



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

## **Re-classification Documentation Framework**

### **2020 Classification**

(for campuses that received the Classification in 2010)

*Framework notes: To assist you in preparing your application, the First-Time Classification framework includes 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 First-Time framework. Consult the First-Time framework for guidance in preparing the Re-Classification application.*

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 2020 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.)** All narrative responses are limited to 500 words.

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 2018-2019, data should reflect evidence from AY 2017-2018. 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 2020. Only those institutions approved for re-classification will be identified. At the end of the application, you will have an opportunity to authorize or prohibit the use of this information for research purposes.

### **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.*

### **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

## **I. Campus and Community Context**

### **A. Campus:**

Provide a description of your campus that will help to provide a context for understanding how community engagement is enacted in a way that fits the culture and mission of the campus. You may want to include descriptors of special type (community college, land grant, medical college, faith-based, etc.), size (undergraduate and graduate FTE), location, unique history and founding, demographics of student population served, and other features that distinguish the institution. You may want to consult your campus's IPEDS data (<https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/Home/FindYourCollege>) and Carnegie Basic Classification data (<http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup/lookup.php>).

### **B. Community:**

Provide a description of the community(ies) within which community engagement takes place that will help to provide a context for understanding how community engagement is enacted in a way that fits the culture and history of the partnership community(ies). You may want to include descriptors of special type (rural, urban, conservative, liberal, etc.), size (population), economic health, unique history, demographics of community population served/employed, and other features that distinguish the institution and community(ies). For local communities, you may want to consult your census data.

## **II. Foundational Indicators**

### **A. President/Chancellor's Leadership Statement**

1. Provide a letter from the President/Chancellor or Provost (Vice President for Academic Affairs) that:
  - Indicates their perception of where community engagement fits into their leadership of the institution,
  - Describes community engagement's relationship to the institution's core identity, strategic direction, and practices, and
  - 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:

2. 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.

<b>Document Excerpt</b>	<b>Web Link (if available)</b>
Annual addresses/speeches (word limit: <b>500</b> ):	

Published editorials (word limit: <b>500</b> ):	
Campus publications (word limit: <b>500</b> ):	
Other (word limit: <b>500</b> ):	

## B. Institutional Identity and Culture

- 1.1.** 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**):

- 1.2.** 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: <b>500</b> ):	
Strategic plan (word limit: <b>500</b> ):	
Accreditation/reaffirmation document/QEP (word limit: <b>500</b> ):	
Other (word limit: <b>500</b> ):	

- 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.

#### ***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 its reporting line.

For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with this infrastructure, its mission, staffing, funding, and reporting since the last classification. If the campus has more than one center coordinating community engagement, describe each center, staffing, and purpose and indicate how the multiple centers interact with one another to advance institutional community engagement

Provide any relevant links that support the narrative. (Word limit: **500**)

### ***Funding***

- 2.1.** 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**)

- 2.2.** 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**)

- 2.3.** 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**)

- 2.4.** As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described ways in which 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**)

- 2.5.** Describe how o the business operations of the campus, positioned as as an anchor institution, align with local economic and community development agendas through hiring, purchasing, and procurement in a way that contributes to an institutional commitment to community engagement.

No  Yes

**2.5.a.** . If Yes: Please describe business operation practices tied to the local community:

### ***Tracking, Monitoring, and Assessment***

3. Provide narratives addressing the following:

3.1. 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)

3.2. Describe the mechanisms used for systematic campus-wide *assessment and measurement* of the outcomes and impacts 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)

3.3. 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)

3.4. Describe the mechanisms, built into any of the data collection or as a complementary process, for defining and measuring quality of community engagement built into any of the data collection or as a complementary process.

No  Yes

3.4.a. If yes: Describe the definition and mechanisms for determining quality of the community engagement. How is quality determined?

3.5. ***Outcomes and Impacts on students***

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

3.6. ***Outcomes and Impacts on faculty***

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

3.7. ***Outcomes and Impacts on community***

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

3.8. ***Outcomes Impacts on institution***

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

3.9. In the past 5 years, has your campus undertaken any campus-wide assessment of community engagement aimed at advancing institutional community engagement?

No  Yes

**3.9.a.** If so, describe what was the nature of the assessment, when was it done, and what did you learn from it.

**Professional Development**

**4.1.** As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described the ways the institution offers professional development support for faculty in any employment status (tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time 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)

**4.2.** In the context of your institution’s engagement support services and goals, indicate which of the following services and opportunities are provided specifically for community engagement by checking the appropriate boxes:

Employment status	tenured /tenure track	full-time non-tenure track	part time	professional staff
Professional development programs				
Facilitation of partnerships				
Student teaching assistants				
Planning/design stipends				
Support for student transportation				
Eligibility for institutional awards				
Inclusion of community engagement in evaluation criteria				
Program grants				
Participation on campus councils or committees related to community engagement				
Research, conference, or travel support				
Other				

For “Other”: Please describe other support or services:

**Faculty Roles and Rewards**

**5.1.** Does the institution have search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty in any employment status (tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty) and staff with expertise in and commitment to community engagement?

No  Yes

**5.1.a.** If Yes: Describe these specific search/recruitment policies or practices and provide quotes from position descriptions:

**5.2.** 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 review, evaluate, and reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? If there are separate policies for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty, please describe them as well.

**5.3.** If current policies do not specifically review, evaluate and reward community engagement, describe the work in progress to revise policies specifically for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty promotion to ensure a full and fair review and assessment of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods.

**5.4** Since your previous classification, have there been any changes in the institution-wide definition of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?

No  Yes

**5.4.a.** If yes, Describe and identify the policy or other document where this appears and provide the definition.

**5.5.** Please provide link(s) to text of current policies which describes how community-engaged approaches are conceptualized and evaluated in faculty promotion and tenure (at tenure granting institutions) review and reward processes or a narrative describing how these policies and processes are implemented , Provide links to policies specifically for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty.

Community Engagement Rewarded as a Form of...	Teaching		Research		Service	
	Yes/No	Provide link or descriptive text	Yes/No	Provide link or descriptive text	Yes/No	Provide link or descriptive text
Institution level						



Provide narrative describing the implementation of these policies and processes:

**5.6.** If there are **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, describe the policies, and indicate whether they are for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty in reappointment or promotion considerations. (Word limit: 500)

**5.7.** List the colleges/schools and/or departments.

**5.8.** What percent of total colleges/schools and/or departments at the institution is represented by the list above?

**5.9.** Please cite three examples of college/school and/or department-level policies, taken directly from policy documents, that specifically reward faculty scholarly work using community-engaged approaches and methods; if there are policies specifically for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty, please cite one example. (Word limit: 500)

**5.10.** Please describe any professional development offerings that your institution provides for faculty and administration to facilitate consistency in approaches to the documentation, review, and evaluation of community-engaged scholarly work as an aspect of promotion and tenure (at tenure granting institutions) processes.

## **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.*

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

### **Teaching and Learning**

1. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described an institution-wide definition community engaged courses used on campus.

- 1.1. For re-classification, describe what has changed, if anything, with the definition of community engaged courses and explain the purpose of the revisions. (Word limit: **500**)
- 1.2. If there is a process for identifying or approving a community engaged 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**)
- 1.3. Fill in the tables below using:
  - data from the most recent academic year (2017-18)
  - data based on undergraduate FTE

<i>Number of community engaged 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 community-engaged 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 community engaged 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 tenured and tenure-track faculty who taught community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of tenured and tenure-track faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of tenured and tenure-track faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of full-time, non tenure-track faculty who taught community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of full-time, non tenure-track faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of full-time, non tenure-track faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of part-time faculty who taught community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of part-time faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of part-time faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of students participating in community engaged 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>

**1.4.** 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.

**1.5.** 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.

## Curriculum

**2.** 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: <b>500</b> )	
Student Leadership Courses		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
Internships/Co-ops		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
Study Abroad		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
Alternative Break tied to a course		(Word limit: 500)	
Other. (Please specify in the "What has changed..." text box to the right.)		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	

**2.1.** 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.

<b>Curriculum</b>	<b>Is Community Engagement integrated into this area?</b>	<b>What has changed since the last classification?</b>	<b>Web Link (if available)</b>
Core Course		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
General Education		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
First Year Experience Courses		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
Capstone (Senior Level Project)		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
In the Majors		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
In Minors		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
Graduate Studies		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	
Other. (Please specify in the "What has changed..." text box to the right.)		(Word limit: <b>500</b> )	

**2.2.** 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**)

### **Co-Curricular Engagement**

*Co-curricular Engagement describes structured learning that happens outside the formal academic curriculum through trainings, workshops, and experiential learning opportunities. Co-curricular Engagement requires **structured reflection** and **connection to academic knowledge** in the context of **reciprocal, asset-based community partnerships**.*

**3.1.** Thinking about the description of co-curricular engagement above, please indicate which of the following institutional practices have incorporated co-curricular engagement at your campus:

- Social innovation/entrepreneurship
- Community service projects - outside of the campus
- Community service projects - within the campus
- Alternative break – domestic
- Alternative break – international
- Student leadership

Student internships  
Work-study placements  
Opportunities to meet with employers who demonstrate Corporate Social Responsibility  
Living-learning communities/residence hall/floor  
Student teaching assistants  
Athletics  
Greek life  
Other (please specify)

**3.1.a.** For each program checked above, provide examples:

**3.2.** Indicate whether students have access to a co-curricular engagement tracking system that can serve as a co-curricular transcript or record of community engagement, and if such a system exists, describe the system used and how it is used.

**3.3.** Indicate whether co-curricular programming provides students with clear developmental pathways through which they can progress to increasingly complex forms of community engagement over time. Please describe the pathways and how students know about them.

**4.1.** 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.

**4.2** Describe how institutions have designed new programs and initiatives, or re-designed existing ones, to both increase students' *access to and participation in* community-engaged activities (particularly students who are not currently engaged) so that a relatively larger portion of students have the opportunity for developing the cultural competencies, asset-based approaches, and values of reciprocity for engaging with communities.

## **Professional Activity and Scholarship**

**5.1.** How have faculty of any employment status (tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time 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. Indicate whether the faculty are tenure-track or part-time/non-tenure track Also, describe how this scholarship has been supported since your last classification. (Word limit: **500**)

- 5.2. How have faculty of any employment status (tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time 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)
- 5.3. How have professional staff contributed to the scholarship of community engagement (through conference presentation, publication, consulting, awards, etc.) associated with their co-curricular engagement achievements (i.e., student program development, training curricula, leadership programming, etc.)? Provide five examples of professional staff scholarship related to community engagement and describe how this scholarship has been supported since your last classification. (Word limit: 500):

### **Community Engagement and Other Institutional Initiatives**

- 6.1. Indicate how community engagement directly contributes to (or is it aligned with) the institution's **diversity and inclusion** goals (for students and faculty, and describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.
- 6.2. Indicate how community engagement is connected to efforts aimed at **student retention** and success, and describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.
- 6.3. Indicate whether the campus **institutional review board** (IRB) or some part of the community engagement infrastructure provides specific guidance for researchers regarding human subjects protections for community-engaged research, and describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.
- 6.4. Indicate whether community engagement is connected to campus efforts that support federally funded grants for **Broader Impacts of Research** activities of faculty and students, and describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.
- 6.5. Indicate whether the institution encourages and measure **student voter registration and voting**, and describe the methods for encouraging and measuring student voter registration and voting and what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.
- 6.6. Indicate whether the institution is committed to providing opportunities for students to **discuss controversial social**, political, or ethical issues across the curriculum and in co-curricular programming as a component of or complement to community engagement, and describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.
- 6.7. Indicate whether your campus has curricular and/or co-curricular programming in **social innovation or social entrepreneurship** that reflects the principles and practices of community engagement outlined by the definition of community engagement provided above, and describe what has changed since the last classification. Provide relevant links if available.

## **B. Outreach and Partnerships**

*Outreach and Partnerships has been used to describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. Outreach has traditionally focused on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use. Partnerships focus 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.). The distinction between these two is grounded in the concepts of reciprocity and mutual benefit, which are explicitly explored and addressed in partnership activities. Community engaged institutions have been intentional about reframing their outreach programs and functions into a community engagement framework that is more consistent with a partnership approach.*

### ***Outreach***

- 1.1. What changes to outreach programs and functions (extension programs, training programs, non-credit courses, evaluation support, etc.) that reflect a community engagement partnership approach have taken place since your last classification? Describe three examples of representative outreach programs (word limit: **500**):
- 1.2. 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? Provide examples of how these institutional resources are consistent with a community engagement partnership approach, (word limit: **500**)

### ***Partnerships***

**2.1. This section replaces the previous “partnership grid” with a series of repeating questions for each of the partnerships you identify.** Describe representative examples of partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year (maximum=15 partnerships).

- 2.1.a. Project/Collaboration Title
- 2.1.b. Community Partner (and email contact information for community partner)
- 2.1.c. Institutional Partner
- 2.1.d. Purpose of this collaboration
- 2.1.e. Length of Partnership
- 2.1.f. Number of faculty involved
- 2.1.g. Number of staff involved
- 2.1.h. Number of students involved
- 2.1.i. Grant funding, if relevant
- 2.1.j. Institution Impact on the institution
- 2.1.k. Community Impact on the community

As part of this section, we are asking for an email contact for each partnership provided. The following email will be sent to your community partner:

*Dear Community Partner,*

*{Name of Campus} is in the process of applying for the 2020 Elective Community*

---

*Engagement Classification from the Carnegie Foundation. The classification is offered to campuses that can demonstrate evidence of collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial creation and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. Partnerships that meet the standards of community engagement are grounded in the qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.*

*We would like ask you to assist with this classification process by providing confidential responses to a very brief online survey (LINK provided). Your input and perspective on the activity is valuable input in evaluating campus community engagement.*

*Many thanks for your response.*

*Sincerely,*

**Survey Questions:**

*The survey will include the first page of this framework with the definition of community engagement.*

*As a community partner, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your collaboration with this institution? (Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree,, Agree, Strongly agree)*

- 1. Community partners are recognized by the campus.*
- 2. Community partners are asked about their perceptions of the institution's engagement with and impact on community.*
- 3. My community voice is heard and I have a seat on the table in important conversations that impact my community.*
- 4. The faculty and/ or staff that our community partnership works with take specific actions to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.*
- 5. The campus collects and shares feedback and assessment findings regarding partnerships, reciprocity, and mutual benefit, both from community partners to the institution and from the institution to the community.*
- 6. The partnership with this institution had a positive impact on my community*

*Open -ended questions:*

- 1. Describe the actions and strategies used by the campus to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.*
- 2. Please provide any additional information that you think will be important for understanding how the campus partnering with you has enacted reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.*

## **2.2. In comparing the “partnership grid” from your previous application/classification**



with the responses above, please reflect on what has changed in the quality, quantity, and impact of your partnership activity. (Word limit: **500**)

- 2.3. 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**)
- 2.4. How are partnerships assessed, what have you learned from your assessments since your last classification, and how is assessment data shared? (Word limit: **500**)
- 2.5. 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**)

### **Reflection and Additional Information**

1. (Optional) Reflect on the process of completing this application. What learnings, insights, or unexpected findings developed across the process?
2. (optional) Please use this space to describe any additional changes since your last classification not captured in previous questions. (Word limit: **500**)
3. (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 Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University, 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