



Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

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

Re-classification Documentation Framework

(for campuses that received the Classification in 2006 or 2008)

The Re-classification Documentation Framework is intended to help you gather information about your institution's current community engagement commitments and activities as well changes that have taken place since your campus last received the classification. The framework comprises all of the questions that appear on the 2015 Documentation Reporting Form (i.e., the application), and seeks evidence of how community engagement has become deeper, more pervasive, better integrated, and sustained. The focus is on depth and quality within a sustainable institutional context, not greater quantity per se. **(The framework is for use as a reference and worksheet only. Please do not submit it as your application.)**

The re-classification documentation framework is designed for an evidence-based reflective process focusing on what has changed since receiving the classification. It is structured to include narrative responses allowing for explanation of changes that have occurred since the previous classification. The narratives are designed to address (1) what currently exists, (2) changes since the last classification, and (3) relevant supporting evidence.

Data Provided: The classification will be determined based on activities and processes that have been implemented, not those that are anticipated. 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.

Wherever requested, please provide links to relevant campus web resources in addition to evidence provided in the application. Reviewers for the Carnegie Foundation may want to examine websites to provide additional clarification of the responses in the application. Reviewers also may ask for a telephone conversation to clarify evidence provided.

Use of Data: The information you provide will be used solely to determine your qualifications for the community engagement classification. Re-classified institutions will

be announced publicly in January 2015. Only those institutions approved for re-classification will be identified. At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to authorize or prohibit the use of this information for research purposes.

Applicant's Contact Information

Please provide the contact information of the individual submitting this application (for Carnegie Foundation use only):

- First Name
- Last Name
- Title
- Institution
- Mailing address 1
- Mailing address 2
- City
- State
- Zip Code
- Phone Number
- Email Address
- Full Name of Institution's President/Chancellor
- President/Chancellor's Mailing Address
- President/Chancellor's Email Address

Community Engagement Definition

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.

I. Foundational Indicators

A. President/Chancellor's Leadership Statement

Required Documentation.

1. Provide a letter from the President/Chancellor or Provost (Vice President for

Academic Affairs) that:

- a. Indicates their perception of where community engagement fits into their leadership of the institution,
- b. Describes community engagement's relationship to the institution's core identity, strategic direction, and practices, and
- c. Discusses how engagement is institutionalized for sustainability in the institution.

Please EITHER copy and paste the text of the letter in the following textbox OR upload a PDF copy of the letter below:

- d. In addition to the letter, provide evidence of recent statements of affirmation of community engagement. In the grid below, provide excerpts from the relevant documents and a web link to the full document if it exists.

Document Excerpt	Web Link (if available)
Annual addresses/speeches (word limit: 500):	
Published editorials (word limit: 500):	
Campus publications (word limit: 500):	
Other (word limit: 500):	

B. Institutional Identity and Culture

Required Documentation. Please complete all three (3) questions in this section.

- 1.a. Does the campus have an institution-wide definition of community engagement (or of other related terminology, e.g., civic engagement, public engagement, public service, etc.)?
 No Yes

Please identify the document or website where the institution-wide definition of community engagement appears and provide the definition (word limit: 500):

- 1.b. How is community engagement currently specified as a priority in the institution's mission, vision statement, strategic plan, and accreditation/reaffirmation documents? Provide excerpts from the relevant documents and a web link to the full document if it exists.

Document Excerpt	Web Link (if available)
Mission or vision statement (word limit: 500):	
Strategic plan (word limit: 500):	
Accreditation/reaffirmation document/QEP (word limit: 500):	
Other (word limit: 500):	

2. Briefly discuss any significant changes in mission, planning, organizational structure, personnel, resource allocation, etc. related to community engagement etc., since the last classification (word limit: **500**):
3. Specify changes in executive leadership since classification and the implications of those changes for community engagement (word limit: **500**):

C. Institutional Commitment

Required Documentation. Please complete all sixteen (16) questions in this section.

Infrastructure

1. As evidence for your earlier classification, you provided a description of the campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement and you reported how it is staffed, how it is funded, and where it reported to.

For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with this infrastructure, its mission, staffing, funding, and reporting since the last classification. Provide any relevant links that support the narrative. (Word limit: **500**)

Funding

- 2.a. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described *internal* budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community.

For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with the internal budgetary allocations since the last classification. (Word limit: **500**)

- 2.b. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described *external* budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community.

For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with the external budgetary allocations since the last classification. (Word limit: **500**)

- 2.c. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described fundraising directed to supporting community engagement.

For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with fundraising activities since the last classification. (Word limit: **500**)

- 2.d. In what ways does the institution invest its financial resources *externally* in the community for purposes of community engagement and community development? Describe the source of funding, the percentage of campus budget or dollar amount, and how it is used. Provide relevant links related to the results of the investments, if available. (Word limit: **500**)

Documentation and Assessment

3. Provide narratives addressing the following:
- How does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide *tracking or documentation* mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community? Who is responsible for gathering data, how are the data managed, how often is it gathered, and how are the data used? What changes are apparent in this data since the last classification? What tracking or documentation mechanisms does the campus still need to develop? Provide relevant web links. (Word limit: **500**)
 - Describe the mechanisms used for systematic campus-wide *assessment and measurement* of the impact of institutional engagement. Who is responsible for gathering data, how are the data managed, how often is it gathered, and how are data used? What assessment and measurement mechanisms does the campus still need to develop? Provide relevant web links. (Word limit: **500**)
 - What are the current findings from the mechanisms used for systematic campus-wide assessment and measurement: and how are these different from the findings since the last classification? (Word limit: **500**)

Impact on students

- d. Describe one key finding from current data and indicate how you arrived at this finding (word limit: **500**):

Impact on faculty

- e. Describe one key finding from current data and indicate how you arrived at this finding (word limit: **500**):

Impact on community

- f. Describe one key finding from current data and indicate how you arrived at this finding (word limit: **500**):

Impact on institution

- g. Describe one key finding from current data and indicate how you arrived at this finding (word limit: **500**):

Professional Development

4. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described the ways the institution offers professional development support for faculty, staff, and/or community partners who are involved with campus-community engagement.

For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with professional development for community engagement. How have the content, program, approaches, or audience for professional development changed since the last Carnegie classification? What have been the results? (Word limit: **500**)

Faculty Roles and Rewards

5. Does the institution have search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement?

No Yes

Describe (word limit: **500**):

6. In the period since your successful classification, what, if anything, has changed in terms of institutional policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? (Word limit: **500**)

7. Is there an institution-wide **definition** of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?

No Yes

Please describe and identify the policy (or other) document(s) where this appears and provide the definition. (Word limit: **500**)

8. 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?

No Yes

If needed, use this space to describe the context for policies rewarding community engaged scholarly work (word limit: **500**):

- 9.a. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **teaching and learning**?
 No Yes

Please describe and provide text from faculty handbook (or similar policy document) (word limit: **500**):

- 9.b. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **scholarship**?
 No Yes

Please describe and provide text from faculty handbook (or similar policy document) (word limit: **500**):

- 9.c. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **service**?
 No Yes

Please describe and provide text from faculty handbook (or similar policy document) (word limit: **500**):

10. 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?

No Yes

Which colleges/school and/or departments? List Colleges or Departments:

What percent of total colleges/school and/or departments at the institution is represented by the list above?:

Please provide three examples of colleges/school and/or department level policies, taken directly from policy documents, in the space below (word limit: **500**):

11. Is there **professional development for faculty and administrators who review candidates' dossiers** (e.g., Deans, Department Chairs, senior faculty, etc.) on how to evaluate faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?

No Yes

Describe the process, content, and audience for this professional development and which unit(s) on campus provides the professional development (word limit: **500**):

12. 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?

No Yes

Describe the process and its current status (word limit: **500**):

Student Roles and Recognition

13. Provide a narrative that speaks broadly to involvement of students in community engagement, such as the ways students have leadership roles in community engagement (give examples), or decision-making roles students have on campus related to community engagement (planning, implementation, assessment, or other). How has student leadership in community engagement changed since the last classification? How is student leadership in community engagement recognized (awards, notation on transcript, etc.)? Provide relevant links. (Word limit: **500**)

Supplemental Documentation

14. Is community engagement noted on student transcripts?

No Yes

If yes, is this a change from your prior classification?

No Yes

15. Is community engagement connected with diversity and inclusion work (for students and faculty) on your campus?

No Yes

Please provide examples (word limit: **500**):

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

No Yes

Please provide examples (word limit: **500**):

II. Categories of Community Engagement

A. Curricular Engagement

Curricular Engagement describes the teaching, learning, and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the

institution.

NOTE: The questions in this section use the term “service learning” to denote academically-based community engaged courses. Your campus may use another term such as community-based learning, academic service learning, public service courses, etc.

There are a total of eight (8) questions in this section.

1. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described an institution-wide definition of service learning used on campus.
 - a. For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with the definition of service learning and explain the purpose of the revisions. (Word limit: **500**)
 - b. If there is a process for identifying or approving a service learning course as part of a campus curriculum, explain the process; if there have been changes in that process since the last application, please explain the changes. (Word limit: **500**)

2. Fill in the tables below using:
 - a. data from the most recent academic year (2012-2013)
 - b. data based on undergraduate FTE

<i>Number of service learning courses</i>	<i>Change in number of courses since last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total courses</i>	<i>Percent change in courses since last application</i>

<i>Number of departments represented by service learning courses</i>	<i>Change in number of departments since last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total departments</i>	<i>Percent change in departments since last application.</i>

<i>Number of faculty who taught service learning courses</i>	<i>Change in number of faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of students participating in service learning courses</i>	<i>Change in number of students since last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total students</i>	<i>Percent change since last application.</i>

3. Provide a description of how the data in question 2 above is gathered and used (how it is compiled, who gathers it, how often, how it is used, etc.). Provide relevant links. (Word limit: **500**)
4. As evidence requested for your earlier classification, you were asked whether you have institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community.

For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, regarding assessment of institutional learning outcomes associated with curricular engagement. What are the outcomes, how are these outcomes assessed, and what are the results of the assessment? Provide relevant links. (Word limit: **500**)

5. For each curricular activity listed below, indicate whether or not community engagement is integrated into it, and then describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.

<i>Curricular Activity</i>	<i>Is Community Engagement integrated with this activity?</i>	<i>What has changed since the last classification?</i>	<i>Web Link (if available)</i>
Student Research		(Word limit: 500)	
Student Leadership Courses		(Word limit: 500)	
Internships/Co-ops		(Word limit: 500)	
Study Abroad		(Word limit: 500)	
Other. (Please specify in the "What has changed..." text box to the right.)		(Word limit: 500)	

6. For each curriculum area listed below, indicate whether or not community engagement been integrated into the curriculum at the institutional level, and then describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.

<i>Curriculum</i>	<i>Is Community Engagement integrated into this area?</i>	<i>What has changed since the last classification?</i>	<i>Web Link (if available)</i>
Core Course		(Word limit: 500)	
General Education		(Word limit: 500)	
First Year Experience Courses		(Word limit: 500)	
Capstone (Senior Level Project)		(Word limit: 500)	

In the Majors		(Word limit: 500)	
Graduate Studies		(Word limit: 500)	
Other. (Please specify in the "What has changed..." text box to the right.)		(Word limit: 500)	

7. How have faculty not only incorporated community-based teaching and learning into courses, but turned that activity into research to improve teaching and learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), i.e., publishing articles, making presentations, conducting studies of their courses, conducting workshops, etc.. Provide five examples of faculty scholarship to improve, critique, promote, or reflect on community engaged teaching and learning. Also, describe how this scholarship has been supported since your last classification. (Word limit: **500**)
8. Provide a summary narrative describing overall changes and trends that have taken place related to curricular engagement on campus since the last classification. In your narrative, address the trajectory of curricular engagement on your campus – where have you been, where are you now, where are you strategically planning on going? Provide relevant links. (Word limit: **500**)

B. Outreach and Partnerships

Outreach and Partnerships describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. The first focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. The latter focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).

There are a total of eight (8) questions in this section.

Outreach

1. What changes to outreach programs (extension programs, training programs, non-credit courses, evaluation support, etc.) have taken place since your last classification? Describe three examples of representative outreach programs (word limit: **500**):
2. What changes have taken place regarding institutional resources (co-curricular student service, work/study student placements, library services, athletic offerings, etc.) that are provided as outreach to the community? Describe examples of representative campus resources (word limit: **500**):

Partnerships

3. Describe representative new and long-standing partnerships (both institutional

and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year (maximum 15 partnerships). Please follow these steps:

- [Download the Partnership Grid template](#) (Excel file) and save it to your computer;
 - Provide descriptions of each partnership in the template; and then,
 - Upload the completed template here.
4. In comparing the “partnership grid” from your previous application/classification and the grid from #3 above, please reflect on what has changed in the quality, quantity, and impact of your partnership activity. (Word limit: **500**)
 5. What actions have you taken since the last classification to deepen and improve partnership practices and relationships—in initiating, sustaining, and assessing partnerships? How did these practices encourage authentic collaboration and reciprocity with community partners? (Word limit: **500**)
 6. How are partnerships assessed, what have you learned from your assessments since your last classification, and how is assessment data shared? (Word limit: **500**)
 7. How have faculty collaborated with community partners to produce scholarly products of benefit to the community that are representative of co-created knowledge between academics and community partners resulting from outreach and partnerships (e.g., technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy reports, publications, etc.). Provide five examples of faculty scholarship conducted with partners for community benefit or to improve, critique, promote, or reflect on partnerships. Also, describe how this scholarship has been supported since your last classification. (Word limit: **500**)
 8. Provide a summary narrative describing overall changes that have taken place related to outreach and partnerships on campus since the last classification. In your narrative, address the trajectory of outreach and partnerships on your campus – where have you been, where are you now, where are you strategically planning on going? Provide relevant links. (Word limit: **500**)

III. Wrap-Up

1. (Optional) Please use this space to describe any additional changes since your last classification not captured in previous questions. (Word limit: **500**)
2. (Optional) Please provide any suggestions or comments you may have on the documentation process and online data collection. (Word limit: **500**)

Request for Permission to use Application for Research

In order to better understand the institutionalization of community engagement in higher education, we would like to make the responses in the applications available for research purposes for both the Carnegie Foundation and its Administrative Partner for the Community Engagement Classification, the New England Resource Center for Higher Education, and for other higher education researchers as well.

Only applications from campuses that are successful in the classification process will be made available for research purposes. No application information related to campuses that are unsuccessful in the application process will be released.

Please respond to A or B below:

- A. I consent to having the information provided in the application for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, the identity of my campus will not be disclosed.
 No Yes
- B. I consent to having the information provided in the application for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, I also agree that the identity of my campus may be revealed.
 No Yes