<p style="text-align:center">**COMMISSION ON OUTREACH AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**
**Minutes**
**December 13, 2012, 2012**
**3:30-4:30 p.m.**
**325 Burruss Hall**</p>

**Attendance:** Carlyle Brewster, Andrea Brunais, Kirsten Buhls (via phone), Jack Davis, Christine Fiori, Guru Ghosh, Aditya Johri, Ed Jones, Maryam Kamali, Andrew Overbay (via phone), Llyn Sharp, Bob Smith, Yannis Stivachtis, Elankumaran Subbiah

**Absent:** Onwubiko Agozino, Kathy Alexander, Peter Callan, Lee Cooper, Bilan Jama, Reed Kennedy, Ionnis Kokkinidis, Gary Long, Jerry Niles, Susan Short

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   Christine Fiori welcomed everyone to the meeting. Self-introductions were made.

2. **Agenda Approval**
   Christine made a call for the approval of the agenda; the agenda was moved to approve; seconded and was approved.

3. **Announcements**
   Christine made the call for announcements. She thanked the commission for their efforts in getting nominations for the Alumni Award for Outreach Excellence.

4. **Approval of Minutes, November 15, 2012**
   The minutes from the November 15, 2012 were sent out electronically for updates; were updated accordingly and were sent onto University Council and to the University Governance website.

5. **Chairman's Report**
   Christine reported on the University Council meetings from November 26th; which included the first reading to change Special Research faculty to just Research faculty. Additionally, for the December 3rd University Council meeting, the second reading to change Special Research occurred and the resolution was passed. At the December meeting the Commission on Student Affairs presenting a resolution to increase evergreen plants in landscaping and electrical outlet expansion on campus was proposed. The decision was made to bring these resolutions to other commissions and that University Council might not be the right forum. Discussion included avoiding the fiscal cliff; reduction on charitable tax donations and restructuring of SCHEV.

   Minutes from the November 26, 2012 University Council meeting are located at: http://www.governance.vt.edu/univcouncil/ucminutes-11-26-12.pdf; and minutes from the December 3, 2012 meeting are located at: http://www.governance.vt.edu/univcouncil/ucminutes_12-03-12.pdf.

   Christine talked about the Outreach Council meeting of November 27th, in which she presented the changes in the Alumni Awards for Outreach Excellence process. The college representatives described their individual strategic plans.

6. **Vice-Chair's Report**
   Carlyle Brewster thanked the group for their help with the nominations for the Alumni Award for Outreach Excellence, as they have a good turnout this year. There were 11 individual nominations and 6 team nominations. Carlyle asked for volunteers to serve on the review committee, Elankumaran Subbiah volunteered, Carlyle and Christine will serve on the committee, Carlyle will ask Carl Zipper who won last year, and the suggestion to ask Susan Short to serve was made.

7. **Reports**

   a. **Virginia Cooperative Extension (VCE)**
      Ed Jones reported on the VCE, commenting that they have filled another agent position and 10 more to go. There will be a conference at the end of January for all extension agents; and Ed mentioned that VCE would like to crease some international opportunities for agents.

   b. **University Council on International Affairs (UCIA) Meeting**
      Bob smith indicated that Jenny Sax gave the updates on Education Abroad which included 120 students to be traveling over winter and spring breaks. OIRED has a mini-grant, which Education Abroad will now handle. The student conduct form has been updated; there is a workshop for study abroad for new faculty; the Cranwell Office is being updated. An email went out seeking nominations for the IFDP; which will be traveling to Singapore and Malaysia for Junior faculty. The thought for the strategic plan was for funding and infrastructure.

8. **Engagement Discussion**
   Christine addressed the list of questions for a survey regarding engagement. Discussion was what should be included; the best practices from Susan Short's interaction with APLU; and the white paper will be sent out to the commission.

   The Global Engagement Strategic Plan is being worked on.

9. **Commission Board Member Comments**
   There were no comments.

   There was a move to adjourn, seconded; the meeting adjourned.
   **PROPOSED MEETING DATES FOR 12-13** (All meetings will be from **3:30-4:30 p.m.** and will take place in 325 Burruss except as noted below)

   NO JANUARY MEETING
   February 21, 2013
   March 21, 2013
   April 18, 2013
   May 9, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Rhodes
Recording Secretary

**Engaged Scholarship at Virginia Tech**

As a public land-grant university, Virginia Tech manifests a revolutionary development in American higher education. The university was founded by the public trust to build and disseminate useful knowledge for its ultimate application to improve the lives of citizens throughout the Commonwealth and beyond.

Today, the discussion of relevance and historic public responsiveness has evolved into one on engagement. The lexicon has changed, but our committed responsiveness to the public good has not. This document defines and describes the engaged scholarship that facilitates the creation and dissemination of this knowledge and provides models of such scholarship within the Academy.

The following insights and recommendations offer strategies with which engaged scholarship at Virginia Tech may be recognized, encouraged and acknowledged. They are based on current scholarship and on organized conversations with community stakeholders. Their goal is to provide both visibility and voice for scholarly engagement throughout the many Virginia Tech communities that we are and that we serve.

## I.  Definition and Description

**Engaged scholarship is the creation, documentation, and dissemination of knowledge constructed through a partnership of scholar(s) and community.  This knowledge is shared in various schema to respond to human issues—making it both accessible and relevant to the public.**

Engaged scholarship, like all scholarship,
- Advances the state of knowledge
- Can be replicated or elaborated
- Can be documented, disseminated, reviewed, discussed, and critiqued
- Has significance and impact.

The overall measure for effective scholarship is based upon scope, quality, relevance and duration of impact to the audience (whether local, national or international), and not solely upon creation of a product. Engaged scholarship is relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs and goals through a collaborative process to contribute to the public good.

### A.  The Context of Engaged Scholarship

Scholars at institutions of higher education define the forms and functions of scholarship in a variety of ways (Boyer 1996; Bruns et al. 2003; Uniscope Learning Community

2008; Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities 1999; Townson 2008). This Virginia Tech definition highlights the three forms of scholarship: *discovery scholarship, learning scholarship, and engagement scholarship.* When scholars are engaged in campus-community partnerships, the traditional boundaries between the forms of scholarship do not exist. The scholars and the community partners engage together—moving research from the labs and teaching from the classroom into a shared and integrated space referred as engaged scholarship.

Like all institutions committed to engagement, Virginia Tech seeks to measure the productivity and impact resulting from campus-community engagement and to celebrate, reward, and promote engaged scholarship and its scholars.

It is the telling of the stories of engaged scholarship (Franz 2009), along with the measuring of the outcome and impact of its collaborations, that affirms Virginia Tech's land-grant mission and celebrates its heritage of service above self.

B. Valuing Engaged Scholarship

The validation of engaged scholarship within the academic community (for example, in the promotion and tenure process) fits within the rubric of traditional scholarly assessment, even as it expands that rubric.

❖ Engaged scholarship advances the state of knowledge with or among disciplines, while developing that knowledge through partnerships outside academic disciplines;
❖ Engaged scholarship has shared ownership (by scholar and community partners) and can and should be replicated for other communities;
❖ Engaged scholarship can be disseminated in traditional, descriptive ways as well as in non-traditional modes (model structures or land uses, for example);
❖ Engaged scholarship can and should be evaluated by its impact on the community with which its scholar(s) has partnered, and that partner should be included among the peers and experts assessing value.

The validation of engaged scholarship should permeate its storytelling, highlighting its public and economic contributions to the community partner and to the scholarly community. When communities are partners, communities are peers.

II. **Modeling Engaged Scholarship at Virginia Tech**

Engaged scholarship is often rooted in one's discipline, often crosses disciplines, and often takes a multi-disciplinary approach. Because disciplines employ multiple and diverse tools and methods to pursue discovery, learning, and engagement, we can have no

single Virginia Tech model for engaged scholarship.    We must deepen and broaden our articulation of scholarship activity to encompass all areas and forms of engaged scholarship.

Engaged scholarship takes many forms as it moves across the domains of discovery, learning and engagement. The types of scholarly engagement include such activities as the creation of theoretical concepts within a think-tank or another problem-solving arena, such applied research as development of a new building type or system which addresses a community or professional need, or development and provision of technical assistance with a community.

As the focus of engagement activities ranges widely, so does the medium of the short- and long-term integration and application with a community. The immediate medium may be a workshop, classroom, laboratory, continuing education or extension activity; or it may utilize building, publication or performance as an application and/or demonstration. The medium is dependent upon the audience, which necessarily includes the immediate community partners, and like communities. The audience includes the community or communities that are immediately impacted by the engagement activities as well as those that could be impacted by further dissemination of the work. The audience may include professionals, students, government, the university, another community or another set of community members.

The quality of engaged scholarship must include impact and be assessed and documented as appropriate to the scope of the activity and by peers of the activity. While measures of quality include such traditional measure as academic peer-reviewed publication, they also extend to include peer-review by the community partners and review of the work's impacts. As such, documentation may include peer evaluation by community members, certification or other professional recognition, and evaluation of economic and/or social impacts.

**References and Selected Bibliography**

Boyer, E.L. 1996. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach. 1(1).*

Bruns, K., Conklin, N., Wright, M., Hoover, D., Brace, B. Wise, G., Pendleton, F., Dann, M., Martin, M., and J. Childers. 2003. Scholarship: The key to creating change through outreach. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.* 8 (1).

Childers, J., and Archer, T. 2003. Outreach scholarship learning community: Agenda for change. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.* Fall/Winter.

Childers, J., Martin, M., Dann, M., Dufour, C., Bruns, K., and Wise, G. 2002. Outreach and engagement: Building and sustaining learning communities in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.* Fall/Winter.

Ellison, J. and T.K. Eatman. 2008. Scholarship in Public: Knowlede creation and tenure policy in the engaged university. Imagining America.

Fichtman Dana, N. and C. Emihovich. 2004. Actualizing a culture of engaged scholarship in the College of education at the University of Florida. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.* 10 (1).

Finkelstein, M. 2001. Toward a unified view of scholarship: Eliminating tension between tradition and engaged work. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.* 6 (2).

Franz, N. 2009. A holistic model of engaged scholarship: Telling the story across higher education's missions. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship.*

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 1999. *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution.* Washington, D.C. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Meyer, L. H. and I.M. Evans, 2003. Motivating the professoriate: Why sticks and carrots are only for donkeys. *Higher Education Management and Policy.* 15 (3).

Townson, L. 2009. Disciplinary influence on faculty engaged scholarship in the land-grant institutions. *Unpublished dissertation.* Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire.

UniSCOPE Learning Community. 2009. *UniSCOPE 2000: A multidimensional model of scholarship for the 21st century:* University Park, PA: UniSCOPE Learning Community.

# Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

*Beth Dierker, Yi Cao, Lisa Burton, Michelle Kuhl, and Andy Furco, University of Minnesota, 2010*

| I. Checklists | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Name of Tool* | *Purpose* | *Elements of Tool (abbreviated version)* | *Measurement Type* | *Web Location* |
| **Dimensions of Engagement** (2002) (Kellogg Forum on Higher Education for the Common Good) | Provides institutions with a tool with which they can assess their commitment to civic engagement | 10 principles: 1)Access to learning, 2)Enhanced Diversity, 3)Civic leadership, 4)Public scholarship, 5)Social well-being, 6)Trusted voice, 7)Public spaces, 8)Community partnerships, 9)Self governance, 10)Public accountability | Qualitative/descriptive | http://www.thenationalforum.org/Docs/PDF/monticello_dialogue3.pdf |
| **Institutional Assessment Tool to Enhance Regional Innovation and Prosperity** (2010) (Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness and Economic Prosperity) | Serves as a self-assessment tool for institutions to get a sense of their engagement in regional economic development. | Poses two questions: 1) How do you assess the institution's current performance?; 2) How important is this activity to the institution's role in regional economic development? Utilizes the following criteria to answer these questions: A. Engage and Assert Institutional Leadership; B. Create a Supportive Culture; C. Ensure that University Activities Benefit the Public; D. Develop an Innovation Economy; E. Provide Relevant Educational Opportunities and Programs; F. Promote Openness, Accessibility and Responsiveness; G. Communicate Contributions, Successes, Achievements that Benefit Region | Quantitiative measures on a 4-point scale | http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=2112 |
| **Research Universities and Civic Engagement Network Reports** (Gibson, 2006) (Stanton, 2007) | Presents a list of characteristics that describe what engaged higher education institutions look like | 1) Improvements in the life of communities will lead to excellence as a core mission of the institution 2) Cultivate reciprocal relationships and shared tasks with the communities; 3) Collaboratively develop an institutional strategy with the institution's local communities and other communities; 4) Design partnerships with community members and increase their access to institutional resources; 5) Support and promote "Engaged Scholarship"; 6) Reward faculty's engaged research and community-based instruction; 7) Provide opportunities for students to develop civic competencies and habits 8) Promote student co-curricular civic engagement opportunities 9) Inculcate a civic ethos institutional-wide with the support of university leaders 10) Allocate sufficient financial resources to achieve the above goals | Qualitative/descriptive | New Times Demand New Research Reports I and II: http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/initiatives/research_universities/conference_report.pdf http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/initiatives/research_universities/Civic_Engagement.pdf                Summary Journal Article: http://esj.sagepub.com/content/3/1/19.full.pdf+html |
| **Accreditation Criterion #5: Engagement & Service** (2010) (The Higher Learning Commission) | Describes part of the institutional accreditation process for higher education institutions. | Criterion 5: As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value. Core Components: 1) The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations. 2) The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities. 3) The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service. 4) Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides. | Qualitative/descriptive | http://www.ncahlc.org/information-for-institutions/criteria-for-accreditation.html |

**Resources Consulted:**

Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement by Furco & Miller

IUPUI website: http://csl.iupui.edu/assessment/accountabilityToolsforCivicEngagement.cfm

Michigan State University website: http://ncsue.msu.edu/

At a Glance by Janet S. Eyler, Dwight E.Giles, Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray

Assessing Institutionalization of Civic Engagement by Cathy Burack & John Saltmarsh

Google Scholar and Google

# Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

*Beth Dierker, Yi Cao, Lisa Burton, Michelle Kuhl, and Andy Furco, University of Minnesota, 2010*

| II. Indicators | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Name of Tool* | *Purpose* | *Elements of Tool (abbreviated version)* | *Measurement Type* | *Web Location* |
| **Indicators of Engagement** (2010) (Campus Compact) | Documents and disseminates "exemplary service-learning and civic engagement practices" | 13 Indicators: 1) Mission and vision; 2) Academic and administrative leadership; 3) Disciplines, Departments, and Interdisciplinary work; 4) Teaching and Learning; 5) Faculty Development; 6) Faculty Roles and Rewards; 7) Support Structures and Resources; 8) Internal Budget & Resource Allocations; 9) Community Voice; 10) External Resource Allocation; 11) Coordination of Community-Based Activities; 12) Forums for Fostering Public Dialogue; 13) Student Voice | Survey with mainly qualitative responses (describing practices) | http://www.compact.org/indicators-of-engagement-project-categories-page/ |
| **Self Evaluation Instruments for Managing the Quality of Service-learning: Institutional level self-evaluation of service-learning** (2006) (The Council on Higher Education and Higher Education Quality Committee in South Africa) | Provides an evaluation tool to manage service-learning quality on institutional level | Four parts: 1) recommended indicators for evaluating the management of the quality of service-learning; 2) reflective questions which attempt to elicit more informed qualitative responses to the statements about the arrangements that should be in place for managing quality; 3) examples of evidence; 4) qualitative responses and evidence | Qualitative responses and evidence | http://www.che.ac.za/documents/d000122/HEQC_Good_Practice_guide_Jun2006_8a.pdf |
| Institutional Self-Assessment Guidebook (Braskamp, n.d.) | Obtains a better understanding of how campuses are structured and organized to foster holistic student development | Four dimensions: 1) student learning and development; 2) culture; 3) curriculum; 4) co-curriculum; 5) community | not clear | http://www.luc.edu/projectfaculty/pdf/institutional_self_assessment.pdf |

**Resources Consulted:**

Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement by Furco & Miller
IUPUI website: http://csl.iupui.edu/assessment/accountabilityToolsforCivicEngagement.cfm
Michigan State University website: http://ncsue.msu.edu/
At a Glance by Janet S. Eyler, Dwight E.Giles, Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray
Assessing Institutionalization of Civic Engagement by Cathy Burack & John Saltmarsh
Google Scholar and Google

# Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

*Beth Dierker, Yi Cao, Lisa Burton, Michelle Kuhl, and Andy Furco, University of Minnesota, 2010*

| III. Benchmarks | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Name of Tool* | *Purpose* | *Elements of Tool (abbreviated version)* | *Measurement Type* | *Web Location* |
| **Resource Guide & Recommendations for Defining and Benchmarking Engagement** (2005) (Committee on Institutional Cooperation) | Provides institutions with benchmarks and measures that enable them to assess their effectiveness in performing as an "engaged university" | <u>7 benchmarks</u>: 1) institutional commitment to engagement, 2) Insititutional resource commitments, 3) Student involvement in engagement activities, 4) Faculty and staff partnerships with community, 5) Institutional engagement with community, 6) Assessing impact and outcomes, 7) Resource/Revenue opportunities | qualitative benchmarks, but evidence could be reported on quantitatively | http://www.cic.net/Home/Reports.aspx See "Other" category |
| **Institutional Benchmarks** (2005) (Presented by Committee on Institutional Cooperation Special Committee on Engagement at Wingspread) | Specifies indicators to "which all CIC institutions can aspire as they advance their engagement commitments." | 1) Evidence of Institutional Commitment to Engagement; 2) Evidence of Institutional Resource Commitments to Engagement; 3) Evidence that Students are Involved in Engagement and outreach Activities; 4) Evidence that Faculty and Staff are Engaged with External constituents; 5) Evidence that Institutions are Engaged with their communities; 6) Evidence of Assessing the Impact and Outcomes of engagement; 7) Evidence of Resource/Revenue Opportunities Generated through Engagement | Benchmarks: applied to all the Committee on Institutional Cooperation institutions (CIC including big ten and U of Chicago)<br><br>Outcome indicators: meant only to be illustrative and would likely vary by institutional context. | http://www.thenationalforum.org/Docs/PDF/Wingspread_05_Final_Monograph.pdf |
| **Institutional audit as part of the Community-Higher Education-Service Partnerships** (2006) | Explores the potential that service learning has as a viable means of providing the kind of academic curricula that would also achieve a degree of community development. | Not available | Case study including a survey and in-depth interviews | not directly accessible but see a description and critique of this assessment tool: http://www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/documents/14/Acta_Academica_Supplementum_2005%283%29/13018-07_Mitchell_et_al.pdf http://www.che.ac.za/documents/d000153/ |

**Resources Consulted:**
Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement by Furco & Miller
IUPUI website: http://csl.iupui.edu/assessment/accountabilityToolsforCivicEngagement.cfm
Michigan State University website: http://ncsue.msu.edu/
At a Glance by Janet S. Eyler, Dwight E.Giles, Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray
Assessing Institutionalization of Civic Engagement by Cathy Burack & John Saltmarsh
Google Scholar and Google

# Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

*Beth Dierker, Yi Cao, Lisa Burton, Michelle Kuhl, and Andy Furco, University of Minnesota, 2010*

| IV. Rubrics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Name of Tool* | *Purpose* | *Elements of Tool (abbreviated version)* | *Measurement Type* | *Web Location* |
| **Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment** (Gelmon, Seifer, Kauper-Brown, & Mikkelsen, 2005) | Provides a standardized scale by which an institution can measure their policies and practices around six major dimensions (made up of 44 components). | Dimensions: 1) definition and vision of community engagement, 2) faculty support for and Involvment in Community Engagement, 3) Student support for and involvement in Community Engagement, 4) Community support for and involvement in Community Engagement, 5) Institutional Leadership and Support for Community Engagement, 6) Community-engaged scholarship | Quantitative measures resulting from the 4 scale rubric | http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/self-assessment-copyright.pdf |
| **Self-Assessment Rubric for Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education** (Furco, 1999) | Helps higher education insitutions gauge their service-learning institutionalization efforts | Dimensions: 1) Philosophy & Mission of SL; 2) Faculty Support for & Involvement in SL; 3) Student Support for and Involvement in SL; 4) Community Participation and Partnerships; 5) Institutional Support for Service-Learning. [Each dimension made up of several components which are measured on 3-stage continuum: 1) Critical mass-building, 2) Quality building, 3) Sustained institutionalization | Qualitative categories but responses could be quantified | http://servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/4774_SELF-ASSESSMENT_RUBRIC.pdf |
| **Assessment Rubric for Institutionalizing Community Engagement in Higher Education** (Furco et al., 2009) *Note: Adapted from Self-Assessment Rubric for Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education* | Helps higher education insitutions gauge their community engagement institutionalization efforts | Dimensions: 1) Philosophy & Mission of CE; 2) Faculty Support for & Involvement in CE; 3) Student Support for and Involvement in CE; 4) Community Participation and Partnerships; 5) Institutional Support for Service-Learning. [Each dimension made up of several components which are measured on 3-stage continuum: 1) Critical mass-building, 2) Quality building, 3) Sustained institutionalization | Qualitative categories but responses could be quantified | http://engagement.umn.edu/community/documents/Furcoetal CEInstRubric.pdf |

**Resources Consulted:**

Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement by Furco & Miller

IUPUI website: http://csl.iupui.edu/assessment/accountabilityToolsforCivicEngagement.cfm

Michigan State University website: http://ncsue.msu.edu/

At a Glance by Janet S. Eyler, Dwight E.Giles, Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray

Assessing Institutionalization of Civic Engagement by Cathy Burack & John Saltmarsh

Google Scholar and Google

## Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

Beth Dierker, Yi Cao, Lisa Burton, Michelle Kuhl, and Andy Furco, University of Minnesota, 2010

| V. Matrices | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Name of Tool* | *Purpose* | *Elements of Tool (abbreviated version)* | *Measurement Type* | *Web Location* |
| **Levels of Commitment to Engagement, Characterized by Key Organizational Factors Evidencing Relevance to Institutional Mission** (Holland, 2006) (Higher Education Network for Community Engagement) | Provides a tool for institutions to use in evaluating the relevance of the campus mission to engagement | Factors: 1) mission, 2) leadership, 3) promotion, tenure, hiring, 4) organization structure and funding, 5) student involvement and curriculum, 6) faculty involvement, 7) community involvement, 8) external communications and fundraising | Quantitative measures resulting from the 4-scale rubric | http://www.henceonline.org/resources/institutional.php |

**Resources Consulted:**

Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement by Furco & Miller

IUPUI website: http://csl.iupui.edu/assessment/accountabilityToolsforCivicEngagement.cfm

Michigan State University website: http://ncsue.msu.edu/

At a Glance by Janet S. Eyler, Dwight E.Giles, Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray

Assessing Institutionalization of Civic Engagement by Cathy Burack & John Saltmarsh

Google Scholar and Google

# Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

*Beth Dierker, Yi Cao, Lisa Burton, Michelle Kuhl, and Andy Furco, University of Minnesota, 2010*

| VI. Systems | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Name of Tool* | *Purpose* | *Elements of Tool (abbreviated version)* | *Measurement Type* | *Web Location* |
| **Carnegie Classsification: Community Engagement** (2010) | Provides institutions with a classification to demonstrate their commitment to community engagement | 1) Foundational Indicators: Institutional Identity and Culture, Institutional Commitment; 2) Categories of Community Engagement: Curricular, Outreach & Partnerships, | Qualitative and quantiative | http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213 |
| **Comprehensive Assessment for the Scholarship of Engagement** (CASE); (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999) | Presents an assessment *process* through which evidence of campus engagement is documented to develop and implement a comprehensive engagement plan | Principles: 1)community engagement is consistent with its mission; 2)continuous, authentic, and meaningful involvement of community; 3)learning at the center; 4)community engagement present in all areas; 5)infrastructure supports the community engagement; 6)active leadership for community engagement at all levels of the organization; 7)supporting interdisciplinary work on community issues; 8)flexibility, responsiveness, and sensitivity to external constituencies; 9)scholarship of engagement is visible both internally and externally; 10) promoting a culture of service | quantitative measures based on ratings received after a variety of activities | http://people.brandeis.edu/~burack/Supplemental_Materials__Civic_Engagement_2006.pdf |
| **Monitoring Evaluation Research Process** (n.d.) | Gathers standardised data from the eight participating campuses to provide evidence to lobby the South African National Department of Education to prioritise SL in higher education. | not available | Templates: Described the intended learning outcomes of each SL module; Logic models: set out the approach for analysis of the potential outcomes for each of the parties involved | not directly accessible but see a description and critique of this assessment tool: http://www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/documents/14/Acta_Academica_Supplementum_2005%283%29/13018-07_Mitchell_et_al.pdf |

**Resources Consulted:**

Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement by Furco & Miller

IUPUI website: http://csl.iupui.edu/assessment/accountabilityToolsforCivicEngagement.cfm

Michigan State University website: http://ncsue.msu.edu/

At a Glance by Janet S. Eyler, Dwight E.Giles, Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray

Assessing Institutionalization of Civic Engagement by Cathy Burack & John Saltmarsh

Google Scholar and Google