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

First-Time Classification Documentation Framework
2020 Classification

> *Framework notes:* *To assist you in preparing your application, this 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 framework below.*

This Documentation Framework is intended to help you gather information about your institution's community engagement commitments and activities as you complete the 2020 Documentation Reporting Form (i.e., the application).

This document and framework is for use as a reference and worksheet only. Please do not submit it as your application. Only applications submitted through the online portal will be reviewed. All narrative responses are limited to 500 words each. A link to the application will be sent to institutions who request this framework between May 1 and July 1, 2018.

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 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.

Use of data: The information you provide will be used to determine your institution's community engagement classification. Only those institutions approved for 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 other 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 creation and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership (of knowledge and resources) between colleges and universities and 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.

Community engagement describes activities that are undertaken with community members. In reciprocal partnerships, there are collaborative community-campus definitions of problems, solutions, and measures of success. Community engagement requires processes in which academics recognize, respect, and value the knowledge, perspectives, and resources of community partners and that are designed to serve a public purpose, building the capacity of individuals, groups, and organizations involved to understand and collaboratively address issues of public concern.

Community engagement is shaped by relationships between those in the institution and those outside the institution that are grounded in the qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes. Such relationships are by their very nature trans-disciplinary (knowledge transcending the disciplines and the college or university) and asset-based (where the strengths, skills, and knowledges of those in the community are validated and legitimized). Community engagement assists campuses in fulfilling their civic purpose through socially useful knowledge creation and dissemination, and through the cultivation of democratic values, skills, and habits - democratic practice.

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 - Required Documentation. Complete all questions in this section.

A.   Institutional Identity and Culture:

1. Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?
o No   o Yes

1.1. If Yes: Quote the mission or vision:

2. Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through campus-wide awards and celebrations?
o No   o Yes

2.1. If Yes: Describe examples of campus-wide awards and celebrations that formally recognize community engagement:

B.   Institutional Assessment:

1. Does the institution have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution's engagement with community?
o No   o Yes

1.1. If Yes: Describe the mechanisms for systematic assessment:

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

The purpose of this question is to determine if the institution regularly checks with community members to assess their attitudes about the institution's activities, partnerships, and interactions with the community. We are looking for evidence of strategies and/or processes (mechanisms) for hearing community views about the role of the institution in community, including a description of how frequently assessment occurs, and who is accountable for managing the process. Responses should describe ongoing data collection mechanisms beyond the use of advisory groups or one-time community events. We expect a classified institution to demonstrate this practice as an historic and ongoing commitment. This question is not focused on data about specific engagement projects, programs or service- learning courses, or an individual's work in community settings. We are looking for a systematic, institutional process for hearing community perspectives.

2. Does the institution aggregate and use all of its assessment data related to community engagement?
o No   o Yes

2.1. If Yes: Describe how the data is used:

If you are using a systematic mechanism for hearing community attitudes, perceptions, and outcomes, please describe how the institution summarizes and reports the data. We also expect a description of how the information is used to guide institutional actions such as budgeting, strategic priorities, program improvement, and, where applicable, leads to problem solving or resolution of areas of conflict with community. A description of these actions or implications can take the form of lists, cases, anecdotes, narratives, media articles, annual reports, research or funding proposals, and other specific illustrations of application of the community perception and outcome data.

C. **Institutional Communication:**
1. Does the institution emphasize community engagement as part of its brand message identity or framework? For example, in public marketing materials, websites, etc.?
o No   o Yes

1.1. If Yes: Describe the materials that emphasize community engagement:

2. Does the executive leadership of the institution (President, Provost, Chancellor, Trustees, etc.) explicitly promote community engagement as a priority?
o No   o Yes

2.1. If Yes: Describe ways that the executive leadership explicitly promotes community engagement, e.g., annual addresses, published editorials, campus publications, etc.:

3. Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plan of the institution?
o No   o Yes

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY
2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework
Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

3.1. If Yes: Cite specific excerpts from the institution's strategic plan that demonstrate a clear definition of community engagement and related implementation plans:

D. Institutional - Community Relations:

1. Does the community have a "voice" or role for input into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?
   o No   o Yes

   1.1. If Yes: Describe how the community's voice is integrated into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement:

The purpose of this question is to determine the level of reciprocity that exists in the institution's engagement with community, specifically in terms of planning and decision-making related to engagement actions and priorities. Please provide specific descriptions of community representation and role in institutional planning or similar institutional processes that shape the community engagement agenda. Community voice is illustrated by examples of actual community influence on actions and decisions, not mere advice or attendance at events or meetings. A list or description of standing community advisory groups is insufficient without evidence and illustrations of how the voices of these groups influence institutional actions and decisions.

E. Infrastructure and Finance

1. Does the institution have a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, network or coalition of centers, etc.) to support and advance community engagement?
   o No   o Yes

   1.1. If Yes: Describe the structure, staffing, and purpose of this coordinating infrastructure. 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:

*The purpose of this question is to determine the presence of "dedicated infrastructure" for community engagement. The presence of such infrastructure indicates commitment as well as increased potential for effectiveness and sustainability. We expect a description of specific center(s) or office(s) that exist **primarily** for the purpose of leading/managing/supporting/coordinating community engagement.*

2. Are internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?
   o No   o Yes

   2.1. If Yes: Describe the source (percentage or dollar amount) of these allocations, whether this source is permanent, and how it is used:

The purpose of all the questions in this section is to assess the level of institutional commitment to community engagement in terms of dedicated financial resources. Please provide the amount or percent of total institutional budget that funds the primary investment and ongoing costs of the infrastructure described in B.1 as well as any other funds dedicated to community engagement, including but not limited to internal incentive grants, faculty fellow awards, teaching assistants for service-learning, scholarships and financial aid related directly to community engagement, and funding for actual engagement projects, programs, and activities. Do not include embedded costs such as faculty salaries for teaching service-learning courses in their standard workload.

3. Is external funding dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?
o No   o Yes

3.1. If Yes: Describe specific external funding:

These funding sources may include public and private grants, private gifts, alumnae or institutional development funds, donor support, or federal/state/local government and corporate funds dedicated to community engagement infrastructure and/or program activities.

4. Is fundraising directed to community engagement?
o No   o Yes

4.1. If Yes: Describe fundraising activities directed to community engagement:

Please describe institutional fundraising goals and activities pursued by offices of advancement, development, alumni, or institutional foundations that are focused on community engagement. Student fundraising activities in support of community engagement may be included.

5. Does the institution invest its financial resources in the community and/or community partnerships for purposes of community engagement and community development?
o No   o Yes

5.1. If Yes: Describe specific financial investments and how they are aligned with student engagement strategy:

In this question, we are asking specifically about financial investments in community programs, community development, community activities/projects, and related infrastructure, often in the context of community/campus partnerships. Examples might be a campus purchasing a van for a community-based organization to facilitate transportation of volunteers; a campus donating or purchasing computers for an after-school program located in a community-based organization; a campus investing a portion of its endowment portfolio in a local community development project, etc. (Do not include PILOT payments unless they are specifically designated for community engagement and community development.)

6. Do the business operation of the campus as an anchor institution align with local economic and community development agendas through hiring, purchasing, and procurement?
o No   o Yes

6.1. If Yes: Please describe business operation practices tied to the local community:

> *This question is asking specifically about how the campus practices in the areas of recruitment, hiring, purchasing, and procurement align with and are an intentional complement to the institutional commitment to community engagement. This can include programs to encourage/support minority vendors, among many other practices. These institutional practices contribute to the context for successful community engagement.*

F. Tracking, Monitoring, and Assessment

1. Does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community?
o No   o Yes

1.1. If Yes: Describe systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms:

> *The purpose of the questions in this section is to estimate sustainability of community engagement by looking at the ways the institution monitors and records engagement's multiple forms. Tracking and recording mechanisms are indicators of sustainability in that their existence **and use** is an indication of institutional value for and attention to community engagement. Keeping systematic records indicates the institution is striving to recognize engagement as well as to reap the potential benefits to the institution. Please use language that indicates an established, systematic approach, not a one-time or occasional or partial recording of community engagement activities. This approach will be demonstrated by means of a description of active and ongoing mechanisms such as a database, annual surveys, annual activity reports, etc. Do not report the actual data here. Here is where you describe the mechanism or process, the schedule, and the locus of managerial accountability/responsibility. You may also describe the types of information being tracked such as numbers of students in service-learning courses, numbers of courses, identity and numbers of partnerships, numbers and types of community-based research projects, etc.*

2. If Yes: Does the institution use the data from those mechanisms?
o No   o Yes

2.1. If Yes: Describe how the institution uses the data from those mechanisms:

> *For each mechanism or process described in E1.1 above, we expect descriptions of how the information is being used in specific ways and by whom. Some examples of data use include but are not limited to improvement of service-learning courses or programs, information for marketing or fundraising stories, and/or the reward and recognition of faculty, students, or partners.*

3. Are there mechanisms for defining and measuring quality of community engagement built into any of the data collection or as a complementary process?
o No   o Yes

3.1. If Yes: Describe the definition and mechanisms for determining quality of the community engagement.

4. Are there systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms to measure the outcomes and impact of institutional engagement?
o No   o Yes

The next series of questions will ask you about Outcomes and Impacts.

Outcomes are the short-term and intermediate changes that occur in learners, program participants, etc., as a direct result of the community engagement activity, program, or experience. An outcome is an effect your program produces on the people or issues you serve or address. Outcomes are the observed effects of the outputs on the beneficiaries of the community engagement. Outcomes should clearly link to goals. Measuring outcomes requires a commitment of time and resources for systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms for the purposes of assessment. Outcomes provide the measurable effects the program will accomplish. When outcomes are reached new goals or objectives may need to be set, but when outcomes are not achieved it may be time to reassess. Impacts are the long-term consequence of community engagement. Impacts are the broader changes that occur within the community, organization, society, or environment as a result of program outcomes. While it is very difficult to ascertain the exclusive impact of community engagement, it is important to consider the desired impact and the alignment of outcomes with that impact. Furthermore, institutions can and should be working toward some way of measuring impact as an institution or as a member institution of a collective impact strategy.

For each question in this section please answer for goals, outcomes, and impacts.

The purpose of the questions is to assess the sustainability of engagement at your institution by looking at your approaches to estimating outcomes and impacts of community engagement on varied constituencies (students, faculty, community, and institution). When institutions engage with communities, we expect there will be effects on these constituent groups. These expectations may vary from institution to institution and may be implicit or explicit. Outcome and Impact may take many forms including benefits or changes that are in keeping with the goals set for engagement in collaboration with community partners. Thus, there is potential for both expected outcomes and impacts and unintended consequences, as well as positive and negative impacts.

For each constituent group identified below we are asking for a description of the mechanism for ongoing, regularly conducted impact assessment on an institution-wide level, not specific projects or programs. The response should include frequency of data collection, a general overview of findings, and at least one specific key finding.

4.1. If Yes: Indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for both **<u>Student Outcomes and Impacts</u>**:

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

First, describe the assessment mechanism(s) such as interviews, surveys, course evaluations, assessments of learning, etc., schedule for data collection, and the key questions that shaped the design of the mechanism(s). We expect to see campus-wide approaches, robust student samples, data collection over time, and a summary of results. The key finding should illustrate impacts or outcomes on factors such as but not limited to academic learning, student perceptions of community, self-awareness, communication skills, social/civic responsibility, etc. Impact findings should not include reports of growth in the number of students involved or of students' enthusiasm for service-learning.

4.2. If Yes: Indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for both **Faculty Outcomes and Impacts**:

First, describe the mechanism and schedule for data collection from faculty, and the key questions or areas of focus that guided the design of the mechanism. Mechanisms used might include but are not limited to interviews, surveys, faculty activity reports, promotion and tenure portfolios or applications, or similar sources. Include descriptions of the methods used for faculty from all employment statuses. Mechanisms used might include but are not limited to hiring protocols, compensation policies, orientation programs, etc. Key findings should describe differences or changes that illustrate impact on faculty actions such as teaching methods, research directions, awareness of social responsibility, etc. Findings should not include reports of growth in the number of faculty participating in community engagement; we are looking for impact on faculty actions in regard to engagement.

4.3. If Yes: Indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for both **Community Outcomes and Impacts** as it relates to community-articulated outcomes:

First, describe the mechanism and schedule for data collection regarding impact on community, and the key questions or areas of focus that guided the design of the mechanism. Describe how the campus has responded to community-articulated goals and objectives. Mechanisms may include but are not limited to interviews, surveys, focus groups, community reports, and evaluation studies. We realize that this focus can be multidimensional in terms of level of community (local, city, region, country, etc.) and encourage a comprehensive response that reflects and is consistent with your institutional and community goals for engagement. We are looking for measures of change, impact, benefits for communities, not measures of partner satisfaction.

4.4. If Yes: Indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for both **Institutional Outcomes and Impacts**:

First, describe the mechanism and schedule for data collection regarding impact on the institution and the key questions or areas of focus that guided the design of the mechanism. Mechanisms might include but are not limited to interviews, surveys, activity reports, other institutional reports, strategic plan measures, performance measures, program review, budget reports, self studies, etc. This section is where you may report measurable benefits to the institution such as image, town-gown relations, recognition, retention/recruitment, or other strategic issues identified by your institution as goals of its community engagement agenda and actions.

5. Does the institution use the data from these assessment mechanisms?
    o No   o Yes

    5.1. If Yes: Describe how the institution uses the data from the assessment mechanisms:

> *Using examples and information from responses above, provide specific illustrations of how the impact data has been used and for what purposes.*

6. In the past 5 years, has your campus undertaken any campus-wide assessment of community engagement aimed at advancing institutional community engagement?
    o No   o Yes

    6.1. If Yes: What was the nature of the assessment, when was it done, and what did you learn from it?

> *Describe how you used specific opportunities and tools for assessing community engagement on your campus (opportunities might be a strategic planning process, a re-accreditation process, the self-study and external review of a center for community engagement, or others; tools might be the Anchor Institutions Dashboard, the Civic Health Index, the National Assessment of Service and Community Engagement (NASCE), the National Inventory of Institutional Infrastructure for Community Engagement (NIIICE), or others).*

G. Faculty and Staff

1. Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty in any employment status (tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty) and/or staff who engage with community?
    o No   o Yes

    1.1. If Yes: Describe professional development support for faculty in any employment status and/or staff engaged with community:

> *Most campuses offer professional development – what is being asked here is professional development specifically related to community engagement. Describe which unit(s) on campus provides this professional development, and how many staff/faculty participate in the professional development activities that are specific to community engagement.*

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				

2.1. If Yes to "Other": Please describe other support or services:

3. Does the institution have search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty in any employment status and staff with expertise in and commitment to community engagement?
o No   o Yes

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

4. Are there **institutional-level policies** for faculty promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically 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.
o No   o Yes

4.1. If Yes: Use this space to describe the context for policies rewarding community-engaged scholarly work:

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY
2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework
Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

"Faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods" refers to community engagement as part of teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service; i.e., community engagement as part of faculty roles.

Characteristics of community engagement include collaborative, reciprocal partnerships and public purposes.

Characteristics of scholarship within research and creative activities include the following: applying the literature and theoretical frameworks in a discipline or disciplines; posing questions; and conducting systematic inquiry that is made public; providing data and results that can be reviewed by the appropriate knowledge community, and can be built upon by others to advance the field.

Campuses often use the term community-engaged scholarship (sometimes also referred to as the scholarship of engagement) to refer to inquiry into community-engaged teaching and learning or forms of participatory action research with community partners that embodies both the characteristics of community engagement and scholarship.

In response to this question, if appropriate, describe the context for these policies; e.g., that the campus went through a multi-year process to revise the guidelines, which were approved in XXXX and now each department has been charged with revising their departmental-level guidelines to align with the institutional guidelines regarding community engagement.

5. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **teaching and learning**? Include tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty if there are policies that apply to these appointments.
   o No   o Yes

   5.1. If Yes: Please cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document):

6. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **research or creative activity**? Include tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty if there are policies that apply to these appointments.
   o No   o Yes

   6.1. Please cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document):

7. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of **service**? Include faculty from any employment status if there are policies that apply to these appointments.
   o No   o Yes

   7.1. If Yes: Please cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document):

8. 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? Are there policies for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty in reappointment or promotion considerations?
   o No   o Yes

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

8.1. If Yes: List the colleges/schools and/or departments.

8.2. If Yes: What percent of total colleges/schools and/or departments at the institution is represented by the list above?

8.3. If Yes: 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:

9. Is there **work in progress** to revise promotion and tenure (at tenure granting institutions) guidelines to reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
    o No   o Yes

    9.1. If Yes: Describe the current work in progress, including a description of the process and who is involved. Describe how the president/chancellor, provost, deans, chairs, faculty leaders, chief diversity officer, or other key leaders are involved. Also describe any products resulting from the process; i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc. Also address if there are policies specifically for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty:

At this point, applicants are urged to review the responses to Foundational Indicators and Institutional Commitment sections above and determine whether Community Engagement is "institutionalized"—that is, whether all or most of the Foundational Indicators have been documented with specificity. If so, applicants are encouraged to continue with the application. If not, applicants are encouraged to withdraw from the process and apply in the 2025 application cycle which will begin through release of that application in January of 2023.

III. <u>Categories of Community Engagement</u>

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, community-based learning, public service courses, etc.

A1. Teaching and Learning

1. Does the institution have a definition, standard components, and a process for identifying community-engaged courses?
   o No   o Yes

   1.1. If Yes: Discuss how your institution defines community-engaged courses, the standard components for designation, and the process for identifying community-engaged courses:

   > *If your institution formally designates community-engaged courses, please provide the definition used for community engaged, the standard and required components for designation, and the process of application and review/selection for designation.*

   1.2. If Yes: How many designated for-credit community-engaged courses were offered in the most recent academic year? ____

2. What percentage of total courses offered at the institution? ____

3. Is community engagement noted on student transcripts?
   o No   o Yes

   3.1. If Yes: Describe how community engagement is noted on student transcripts:

4. How many departments are represented by those courses? ____

5. What percentage of total departments at the institution? ____

6. How many faculty taught community-engaged courses in the most recent academic year? ____

7. What percentage are these of the total faculty at the institution? _____

8. What percent of the faculty teaching community-engaged courses are tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time? _____

9. How many students participated in community-engaged courses in the most recent academic year? _____

10. What percentage of students at the institution? _____

11. Describe how data provided in questions 2-10 above are gathered, by whom, with what frequency, and to what end:

12. Are there **institutional (campus-wide)** learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community?
    o No   o Yes

    12.1. If Yes: Please provide specific examples of institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

Please provide specific and well-articulated learning outcomes that are aligned with the institutional goals regarding community engagement. Learning outcomes should specify the institutional expectations of graduates in terms of knowledge and understanding, skills, attitudes, and values. Those outcomes are often associated with general education, core curriculum, and capstone experiences that include community engagement.

13. Are institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community systematically assessed?
    o No   o Yes

    13.1. If Yes: Describe the strategy and mechanism assuring systematic assessment of institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

    13.2. If Yes: Describe how the assessment data related to institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community are used:

14. Are there **departmental or disciplinary** learning outcomes or competencies for students' curricular engagement with community?
    o No   o Yes

    14.1. If Yes: Provide specific examples of departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY
2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework
Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

15. Are departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community systematically assessed?
o No   o Yes

15.1. If Yes: Describe the strategy and mechanism assuring systematic assessment of departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

15.2. If Yes: Describe how assessment data related to departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community are used:

A.2. Curriculum

1. Is community engagement integrated into the following curricular (for-credit) activities? Please select all that apply:
- ❏ Student Research
- ❏ Student Leadership
- ❏ Internships, Co-ops, Career exploration
- ❏ Study Abroad
- ❏ Alternative Break tied to a course

1.1. For each category checked above, provide examples:

2. Has community engagement been integrated with curriculum on an institution-wide level in any of the following structures? Please select all that apply:
- ❏ Graduate Studies
- ❏ Core Courses
- ❏ Capstone (Senior-level project)
- ❏ First-Year Sequence
- ❏ General Education
- ❏ In the Majors
- ❏ In the Minors

2.1. For each category checked above, provide examples:

B. 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***.

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. Please select all that apply:
- ❏ Social innovation/entrepreneurship

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

- ❏ 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)

1.1. For each program checked above, provide examples:

As with curricular engagement, a number of these activities take place off campus in communities and may or may not be characterized by qualities of reciprocity, mutuality, and be asset-based. This question is asking about which offerings reflect these qualities. The examples provided should indicate how a co-curricular program has been transformed by and/or reflect these community engagement principles.

2. Do students have access to a co-curricular engagement tracking system that can serve as a co-curricular transcript or record of community engagement?

   2.1. If Yes: Please describe the system used and how it is used.

3. Does co-curricular programming provide students with clear developmental pathways through which they can progress to increasingly complex forms of community engagement over time?

   3.1. If Yes: Please describe the pathways and how students know about them.

C. **Professional Activity and Scholarship**
   1. Are there examples of staff professional activity (conference presentation, publication, consulting, awards, etc.) associated with their co-curricular engagement achievements (i.e., student program development, training curricula, leadership programing, etc.)?
   o No   o Yes

   1.1. Provide a minimum of five examples of staff professional activity:

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

*2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework*

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

The purpose of this question is to determine the level to which staff are involved in professional activities that contribute to the ongoing development of best practices in curricular and co-curricular engagement. Doing so is an indicator of attention to improvement and quality practice as well as an indication that community engagement is seen as a valued staff professional activity. Please provide examples that your staff have produced in connection with their community engagement professional duties. We expect this to include professional products on topics such as but not limited to curriculum and co-curriculum development, assessment of student learning in the community, student development and leadership, etc., that have been disseminated to others **through professional venues** as illustrated in the question.

2. Are there examples of faculty scholarship, including faculty of any employment status associated with their curricular engagement achievements (scholarship of teaching and learning such as research studies, conference presentations, pedagogy workshops, publications, etc.)?

o No   o Yes

2.1. Provide a minimum of five examples of faculty scholarship from as many different disciplines as possible:

The purpose of this question is to determine the level to which faculty are involved in traditional scholarly activities that they now associate with curricular engagement. Doing so is an indicator of attention to improvement and quality practice as well as an indication that community engagement is seen as a valued scholarly activity within the disciplines. Please provide scholarship examples that your faculty have produced in connection with their service learning or community-based courses. We expect this to include scholarly products on topics such as but not limited to curriculum development, assessment of student learning in the community, action research conducted within a course, etc., that have been disseminated to others through scholarly venues as illustrated in the question.

3. Are there examples of faculty scholarship and/or professional activities of staff associated with the scholarship of engagement (i.e., focused on community impact and with community partners) and community engagement activities (technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy reports, publications, other scholarly artifacts, etc.)?

o No   o Yes

3.1. Provide a minimum of five examples of scholarship from as many different disciplines as possible:

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

The purpose of this question is to explore the degree to which community engagement activities have been linked to faculty scholarly activity and staff professional activity. Describe outputs that are recognized and valued as scholarship and professional activity. Please provide examples such as but not limited to research studies of partnerships, documentation of community response to outreach programs, or other evaluations or studies of impacts and outcomes of outreach or partnership activities that have led to scholarly reports, policies, academic and/or professional presentations, publications, etc. Examples should illustrate the breadth of activity across the institution with representation of varied disciplines, professional positions, and the connection of outreach and partnership activities to scholarship. Broader Impacts of Research activities producing co-created scholarship of investigators and practitioners aimed at meaningful societal impacts could be included here.

D. Community Engagement and Other Institutional Initiatives
Please complete all the questions in this section.

1. Does community engagement directly contribute to (or is it aligned with) the institution's **diversity and inclusion** goals (for students and faculty)?
   o No   o Yes

   1.1. Please describe and provide examples:

2. Is community engagement connected to efforts aimed at **student retention** and success?
   o No   o Yes

   2.1. Please describe and provide examples:

3. Does the campus **institutional review board** (IRB) or some part of the community engagement infrastructure provide specific guidance for researchers regarding human subjects protections for community-engaged research?
   o No   o Yes

   3.1. Please describe and provide examples:

4. Is community engagement connected to campus efforts that support federally funded grants for **Broader Impacts of Research** activities of faculty and students?
   o No   o Yes

   4.1. Please describe and provide examples:

5. Does the institution encourage and measure **student voter registration and voting**?
   o No   o Yes

   5.1. Describe the methods for encouraging and measuring student voter registration and voting.

6. Is the institution 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?
o No o Yes

6.1. Describe the ways in which the institution actively promotes discussions of controversial issues:

7. Does your campus have 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?
o No o Yes

7.1. Please describe and provide examples:

E. **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.

E1. Outreach
1. Indicate which outreach programs and functions reflect a community engagement partnership approach. Please select all that apply:
   ❏ Learning centers
   ❏ Tutoring
   ❏ Extension programs
   ❏ Non-credit courses
   ❏ Evaluation support
   ❏ Training programs
   ❏ Professional development centers
   ❏ Career assistance and job placement
   ❏ Other (please specify)

   1.1. For each category checked above, provide examples of how the outreach is consistent with a community engagement partnership approach:

2. Which institutional resources are provided as outreach to the community? Please select all that apply:
    - ❏ Cultural offerings
    - ❏ Athletic offerings
    - ❏ Library services
    - ❏ Technology
    - ❏ Faculty consultation
    - ❏ Other (please specify)

    2.1. For each category checked above, provide examples of how these institutional resources are consistent with a community engagement partnership approach:

E.2. Partnerships
This section replaces the previous "partnership grid" with a series of repeating questions for each of the partnerships you identify.

1. Describe representative examples of partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year (maximum=15 partnerships).

    1.1. Project/Collaboration Title
    1.2. Community Partner (and email contact information for community partner)
    1.3. Institutional Partner
    1.4. Purpose of this collaboration
    1.5. Length of Partnership
    1.6. Number of faculty involved
    1.7. Number of staff involved
    1.8. Number of students involved
    1.9. Grant funding, if relevant
    1.10. Impact on the institution
    1.11.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.

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY
2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework
Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

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:*
> 7. *Describe the actions and strategies used by the campus to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.*
> 8. *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.*

The purpose of this question is to illustrate the institution's depth and breadth of interactive partnerships that demonstrate reciprocity and mutual benefit. Examples should be representative of the range of forms and topical foci of partnerships across a sampling of disciplines and units.

2. Does the institution or departments take specific actions to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships?

   o No   o Yes

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

2.1. Describe the actions and strategies for ensuring mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships:

> *The purpose of this question is to determine if the institution is taking specific actions to ensure attention to reciprocity and mutual benefit in partnership activities. Do not provide project examples here. Please describe specific institutional strategies for initiating, sustaining, and enhancing interaction within partnerships that promote mutuality and reciprocity in those partnerships. Examples could include the development of principles that inform the development and operation of partnerships, professional development activities, recognition or review protocols, reporting or evaluation strategies, etc.*

3. Are there mechanisms to systematically collect and share feedback and assessment findings regarding partnerships, reciprocity, and mutual benefit, both from community partners to the institution and from the institution to the community?

   o No   o Yes

   3.1. If yes, describe the mechanisms and how the data have been used to improve reciprocity and mutual benefit:

IV. <u>Reflection and Additional Information</u>

1. (Optional) Reflect on the process of completing this application. What learnings, insights, or unexpected findings developed across the process?

2. (Optional) Use this space to elaborate on any question(s) for which you need more space. Please specify the corresponding section and item number(s).

3. (Optional) Is there any information that was not requested that you consider significant evidence of your institution's community engagement? If so, please provide the information in this space.

4. (Optional) Please provide any suggestions or comments you may have on the application process for the 2020 Elective Community Engagement Classification.

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, and for other higher education researchers as well.

Only applications from campuses that agree to the use of their application data will be made available for research purposes.

No identifiable 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.

o No   o 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.

o No   o Yes

SWEARER CENTER
BROWN UNIVERSITY

2020 Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification
First Time Classification Documentation Framework

Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching