



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.

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