into a pre/post test the researcher can assess changes in stakeholder perceptions over time.</p>
36	<p>Leiderman, Furco, Zapf & Goss (2002)</p> <p>Building partnerships with college campuses: community perspectives (A monograph). Council of Independent Colleges</p> <p>http://www.cic.edu/caphe/grants/engaging.asp</p>	<p>Assessing community perspective on college-community partnerships</p> <p>Not a specific assessment tool, but details basic & required elements of a good partnership as identified by community partners</p> <p>Produced through summit focused on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bringing community perspectives into clearer focus by documenting the perspectives, experiences, and voices of experienced community partners regarding the creation & maintenance of partnerships between community orgs and institutions of higher ed 2. Improving understanding re: those perspectives as a way to gain insight into common challenges and opportunities that ultimately lead to more successful & effective partnerships between institutions of higher education and community organizations. 	<p>Required Elements of a Good Partnership (Basic)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty & student participation in engagement activities. • An understanding of each partner’s assets/ capacities • Shared decision-making & resource allocation. • Realistic expectations. • Knowledge of community needs - how theoretical & macro issues play out locally. • Diverse representation and participation from colleges, including faculty, students, administration, and staff. • An understanding of student’s capacities. • An understanding of different ways to work in communities • Adherence to basic standards for planning, resource use, & interacting with another’s and base of legitimacy. <p>Enables the Enhancement of Partnerships (Advanced)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that communities & campuses each have multiple players & perspectives (partners not monolithic). • Explicit attention to faculty & student dev & preparation • Existence of people in communities who network/ connect • Attention to building capacity of all partner organizations. • Specific opportunities for community partners (staff & residents) to make use of campus resources, e.g. classes, research, and advanced degrees, not just use of the gym. • Stated outcomes with eval. to determine if goals met. • Attention to the institutionalization of a college’s partnership in the community. 	<p>Authors’ note: The list, generated by the community partners, is consistent with the elements of sound collaboration noted in other community collaboration initiatives (Chaskin, 2001; Leiderman, 2001). Since this list is fairly well known among practitioners and researchers who work on community self-determination and improvement, it was particularly frustrating to community partners that its elements are not better observed in collaborations between community organizations and higher educational institutions.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing stakeholder (i.e. community, student, faculty) perspectives on SL, Engagement, Partnership				
37	<p>Shinnamon, Gelmon & Holland (1999)</p> <p>Community -Campus Partnerships for Health: Methods & Strategies for Community Partner Assessment</p> <p>http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/tools-partner.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing community perspectives on Service Learning</p> <p>The “End-of-Program Survey” for community partners is intended to describe the perspectives & attitudes of community partners on several issues related to their experience(s) as a community site for SL course(s). Topics assessed by the survey include the partner's view on the impact they perceive SL has had on students, motivation for participating in SL programs, satisfaction with the roles and responsibilities in the process of teaching SL courses, community involvement and influence of the university-community partnership.</p>	<p>Questionnaire including questions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature of organization • Perspective on SL courses (perc. benefit, support for) • Attitude toward community involvement (perceived benefit to community, agency, and university, impacts of program, experience within the program) • Personal reflections on SL experience (relationships, mentoring role, learning, impact, expectations for future) • Satisfaction with roles & responsibilities (evaluating students, designing curriculum, facilitating student reflections, participation in classroom, on-site supervision) • Process of participating in SL partnership (motivations for involvement, logistics, concerns re program, impact) <p>Focus group questions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature of partnership • What went well • Benefits/ Burdens of partnership • What should be done differently • Learning about university • Key elements/ ingredients of successful partnership 	<p>Questions pertain to the influence and impact that SL has on a community/ campus partnership, community's role as mentor/teacher & student involv. in community. Partner survey based on 3 scales & has two Likert scales asking for agreement/ satisfaction with statements re: SL experience. Remaining scale allows partners to rank items re: process of participating.</p> <p>Designed as a post-test to describe profile of community partners supervising students in SL courses.</p> <p>Modification to a pre/post tests allows researcher to assess change in community partners' perceptions.</p> <p>Includes instructions on administration and analysis.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing impact/ contribution				
38	Upbeat, Salford University (no date) http://www.upbeat.eu.com/	<p>Project development and evaluation tool regarding outreach activities</p> <p>Relevance to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide academics/researchers who are interested in putting their research into practice but do not know where to start • Staff development. The matrix looks at the skills/expertise of individuals in the project team and identifies areas of development Hart (2009) 	<p>Matrix maps critical human success factors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Business acumen 2. Social networking 3. Intelligence 4. Individual performance 5. Foresight enabling skill <p>Against six levels of engagement with business and community partners.</p>	<p>UPBEAT is the result of a pan-European study to explore how HEIs can maximize the impact of university outreach programs on business & communities. By studying Academic Enterprises across Europe, a number of major elements have been identified which are consistently present in winning commercial or community focused academic ventures</p> <p>Not so relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capturing institutional change • Assessing or defining partnership activity from a community perspective Hart (2009)

39	<p>Commission on innovation, competitiveness, and economic prosperity (2010), Association of Public and Land-grant Universities</p> <p>Institutional Assessment Tool to Enhance Regional Innovation and Prosperity www.aplu.org/document.doc?id=2112</p>	<p>Assessing University's economic contribution to community</p> <p>Many characteristics of a university making an impact on regional economic development (RED) are listed. These can serve as a self-assessment tool to evaluate engagement in RED. Several relate to cultural aspects of public colleges & universities. Others are focused on structural elements (e.g., existence of specific positions, programs or offices to facilitate increased partnerships with external community). Yet other aspects relate to interface between university and community and require an understanding of the important synergistic relationship between local university and regional economic development. These latter aspects are premised on existence of a reciprocal relationship with external community, recognizing its contributions and respecting its knowledge and perspective.</p>	<p>Survey includes following indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutional leadership (mission, joint priority dev., alignment of strengths, training, on-going dialogue, etc.) 2. Supportive culture (reward systems recognizes faculty involvement, IP, policies/ processes, open access to facilities, interdisciplinary efforts, curriculum alignment, efficient contracting, etc.) 3. Benefits to the public (leverage university assets, enhanced education programs that align with changing regional needs, technology transfer/ commercialization, links to technology based, links to regional companies, recognition among business/gov leaders of university cultural activities, etc.) 4. Innovative economy (public-private partnerships inventoried, developed and enhances, nurturing infrastructure, creation of new industry with support for training students in these, etc.) 5. Relevant educational opportunities/ programs (culture of entrepreneurship, cross-disciplinary, integrated, flexible curricula, internships, etc.) 6. Openness, accessibility, responsiveness (user-friendly systems to access faculty/ staff knowledge, designated point of contact, civic discourse, networks) 7. Communication of contributions, successes, achievement, benefiting region (highlight success stories, educate faculty re: opportunities, etc.) 	<p>An institution may be economically engaged without demonstrating all of the characteristics listed in this document. This tool does not pretend to capture every possible issue or topic related to an institution's role in regional economic development. Innovation to enhance and create economic prosperity depends on regional factors and the culture of the educational institution. Therefore, institutions are encouraged to use this document as a checklist or guide to stimulate conversations on campus and result in appropriate strategies and actions. These efforts will enhance the institution's economic role and impact on its local, regional, and/or state-wide community while providing benefits to faculty and students and advancing the institution's research, instruction, and broader social objectives.</p>
----	---	--	---	---

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing impact/ contribution				
40	<p>The Netter Centre for Community Partnerships at The University of Pennsylvania (2008)</p> <p>Anchor Institutions Toolkit: A guide for neighborhood revitalization http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/anchor/toolkit/</p>	<p>Informing institutional efforts aimed at collaborative actions benefiting institutions and communities</p> <p>This is not an assessment tool, but could inform the development of indicators</p> <p>Toolkit for Anchor Institutions to use as a guide to rebuild, revitalize, strengthen and improve their local communities. Each of the tools in this kit was developed and implemented by the University of Pennsylvania working with stakeholders of West Philadelphia, Penn's local geographic community, including neighborhood associations, city officials and city agencies, local businesses, nonprofits and higher education institutions as appropriate.</p> <p>Encourage a detailed self-assessment by all partners (institutional and community-based) to identify strengths, resources, etc.</p>	<p>Key ingredients in effective partnerships (aimed at community transformation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committed and demonstrated institutional leadership Senior administrators acknowledge the importance of this work and are willing to participate. An entity within the anchor that pushed and promoted the agenda for engagement Preparation Opportunity for participation by stakeholders Linking of the efforts with the Core mission of Penn. The work was academically informed. 	<p>Contains extensive and detailed information on the process.</p> <p>One element of the multipronged approach that is essential for anchors to keep in mind is the importance of beginning where one can. Initially, Penn did not utilize all the tools in the toolkit simultaneously; they started where they had the resources and where the results could quickly be observed, measured, and would create momentum. For Penn, this meant utilizing the clean and safe tool first. Improving the physical environment created a tangible entity that people could readily see, understand and celebrate.</p>
41	<p>The University of Brighton (2006-07)</p> <p>Community Engagement Audit www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp</p>	<p>Assessing institutional performance in Community Engagement</p> <p>Developed to capture baseline information about university-community engagement, to support social engagement aspirations of the university's Corporate Plan (University of Brighton, 2007a) and to underpin dev. of its long-term economic & social engagement strategy.</p> <p>Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capturing data on university-community engagement activities that are intended primarily to have a social impact Establishing baseline information <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>Collected information included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modules and units of study involving CE by Faculty Details of modules delivered by the local community validated by the University. Details of research projects and activities undertaken in 2006-7, primarily directed towards needs of community. Examples of dissemination activities Support Activities undertaken by staff in working hours linked to their work related expertise & skills Number of staff and students volunteering in their own time and the number of hours. Details of public events that took place in 2006-7. Details of goods & facilities provide to local orgs by Univ. Details of fundraising & donations made by students/ staff 	<p>40 Schools, Faculties and Departments were invited to complete the audit; of these 36 did so giving a substantial 90% response rate.</p> <p>Report also includes case studies.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing impact/ contribution				
42	<p>Hart & Aumann (2007) An ACE way to engage in community-university partnerships: Making links through Resilient Therapy In: Community-university partnerships in practice. Niace, Leicester. http://eprints.brighton.ac.uk/8121/</p>	<p>Documenting drivers, processes and outcomes of partnership working where the university and the community collaborate for the purpose of socially beneficial outcomes.</p> <p>Relevance to this exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the micro-dynamics of public engagement between individual university personnel, students, community groups and community members Reflection tool for partnership processes Assessing or defining partnership activity from a community perspective <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>The ACE way sets out seven dimensions of import:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Attractions Conservation Crevices Contingencies Expectations Enlightenment Emergence 	<p>Not so relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capturing institutional change Establishing large data sets for comparative purposes <p>Hart (2009)</p>
43	<p>Michigan State University (2007) Outreach & Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI) http://ncsue.msu.edu/measure.aspx</p>	<p>Assessing faculty involvement in community engagement</p> <p>Ensuring that universities direct some of their intellectual resources and research discoveries to benefit communities is a significant part of the mission of land-grant institutions such as Michigan State University. It is increasingly important that these universities be able to demonstrate to the public that they are fulfilling this part of their mission effectively. Toward this end, MSU developed the OEMI, which collects data about outreach and engagement activities.</p>	<p>Faculty and academic staff report on the their teaching, research, and service each year.</p> <p>Numerical data on outreach activities is collected on these dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Time spent Social issues Boldness By Design imperatives Forms Locations Non-university participants External funding and in-kind support <p>Descriptive information collected on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Purposes Methods Disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives Impacts on ongoing research Impacts on external audiences 	<p>MSU has over six years of data and boast one of the most sophisticated databases of scholarly outreach and engagement information within higher ed. The OEMI is used as other institutions as well.</p> <p>Data used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describing university's outreach & engagement activity to public Assessment & strategic planning Benefiting faculty <p>Providing a basis for cross-institutional comparisons</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing impact/ contribution				
44	<p>REAP/ Pearce, Pearson, & Cameron (2007)</p> <p>The Ivory Tower and Beyond: Bradford University at the heart of its Communities: Bradford University's REAP approach to Community Engagement http://www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork/downloads/REAP_Report_Bradford_U.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional performance in Community Engagement</p> <p>Primarily a qualitative measurement tool, with the capacity to add quantitative elements in as far as they become relevant and amenable to a cost effective data collection method. Tool proved a useful mechanism for assessing progress of the University's CE work and of the relevance of the REAP definition. The early CE work and the REAP definition developed alongside each other, and the matrix is only a preliminary testing of projects at different stages of evolution.</p> <p>Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dev. outcome eval framework for university-community engagement work • Assessing value added to university and local communities through CE activities • Adapting to the specific circumstances of individual institutions • Understanding micro-dynamics of public engagement between university personnel, students, community groups/ members 	<p>Inputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reciprocity (Community partner: intellectual space/culture, validation, expertise, accessible ideas / University: capacity to organize projects, access to networks, community knowledge, trust of communities, non academic partnerships, credibility) 2. Access (Community: physical space and resources, greater understanding of how University works and who to contact) <p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partnership (stronger relationships and identification of mutual benefits) 2. Externalities (over time – more social networks, greater social trust and skills diffusion) 	<p>Not intended as a tool:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is filled out in full for each project/ collaboration • That has to be filled out prior to partnership initiation • That cannot be changed. <p>It is intended as a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide to thinking through potential partnerships • Breakdown of REAP approach • Approach to developing a culture of CE in the University • Tool for evidence based learning, through partners setting milestones, indicators of achievement & methodology for gathering evidence.
45	<p>University of Cambridge (2003-04)</p> <p>Community Engagement Report http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/communications/community/report/2003.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional performance in Community Engagement (of departments, colleges, and student societies of the University of Cambridge)</p> <p>Aim: capture community activities conducted over and above, but in very many cases are synergistic with, the University's core purpose of teaching and research. 'Community' is defined in the broadest sense – ie any contribution broadly accepted by society as charitable.</p> <p>Linked with Russell group (above)</p>	<p>Asked for a short description of each project as well as information on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who benefited from the project 2. What the dept, college, museum or society contributed towards project (money and in kind) 3. How many paid staff involved & time spent on project 4. How many staff vols involved & time spent on project 5. How many student vols involved & time spent on project 6. If any other resources came into the project, where they came from and how much they were worth. 	<p>Survey focused on academic year & participants included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff working the community in University/ college time • Staff volunteering own time for Univ-related comm. activities • Students vol. in activities org. by University/ colleges • Students vol. in activities organized by student orgs. <p>To support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more accurate picture of univ & college support for educational and charitable initiatives which can be fed to bodies such as HEFCE, general public, press and other potential supporters • Better signposting between projects, to share good practice • Support for units running act.

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing impact/ contribution				
46	<p>Russell Group (2003)</p> <p>Higher Ed. Community Engagement Model http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/about/community/communityhub/model/</p> <p>User Guide: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/about/community/communityhub/model/userguide.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional contribution to community</p> <p>Based on London Benchmarking Model, used by companies to measure community contributions, but adapted by Higher Education Institutions.</p> <p>Piloted in 2004, evaluated & opened up for use by any HEI in 2006. Aims to capture community activities, conducted over & above University's core purposes of teaching & research. 'Community' defined broadly – i.e. any contribution broadly accepted by society as charitable.</p> <p>Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing benchmarking Systematic monitoring & to inform strategic planning Quantifiable evidence for senior managers to demonstrate value of community engagement Public relations and marketing opportunities <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>Survey includes questions on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Motivation for contribution to community Subject focus of contribution Type of organizations benefitting Type of university unit Geographic area of project Funding of activity Contribution type (cash, time, in-kind) Other contributions (non-university) Number of organizations benefitting Number of individuals benefitting 	<p>The HECE Model has a number of applications, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a tool for systematic monitoring, and informing strategic decisions. Hard evidence for senior managers to demonstrate the value of community activities. For public relations and marketing purposes.
47	<p>Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE, 2002)</p> <p>Evaluating the regional contribution of an HEI: A Benchmarking Approach http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2002/02_23/02_23tool.pdf</p>	<p>Assessing institutional economic and social contribution to community</p> <p>Designed to help higher education institutions assess contribution made to the economic and social development of region, and how contributions might be developed.</p> <p>The tool has three functions, To:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Assess improvements in strategy, performance & outcomes of HEI regional engagement Help HEI set strategic priorities Support joint strategies within a regional partnership <p>(Hart, 2008)</p>	<p>Tool examines following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing regional framework conditions Human capital development process Business development processes Interactive learning and social capital development processes Redistributive processes Cultural development Promoting sustainability 	<p>Relevant for: strategic planning at the level of individual universities and regionally; assessing regional development links with business and the community; devising benchmarking indicators</p> <p>Not Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing how well universities manage implementation of regional dev strategy; Evaluating success in education or research terms Assessing, defining benchmarks from a community perspective

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Assessing impact/ contribution				
48	<p>Initiative for a Competitive Inner City and CEOs for Cities (2002)</p> <p><i>Leveraging Colleges and Universities For Urban Economic Revitalization: An Action Agenda</i> http://www.edu-impact.com/leveraging-colleges-and-universities-urban-economic-revitalization-action-agenda</p>	<p>Informing institutional efforts aimed at collaborative actions benefiting institutions and communities</p> <p>This is not an assessment tool, but could inform the development of indicators</p> <p>Interviewed > 100 professionals in the field and 10 university presidents. Based on this research, we developed a strategic framework to accelerate urban economic revitalization, improving the value and well-being of the urban communities where universities have sizable and immovable investments.</p>	<p>Strategic Framework outlines University roles in job and business development, positioning institutions as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Purchaser (redirecting institutional purchasing toward local business) Employer (offering employment opportunities to local residents) Real estate developer (using University real estate development to anchor local economic growth) Incubator (offering services to support start-up companies and expedite research commercialization) Advisor/ Network builder (channeling university expertise to increase local business capacity or improve local business environment) Workplace developer (addressing local and regional workforce needs) <p>Three core processes at play: operating, leaning, investing</p>	<p>To better leverage the assets and resources of colleges and universities, we have developed a strategic framework that defines the role of these institutions in job and business development. A comprehensive use of the framework can accelerate urban revitalization, improving the value and wellbeing of the urban communities where universities have sizable and immovable investments.</p>
49	<p>HEFCE (2001)</p> <p>Higher education-business and community interaction survey http://www.hefce.ac.uk/econsoc/buscom/hebci/</p>	<p>Assessing institutional contribution to the community</p> <p>Relevance to this exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get info on national trends in dev of HEIs' capacity to respond to external partner needs Get full data by institution, region and nation International comparison: data from HE-BCI have been used by the UK funding councils and others to compare UK's performance with both North America & Europe in exchanging knowledge with business and the community Use as example from which ideas can be generated for indicators, audit, benchmarking or evaluation tools on public and/or business engagement <p>(Hart, 2008)</p>	<p>Key indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research related activities Business and community services Regeneration and development programs Intellectual property Social, community and cultural engagement 	<p>Designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide data re: continuing development & range of interactions between higher ed sector, business & wider community Provide reliable & relevant info to support continued public funding of the so-called 'third stream' of HEIs' activity - enhancing contribution of HE to the economy and society Give HEIs a consistent basis for benchmarking & info management <p>Develop a suite of indicators at the level of the individual HEI, some of which will be appropriate to inform allocations of funding in the UK</p>
50	<p>Driscoll, A., Gelmon, S., Holland, B., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). <i>Studies of impact on faculty, students, community and institutions. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning</i>, 3(1), 66-71. http://www.servicelearning.org/library/resource/2129</p>	<p>Assessing impact of SL on students, faculty, community and institutions</p> <p>A comprehensive case study model of assessment developed at Portland State University responds to the need to measure the impact of service-learning on four constituencies (student, faculty, community, and institution).</p>	<p>Figures 1-4 on pages 68-69 outline the specific variables, indicators, and measurements for each stakeholder.</p>	<p>The case studies blend quantitative and qualitative measures in order to determine the most effective and practical tools to measure service-learning impact and to provide feedback for continuous improvement of practice. Insights from the design process and preliminary results have potential value for institutions with similar agendas for service-learning and community partnerships.</p>

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
Other tools/ articles of possible relevance				

51	<p>Rennekamp et al, (undated)</p> <p>Measuring Extension's Performance in the Age of Engagement (White paper, prepared for ASRED & AEA by Southern Region Indicator Work Group. asred.msstate.edu/toolbox/files/measuring_excellence_in_ext.doc</p>	<p>Discussion of efforts to measure Community Engagement</p> <p>Relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An analysis of benchmarking progress within the context of US Extension Colleges Identifying problems in relation to reliability, validity, and aggregation of data Analyzing 'inputs-outputs-outcomes' in relation to HEIs measuring engagement with multiple stakeholders Providing clear framework & categories of engagement Comparing university achievements internationally <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>Suggests following questions for selecting indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is indicator already being collected by a number of states? Would addition of the indicator add a significant reporting burden to the states? Can the indicator be defined in a manner that data can be collected consistently across departments or institutions? Do accepted protocols, methods and conventions exist for measuring the indicator? Can assurances be provided that will guard against the misuse of the data? Does the indicator fairly represent the nature or magnitude of Cooperative Extension work? Does the indicator fall within one of the CIC's seven categories of engagement indicators? <p>*See CIC seven categories</p>	<p>Not so relevant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing or defining partnership activity from a community perspective <p>Understanding micro-dynamics of public engagement between university, personnel, students, community groups & community members</p>
----	--	---	--	---

52	<p>Mcloughlin, Kaminski, Sodagar, Sabina, Harris, Arnaudo, & McBrearty, (2009)</p> <p>A strategic approach to social impact measurmt. of social enterprises: The SIMPLE methodology <i>Social Enterprise Journal</i>, 5 (2), 154-178</p>	<p>Measuring social impact of social enterprises</p> <p>Relevant to this exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing impact measures for social enterprise Supporting strategic planning and decision making Accommodating all types of organizations and incorporating other measurement methodologies Contributing to university-level audit or benchmarking data <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>Article requested from author</p>	
----	---	--	--------------------------------------	--

#	Title (and source)	Focus	Domains included	Notes
<i>Other tools/ articles of possible relevance</i>				
53	<p>Hills & Sullivan (2006)</p> <p>Measuring public value 2: Practical approaches</p> <p>http://www.theworkfoundation.com/research/publications/publicationdetail.aspx?oItemId=171</p>	<p>Measuring public value</p> <p>Relevance to this exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing models of university public engagement that incorporate public perceptions of their value • Developing mechanisms to capture outcomes that are generated by the combination of activities across multiple dimensions <p>Hart (2009)</p>	<p>Key criteria are whether measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate • Holistic • Democratic • Trustworthy • Measurement process itself generates public value. 	<p>Public value is heralded as a 'third way' beyond traditional and new public mgmt. but it poses epistemological & ontological challenges. There are useful areas of that can contribute to understanding how public value might be measured, such as attempts to measure other broad concepts such as wellbeing, happiness & quality of life, & learning from field of evaluation about impact of measurement on what is measured.</p> <p>The paper sets out principles necessary for any measure of public value & suggests this needs to include what is being measured & how measures are developed and used, with a key principle that measures themselves should contribute to public value.</p>

Note: this search is not complete and is significantly challenged by shifting names, versions of tools, modifications, etc. In a majority of cases the tools is simply noted or highlighted as a key or common resource. Recommend additional searches as group focuses in on selected tools

Table 3: Sample of articles referencing tool identified in Table 1

CCPH (Gelmon et al)

<p>Beere, C.A., Votruba, J.C., & Wells, G.W. (2011). <i>Becoming an engaged campus: a practical guide for institutionalizing public engagement</i>. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.</p>	<p>Chapter on aligning accountability and reporting systems.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Swords, A. C. S. & Kiely, R. (2010). <i>Beyond Pedagogy: Service Learning as Movement Building in Higher Education</i>. <i>Journal of Community Practice</i>, 18, 148-170. http://pdfserve.informaworld.com.subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/190796_770885140_926162782.pdf</p>	<p>This article focuses on how service learning can function as a democratizing and empowering approach to pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. The dominant discourse of service learning has evolved into a narrowly-defined alternative pedagogy that promotes student learning and enrichment but very little community development, institutional change, and policy change. For service learning to lead to more meaningful social change, beyond pedagogical innovation, it must be reinvented as a more robust approach including pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. We illustrate weak and robust forms of each of the previously mentioned dimensions with concrete examples from our service-learning work and in particular, from case study research comparing two global service-learning programs in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. We discuss challenges and implications for designing, implementing, and sustaining a more robust approach to service learning, beyond current pedagogical practice and toward social movement learning aimed at policy and institutional change.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Gelmon, S.B., Lederer, M., Seifer, S.D. & Wong, K. (2009). <i>Evaluating the Accomplishments of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative</i>. <i>Metropolitan Universities Journal</i>, 20(2), 22-46.</p>	<p>The findings of the evaluation of the three-year Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative are presented, describing changes in institutional capacity for community-engaged scholarship, and changes in promotion and tenure policies and processes. The change process in the participating institutions is assessed using the Kotter model of organizational change. Facilitators of and barriers to the change process to support community-engaged scholarship are described. Their paper concludes with recommendations.</p>	<p>Used in study</p>
<p>Seifer, S.D., Wong, K., Gelmon, S.B. & Lederer, M. (2009). <i>The Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: A National Change Initiative Focused on Faculty Roles and Rewards</i>. <i>Metropolitan Universities Journal</i>, 20(2), 5-21. http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/MUJ_20.2_Seifer.pdf</p>	<p>This issue of Metropolitan Universities includes papers emanating from the work of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, a three-year (2004-2007) initiative designed to build capacity for community-engaged scholarship (CES) in health professional schools. As the core principles and challenges of CES are similar across disciplines, readers will find the Collaborative's processes, products and outcomes relevant to any institutional context. This paper presents the rationale and context for the Collaborative; describes its institutional change model, key components, and lessons learned; and introduces the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative that builds from the Collaborative's work.</p>	<p>Used in study</p>
<p>Holland, B. (2009). <i>Will it last? Evidence of institutionalization at Carnegie classified community engagement institutions</i>. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 85-98.</p>	<p>Community engagement has endured a long period of critical examination as an innovative practice in higher education, with some still questioning whether it is merely a faddish idea that will disappear with the retirement of the generation of activist-minded baby boomer faculty. Despite significant measurable indicators of growth in institutional commitment to community engagement (such as the growth of membership in Campus Compact, the number and diversity of institutions applying for grants from Learn and Serve America, and the introduction of engagement into regional accreditation processes), questions persist as to whether the practice survives only at the margin of academic organizations based on the temporary support of soft money, the strong advocacy of particular key academic voices, and current national attention.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>

Furco, A. & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 47-54.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/doi/10.1002/he.357/pdf>

Colleges and universities with institutionalized community engagement have (1) a philosophy and mission that emphasizes engagement; (2) genuine faculty involvement and support for engaged research or teaching, or both; (3) a broad range of opportunities for students to access and involve themselves in high-quality engagement experiences; (4) an institutional infrastructure that supports engagement practice; and (5) mutually beneficial, sustained partnerships with community partners (Holland, 2001). These five foundational components work synergistically to build and sustain an institutional culture in which community-engaged research, teaching, and public service are valued to the extent that they become fully infused within the academic fabric of a higher education institution.

Highlights

Furco's Rubric

Swords, A. C. S. & Kiely, R. (2010). Beyond Pedagogy: Service Learning as Movement Building in Higher Education. *Journal of Community Practice*, 18, 148-170.

http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/190796_770885140_926162782.pdf

This article focuses on how service learning can function as a democratizing and empowering approach to pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. The dominant discourse of service learning has evolved into a narrowly-defined alternative pedagogy that promotes student learning and enrichment but very little community development, institutional change, and policy change. For service learning to lead to more meaningful social change, beyond pedagogical innovation, it must be reinvented as a more robust approach including pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. We illustrate weak and robust forms of each of the previously mentioned dimensions with concrete examples from our service-learning work and in particular, from case study research comparing two global service-learning programs in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. We discuss challenges and implications for designing, implementing, and sustaining a more robust approach to service learning, beyond current pedagogical practice and toward social movement learning aimed at policy and institutional change.

Highlights

Weerts, D. J. & Sandmann, L. R. (2010). Community Engagement and Boundary Spanning Roles at Research Universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(6), 632-657.

During the last decade, community engagement has emerged as an important priority among many colleges and universities in the United States. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defines community engagement 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" (Carnegie, 2006). As the Carnegie definition suggests, engagement differs from traditional conceptualizations of public service and outreach in important ways. Specifically, service and outreach are typically conceived as one-way approaches to delivering knowledge and service to the public, whereas engagement emphasizes a two-way approach in which institutions and community partners collaborate to develop and apply knowledge to address societal needs (Boyer, 1996; Kellogg Commission, 1999).

Make reference to tool and discusses moving beyond it.

Dallimore, E., Rochefort, D.A., & Simonelli, K. (2010). Community-Based Learning and Research. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 124, 15-22.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/doi/10.1002/tl.416/pdf>

The origins of community-based learning and research (CBLR) are found in a variety of precursor activities, including the "action research model" first promoted by Kurt Lewin in the 1940s and the more recent practices of "participatory research" associated with development planning in the third-world (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, and Donohue, 2003; Stoecker, 2002). As more voices call for higher education to engage the world beyond the campus walls (Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett, 2007), CBLR continues to offer an excellent means for fulfilling this responsibility.

Highlights

Westdijk, K., Koliba, C., & Hamshaw, K. (2010) Collecting data to inform decision making and action: the University of Vermont's faculty community engagement tool. *Journal of Higher Ed and Outreach and Engagement*, 14(2), 5.

<http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/viewArticle/42>

Ascertaining the breadth and depth of CE at the level of the university or college (Bergkamp, 1996; Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005; Maurasse, 2001; Siscoe, 1997; Ward, 1999), academic department (Battistoni, Gelson, Saltmarsh, Wergin, & Zlotkowski, 2003), academic discipline (Steinke & Harrington, 2002; Zlotkowski, 2000), and individual faculty member (Korfmacher, 1999; Wade & Demb, 2009) has been the focus of a great deal of literature concerning community engagement in higher education.

Highlights

<p>Furco, A. & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 47-54.</p> <p>http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/doi/10.1002/he.357/pdf</p>	<p>Colleges and universities with institutionalized community engagement have (1) a philosophy and mission that emphasizes engagement; (2) genuine faculty involvement and support for engaged research or teaching, or both; (3) a broad range of opportunities for students to access and involve themselves in high-quality engagement experiences; (4) an institutional infrastructure that supports engagement practice; and (5) mutually beneficial, sustained partnerships with community partners (Holland, 2001). These five foundational components work synergistically to build and sustain an institutional culture in which community-engaged research, teaching, and public service are valued to the extent that they become fully infused within the academic fabric of a higher education institution.</p>	Highlights
<p>Chadwick, S.A. & Pawlowski, D. R. (2007). Assessing Institutional Support for Service-Learning: A Case Study of Organizational Sensemaking. <i>Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning</i>, 31-39.</p> <p>http://www.eric.ed.gov:80/PDFS/EJ831323.pdf</p>	<p>This paper provides an example of how institutional service-learning assessment data can be used to drive organizational change. Furco's (1999) self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education is used in modified form as the instrument through which organizational-level assessments were made. The process of organizational change over time is reported through the lens of Weick's (1995) Organizational Information Theory and specifically the double interact, comprised of act, response, and adjustment as organizational members reduce their uncertainty and make sense of organizational action and communication.</p>	Modified version used in a case study
<p>Butin, D.W. (2006). The Limits of Service-Learning in Higher Education. <i>The Review of Higher Education</i>, 29(4), 473-498.</p>	<p>The service-learning movement has become a major presence within higher education. More than 950 colleges and universities are Campus Compact members, committed to the civic purposes of higher education. Tens of thousands of faculty engage millions of college students in some form of service-learning practice each and every year. Major federal and private funding sustains and expands an increasingly diverse K-16 service-learning movement.</p>	Examines
<p>Kramer, M. (2000). Make it Last Forever: The Institutionalization of Service Learning in America. <i>National Service Fellowship Program of the Corporation for National Service</i>. 1-133.</p> <p>http://www.nationalserviceresources.org/files/legacy/filemanager/download/NatlServFellows/kramer.pdf</p>	<p>Michael Kramer's National Service Fellowship research focused on identifying strategies that schools, districts, and states have used to successfully institutionalize service-learning in American K-12 schools. Kramer surveyed 20 state Learn and Serve Coordinators and other national service-learning organizations to select 80 schools and districts that participated in interviews detailing their progress towards sustaining service-learning as an instructional strategy. The synthesis of this information was used to compile a conceptual model and map of the relevant institutionalization factors. This information was then used to suggest an assessment and design process for institutionalizing service-learning at each level.</p>	Highlights
<p>Collins, D. (year unknown). Rewarding Service Learning in Community Colleges through Faculty Promotion and Tenure Systems. <i>The Journal for Civic Commitment</i>.</p> <p>http://www.mesacc.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue11/Collins.shtml</p>	<p>As a follow-up to several questions posed by the American Association of Community Colleges in 2003, this research examined the extent to which curricular service-learning endeavors by faculty are rewarded through promotion & tenure processes in community colleges. The 2006 research sampled participants from the original 2003 survey sample. The 2006 follow-up sample consisted of community colleges that had self-identified as a service-learning community college in the 2003 research; hence, all community colleges in the sample were known to have a curricular service-learning program.</p>	Incorporated into study

Holland's Matrix

<p>Swords, A. C. S. & Kiely, R. (2010). Beyond Pedagogy: Service Learning as Movement Building in Higher Education. <i>Journal of Community Practice</i>, 18, 148-170.</p> <p>http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/190796_770885140_926162782.pdf</p>	<p>This article focuses on how service learning can function as a democratizing and empowering approach to pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. The dominant discourse of service learning has evolved into a narrowly-defined alternative pedagogy that promotes student learning and enrichment but very little community development, institutional change, and policy change. For service learning to lead to more meaningful social change, beyond pedagogical innovation, it must be reinvented as a more robust approach including pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. We illustrate weak and robust forms of each of the previously mentioned dimensions with concrete examples from our service-learning work and in particular, from case study research comparing two global service-learning programs in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. We discuss challenges and implications for designing, implementing, and sustaining a more robust approach to service learning, beyond current pedagogical practice and toward social movement learning aimed at policy and institutional change.</p>	Highlights
--	--	------------

<p>Weerts, D. J. & Sandmann, L. R. (2010). Community Engagement and Boundary Spanning Roles at Research Universities. <i>The Journal of Higher Education</i>, 81(6), 632-657.</p>	<p>During the last decade, community engagement has emerged as an important priority among many colleges and universities in the United States. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defines community engagement 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” (Carnegie, 2006). As the Carnegie definition suggests, engagement differs from traditional conceptualizations of public service and outreach in important ways. Specifically, service and outreach are typically conceived as one-way approaches to delivering knowledge and service to the public, whereas engagement emphasizes a two-way approach in which institutions and community partners collaborate to develop and apply knowledge to address societal needs (Boyer, 1996; Kellogg Commission, 1999).</p>	<p>Make reference to tool and discuss moving beyond it.</p>
<p>Westdijk, K., Koliba, C., & Hamshaw, K. (2010) Collecting data to inform decision making and action: the University of Vermont’s faculty community engagement tool. <i>Journal of Higher Education and Outreach & Engagement</i>, 14(2), 5. http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/viewArticle/42</p>	<p>Ascertaining the breadth and depth of CE at the level of the university or college (<i>Bergkamp, 1996; Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005; Maurasse, 2001; Siscoe, 1997; Ward, 1999</i>), academic department (<i>Battistoni, Gelson, Saltmarsh, Wergin, & Zlotkowski, 2003</i>), academic discipline (<i>Steinke & Harrington, 2002; Zlotkowski, 2000</i>), and individual faculty member (<i>Korfmacher, 1999; Wade & Demb, 2009</i>) has been the focus of a great deal of literature concerning community engagement in higher education.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Holland, B. (2009). Will it last? Evidence of institutionalization at Carnegie classified community engagement institutions. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 85-98.</p>	<p>Community engagement has endured a long period of critical examination as an innovative practice in higher education, with some still questioning whether it is merely a faddish idea that will disappear with the retirement of the generation of activist-minded baby boomer faculty. Despite significant measurable indicators of growth in institutional commitment to community engagement (such as the growth of membership in Campus Compact, the number and diversity of institutions applying for grants from Learn and Serve America, and the introduction of engagement into regional accreditation processes), questions persist as to whether the practice survives only at the margin of academic organizations based on the temporary support of soft money, the strong advocacy of particular key academic voices, and current national attention.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Chadwick & Powlowski (2007). Assessing Institutional Support for Service-Learning: A Case Study of Organizational Sensemaking. <i>Michigan J. of Community Service Learning</i>, 13(2), 31-39. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjcs/3239521.0013.203/2?page=root;size=100;view=image</p>	<p>This paper provides an example of how institutional service-learning assessment data can be used to drive organizational change. Furco's (1999) self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education is used in modified form as the instrument through which organizational-level assessments were made. The process of organizational change over time is reported through the lens of Weick's (1995) Organizational Information Theory and specifically the double interact, comprised of act, response, and adjustment as organizational members reduce their uncertainty and make sense of organizational action and communication.</p>	<p>Modified version used in study</p>
<p>Holland, B. A. (2001). Exploring the Challenge of Documenting and Measuring Civic Engagement Endeavors of Colleges and Universities: Purposes, Issues, Ideas. <i>Campus Compact</i>. http://www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/pdf/holland_paper.pdf</p>	<p>The concept of engagement began to enter the higher education vocabulary in 1994, when Russell Edgerton, then President of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), focused on the topic of “engaged institutions” at the AAHE Annual Meeting (Edgerton 1994). Since that time, the term engagement has been gradually defined and applied to a variety of institutional/community relationships and a range of institutional strategies meant to link the work of the academy with public action and societal priorities. Today, public scholarship, engagement, the concept of the campus as a citizen and the status and the value of linking community contributions to the curriculum and educational goals of an institution (e.g. service-learning; problem-based learning using community concerns and topics) are topics of growing interest to institutions of all types.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>

Campus Compact

Beere, C.A., Votruba, J.C., & Wells, G.W. (2011). *Becoming an engaged campus: a practical guide for institutionalizing public engagement*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Chapter on aligning accountability and reporting systems.

Highlights

Carnegie Classification

Sandmann, L.R. & Driscoll, A. (2011). *Carnegie signaling the importance of community-engaged health care teaching and learning*. *J Public Health Management Practice*, 17(4), 388–389

The Carnegie Foundation's development of an elective classification in community engagement has given this topic precedence in the conversations and agendas in the higher-education community. For those administrators, faculty, students, and community partners in public health management and practice who seek to create a supportive collaborative culture in which engaged learning and public scholarship can thrive, evidence from the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification applications can provide useful guidance as well as recognition. In addition, the community engaged classification framework has quickly become an evaluation tool for many campuses and their partners. The guidance, recognition, and evaluation provided by the Carnegie community engagement classification can act to support and enable colleges and universities working in partnership with community to more effectively fulfill their academic and civic mission. Such partnerships offer higher-education institutions the potential to effectively play key roles in the mandate to address critical public health issues.

Highlights

Hart & Northmore (2010) *Audition and Evaluating University-Community Engagement: Lessons from a UK case study*, *Higher Education Quarterly*, DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-273.2010.00466.x

http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/images/stories/Static/materials_and_resources/angie_simon_article.pdf

The growing importance of community and public engagement activities in universities has led to an increasing emphasis on auditing and evaluating university–community partnerships. However, the development of effective audit and evaluation tools is still at a formative stage. This article presents a case study of the University of Brighton's experience of evaluating such partnerships. Drawing on this experience, a review of the literature and an analysis of published measurement frameworks, the challenges of measuring community and public engagement are discussed and a typology of dimensions for university public engagement presented. A critique of the Brighton case study and the lessons learned provides a basis for clarifying the activities that universities might want to measure and the key questions they need to ask when determining which tools are appropriate.

Highlights

Beere, C. (2009). *Understanding and enhancing opportunities of community-campus partnerships*. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 55-63

This chapter defines partnership, provides an overview of the partnership-related data reported to Carnegie, and offers recommendations for universities, their partners in the community, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to strengthen and advance such partnerships for the future.

Examines Carnegie classified institutions

Driscoll, A. (2009). *Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirming higher education's role in community*. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 5-12

http://www.niu.edu/engagedlearning/engaged_learning/pdfs/Carnegie-Driscoll.pdf

In 2005, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) stirred the higher education world with the announcement of a new classification for institutions that engage with community. The classification, community engagement, is the first in a set of planned classification schemes resulting from the foundation's reexamination of the traditional Carnegie classification system. The new classifications are intended to provide flexibility, closer match of data with purpose, and a multidimensional approach for better representing institutional identity. The first of those new schemes, community engagement, has prompted a flurry of inquiry, self-assessment, documentation, and development of engagement practices as educators in colleges and universities strive to qualify for the classification.

Examines Carnegie classified institutions

<p>Furco, A. & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 47-54.</p>	<p>Colleges and universities with institutionalized community engagement have (1) a philosophy and mission that emphasizes engagement; (2) genuine faculty involvement and support for engaged research or teaching, or both; (3) a broad range of opportunities for students to access and involve themselves in high-quality engagement experiences; (4) an institutional infrastructure that supports engagement practice; and (5) mutually beneficial, sustained partnerships with community partners (Holland, 2001). These five foundational components work synergistically to build and sustain an institutional culture in which community-engaged research, teaching, and public service are valued to the extent that they become fully infused within the academic fabric of a higher education institution.</p>	<p>Examines Carnegie classified institutions</p>
<p>Holland, B. (2009). Will it last? Evidence of institutionalization at Carnegie classified community engagement institutions. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 85-98.</p>	<p>Community engagement has endured a long period of critical examination as an innovative practice in higher education, with some still questioning whether it is merely a faddish idea that will disappear with the retirement of the generation of activist-minded baby boomer faculty. Despite significant measurable indicators of growth in institutional commitment to community engagement (such as the growth of membership in Campus Compact, the number and diversity of institutions applying for grants from Learn and Serve America, and the introduction of engagement into regional accreditation processes), questions persist as to whether the practice survives only at the margin of academic organizations based on the temporary support of soft money, the strong advocacy of particular key academic voices, and current national attention.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Bringle, R.G. & Hatcher, J.A. (2009). Innovative practices in service learning and curricular engagement. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 37-46.</p>	<p>As civic and community engagement become more salient within higher education (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens, 2003), there is a need to examine critically the core components that allow campuses to realize Ernest Boyer's vision for the new American college that connects its rich resources "to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers, to our cities" (1996, pp. 19–20). Boyer's call is aligned with higher education rethinking about how community involvement can change the nature of faculty work, enhance student learning, better fulfill campus mission, and improve the quality of life in communities (Bringle, Games, and Malloy, 1999; Calleson, Jordan, and Seifer, 2005; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens, 2003; Edgerton, 1994; Harkavy and Puckett, 1994; O'Meara and Rice, 2005; Percy, Zimpher, and Brukaradt, 2006). This civic dimension of higher education is the basis for the Carnegie elective Community Engagement Classification.</p>	<p>Examines Carnegie classified institutions</p>
<p>Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D.E., Ward, E., & Bulione, S.M. (2009). Rewarding community-engaged scholarship. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 25-35</p>	<p>This chapter presents findings that are part of a larger qualitative study of the applications, faculty handbooks, and key informant interviews from Carnegie community-engaged campuses. For the purposes of this study, we focused on campuses that emerged as the most engaged: those that received the classification for curricular engagement and for outreach and partnerships. We surmised that these campuses would be more likely to have community engagement articulated in the institutional reward policies. Of the sixty-two campuses that received the classification for curricular engagement and for outreach and partnerships, thirty-three elected to answer the question on reward policies and provided documentation to support their answer. For five of the campuses, we were unable to gain permission to use the application for this study. Eight campuses from Carnegie's 2005 pilot cohort for the classification are also included in the final sample. Finally, it should be noted that of the thirty-three campuses that answered yes to the question of whether the institution has policies that reward the scholarship of engagement, two of the institutions do not grant tenure.</p>	<p>Examines Carnegie classified institutions</p>
<p>Sandmann, L.R. & Plater, W.M. (2009). Leading the engaged institution. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 13-24</p>	<p>This chapter examines the characteristics and choices of leaders in Carnegie community engaged classified institutions. // In leading engaged institutions, executives can easily master the rhetoric of involvement and speak to audiences inside and outside the university with disarming conviction, but they must hold themselves accountable for the authenticity of their rhetoric and the alignment of consequence with declaration. There is no better way to test one's convictions than becoming attached to the local community—the neighborhood—through personal and direct interaction: conversation plus action. And the committed must determine whether the institutions they lead meet the criteria and judgment necessary for classification as an engaged campus.</p>	<p>Examines Carnegie classified institutions</p>
<p>Sandmann, L.R., Thornton, C.H. & Jaeger, A.J. (2009). The first wave of community engaged institutions. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 99-104</p>	<p>To provide predictability and reliability, the Carnegie framework was only minimally revised in the 2008 classification round and will not be changed for the next round as well. Nevertheless, in anticipation of the continuing wave of change, we offer the following considerations in institutional practice & potential adjustments in the framework that may be considered for future classification efforts.</p>	<p>Examines Carnegie classified institutions</p>

<p>Thornton, C.H. & Zuiches, J.J. (2009). After the engagement classification: using organization theory to maximize institutional understandings. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 75-83.</p>	<p>In this chapter, we apply Bolman and Deal's theory (2003) to North Carolina State University's findings from the Carnegie community engagement application process. Each of the four perspectives serves to emphasize both areas of excellence in NC State's institutional commitment to engagement, as well as areas for improvement, while putting the data in a context that is useful for organizational consideration and decision making.</p>	<p>Examines Carnegie classified institutions</p>
<p>Weerts, D. & Hundson, E. (2009). Engagement and institutional advancement. <i>New Directions for Higher Education</i>, 147, 65-74.</p>	<p>This chapter examines ways in which engaged institutions allocate internal resources to support engagement and how these campuses have reshaped their institutional advancement programs (marketing, branding, and fundraising activities) to leverage financial support for engagement. We begin with a brief literature review discussing the relationship between advancement and engagement, followed by a formal investigation of how engaged institutions have approached resource development to support engagement programs. All colleges and universities discussed as engaged institutions in this chapter are recipients of the Carnegie Foundation's elective classification in curricular engagement and outreach and partnerships (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2008).</p>	<p>Examines Carnegie classified institutions</p>
<p>Hart, A., Northmore, S. and Gerhardt, C. (2009) Auditing, Benchmarking & Evaluating Public Engagement. Bristol: National Co-ordinating Centre for PE https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/our-research/literature-reviews-and-research</p>	<p>This briefing paper is written for academics, university administrators and community partners interested in monitoring and evaluating university public engagement. It provides an accessible guide to the field that can assist them in answering the questions they want to answer, in tailoring their own approach and negotiating that approach between the university and local communities. By 'local communities' we mean geographically defined communities, identity communities, and other collectivities that universities want to engage with.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Engagement academy for University Leaders (2008). <i>Meet the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement (PowerPoint Presentation)</i></p>	<p>Overview of rationale for assessment, listing of a variety of frameworks/ tools, focus on Carnegie</p>	<p>Considers a range of tools, but focuses on Carnegie</p>
<p>Langworthy, A. & Garlick, S. (2008). The challenge of benchmarking community engagement. <i>The Australian Journal of Community Engagement</i>, 3(2), 17-23 http://aucea.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Autumn-2008.pdf#page=17</p>	<p>In an environment increasingly driven by the need for an evidence base and accountability, there is pressure to identify measures of university community engagement. The Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance(AUCEA) recognised the need for the development of national and international benchmarks for engagement activity, the inclusion of engagement as a part of institutional profile assessments by government and as part of the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) assessment regime. The AUCEA Benchmarking Pilot Project has collaboratively developed definitions, rationale and a set of goals, strategies and measures as a basis for benchmarking university community engagement. As the project enters a pilot phase where participating universities will populate the indicators using their own internal processes and a shared partner perception survey, many challenges will be faced. This paper outlines the process undertaken by the AUCEA Benchmarking Pilot Project and the outcomes so far.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Weerts, D.J. & Sandmann, L.R. (2008). Building a two-way street: challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities. <i>The review of higher education</i>, 32(1), 73-106.</p>	<p>The purpose of this study is threefold. First, we examine how public research universities are adopting a two-way interactive model of engagement on their campuses. In so doing, we explore barriers and enablers that either inhibit or promote engagement at research-intensive institutions. Second, our analysis explores how institutional mission, history, setting, and role within a state system of higher education influence institutional approaches to engagement. Third, we investigate how external stakeholders understand and evaluate institutional efforts to become more engaged with the communities they serve.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>
<p>Rennekamp et al, (undated) Measuring Extension's Performance in the Age of Engage. (White paper, prepared for ASRED & AEA by Southern Region Indicator Work Group.</p>	<p>The <i>Report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities</i> rekindled an age-old debate regarding what constitutes an appropriate service or outreach mission for such institutions. The commission concluded that public universities must renew their commitment to communities and better serve the needs of society.</p>	<p>Highlights</p>

CIC

Rennekamp et al, (undated) Measuring Extension's Performance in the Age of Engage. (White paper, prepared for ASRED & AEA by Southern Region Indicator Work Group.

The *Report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities* rekindled an age-old debate regarding what constitutes an appropriate service or outreach mission for such institutions. The commission concluded that public universities must renew their commitment to communities and better serve the needs of society.

Highlights

Minnesota

Westdijk, K., Koliba, C., & Hamshaw, K. (2010) Collecting data to inform decision making and action: the University of Vermont's faculty community engagement tool. *Journal of Higher Education and Outreach & Engagement*, 14(2), 5.
<http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/viewArticle/42>

Ascertaining the breadth and depth of CE at the level of the university or college (*Bergkamp, 1996; Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005; Maurasse, 2001; Siscoe, 1997; Ward, 1999*), academic department (*Battistoni, Gelmon, Saltmarsh, Wergin, & Zlotkowski, 2003*), academic discipline (*Steinke & Harrington, 2002; Zlotkowski, 2000*), and individual faculty member (*Korfmacher, 1999; Wade & Demb, 2009*) has been the focus of a great deal of literature concerning community engagement in higher education.

Highlights

Talloires/ Tufts

Hart & Northmore (2010) Audition and Evaluating University-Community Engagement: Lessons from a UK case study, *Higher Education Quarterly*, DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-273.2010.00466.x
http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/images/stories/Static/materials_and_resources/angie_simon_article.pdf

The growing importance of community and public engagement activities in universities has led to an increasing emphasis on auditing and evaluating university–community partnerships. However, the development of effective audit and evaluation tools is still at a formative stage. This article presents a case study of the University of Brighton's experience of evaluating such partnerships. Drawing on this experience, a review of the literature and an analysis of published measurement frameworks, the challenges of measuring community and public engagement are discussed and a typology of dimensions for university public engagement presented. A critique of the Brighton case study and the lessons learned provides a basis for clarifying the activities that universities might want to measure and the key questions they need to ask when determining which tools are appropriate.

Highlights

Hart, A., Northmore, S. and Gerhardt, C. (2009) Auditing, Benchmarking & Evaluating Public Engagement. Bristol: National Co-ordinating Centre for PE
<https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/our-research/literature-reviews-and-research>

This briefing paper is written for academics, university administrators and community partners interested in monitoring and evaluating university public engagement. It provides an accessible guide to the field that can assist them in answering the questions they want to answer, in tailoring their own approach and negotiating that approach between the university and local communities. By 'local communities' we mean geographically defined communities, identity communities, and other collectivities that universities want to engage with.

Highlights

Langworthy, A. & Garlick, S. (2008). The challenge of benchmarking community engagement. *The Australian Journal of Community Engagement*, 3(2), 17-23
<http://aucea.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Autumn-2008.pdf#page=17>

In an environment increasingly driven by the need for an evidence base and accountability, there is pressure to identify measures of university community engagement. The Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA) recognised the need for the development of national and international benchmarks for engagement activity, the inclusion of engagement as a part of institutional profile assessments by government and as part of the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) assessment regime. The AUCEA Benchmarking Pilot Project has collaboratively developed definitions, rationale and a set of goals, strategies and measures as a basis for benchmarking university community engagement. As the project enters a pilot phase where participating universities will populate the indicators using their own internal processes and a shared partner perception survey, many challenges will be faced. This paper outlines the process undertaken by the AUCEA Benchmarking Pilot Project and the outcomes so far.

Highlights