Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Elective Classification for Community Engagement

2024 First Time Documentation Guide to the Application

How to use this guide

For each of the questions in the application, this guide provides additional clarification, if needed, for what is being asked. It is not primarily providing information about the purpose of each question, nor does it provide specific examples for each question.

For first-time classification, each response is limited to 500 words unless noted otherwise. You are advised not to put web links into responses – reviewers will not check web links. Your response should provide the evidence requested and adding links will simply leave less room for your response.

Data provided: Typically, the data provided in the application should reflect the most recent academic year. Since campuses will be completing the application in academic year 2022-2023, data typically would reflect evidence from AY 2020-2021. Wherever data is requested, please note that COVID has likely impacted data from 2021-2022, 2020-2021, and 2019-2020. Therefore, campuses may use data from the pre-COVID academic year – AY 2018-2019 - if you determine that it provides a better representation of your campus's community engagement. If you do so, please note the academic year that the data represents within the response. If some of your data from COVID years is determined to be an accurate representation of your community engagement, while some is not, then use the best data you have for the question and indicate what AY the data refers to.

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 application, you will have an opportunity to authorize or prohibit the use of this information for other research purposes.

Community Engagement Definition

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defines community engagement as 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.

SECTION 1: Applicant's Contact Information

SECTION 2: Campus, Community, and Community Engagement Context

1. If your campus has an institutionally sanctioned definition of community engagement and related terms, provide them here. Describe the context for the creation of the definition, how it was approved, how it is used, and any evidence of its effectiveness in guiding community engagement on campus. If your campus does not have an institutional definition of community engagement but you are on a campus that has multiple definitions reflecting how different units and disciplines interpret community engagement, provide some description and examples here. If your institution does not have such a definition, please describe any work under way to adopt one.

When institutionalizing community engagement, it is important that there is a clear and shared definition across the campus so that every unit on campus is working towards the same ends. This does not mean that the same terminology has to be used by every unit: community engagement may go by different terminology depending on the academic and community

context. A policy paper from the Academy of Community Engagement Scholarship emphasizes that "while engaged scholarship continues to be termed differently," there remain core "standards and values" that define community engagement: participatory practices, reciprocity, co-construction, democratic practices, shared authority, and shared resources. Regardless of what terminology for community engagement is used on your campus, is it defined by the core standards and values of engagement? This question is asking about how community engagement is understood on your campus. It is also asking about the process that led to either an approved definition or the process that is underway to arrive at a shared definition.

2. Describe your college or university in a way that will help to provide a context to understand how community engagement is enacted. For an institution with multiple campuses, please describe each campus for which you are seeking endorsement. Include descriptors of special type (regional, metropolitan, multi- campus, faith-based, etc.), location, unique history and founding, demographics of student population served, specific institutional priorities, initiatives and other features that distinguish the institution.

The campus context for embracing community engagement as an institutional priority is different for every campus. This question provides you with an opportunity to provide the institutional context of your campus.

3. Describe 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 aligns with the culture and history of the community(ies) partners.

The community context for community engagement is different for every campus. This question provides you with the opportunity to discuss the unique characteristics of the community(ies) that your campus engages with. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptors of special type (regional, urban, etc.), size (population), economic health, unique history, demographics of community population served/employed, and other features that distinguish the institution and community(ies).

4. Describe how community engagement has been structured and shaped at your campus. This may include the institution's founding and history, community requests/demands for campus responsiveness to community issues, leadership priorities, the evolution of community engagement on campus and in communities, institutional culture (e.g., highly decentralized), or any number of longstanding or recent factors including a response to a legacy narrative that may not always have been positive.

This question is asking for information different from that of #2 above. This question is asking about how community engagement is structured on your campus, such as: where does the community engagement unit report to, and is it the way it is because of the way community engagement evolved on the campus? Often, large campuses understand the structures on the campus as being decentralized, so the community engagement work is also decentralized. Or it may be that community engagement is driven by executive leadership on the campus with certain priorities. Or it may be a case of the campus working to improve local community relations and address past isolation from community issues. Whatever it is that fundamentally shapes the structures of community engagement on campus, here is where you can share that information.

5. Describe how community engagement efforts have been impacted by recent national and global events, including the COVID 19 pandemic; greater attention to racial justice; the crisis of decreasing trust in American democracy and institutions; and natural disasters.

A lot has happened since the 2020 classification cycle that impacts not only the overall state of higher education but the state of community engagement – its processes and its central purpose of revitalizing a diverse democracy committed to equity. It is expected that the global pandemic, racial injustice, and global warming has impacted the communities that your campus engages with as well as your campus practices and culture. It is also expected that these events have impacted campuses unevenly. This question offers an opportunity for you to share how external events have impacted the community engagement work of the campus.

SECTION 3: Quality of Community Engagement Relationships

Once the campus and community context has been shared, this section focuses on evidence of engagement – and it is intentional that the first evidence-based section is about community partnerships. The quality of partner relationships is foundational to the application. All of the questions in this section focus on how 1) the standards and values of community engagement explicitly stated in the definition of community engagement from the Carnegie Foundation are enacted, and 2) how campuses are accountable to quality community engagement.

1. Describe specific systematic actions and strategies used to ensure the institution, academic units (colleges, departments), and faculty and staff are building academic-community partnerships that center mutuality and reciprocity. Please provide one example for each of the following categories of practices that indicate mutuality and reciprocity (maximum word count 1000):
    a. how the effectiveness of those actions and strategies are shared with partners.
    b. how the campus ensures that community partners have “significant voice” and input into institutional or departmental planning.
    c. how the systematic data from the feedback and assessment of partnerships is used to improve reciprocity and mutual benefit.

One indicator of mutuality and reciprocity is deep collaboration between the campus and the community partner. This question asks for evidence of how community engagement assessment data is shared with community partners, the extent to which community partners have input into shaping community engagement goals and practices, and how shared data is used to deepen mutuality and reciprocity. While there is often a great deal of activity in this area, this question asks for just one example in each of the sub-question areas.

2. Community engaged campuses collect data about the mutuality of community partnerships. Describe the nature of data your institution collects about community partnerships. Describe how the use of disaggregated partner demographic data (specifically by racial and/or demographic groups) is used in your assessment and planning. Please describe at least two but not more than four examples of how this data is used (maximum word count 1000).

There is a saying that “we measure what we care about.” This question posits that if we care about community partnerships, then we will gather data about the quality of the partnerships and use that data to improve practice. The question also posits that understanding partnerships includes understanding who our partners are (and how that impacts how the campus understands its relationship to the partners). Campuses often have multiple ways to assess partnerships. This question asks you to provide two-to-four salient examples.

3. Provide an example of collective goals that the campus and community have developed and agreed upon to guide community engagement. How are these goals tracked, measured, and reported annually to various stakeholders?

An important practice of mutuality and reciprocity is that community engagement goals and outcomes are determined collectively between those on campus and community partners. This question begins with asking for evidence of collaborative goal setting and ends with how progress towards meeting those goals is measured and shared for collective improvement.

4. Describe how community partners in marginalized communities are compensated for their labor in enriching student learning and faculty research.

This question gets at how campuses value their community partners and what they contribute to the interests of the campus in the areas of faculty research and student learning. It asks the question of what is the value added to the central mission of the campus provided by community partners, and whether that value-added is compensated? This question is not about the benefits accrued by the community partner, say in the area of volunteer hours provided by students, or in research reports provided by faculty. These can be important, but this question gets at monetary compensation provided to the community partner for the benefits gained by the campus. This could, for example, be in the form of a direct payment, like a stipend, or an indirect payment, like tuition remission for community partners to take courses at the campus.

SECTION 4. Academic Community-Campus Partnerships

1. Describe at least five but no more than eight representative examples of partnerships (i.e., institutional, centers, departmental, and faculty/staff) that illustrate both the breadth and depth of community engagement during the most recent academic year.

   Campus questions for each partnership:
   1. Project/Collaboration Title
   2. Community Partner Name
   3. Community Partner Contact
   4. Campus Partner (person, program, department, center, etc.)
   5. Purpose of the Community-Campus Partnership
   6. Provide one example as to how reciprocity is enacted through the partnership
   7. Length of Partnership
   8. Number of faculty involved
   9. Number of staff involved
   10. Number of students involved annually
   11. Titles of Courses Linked to Partnership

12. Grant funding, if relevant
13. Impact on the community
14. Impact on the campus

This question is intended to get a sense of who your community partners are and what community issues shape the partnership. Campuses often have many partners with different levels of engagement with different parts of the campus. There are a few things to keep in mind here: First, choose five to eight partnerships that best represent the wider range of partnership activity. Second, the way that this question is structured around "academic community-campus partnerships" signals the importance that the Carnegie Foundation places on partnerships that are connected to the academic core of the campus – connected with teaching and learning and research. Third, "representative" is not synonymous with longevity. Long-term commitments are important and can be revealed here, but also short-term partnerships may indicate responsiveness to community issues.

This question is also linked to question # 8 in Section 14.

SECTION 5: Institutional Identity and Culture

1. Describe how your campus mission and vision reflect an institutional commitment to community engagement. Provide a quote from the mission and/or vision statement that best represents your institution's commitment to community engagement.

In order to institutionalize community engagement, it has to be easily recognized as central to the campus mission and be something that advances the campus mission. This question is asking whether community engagement on the campus is mission-driven. It is not enough to claim that "community engagement is in our DNA," which is why the question asks for evidence in the form of direct quotes from the formal mission or vision statements of the campus. Almost all campus mission and vision statements can be read as implicitly reflecting institutional commitment to civic development and education for the common good - this question is asking about explicit commitment to community engagement in mission and vision statements.

2. Describe the formal recognitions provided by your institution through campus wide awards and/or celebrations for community engagement.

Activities that are valued on a campus are publicly celebrated, made visible as a valued activity that others might emulate, and recognized by awards and ceremonies that create opportunities for celebration and visibility. In the response to this question, you can talk about who is being recognized (students, faculty staff, community partners – or all of these) and what they are being recognized for (community service, service-learning, participatory research). Also, do not confuse this question with later questions about faculty rewards. The application distinguishes between *awards* and *rewards* in positing that awards are relatively easy to enact but may not indicate a change in campus culture, whereas faculty rewards are part of the incentive system for faculty advancement and reflect core values of the academic culture on the campus.

3. Describe how community engagement is defined and planned for in the institutional strategic plan and provide quoted examples from the strategic plan that demonstrate a

clear definition and specified steps for achieving deep and pervasive community engagement at your institution.

It is one thing to claim that the campus values community engagement, but it is something quite different to back up that claim with plans for intentional implementation. This question is asking for evidence that there is a connection between the campus mission embracing community engagement and ensuring that it is a strategic priority for the campus. The question has within it a few things worth paying attention to. First, it asks for evidence directly from the strategic plan. Second, it asks whether there is a shared definition of community engagement in the strategic plan (in other words, is it clear what is being implemented?). Third, it asks about implementation – how are the strategic priorities going to be enacted? Finally, the framing around "deep and pervasive" gets at institutionalization: is this a plan for community engagement to take place in one area of the campus or in a few departments/disciplines, or is this an institution-wide priority with strategic institution-wide implementation?

4. Describe how community engagement is emphasized as part of the institution's brand message identity or framework.

All campuses present themselves publicly in a way that creates an identity for the campus – what they want to be known for in a way that distinguishes them from other campuses. This question is asking about the construction of that identity and where community engagement fits in that intentional messaging. This kind of brand messaging usually takes place in a wide array of outlets, for example, in public marketing materials, websites, etc.

5. Describe how executive leadership of the institution (president, chancellor, provost, chief diversity officer, trustees, etc.) explicitly promote community engagement as a priority.

For the success of any significant initiative on campus, leadership matters – it's not the only thing that makes a difference, but it is essential. This question is asking for evidence that the executive leadership of the campus is (for example) publicly shaping the way community engagement is understood and enacted on campus; is making it visible and communicating its importance to the campus; is reinforcing the centrality of community engagement to the campus identity; and/or is validating the community engagement activity that is being enacted on campus.

SECTION 6: Infrastructure and Finance

For questions 1-3 in this section, provide evidence of the level of institutional commitment to community engagement in terms of dedicated financial resources. Identify the ongoing costs of the infrastructure described in #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.

1. Describe the structure, staffing, and purpose of the campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, network or coalition of centers, etc.) to support and advance

community engagement. 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.

In understanding the institutionalization of community engagement, it has been long been demonstrated that some kind of enabling mechanism is needed to assure that it is embedded in the core academic work of the campus. The application refers to this mechanism as a "coordinating infrastructure." The framing of "coordinating infrastructure" suggests that it is an office or center that itself is dedicated to advancing community engagement activity and that it serves as a unit that coordinates and facilitates community activity across the campus, particularly in academic work, or in faculty teaching and research. On some engaged campuses, there may be more than one center facilitating community engagement. If this is the case, then the "coordinating infrastructure" question becomes one of the extent to which the work of the various centers is coordinated, and how that coordination happens. In answering this question, be sure to describe the mission and purpose of the center(s), how it is staffed and resourced, and where the center(s) is located (its reporting line).

2. Describe the internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with the community. Describe whether the sources of these funds are permanent or temporary. Describe how budget shortfalls may have impacted funding for community engagement.

Resources say a lot about commitment. This question is asking about campus budgets dedicated to community engagement (not for any activity external to the campus, but for community engagement activity). It is asking not only about the center, but also other units and activities that support community engagement. Is community engagement funded through operational funds (on-going budget line items), through grant funding (temporary) or some combination of both – and if both, what is the mix? Both public and private campuses have been impacted by financial challenges from the global pandemic in addition to the structural challenges of higher education funding generally. And, as with the 2007 economic downturn, the impact has not typically been linear; perhaps cuts occurred and now finances are being restored. This question provides the opportunity to discuss how community engagement is funded and the challenges that funding has faced.

3. Describe any strategic fundraising efforts or external funding (grants) specifically undertaken to support community engagement and identify any specific endowments earmarked for community engagement.

This question is different than #2 in that it is not asking about budgets and finances, but about fundraising and grant-getting. This is where you can provide evidence of community engagement being an explicit part of a campus capital campaign, or where individual donors have contributed for the specific purpose of supporting community engagement either with one-time funds or through the creation of an endowment specifically for community engagement, or where the campus was successful in obtaining a grant specifically for community engagement activity.

4. Describe any specific community investments made by the institution and/or the business practices adopted by the institution that complement and align with community engagement efforts. Provide at least two but not more than four examples from the following practices (maximum word count 1000):
    a. Description of how the business operations of the campus align with local economic and community development agendas through hiring, purchasing, and procurement.
    b. Description of the specific mechanisms that are employed to assure community benefit when the campus is involved in local property acquisition and real estate development.
    c. Description of the campus's participation in a local Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) program.

Every campus operates not only as an educational enterprise, but also as a corporate enterprise. This question is getting at how those two sides of the campus align around community engagement and aim to mitigate when community engagement and business practices may be in conflict. For example, it is not atypical for a campus's community engagement activities focused on housing issues to be directly in conflict with the campus's land acquisition, contributing to gentrification and creating housing insecurity for low-income families and individuals. When campuses claim an institutional identity around community engagement, they are often intentional about aligning the business practices of the campus with the community engagement educational practices. That alignment can be expressed in many ways, which is what the sub-questions about hiring, purchasing, procurement, community benefits agreements, and PILOTs are asking.

5. Describe the ways that your campus provides unencumbered financial resources to local communities of color and/or other historically marginalized communities.

It is not unusual for a campus to be an island of wealth in a local ocean of poverty. This is true in both urban and rural America. This question is asking about whether and how the campus is investing its financial resources (not the in-kind resources of its faculty, staff, and students, or monetized student volunteer hours) in local communities where organizations and individuals in those communities determine how the resources will be spent.

SECTION 7: Institutional (Campus-Wide) Tracking, Monitoring, and Assessment

The purpose of the questions in this section is to estimate the sustainability of community engagement by looking at the ways the institution monitors and records community 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.

1. Describe the mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution's engagement with community. Who is responsible for gathering data, how is the data managed, how often is it gathered, and how is the data used?

This question specifically is asking about systematic assessment. What the Carnegie Foundation means by "systematic assessment" is that there are systems in place for assessing community engagement – on-going, permanent processes for gathering data, and ongoing, regular processes for making sense of the data to inform practice and drive improvement. This question specifically asks about systems that provide data about what those in the community think about how the campus is engaging with the community. The second part of the question is about the assessment process – how the data is gathered (which individual or office is responsible?) and how often is the data gathered, how the data is managed (how is it compiled, how is it shared and with whom?), and how is the data used (what is the purpose of collecting this assessment data and is informing improvement related to that purpose?).

2. Describe how the institution maintains systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation to record and/or track engagement with the community. Who is responsible for gathering data, how is the data managed, how often is it gathered, and how is the data used?

This question is asking about the tools (often software) that allow for the tracking of activity (by students, staff, and/or faculty who are engaged with the community). The second part of the question is about the tracking or documentation process – how the data is gathered (which individual or office is responsible) and how often is the data gathered, how the data is managed (how is it compiled, how is it shared and with whom), and how is the data used (what is the purpose of tracking these activities).

3. For your institution, what are the standards of high-quality community engagement that the campus aspires towards and how were those standards determined (who was involved, what was the process, and how are they implemented)?

One of the methodological limitations of the Elective Classification for Community Engagement is that while it gathers evidence about campus community engagement that has taken place, the questions are not able to get at whether that engagement was of high quality. This question is one way to address that limitation by asking about how your campus determines what quality community engagement is and how those quality standards are put into practice.

4. Describe any campus-wide assessments or self-study of community engagement (not including this application) that has taken place in the last five years and how it was used to advance the depth and pervasiveness of community engagement at your institution.

Often, either because of the length of time between classification cycles, or because of other institutional assessments (such as accreditation), campuses look for tools to help them assess their community engagement activity or may bring outside consultants to help with assessment.

This question asks whether your campus has undertaken any kind of assessment of community engagement within the last five years, what the campus learned from the assessment, and how practice has been reinforced or changed. Campuses that did a Campus Compact Civic Action Plan (CAP) can use that as a tool.

5. Describe how the institution aggregates and uses all its assessment data related to community engagement. Who is responsible for gathering data, how is the data managed, how often is it gathered, and how is the data used?

Assessment of community engagement is only worthwhile if the findings are used to drive improved practice. This question moves beyond the collection of data to how different data sources are brought together across the campus (from understanding partnership perceptions, to student, staff, and faculty activity, and more), how meaning is made from the data, and how a holistic understanding of the community engagement assessment data is used to improve campus practices.

SECTION 8: Outcomes and Impacts

The purpose of the questions in this section is to gather evidence of how community engagement affects four key entities: students, community partners, faculty, and the campus. 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. This is the section to report data resulting from institutional tracking, monitoring, and assessment of community engagement.

Outcomes are the short-term and intermediate changes that occur in learners, program participants, etc., as a direct result of a 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, and when outcomes are not achieved it may be time to analyze why.

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 part of a collective impact strategy.

1. Provide an example of institutional, departmental, and/or programmatic learning outcomes for students who participate in for-credit courses that are community engaged, and describe one key finding.

This question focuses specifically on learning outcomes. While there may be co-curricular learning outcomes on your campus, this question is specifically about learning outcomes that are expected from community engagement courses. These community engagement learning outcomes may be specified at the institutional level (for example, as part of the general education curriculum) or they may be community engagement learning outcomes in a department or major, or they may be tied to a community engagement program (for example, a leadership program that involves students from across majors) – or a combination of these. The question is structured in a way that presumes (see question 2 below) that if learning outcomes are being named, then they are also being measured – and the question asks what has been learned from the assessment of community engagement learning outcomes.

2. Describe how institutional, departmental, and/or programmatic learning outcomes for students who participate in for-credit courses that are community engaged are systematically assessed. Include the strategy and mechanisms for assessment in your description.

For the community engagement learning outcomes tied to courses, how are those outcomes assessed? In other words, how does the campus know that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes of their community engagement courses? How does the assessment happen on an on-going basis? What are the artifacts produced by the students that are assessed? How does that assessment of the artifacts happen – what is the assessment process, and who is involved?

3. Provide examples of changes made to for-credit courses that are community engaged based on the results of institutional, departmental, and/or programmatic learning outcomes assessment.

Based on the assessment processes described in the answers to questions 1 and 2 above, what has been an outcome of that assessment – how has what was learned in the assessment process about the extent to which students were achieving the desired community engagement learning outcomes had an effect on practice?

4. Provide an example of a systematic, campus-wide, mechanism for assessing student achievement of institutional community engagement learning outcomes for students who participate in co-curricular experiences that are community engaged, and describe one key finding of each.

Just as there can be community engagement learning outcomes tied to courses, there can also be community engagement learning outcomes for co-curricular experiences. This question is structured in a way that presumes that if learning outcomes are being named, then they are also being measured – and the question asks what has been learned from the assessment of community engagement learning outcomes.

5. Provide an example of a systematic, campus-wide, assessment mechanism for assessing community engagement outcomes and impacts on community indicators and describe one key finding of each.

The question asks about what you know about outcomes and impacts for the community(ies) that those on the campus partner with. It asks for a specific example of a systematic (on-going, permanent processes for gathering data, and ongoing, regular processes for making sense of the data to inform practice and drive improvement) campus-wide assessment mechanism that provides information about the outcomes and impacts in the community and at least one thing that has been learned about the outcomes and impacts in the community from the campus engagement activities.

6. Provide an example of a systematic, campus-wide, mechanism for assessing community engagement outcomes and impacts on faculty and describe one key finding of each.

This question asks about what you know about outcomes and impacts for faculty who participate in community engagement. It asks for a specific example of a systematic (on-going, permanent processes for gathering data, and ongoing, regular processes for making sense of the data to inform practice and drive improvement) campus-wide assessment mechanism that provides information about the outcomes and impacts for faculty and at least one thing that has been learned about the outcomes and impacts for faculty from the campus engagement activities.

7. Provide an example of a systematic, campus-wide, mechanism for assessing community engagement outcomes and impacts on the campus and describe one key finding of each.

This question asks about what you know about outcomes and impacts for the campus from its community engagement activities. It asks for a specific example of a systematic (on-going, permanent processes for gathering data, and ongoing, regular processes for making sense of the data to inform practice and drive improvement) campus-wide assessment mechanism that provides information about the outcomes and impacts on the campus and at least one thing that has been learned about the outcomes and impacts on the campus from community engagement activities.

8. Describe how the institution uses and disseminates data from the mechanisms described in questions 4-7 above and provide an example.

Having asked about the outcomes and impacts of community engagement for students, community partners, faculty, and the campus, and having asked for one key finding in each area based on systematic assessment, this question asks what happens with the findings in each area – how are the findings used, who are the findings shared with, and how are the findings used to improve practice?

9. According to data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), community engaged teaching and learning (service learning, community-based learning) is the only “high impact” practice in which students of color have higher participation rates than white students. Provide an example of how your campus disaggregates student data by race, ethnicity, gender, and other identity-based demographics to understand who is participating in community engaged courses and how their outcomes may differ.

Because high impact practices as identified through the NSSE have what is referred to as a "compensatory effect" where "historically underserved students tend to benefit more…than majority students," it is important to be able to understand which students on campus are participating in community engaged learning and what opportunities are made available to them and at what point in their years of study. This question asks for an example of how student data is disaggregated so that the campus can make sure that high impact learning experiences are made available to the students who benefit most from them.

10. Research indicates that the academic success of minoritized students is enhanced by increased opportunities to take courses with faculty who share a minoritized social identity because of the potential of shared experiences in learning - faculty who represent ethnic, racial, gender, and cultural diversity. Further, research shows that women and faculty of color are more likely to bring active and collaborative teaching approaches into their courses, such as community engaged courses. Provide an example of how your campus disaggregates faculty and student data by race, ethnicity, gender, or other identity-based demographics to understand who is participating in community engaged courses and the effect of community engagement.

Building on the question above, this question asks if there are mechanisms in place that provide disaggregated data on the race, ethnicity, gender, and other identity-based demographics of both faculty and students who participate in community engaged courses. In order for community engagement to be institutionalized in ways that advance equity, then the data collected to assess its outcomes and impacts needs to be disaggregated in order to identify where equity gaps exist.

SECTION 9: Faculty and Staff

Scholarly work that uses "community engaged approaches and methods" refers to community engagement as part of teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service.

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.

1. Describe 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 seek to develop or deepen community engaged approaches and methods.

In order for community engagement to be embedded into the academic culture of the campus, faculty need the knowledge and skills to implement it effectively. Typically, community engaged approaches to teaching and research have not been part of faculty socialization into their disciplinary or professional communities. Therefore, faculty development is essential in offering faculty opportunities to develop the competencies for high quality community engagement. The kind of faculty development offered may be structured differently depending on faculty rank and tenure status.

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 community engagement support services and goals, describe at least two but not more than four examples from the following practices, as they specifically relate to community engagement (maximum word count 1000):

   Professional development programs
   Facilitation of partnerships
   Remote/on-line community engagement
   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
   Support for peer-reviewed publishing about community engagement
   Training to understand diversity, inclusion, and equity related to community engagement

Related to the question above, this question is aimed at identifying which of the professional development opportunities for building faculty capacity to implement high quality community engagement are available on campus – asking for evidence of at least two but not more than four examples.

3. Describe any 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 and cite at least one example:

This question gets at one part of building a faculty culture of community engagement – attracting faculty for whom community engagement is either part of their scholarly identity or faculty who are seeking to implement community engagement into their scholarly roles. How does the campus signal the importance of community engagement through its public, highly visible search processes?

4. Indicate the campus approach to faculty tenure and promotion: (Check all that apply)

☐ My campus has a contract structure rather than a tenure and promotions structure.
☐ My campus has a tenure and promotion structure defined at the department level.
☐ My campus has a tenure and promotion structure defined at the school level.
☐ My campus has a tenure and promotion structure defined at the institutional level.

Campuses differ greatly in the way faculty positions are structured. The first part of this question asks about whether the predominant faculty structure is one that is probationary leading to tenure or one that is contractual without the possibility of tenure. The second part of the question is asking about where the criteria and guidelines for tenure and promotion (including promotion for non-tenure track faculty) is defined – is it in departmental guidelines and criteria, at the school or college level within a university, or at the institutional level (or perhaps some combination of the three)?

5. Describe the policies for faculty promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) from any level of the institution (campus, college or school, department) 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, research, and clinical faculty, please describe those as well.

A strong indicator of institutionalization of community engagement into faculty culture is that there are policies and guidelines explicitly rewarding community engagement. This question builds on the one above and asks for a description of the faculty reward policies explicitly rewarding community engagement from any level at the institution.

6. Provide the text of the policy for faculty promotion, reappointment, bonuses and/or merit pay (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) from any level of the institution that specifically reward faculty for the following. Specify if these policies are different for faculty of different employment statuses (adjunct, full-time contract, tenure track, tenured, etc.).
    1. Community engaged teaching and learning (maximum word count 500):
    2. Community engaged research and creative activity (maximum word count 500):
    3. Community engagement as a form of service (maximum word count 500):

This question builds on the one above and asks that you provide the specific text rewarding community engagement from any level of the campus that makes explicit whether community engagement is rewarded as a part of faculty research, teaching, or service.

7. Describe the pervasiveness of the policies outlined in question six. For example, are they practiced across the institution? By most departments? By a few?

Now that you have provided information on the faculty structure at your institution and where faculty reward policies are employed at different levels in the institution, as well as how community engagement is rewarded as part of the faculty roles, this question is asking you to describe how widespread these policies rewarding faculty for community engagement are – do they apply to all faculty at the campus, to faculty in a particular school or college, or to faculty in a department or set of departments?

8. Cite three examples of college/school and/or department-level policies, with text taken directly from policy documents, that specifically reward faculty for community engagement across teaching, research, and service.

A strong indicator of institutionalization of community engagement into faculty culture is that there are policies and guidelines explicitly valuing community engagement closest to the disciplinary and professional academic units of the faculty member. This question asks for evidence of faculty rewards for community engagement within the academic home of the faculty member.

9. Describe any revisions to the promotion and tenure (at tenure granting institutions) guidelines to reward faculty for community engaged teaching and learning, research, creative activity, and service. Describe when the revisions occurred and the process resulting in the revisions. Describe the involvement of the president/chancellor, provost, deans, chairs, faculty leaders, chief diversity officer, community engagement center director, or other key leaders. Describe any products resulting from the process; i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc. Specify if these policies are different for faculty of different employment statuses (adjunct, full-time contract, tenure track, tenured, etc.).

If there are faculty reward policies in place that specifically reward faculty for community engagement, it is very likely that those policies are there because there was a deliberate process of policy revision to include them. This question is asking you to describe, in as much detail as possible, how that revision process occurred.

10. If revisions have not taken place but there is 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, describe the current work in progress, including a description of the process and who is involved. Describe how the president/chancellor, vice presidents/chancellors, provost, vice provosts, deans, chairs, faculty leaders, chief diversity officer, community engagement center director, or other key leaders are involved. Also describe any products resulting from the process; i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc. Specify if these policies are different for faculty of different employment statuses (adjunct, full-time contract, tenure track, tenured, etc.).

Because faculty reward policies are artifacts of faculty culture, and because culture change is inherently a slow process, this question is asking about where your campus is in that culture change process. While there is not an expectation that all community engaged campuses have completed the process of revising their faculty reward policies to specifically reward community engagement, there is the expectation that there has been some activity on campus that addresses the need for revision and begins to formulate a process for achieving those revisions.

11. Provide 5-10 examples of **staff** professional activity (conference presentation, publication, consulting, awards, etc.) - a title may not convey how the example is about community engagement, so please provide a short description of how the activity is related to community engagement (maximum word count 1000).

Professional staff on campus whose position is focused on advancing community engagement, often referred to as community engagement professionals, contribute to developing scholarship in the field of community engagement. This question is specifically about the intellectual and scholarly contributions of community engagement staff.

12. Provide 5-10 examples of **faculty** scholarship from as many different disciplines as possible - a title may not convey how the example is about community engagement, so please provide a short description of how the activity is related to community engagement (maximum word count 1000).

Use the answer to this question to provide a broad summary of the ways in which faculty are producing community engaged scholarship. The question is asking about a variety of examples that indicate the pervasiveness of this scholarship by faculty from across the campus. It also asks that for whatever evidence is provided, that there is a brief description about what makes it community engaged.

13. Describe the ways in which the tenure and promotion process, and the staff reward process, accounts for the often-racialized nature of community engagement that disproportionately impacts faculty, staff, students and communities of color.

It is not uncommon that faculty reward policies embody notions about “excellence” that are constructed from a white, patriarchal, Euro-centric belief system, creating systems of epistemic marginalization and exclusion for scholars from non-dominant groups. There is considerable evidence that historically marginalized faculty and staff – faculty and staff of color and women – are more likely than their white and male counterparts to pursue community engaged forms of scholarship and to view the academic profession as an opportunity to influence social change. There is also evidence that these same community engaged faculty of color assume disproportionate, unrecognized labor in advising students of color and in providing service to the institution in assisting it in achieving its diversity, inclusion, and equity roles, all of which absorbs time that predominantly white faculty devote to research and teaching in response to the incentives of the reward structure. This question asks how the campus is acknowledging and addressing the epistemic marginalization of certain scholarship and scholars as well as acknowledging and addressing unrecognized labor of community engaged faculty of color and its implications for the ability of these scholars to thrive at the institution.

SECTION 10: Curricular Engagement

1. Provide the definition used for community engaged courses, the standard and required components for designation of community engaged courses, and the process through which the institution assures fidelity to the definition in those courses.

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 term “community engaged courses” is used in the application to denote academically-based community engaged courses. Other terms may be used by campuses, including service-learning, community-based learning, public service courses, etc.

This question is foundational to understanding the degree to which community engagement is part of the instructional culture of credit-bearing courses across the campus – the extent to which it pervades teaching and learning, and, thus, faculty work in curriculum and pedagogy as well as student learning. The question asks how community engagement is defined; in other words, without some parameters, any kind of teaching and learning that in any way involves the community could be considered. Additionally, it asks how that definition is connected to a course designation. In other words, how is it decided that a course is community engaged – is it through some process of designation or is it up to a faculty or staff member to claim that a course is community engaged? Without knowing both how community engaged courses are defined and designated, then it is not possible to know the validity of any quantification of community engaged courses.

2. Complete the table below. Data should be drawn from undergraduate and graduate for-credit courses and be indicated accordingly. Please also indicate what academic year the data represents:

Number of for-credit community engaged designated courses (UG/G)	
Percentage of community engaged designated courses as part of all for-credit courses(UG/G)	
Number of faculty teaching for-credit community engaged designated courses	
Percentage of faculty teaching for-credit community engaged designated courses as part of all faculty	
Of the faculty teaching for-credit community engaged designated courses, what percentage are full-time?	
Of the faculty teaching for-credit community engaged designated courses, what percentage are part time?	
Of the faculty teaching for-credit community engaged designated courses, what percentage are tenured or tenure-track?	
Number of academic departments offering for-credit community engaged designated	

courses	
Percentage of academic departments offering for-credit community engaged designated courses as part of all departments	
Number of students enrolled in for-credit courses community engaged designated courses (UG/G)	
Percentage of students enrolled in for-credit courses community engaged designated courses as part of all students (UG/G)	

What academic year does this data represent? (Select One)
[Dropdown Menu: 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22]

Based on the definition and designation from question 1, this set of questions is asking for you to share your data about community engaged courses, the number of faculty (full and part time) who teach these courses, and the number of students who are enrolled in these courses. It also asks for data about departments that offer community engaged courses. These questions also allow you to distinguish between undergraduate and graduate courses.

3. Describe how the data in the table above were derived. How was it gathered, by whom, with what frequency, and for what purpose? Reflect on how the data indicates the levels of pervasiveness and depth community engagement is infused in the curriculum.

This question is grounded in the assumption that there is a definition of community engaged courses that is tied to a course designation process, producing valid data for assessing community engagement in the curriculum. Based on that assumption, this question asks about the details for how the data for understanding curricular engagement is gathered. It also asks you to reflect on your data and what it tells you about the extent to which community engagement is embedded in faculty teaching and student learning across the campus.

4. Describe how community engaged courses are noted on student academic transcripts.

Building on the questions above, this question asks about how community engaged courses show up as academic work on student transcripts.

5. Describe how community engagement is integrated into traditional curricular structures by providing at least two but not more than four examples from the following categories (maximum word count 1000):

   Core Courses
   Capstone (Senior-level project)
   First-Year Sequence
   General Education

In the Majors
In the Minors
Graduate courses
Medical education/training/residencies

This question is about where in the curriculum community engaged courses are situated. You do not need to provide a comprehensive inventory here – the question asks for at least two, and no more than four, examples across all of the curricular structures in the question.

6. Describe how community engagement is integrated into the following academic activities offered for credit and/or required by a curricular program by providing one or two examples from the following categories:

Student Research
Student Leadership
Internships, Co-ops, Career exploration
Study Abroad/Study Away
Alternative Break tied to a course
Campus Scholarship Program

In addition to the curricular structures listed in question 5, there are many campuses that also attach credit bearing curriculum to programs that have community engagement components. The question asks for evidence of for-credit activities – for example, a leadership program might have a required community engagement component, but there is not a course or credit involved; in that case it is not appropriate evidence for this question. Again, this question is not asking for a comprehensive inventory of activities; provide one or two examples total across all of the activities listed.

SECTION 11: Co-Curricular Engagement

Co-curricular Engagement describes structured learning that happens outside the formal for-credit academic curriculum through training, 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. Describe how community engagement is integrated into institutional co-curricular practices by providing at least two but not more than four examples from the following categories (maximum word count 1000):

   Social Innovation/entrepreneurship
   Community service projects - outside of the campus
   Community service projects - within the campus
   Alternative break - domestic
   Alternative break - international
   Student leadership
   Student internships/co-ops/career exploration
   Student research

Work-study placements
Opportunities to meet with employers who demonstrate Corporate Social Responsibility
Living-learning communities/residence hall/floor
Student teaching assistants (provided the TAs are not receiving credit)
Campus Scholarship Program
Athletics
Greek Life

Community engagement is often part of programming outside of academic courses. This question asks about the co-curricular activities on campus that have community engagement integrated into them. The question asks for at least two but not more than four examples across all of the activities listed.

2. Describe any co-curricular engagement tracking system used by your institution that can provide a co-curricular transcript or record of community engagement.

For the co-curricular activities that include a community engagement component, this question asks how those activities are tracked, and whether documenting students' co-curricular community engagement is compiled into a co-curricular transcript.

SECTION 12: Pathways for Student Development and Learning Through Community Engagement

1. Describe the curricular and co-curricular developmental pathways through which students can progress to increasingly complex forms of community engagement over time.

This question is asking whether there are clear roadmaps for students to guide them through a progression of community engagement activities as they progress through their undergraduate experience. For an example of a developmental pathway, is a freshman student who participates in a community service activity as part of orientation provided with a set of community engagement opportunities within the curriculum and in the co-curriculum for their first year, for continued community engagement opportunities both inside and outside the curriculum after having declared a major, through to additional opportunities leading to a community engaged capstone experience?

2. Provide a narrative that speaks broadly to involvement of students in community engagement, such as the ways students have leadership roles in community engagement (give examples), or decision-making roles students have on campus related to community engagement (planning, implementation, assessment, or other). How is student leadership in community engagement recognized (awards, notation on transcript, etc.)?

Oftentimes, part of the deepening of students' community engagement comes through their ability to take on leadership roles in community engagement programs. This can have multiple dimensions to it. This question asks you to provide a narrative of how this works on your campus.

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

This question is asking to what extent students on your campus are provided scaffolded community engagement opportunities as they progress through their undergraduate experience. If you are a medical or professional program how are your students provided scaffolded community engagement experiences in their training.

SECTION 13: Community Engagement and other Institutional Initiatives

1. Indicate if community engagement is intentionally and explicitly aligned with or directly contributes to any of the following additional institutional priorities: (In Table - Check all that apply)
    a. campus diversity, inclusion, and equity goals (for students and faculty)
    b. efforts aimed at student retention and success
    c. encouraging and measuring student voter registration and voting
    d. development of skills and competencies to engage in dialogue about controversial social, political, or ethical issues across the curriculum and in co-curricular programming
    e. social innovation or social entrepreneurship that reflects the principles and practices of community engagement
    f. the campus institutional review board (IRB) provides specific guidance for researchers regarding human subject protections for community engaged research
    g. efforts that support federally funded grants for Broader Impacts of Research activities of faculty and students
    h. outreach activities
    i. lifelong learning (non-credit)
    j. campus food security programs (internal and external)

For community engaged campuses, it is typical that community engagement is one among a number of campus priorities. This question is asking about how community engagement as a priority is intentionally connected with other priorities. What is meant by "intentionally connected" is that community engagement is purposely used as a way to achieve the success of a priority (conversely, it does not mean that, in hindsight, community engagement happens to be associated with a particular practice).

2. Describe at least two but not more than four examples from question one, including lessons learned and improvements made over the past two years (maximum word count 1000).

For the institutional priorities above that are intentionally connected to community engagement, provide at least two but not more than four examples; what does that intentional connection look like in practice?

SECTION 14: Reflection and Additional Information

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

This is an opportunity for you to analytically think about the process you have been through to complete this application, and what some of the key things that you have learned for the process.

2. During the process of completing the application, did your campus work with a consultant, attend a workshop/webinar, or utilize other resources? If yes, what resources were utilized? This is also an opportunity to provide feedback on those resources.

3. (Optional) Reflect on who was around the table, who was missing, representation of the community members, and how might these voices have improved this report.

4. (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).

5. (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.

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

7. 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 the Carnegie Foundation, its administrative partners, and other higher education researchers. 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. We encourage you to indicate your consent below to advance research on community engagement.

Please respond to A, B, or C below:

A. I consent to having the information provided in the application used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, the identity of my campus will not be disclosed.

B. I consent to having the information provided in the application used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, I also agree that the identity of my campus may be revealed.

C. I do not consent to having the information provided in the application used for research purposes.

8. Before you submit your final application, please provide a list of community partners that should receive the partnership survey. Include the partners described in Section 4, but you may include additional partners up to a total of 15 (see guide for partnership survey information).

a. Partner Organization Name
b. Partner Organization Contact Full Name
c. Partner Organization Contact Email Address

This question is linked to a survey of community partners. This is an opportunity for the classification to bring community voice into the process. In order to do this in a way that attempts to get authentic, candid feedback from community partners, the community partners are assured of confidentiality in their responses. Survey responses will not be shared with the campus. **At the time you submit your application**, your community partners will be contacted.

In the 2020 cycle, a pilot was initiated to collect information from community partners. This information was enlightening. Although partnership survey responses were not used in an evaluative manner in this pilot, reviewers found that the partner responses generally validated the broader assessment of a campus indicating a strong relationship between the variety of other indicators in the application framework and the likelihood of strong partnership.For the 2024 cycle, partnership survey responses will be used in an evaluative manner as part of the holistic review process.

The community partners that you identify will be sent a short survey with the following questions:

Dear community organization partnering with a college or university,

{Name of Campus} is in the process of applying for the 2024 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 were provided your email address by the campus applying for the Community Engagement Classification. The Community Engagement classification is offered by the Carnegie Foundation and is available to all colleges and universities in the United States. For more information about the classification, please go to https://carnegieelectiveclassifications.org.

We would like to ask you to assist with this classification process by providing confidential responses to a very brief online survey. While your participation in the survey is entirely voluntary, your input and perspective on the activity are valuable in evaluating campus community engagement. Beyond the evaluation of campus community engagement, the responses provided by community partners contributes to a national understanding of how communities and campuses are collaborating for the purpose of deepening the quality and impact of such partnerships.

In order to be able to assess and improve partnership activities, it is important to provide candid responses to the questions. The responses you provide are confidential and will not be shared with your partner campus.

Many thanks for your response.

Sincerely,

The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Team

Survey Questions

The survey will include the definition of community engagement from the Carnegie Foundation. Exact language of the survey follows:

As a community partner, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your collaboration with this institution? (1= Strongly disagree, 4=Strongly agree)

1. *As a partner, I feel that my organization and I are recognized by the campus.*
2. *I am asked about my perceptions of the institution's engagement with and impact on the community.*
3. *My experience, knowledge, and opinions are valued in this partnership.*
4. *I am involved in important campus conversations that impact my community.*
5. *The faculty and/or staff in our community partnership try to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.*
6. *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.*
7. *Our partnership with the campus is having a positive impact on my community.*
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.*

Please indicate whether you consent to having your responses used for research purposes by the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. For research purposes, all responses will be aggregated, and no individual partner or campus information will be identified. If you have any questions, please contact us via email: info@carnegieelectiveclassifications.org.

Please respond to A or B:

A. I consent to having the information provided in the survey used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, the identity of my organization will not be disclosed.

B. I do not consent to having the information provided in the survey used for research purposes.