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Prepared by John Saltmarsh
with some help from Bob Bringle
WORKSHOP GOALS

- Explore classification’s structure and types of evidence requested
- Determine alignment between campus and documentation requested (i.e., strengths, challenges)
- Develop a campus plan to complete the application
- Identify subsequent activities
- Gather ideas from each other
FIGURE 1-9  R. C. James (photographer).
2005 Pilot of Documentation Framework (14 campuses)

2006, 2008: Classification for Curricular Engagement, Outreach and Partnerships, or both

2010: Classification only for both areas

2015: shifts to 5-year cycle; Classification and Re-Classification
Create an elective classification that will depend on voluntary participation by institutions:

“we open the possibility for a special-purpose classification involving only those institutions with special commitments in the area of community engagement.”

McCormick and Zhao, Rethinking and Reframing the Carnegie Classification, *Change*, 2005.
BACKGROUND

Framework is designed to:

1) Respect the diversity of institutions and their approach to community engagement

2) Engage institutions in a process of inquiry, reflection, and self-assessment; and

3) Honor institution’s achievements while promoting ongoing development of their programs

Driscoll, Carnegie’s Community Engagement Classification: Intentions and Insights, Change, 2008
DO NOT DO IT FOR CARNEGIE; DO IT FOR YOUR OWN SELF-INTERESTS

- Clarify community engagement agenda on campus (town hall meetings, convocations, symposia)
- Inform others about community engagement
- Connect discussions/work to executive leadership, deans, and chairs (and what they care about)
- Build connections across campus (other units, strategic initiatives)
- Building connections with community partners, new and old
- Find ways to develop new leaders, new advocates, new allies, and augmented understanding of CE activities
Community engagement describes 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.

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

- Distance Education & Community-Based Learning
- Community-Based Research
- Teaching
- Research
- Service
- Professional Community Service/Voluntary Community Service
- Participatory Action Research
- Service Learning
- Engagement
Partnerships and Reciprocity

Engagement “requires going beyond the expert model that often gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration…calls on faculty to move beyond ‘outreach,’…asks scholars to go beyond ‘service,’ with its overtones of noblesse oblige. What it emphasizes is genuine collaboration: that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared. It represents a basic reconceptualization of…community-based work.”

O’Meara and Rice, Faculty Priorities Reconsidered (2005).
Reciprocity

As a core principle – there is a flow of knowledge, information and benefits in both directions between the University and community partners.

Reciprocity is what defines and distinguishes engagement: reciprocity = engagement
The first elective category to be developed was, significantly, community outreach and engagement. If the effect of Carnegie’s efforts (and those of Dupont Circle and AAUP) in the first three quarters of the 20th century was to inscribe in academic structures and in the consciousness of faculty a national [and cosmopolitan] orientation, those organizations are increasingly emphasizing the value of the local. (p.12)

A benchmarking tool:

- mainly descriptive
- self-reported data/information
- institutions evaluate various aspects of their processes in relationship to standards of best practice (Documentation Framework)
- not a ranking tool – no hierarchy or levels of classification
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the resources put into the project to enable the delivery of outputs</td>
<td>All the activities undertaken and products and services delivered</td>
<td>The changes, benefits, learning or other effects that result from the outputs</td>
<td>The effect of a project at a higher or broader level, in the longer term, after a range of outcomes have been achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Institutional Motivation**

- **Institutional self-assessment and self-study**: A way to bring the disparate parts of the campus together in a way that advances a unified agenda. At the same time it allows for the identification of promising practices that can be shared across the institution.

- **Legitimacy**: Seeking a new level of legitimacy and public recognition and visibility for your work.

- **Accountability**: A way to demonstrate that the institution is fulfilling its mission to serve the public good.

- **Catalyst for Change**: A tool for fostering institutional alignment for community-based teaching, learning and scholarship.

- **Institutional Identity**: The classification is a way to clarify institutional identity and mission that distinguishes the institution from peers.
311 of 389 applicant institutions were classified

173 public/138 private institutions

- 111 research universities
- 103 master’s colleges and universities
- 59 baccalaureate colleges
- 17 community colleges
- 8 specialized focus (arts, medicine, technology)
2010 CLASSIFICATION

• 305 campuses expressed an intent to apply and received the application

• 154 campuses submitted an application

  (151 campuses withdrew)

• 115 received the classification
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION (2008 AND 2010)

BA (all) – 10.1%
MA (all) – 63.7%
DRU – 10.1%
RU-H – 13%
RU-VH – 4.3%
CLASSIFICATION
PROPOSITIONS
THE CLASSIFICATION SUGGESTS 2 PROPOSITIONS

1. Engagement is achieved through institutional transformation

2. Multiple pathways to engagement are reflected in institutional engagement
Proposition 1:
Engagement is achieved through institutional transformation
A MODEL OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE

(1) alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products;

(2) is deep and pervasive, affecting the whole institution;

(3) is intentional; and

(4) occurs over time.
Figure 1
Transformational Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pervasiveness</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustment (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far-Reaching Change (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Eckel, Hill & Green (1998)
Quadrant four represents deep and pervasive change that transforms the institutional culture. Eckel, Hill, and Green call this change in “the innermost core of a culture...our underlying assumptions; these deeply ingrained beliefs” that “are rarely questioned and are usually taken for granted.” Transformational change, they write, “involves altering the underlying assumptions so that they are congruent with the desired changes”.
A proposition that emerges from this conceptual framework, and from the literature on both community engagement in higher education and institutional change, is that campuses that received the Elective Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement provided sufficient evidence to be located in or to be moving toward the fourth quadrant, demonstrating transformational change reflected in an institutional culture that values community engagement.
Proposition 2: Multiple pathways to engagement are reflected in institutional engagement
Pathways to the Community Engagement

- The Civic Mission of Higher Education Mission Pathway
- Improved Teaching and Learning Pedagogical Pathway
- The New Production of Knowledge Epistemological Pathway
- Connecting to the Community Partnership Pathway

NERCHE
Which best describes where your campus is now in terms of making the Carnegie application?
1. We are **just getting started** and this Wisconsin Campus Compact workshop will be our starting point.

2. We have begun work on preparing our application, and we have a working group who **began some substantive** work on the application before attending the WCC workshop.

3. We have a good start: we have a working group that is **organized** and has been meeting, we have a **strategy** for completing our application, and we are **already compiling evidence** for our application.

4. We have a well-organized campus group with a clear strategy for completing our application and we **already have much of the evidence** together for our application.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
CLASSIFICATION

DOCUMENTATION FRAMEWORK
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Elective Community Engagement Classification

2015 Documentation Reporting Form:
First-Time Classification Documentation Framework

Framework notes: To assist you in preparing your application, this framework includes various notes that provide additional guidance as to the purpose of certain application questions and the type of information that is expected in applicants’ responses. This guidance is shown in blue text throughout the framework below.

This documentation framework is intended to help you gather information about your institution's commitments and activities regarding community engagement as you complete the Documentation Reporting Form. (The framework is for use as a reference and worksheet only. Please do not submit it as your application.)

Data provided: The data provided in the application should reflect the most recent academic year. Since campuses will be completing the application in academic year 2013-2014, data should reflect evidence from AY 2012-2013. If this is not the case, please indicate in the Wrap-Up section of the application what year the data is from.
• Foundational Indicators
  • Institutional Commitment
  • Institutional Identity and Culture

• Curricular Engagement

• Outreach and Partnerships
FOUNDATIONAL INDICATORS

- **Institutional identity and culture**
  - Mission/vision
  - Recognition
  - Assessment/data
  - Marketing materials
  - Leadership priority

- **Institutional commitment**
  - Infrastructure
  - Budget/fundraising
  - Tracking/documentation
  - Assessment/data
  - Strategic plan
  - Professional development
  - Community voice
  - Recruitment/promotion
  - Student leadership
Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?

Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?

Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?

Does the institution have search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise and commitment to community engagement?

Are there institutional level policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
Status of your campus each on indicator

1. This might be a problem because . . .

2. This might be a weakness because . . .

3. This is probably OK because we have the following evidence . . .

4. This is a campus strength we have the following evidence . . .
Curricular Engagement describes teaching, learning, and scholarship which engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance the well-being of the community, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.
Outreach and Partnership describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. The first focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use benefiting both campus and community. The latter focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, discovery, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (e.g., research, economic development, capacity building, etc.) and related scholarship.
COLLECTING DATA AND INFORMATION

• Start the process as soon as possible including when letter of interest is submitted

• Decide who oversee the process. A central office can serve as the campus-wide resource that supports and facilitates the process. In the absence of an office, suggest a faculty stipend for coordination or identify appropriate administrator who is knowledgeable about most areas of the college

• Visit websites to find information, ask faculty and administrators for pertinent material about programs and services that are appropriate to include in the application

• Request relevant information from key areas, i.e., Institutional Research, Foundation and Grants office, various outreach programs, service learning faculty, etc.

• Review existing data, i.e., annual reports, grants, brochures, catalogues, assessment and strategic plans, etc.
• Lots of counting in early documentation

• Lots of counting of what’s available—exhaustive (maybe) vs. highlights vs. representative vs. well-documented

• Fidelity to definitions (yours or Carnegie’s): e.g., Is it really service learning?

• When you count, try to contextualize numbers and how they matter to the campus’s future
  • # of SL courses vs. SL in target areas of a strategic plan—first year courses, honors, capstones
  • # of SL courses vs. breadth and depth across curriculum
  • Random CE projects vs. alignment with campus and community priorities
THE RISING BAR ON ASSESSMENT

• Determine what you know, then develop the institutional capacity to get what you would like to know (particularly on outcomes and impact)—part of your story can be what you are planning to do in the future

• Look for the intersection of (a) practical and (b) meaningful

• Develop partners to help with assessment (e.g., Institutional Research, Assessment, External Affairs, Outreach, Student Affairs)
• Lots occurring that are not known or not well documented—and some of it should be ignored

• Volunteering and extension may be counter examples to Carnegie’s view of partnerships—opportunity to educate about partnerships that are participatory, inclusive, and just

• Develop new opportunities for community input (campus, unit, project, service learning) beyond token “Community Advisory Councils”—what would you do if you took this seriously

• Develop a “Civic Agenda” with the community for continued CE partnering

• Develop scholarship around measuring outcomes and impact—identify compelling intellectual questions that the campus and the community care about
QUESTIONS ON FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS

- Are there **institutional level policies** for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?

- Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **teaching and learning**?

- Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **scholarship**?

- Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **service**?

- Are there **college/school and/or department level policies** for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?

- If current policies do not specifically reward community engagement, is there **work in progress** to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
AREAS OF CHALLENGES
AREAS OF CHALLENGE

• Assessing the community’s perspective on engagement
• Assessing impact of institutional engagement on faculty, community, and institution
• Developing substantive roles for the community in creating the institution’s plans for engagement
• Demonstrating how institutions had achieved genuine reciprocity
• Specifying student learning outcomes resulting from community engagement
• Lack of significant support for faculty
• Changes in the recognition and reward system for promotion and tenure
• Counting engagement as service (not teaching or scholarship)
During the 2010 selection process, even among the most effective applications, there were categories of practice in need of continued development. Those areas included:

(1) assessment

(2) reciprocal partnerships

(3) faculty rewards, and

(4) integration and alignment with other institutional initiatives
The assessment practices required by the Community Engagement Classification must meet a broad range of purposes: assessing community perceptions of institutional engagement; tracking and recording of institution-wide engagement data; assessment of the impact of community engagement on students, faculty, community, and institution; identification and assessment of student learning outcomes in curricular engagement; and ongoing feedback mechanisms for partnerships. That range of purposes calls for sophisticated understandings and approaches to achieve the respective assessment goals. We urge institutions to continue to develop assessment toward those ends.
Partnerships require a high level of understanding and intentional practices specifically directed to reciprocity and mutuality. In the 2010 applications, we noted that institutions have begun to attend to processes of initiating and nurturing collaborative, two-way partnerships, and are developing strategies for systematic communication. Maintaining authentically collaborative, mutually beneficial partnerships takes ongoing commitment, and we urge institutions to continue their attention to this critical aspect of community engagement.
With regard to faculty rewards for roles in community engagement and community-based achievements, we see little change in institutional practices related to the scholarship of engagement. This year’s applications reveal two common approaches to conceptualizing community engagement for promotion and tenure. The first is to place the engagement achievements in the categories of teaching or research and to require traditional forms of scholarship (articles, presentations, and grants). The second is to consider community engagement in a broad category of service along with campus-based and discipline-based professional service, and community service that ranges from volunteerism to consultation; this second approach may or may not carry expectations of a scholarly approach. We urge Community Engagement institutions to initiate study, dialogue, and reflection to promote and reward the scholarship of engagement more fully.
Community engagement offers often-untapped possibilities for alignment with other campus priorities and initiatives to achieve greater impact—for example, first-year programs that include community engagement; learning communities in which community engagement is integrated into the design; or diversity initiatives that explicitly link active and collaborative community-based teaching and learning with the academic success of underrepresented students. There remain significant opportunities for campuses to develop collaborative internal practices that integrate disparate initiatives into more coherent community engagement efforts.
EXAMPLES OF REVISED PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
“Engaged scholarship now subsumes the scholarship of application. It adds to existing knowledge in the process of applying intellectual expertise to collaborative problem-solving with urban, regional, state, national and/or global communities and results in a written work shared with others in the discipline or field of study. Engaged scholarship conceptualizes ‘community groups’ as all those outside of academe and requires shared authority at all stages of the research process from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the research, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer evaluation.”
Documentation may include, but is not limited to,

i. Publications, such as books, book chapters, monographs, and journal articles.

ii. Reports, including technical reports, reports prepared for a community partner or to be submitted by a community partner...

xiv. Letters from external colleagues, external agencies, or organizations attesting to the quality and value of the work.
THE 2015 CLASSIFICATION CYCLE
THE 2015 CLASSIFICATION FRAMEWORK

- Revised Questions: Questions on faculty rewards and changes in promotion guidelines have been moved out of the “supplemental questions” into the standard questions in the framework.

- New Supplemental Questions: Is community engagement connected with diversity and inclusion work (for students and faculty) on your campus?

- Is community engagement connected to efforts aimed at student retention and success?

- New Guide to Application
2015 Classification: Campus Classification and Re-Classification

First Time Classification For the 2015 classification, campuses that have not previously received the classification will need to submit an application using what is referred to as the "first-time documentation framework." A PDF version of the Documentation Framework to be used for planning purposes only is available here. There is also a guide attached to this version to assist institutions in the documentation planning process.
For the 2015 classification, institutions that received the classification in 2006 and 2008 and are seeking to retain the classification will be able to re-apply through a reclassification process. A PDF version of the application for reclassification to be used for planning purposes only is available.

Institutions that received the classification in 2010 will not need to do anything in 2015. 2010 classified campuses will retain the classification until 2020. To be reclassified in 2020, the 2010 campuses will need to reapply through a reclassification process announced in 2018.
### 2015 Community Engagement Classification Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Announcement 2015 process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1 - June 30, 2013</td>
<td>Request for application (payment of fee and release of application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2014</td>
<td>Applications Due/Reviewing begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Review Process completed/ campuses notified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>2015 classification results announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTIVE APPROACHES FOR APPLICANTS

1. The First-Time Classification Framework is available on the Carnegie Foundation website with an embedded “guide” for applicants. It is advisable for applicants undertaking the Re-Classification Framework to consult the First-Time Classification for information from the “guide”. Because this is an institutional classification, evidence for community engagement often comes from many parts of the campus as well as from community partners.

2. Campuses that have been successful in achieving the classification report that it has been highly beneficial to form a cross-institutional team with community representation to work on the application.
3. An authentic understanding of community engagement is enhanced when campuses describe successes as well as activities that didn't go as planned. The latter provide opportunities for learning and improvement and can be described accordingly. Each section of the application has word limits.

4. While it is understandable that you will want to tell everything about your campus’s community engagement activity, it is necessary to be judicious in selecting the most important and compelling evidence for the application.
RESOURCES

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/description
community_engagement.php

NERCHE

www.nerche.org
Contact

John Saltmarsh
New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE)
john.saltmarsh@umb.edu
Tel: 617-287-7743