

ISSN (Online) 2162-9161



# EJOURNAL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

VOLUME 8 | ISSUE 3

## **Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

**John Saltmarsh**  
University of Massachusetts Boston

### **Author Note**

John Saltmarsh, Department of Leadership in Education, University of Massachusetts Boston.

Correspondence regarding this introduction should be addressed to John Saltmarsh, Professor of Higher Education, College of Education and Human Development, University of Massachusetts Boston. E-mail: john.saltmarsh@umb.edu

## Background

Increasingly, universities are called upon to mobilize their intellectual and human capacity to address needs in their communities and beyond. In addition to the creation of a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure and strategic approach, it is important to account for the significant variation in, and quality of, community engagement that exists across academic units at a university. The unit of a college/school within a university should be developed as the locus of faculty and student engagement, and the proximity of engagement efforts to an academic unit emphasizes the importance of community engagement through teaching and learning and in faculty scholarship. Colleges/schools within a university often have their own well-developed missions and goals embracing community engagement; can be seen as hubs for innovation, pathways, or strategies for engagement; and have their own natural disciplinary base within the community for engagement.

Based upon a review of the literature on community engagement in higher education, organizational change, and the scholarship of engagement, this organizational assessment rubric is designed to be used by the unit of a college to examine structures, policies, and practices, with the goal of advancing community engagement within the college for the purposes of self-assessment and strategic planning.

## Key definitions

In the context of this rubric, *community engagement* refers to relationships between those in the college and those outside the college 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 transdisciplinary (i.e., related to knowledge transcending the disciplines and the college) and asset-based (i.e., related to valid and legitimate knowledge that exists outside the college). Transdisciplinary and asset-based frameworks and approaches impact both pedagogy and scholarship. They also inform an organizational logic that colleges will need to change their policies, practices, structures, and culture in order to enact engagement and support scholars involved in community-engaged teaching and learning and community-engaged knowledge generation.

This framing of community engagement aligns with the definition provided by the Carnegie Foundation for their Community Engagement Classification:

*Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.*

*The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.*

The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification is intended to provide institution-wide assessment, whereas this college self-assessment rubric is aimed more specifically at an academic unit. Therefore, there is particular emphasis on the core academic activities of teaching and learning and scholarship. For many colleges, the academic culture, and the incentives for faculty conveyed through that culture, emphasizes the importance of scholarship and creative activity. Therefore, to guide the use of the rubric, scholarship is community-engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships and addresses public purposes. Community-engaged scholarship (CES) is characterized by creative intellectual work based on a high level of professional expertise, the significance of which can be validated by peers and which enhances the fulfillment of the mission of the campus/college/department. CES meets the standards of research when it involves inquiry,

---

## Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University

---

advances knowledge, is disseminated, and is open to review and critique by relevant academic, community, and/or professional peers. Community-engaged research conceptualizes “community groups” as all those outside of academe and requires shared authority at all stages of the research process, from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the research, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer evaluation. Research is community-engaged when faculty, students, community-based organizations, government agencies, policymakers, and/or other actors collaborate to identify areas of inquiry, design studies and/or creative activities, implement activities that contribute to shared learning and capacity building, disseminate findings, and make recommendations or develop initiatives for change.

The rubric provides three stages of progress—Emerging, Developing, and Transforming—with space left for identifying evidence for their assessment. The stages of the rubric are described as follows:

**Stage 1: Emerging.** At this stage, a college is beginning to recognize community engagement as a strategic priority and is building a college-wide constituency for the effort.

**Stage 2: Developing.** At this stage a college is focused on ensuring the development of its institutional capacity and the capacity of individuals to sustain the community-engagement effort.

**Stage 3: Transforming.** At this stage a college has fully institutionalized community engagement into its fabric, and it has mechanisms in place to ensure progress and sustainability, continuing to assess its progress and achievements as it looks toward the future.

**Indicators.** Evidence of change in policy, practices, structures, and culture.

**Components of the rubric<sup>1</sup>**

The self-assessment rubric contains eight dimensions, each of which includes a set of components that characterize the dimension. The eight dimensions of the rubric and their respective components are listed here.

<b>DIMENSION</b>		<b>COMPONENTS</b>
<b>I.</b>	<b>Leadership and Direction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hiring criteria for dean and chairs</li> <li>• Leadership development opportunities for dean and chairs</li> <li>• Faculty council that meets regularly and advises college decision making on engagement and resources</li> <li>• Advisory Leadership Council that includes community partners, faculty, staff, and students</li> </ul>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Mission and Vision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulation in mission and vision statements</li> <li>• Definition of community-engaged scholarship (CES)</li> <li>• Strategic planning</li> <li>• Alignment with institutional mission</li> <li>• Alignment with educational innovations</li> <li>• Alignment with accreditation</li> <li>• Alignment with complimentary strategic priorities (i.e., diversity, inclusion and equity; student success; engaged learning through high-impact practices)</li> <li>• Funding priority</li> </ul>

---

<sup>1</sup> A number of the rubric components have been adapted from O’Meara, K. A. (2016). Legitimacy, agency, and inequality: Organizational practices for full participation of community-engaged faculty. In M. Post, E. Ward, N. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Publicly engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education* (96-110). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

<b>DIMENSION</b>	<b>COMPONENTS</b>
<b>III. Visibility and Communication</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positioning engaged scholarship on the web, via YouTube clips, in college and department publications, and reports to executive administration</li> <li>• (faculty) Hiring—job descriptions that emphasize CES</li> <li>• (students) Recruitment and admissions criteria that are explicit about valuing community engagement</li> <li>• Membership and participation by dean, chairs, faculty, staff, and students in networks focused on advancing community engagement</li> </ul>
<b>IV. Recognition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College awards for CES</li> <li>• Engaged department award</li> <li>• Annual faculty activity report—data collected on CES</li> <li>• Annual faculty activity reports that allow faculty to get credit for mentoring for CES</li> <li>• A place for CES in official college CV form</li> <li>• Merit pay criteria that recognizes CES</li> </ul>
<b>V. Rewards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CES is valued in promotion and tenure via definitions of scholarship, criteria, documentation, peer review</li> <li>• Community engagement included in evaluation criteria for term contracts for NTT faculty</li> <li>• Sabbaticals—CES encouraged for sabbaticals</li> <li>• Post-tenure review—CES and teaching and learning valued in post-tenure review criteria</li> </ul>

DIMENSION	COMPONENTS
<p><b>VI. Capacity-Building Infrastructure for Support and Sustainability</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative assistance—staffing to support community engagement</li> <li>• Dedicated operational budget</li> <li>• Assistance developing partnerships, memoranda of understanding with community partners</li> <li>• Faculty development programs for integrating community engagement into scholarship and teaching</li> <li>• Training for personnel review committee members on evaluating CES</li> <li>• Formal and informal mentoring programs</li> <li>• Stipends or course release for seeding engaged research or course development</li> <li>• Structured opportunities for faculty to connect with community partners</li> <li>• Writing retreats and assistance finding places to submit CES for publication</li> <li>• Assistance with grant writing to support community engagement</li> <li>• Conference support for faculty and graduate assistants (in addition to faculty development resources for disciplinary conferences)</li> <li>• Interfacing with other engagement units on campus</li> </ul>

DIMENSION	COMPONENTS
<b>VII. Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected and assessed on faculty engaged scholarship</li> <li>• Data collected and assessed on community-engaged courses</li> <li>• Data collected and assessed on community engagement learning outcomes</li> <li>• Data gathered and assessed on community perceptions of partnerships</li> <li>• Measures established and data gathered and assessed on community impacts</li> <li>• Interfacing with Institutional Research to draw on campus data that will assist with assessment of community engagement (e.g., NSSE results, HERI faculty survey)</li> </ul>
<b>VIII. Curricular Pathways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community engagement in the curriculum of majors and graduate programs</li> <li>• Community engagement in college minor</li> <li>• Community engagement graduate certificate</li> <li>• Completion of a community engagement minor or graduate certificate appears on the official transcript.</li> </ul>

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

**DIMENSION I: Leadership and Direction**

A primary feature of institutionalized community engagement in a college is long-term, sustained, consistent, and committed leadership at the administrative level, among the dean, associate deans, and department chairs.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. Hiring criteria for dean, associate deans, and department chairs	There are no criteria around community engagement in the qualification for hiring of the dean, associate deans, and chairs.	There are community engagement criteria in the qualifications for the hiring of the dean and chairs, but they are largely rhetorical and applied inconsistently.	The college has clear criteria for community engagement as a qualification for hiring of the dean and chairs and they are prioritized and applied consistently.	
2. Leadership development opportunities for dean, associate deans, and department chairs	There are no opportunities for the dean, chairs, program directors, or center directors to participate in professional development leadership for advancing community engagement.	There are sporadic, inconsistent, and poorly coordinated opportunities for the dean, chairs, program directors, or center directors to participate in professional development leadership for advancing community engagement.	The college offers ongoing and coordinated opportunities for the dean, chairs, program directors, or center directors to participate in professional development leadership for advancing community engagement.	
3. Faculty council that meets regularly and advises college decision making on engagement and resources	The governing body of the college is not attuned to its role in advancing community engagement as a priority of the college.	The governing body of the college is reactive to opportunities for and challenges to integrating community engagement instead of demonstrating leadership for advancing it.	The governing body of the college provides leadership for coordination and integration of policies, structures, and guidance for practices that advance community engagement across the college.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

---

COMPONENT	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
4. Advisory Leadership Council that includes community partners, faculty, staff, and students	There is not an advisory body that brings together multiple stakeholder perspectives with the goal of advancing community engagement in the college.	There is an advisory body in the college that has limited ability to advance community engagement because it does not include community partners and/or student voice, perspective, and representation.	The college has a visible and active advisory body representing all stakeholder groups invested in the success of community engagement across the college.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

**DIMENSION II: Mission and Vision**

A primary feature of institutionalized community engagement in a college is a clear articulation of the importance and centrality of community engagement in the mission and vision of the college.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. Articulation in mission and vision statements	Community engagement does not appear in the mission and/or vision statements of the college.	Community engagement appears in the mission and/or vision statements of the college, but it is framed in ways that do not reinvigorate the work of the college or advance high-quality community engagement.	Community engagement is clearly framed in both the mission and vision statement of the college such that there is not ambiguity as to its place as a commitment of the college.	
2. Definition of community-engaged scholarship	The college has not adopted a single, operative definition of community engagement to guide policy or practice.	The college has adopted a definition of community engagement that is vague, creates confusion, and does not provide guidance for policy and practice.	The college has undertaken an inclusive process for arriving at a widely accepted and clearly understood definition of community engagement that guides the way that policies, structures, and practices are operationalized in the college.	
3. Strategic planning	There has not been a strategic planning process in the college to identify community engagement as a college priority.	The strategic plan of the college has not clearly set forth community engagement as a priority and/or has not provided a framework for how community engagement advances the mission of the college.	The strategic plan of the college clearly and unambiguously prioritizes community engagement as one of the ways in which the college fulfills its mission.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
4. Alignment with institutional mission	In the event that the campus mission includes community engagement, the college mission does not connect to it or align with it.	In the event that the campus mission includes community engagement, the college mission suggests complementarity but does not provide a framing for how the college helps fulfill the campus mission.	The college mission and campus mission are closely aligned in ways that reinforce a commitment to operationalizing community engagement as a way to advance institutional mission.	
5. Alignment with educational innovations	As the college undertakes innovation in teaching, research, creative activity, service, and other institutional commitments, there is not consideration of how community engagement can contribute to those innovations.	As the college undertakes innovations in policies, structures, and practices, the ways in which community engagement can serve as a catalyst for deepening innovation is typically an afterthought.	Educational innovations are examined through the lens of community engagement so as to understand synergies and to maximize the ways community engagement can deepen innovation.	
6. Alignment with accreditation	Program accreditation and processes do not account for community engagement practices, and assessment for accreditation does not systematically capture community engagement data.	Accreditation processes align inconsistently with community engagement commitments, and there is some alignment of assessment data for community engagement and for accreditation.	The college integrates the systematic assessment of community engagement with the data collected for accreditation so that accountability and quality improvement are maximized.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
7. Alignment with complementary strategic priorities (i.e., diversity, inclusion, and equity; student success; engaged learning through high-impact practices)	The college is pursuing multiple strategic priorities but is not explicit in examining the connections between them.	The college recognizes that community engagement has some relation to commitments to diversity and to achieving student success goals but has not operationalized the connections.	The college has made specific connections related to policies, structures, and practices that support community engagement and the ways in which they advance diversity, inclusion and equity goals, student success goals, and/or improved student learning goals.	
8. Funding priority	Support for community engagement is not reflected in the operational budget of the college or in fundraising priorities.	There is inconsistent and uncoordinated funding for community engagement through operational monies in the college and inconsistent and uncoordinated efforts at fundraising for community engagement.	The operational budget of the college reflects clear and targeted funding for community engagement on an ongoing, reliable basis, and community engagement is a fundraising priority for the college.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

---

**DIMENSION III: Visibility and Communication**

A primary feature of institutionalized community engagement in a college is the messaging that is created and shared about the work of the college, what it values, how those values are put into practice, and how the scholarly identities of faculty and students are embodied in their activities.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. Positioning engaged scholarship on the web, via YouTube clips, in college and department publications, and reports to executive administration	There is little if any public communication about the importance of community engagement or the sharing of examples of community engagement activities carried out throughout the college.	Communication about community engagement is inconsistent and intermittent, creating mixed messages about its importance to the college.	Community engagement can be found in all modes of communication by the college, and there is a clear message about what community engagement is, what it looks like in practice, and how it helps the college fulfill its mission.	
2. (Faculty) Hiring: Job descriptions that emphasize community-engaged scholarship	There is nothing in the job descriptions for faculty that references or signals to potential applicants that community engagement is valued by the college.	Job descriptions for faculty hires reference community engagement but do not signal that it is priority for the college.	Job descriptions for faculty hires make it clear that community engagement is a core part of the institutional identity of the college and that faculty scholarly work that is shaped by community engagement will be valued by the college.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
3. (Staff) Hiring: Job descriptions that emphasize community engagement	There is nothing in the job descriptions for staff that references or signals to potential applicants that community engagement is valued by the college.	Job descriptions for staff hires reference community engagement but do not signal that it is priority for the college.	Job descriptions for staff hires make it clear that experience with and knowledge of community engagement is valued and that community engagement is a core part of the institutional identity of the college.	
4. (Students) Recruitment and admissions criteria that are explicit about valuing community engagement	There are no references to community engagement in the marketing and recruitment materials used for student admissions.	Admissions materials make vague and inconsistent references to community engagement, do not make it clear that it is part of academic programs, and do not signal that it is a defining feature of the college.	Recruitment and admissions materials consistently make it clear that community engagement is a part of the core academic offerings of the college and that opportunities for community engagement are available to all students.	
5. Membership and participation by dean, chairs, faculty, staff, and students in networks focused on advancing community engagement	The college is not known among peers for community engagement, in part because the college is not represented within national and international networks and is not demonstrating leadership in academic associations.	Presence at and representation in national and international networks and associations is not consistent or coordinated.	The college is well represented by different stakeholders among a range of associations and networks, establishing a presence and visibility that both highlights the community engagement of the college and allows for participation in leadership opportunities nationally and internationally.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

**DIMENSION IV: Recognition**

A primary feature of institutionalized community-engaged scholarship in a college is making CES visible and celebrating its success in public ways.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. College awards for CES	There is no college award for CES.	There is public recognition for CES at annual events in the college, but there are no clear criteria for the recognition and no consistency in upholding CES as a college priority.	The college has a set of annual awards for CES that recognize faculty, community partners, and students; there are clear award criteria for exemplary CES; the awards are made consistently and are given visibility to signal CES as a college priority.	
2. Engaged department award	There is no award for a department within the college that recognizes CES as a department priority.	Some departments are periodically recognized for a commitment of the faculty and chair to CES, but there is no award, no clear criteria for the recognition, and no consistency in upholding CES as a departmental priority.	The college has an annual award for departments in the college that enact exemplary CES; there are clear award criteria for departmental CES; the awards are made consistently and are given visibility to signal CES as a college priority.	
3. Annual faculty activity report—data collected on CES	The annual faculty activity report does not have an area that allows faculty to claim their CES as part of their teaching, research, and service roles.	The annual faculty activity report identifies CES as an area of faculty activity, but there is not a clear way for faculty to report on CES as part of their teaching, research, and service roles.	The annual faculty activity report identifies CES as an area of faculty activity, and there is a clear way for faculty to report on CES as part of their teaching, research, and service roles.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
4. Annual faculty activity report – faculty get credit for mentoring for CES	The annual faculty activity report does not identify a faculty service role for mentoring of junior faculty.	The annual faculty activity report does not specifically identify a faculty service role for mentoring of junior faculty for CES.	The annual faculty activity report specifically allows for faculty to claim, as part of their service role, the mentoring of junior faculty in undertaking CES and framing a scholarly identity based on CES.	
5. A place for CES in the official college CV form	The official CV template provided by the college is not structured in a way that recognizes CES as a distinct activity.	The official CV template provided by the college recognizes CES as a distinct activity only in the faculty service role.	The official CV template provided by the college recognizes CES as a distinct activity across the faculty roles and within scholarship, and is structured with sections for peer-reviewed CES and technical reports and other scholarly artifacts that are CES.	
6. Merit pay criteria that recognize CES	There is no merit pay criteria that recognize CES.	Merit pay is intermittently awarded for CES, and there are not clear criteria for what constitutes meritorious CES.	Merit pay is consistently awarded for CES; there are clear criteria for what constitutes meritorious CES.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

---

**DIMENSION V: Rewards**

A primary feature of institutionalized community-engaged scholarship in a college is that it is rewarded through formal reward structures, with explicit policies and criteria, valuing CES in the core academic culture of the college.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. CES is valued in promotion and tenure via definitions of scholarship, criteria, documentation, peer review	The faculty reward policies are silent on CES.	The faculty reward policies include community engagement, but the only place that community engagement is recognized is in the faculty service role.	CES is clearly defined in the policies documents in such a way that they include engaged scholarly work across the faculty roles; there are explicit criteria for community engagement in teaching, in research and creative activity, and in service; there are criteria in the areas of research and creative activity that acknowledge that not all CES will appear in peer-reviewed journals, and that community expertise may constitute reconsideration of who is a peer.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
2. Community engagement included in evaluation criteria for term contracts for NTT faculty	NTT faculty contracts are silent on CES.	NTT faculty contracts encourage but do not require or compensate for faculty community engagement through teaching or for the scholarship of teaching and learning on community-engaged pedagogical practices.	NTT faculty contracts explicitly compensate faculty for community-engaged pedagogical practices recognizing the time commitment needed for establishing and maintaining community partnerships, for curriculum redesign for community-engaged teaching and learning, and for improving practice through the scholarship of teaching and learning.	
3. CES encouraged for sabbaticals	Sabbatical policies are silent on CES.	Sabbatical policies refer to the possibilities of CES as a plan of study but do not make clear the importance of developing a sabbatical plan that aligns with the priorities of the college and can advance CES as a college goal.	Sabbatical policies encourage faculty to undertake CES at different levels—to build capacity for CES, to develop a CES approach to research and/or teaching, to advance existing CES research and/or teaching—in ways that align with the goals of the college and advance the priorities of the college.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
4. CES and teaching and learning are valued in post-tenure review criteria	Post-tenure review policies are silent on CES.	Post-tenure review policies include community engagement, but the only place that community engagement is recognized is in the faculty service role.	Post-tenure review policies offer opportunities for faculty to revitalize their scholarship by undertaking CES. CES is clearly defined in the post-tenure review policies documents in such a way that they include engaged scholarly work across the faculty roles; there are explicit criteria for community engagement in teaching, in research and creative activity, and in service; there are criteria in the areas of research and creative activity that acknowledge that not all CES will appear in peer-reviewed journals, and that community expertise may constitute reconsideration of who is a peer.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

**DIMENSION VI: Capacity-Building Infrastructure for Support and Sustainability**

A primary feature of institutionalized community-engaged scholarship in a college is the establishment of a capacity-building infrastructure that supports and sustains CES.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. Administrative assistance—staffing to support community engagement	No staffing dedicated to CES.	Inadequate staff support for supporting CES.	Adequate staff support with dedicated responsibilities for supporting CES.	
2. Dedicated operational budget	No operational budget for supporting CES.	Inadequate operational budget, or soft money (unsustainable grant money) supporting CES.	Adequate operational budget dedicated to supporting CES.	
3. Assistance developing partnerships, memoranda of understanding with community partners	No assistance in developing community partnerships, and no resources for faculty or community partners in formalizing relationships.	Inadequate assistance in developing community partnerships, and inadequate resources for faculty or community partners in formalizing relationships.	Appropriate levels of assistance in developing community partnerships, and resources for faculty or community partners in formalizing relationships.	
4. Faculty and staff development programs for integrating community engagement into scholarship and teaching	No faculty and staff development for CES.	Inadequate and intermittent faculty and staff development opportunities for advancing CES.	Ongoing, robust faculty and staff development opportunities for advancing CES.	
5. Training for personnel review committee members on evaluating CES	No training for personnel review committees on how to fairly evaluate CES.	Inadequate and intermittent training for personnel review committees on how to fairly evaluate CES.	Ongoing training for personnel review committees on how to fairly evaluate CES.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
6. Formal and informal mentoring programs	No mentoring programs for supporting junior faculty in building a scholarly profile around CES.	Inadequate and ad hoc mentoring programs for supporting junior faculty in building a scholarly profile around CES.	Ongoing and structured mentoring programs for supporting junior faculty in building a scholarly profile around CES.	
7. Stipends or course release for seeding engaged research or course development	No funding to facilitate faculty experimentation with CES.	Inadequate and unreliable funding to facilitate faculty experimentation with CES.	Ongoing, substantial funding to facilitate faculty experimentation with CES.	
8. Structured opportunities for faculty to connect with community partners	No structured opportunities for faculty and community partners to connect.	Few opportunities for faculty and community partners to connect.	Ongoing, structured opportunities for faculty and community partners to connect.	
9. Writing retreats and assistance finding places to submit CES for publication	No writing retreats and assistance finding places to submit CES for publication.	Little support for assisting faculty and graduate students with submitting CES for publication.	Ongoing writing retreats and assistance for faculty and graduate students for finding places to submit CES for publication.	
10. Assistance with grant writing to support community engagement	No assistance provided for grant writing to support community engagement.	Little if any assistance provided for grant writing to support community engagement.	Ongoing and adequate assistance provided for grant writing to support community engagement	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
11. Conference support for faculty, staff, and graduate assistants (in addition to faculty development resources for disciplinary conferences)	No support for faculty, staff, and graduate assistants to present at or attend CE conferences that are typically non-disciplinary conferences (funding support in addition to faculty development resources for disciplinary conferences).	Intermittent and unreliable support for faculty, staff, and graduate assistants to present at or attend CE conferences that are typically non-disciplinary conferences (funding support in addition to faculty development resources for disciplinary conferences).	Ongoing support for faculty, staff, and graduate assistants to present at or attend CE conferences that are typically non-disciplinary conferences (funding support in addition to faculty development resources for disciplinary conferences)	
12. Interfacing with other engagement units on campus	Little or no coordination between CES activities in the college and CES offices and programs across campus.	Poor coordination between CES activities in the college and CES offices and programs across campus.	Strong coordination between CES activities in the college and CES offices and programs across campus.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

---

**DIMENSION VII: Assessment**

A primary feature of institutionalized community-engaged scholarship in a college is the systematic collection and evaluation of data to better understand the extent, quality, and impact of community-engagement activities.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. Data collected and assessed on faculty engaged scholarship	There are no mechanisms in place to gather data on the CES of faculty in the college.	There are some data collected about the CES by faculty, but the data collection is not systematic and the data are not analyzed.	Mechanisms, such as annual faculty reports, are structured to gather data on CES on an ongoing basis, the results of which are analyzed and shared across the college.	
2. Data collected and assessed on community-engaged courses	There are no mechanisms in place to gather data on the number of community-engaged courses offered by the college, the number of students enrolled in those courses, what departments are offering community-engaged courses, or the number of faculty who are teaching those courses.	There are some data collected about community-engaged course offerings, but the data collection is not systematic and the data are not analyzed.	On an ongoing basis, the college gathers data on the number of community-engaged courses offered by the college, the number of students enrolled in those courses, what departments are offering community-engaged courses, and the number of faculty who are teaching those courses, and analyzes and reports that data to the college and publicly.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
3. Data collected and assessed on community engagement learning outcomes	There are no articulated learning outcomes associated with community engagement in the curriculum.	Community engagement learning outcomes are not well articulated, are often stated as goals rather than measurable outcomes, and are assessed as learning outcomes for the college.	All community engagement courses offered through the college have a consistent set of learning outcomes such that the college can measure and report on the community engagement learning by students across the college.	
4. Data gathered and assessed on community perceptions of partnerships	There are no mechanisms in place to gather community partner perceptions of the community engagement by the college.	There are periodic and inconsistent efforts to gather community partner perceptions of the community engagement activities of the college, and the results are not widely shared or used for quality improvement.	The college regularly gathers, analyzes, and shares—with the college and with the community partners—data on the community partner perceptions of community engagement by the college.	
5. Measures established and data gathered and assessed on community impacts	There are no data gathered about the impact on the community of community engagement activities by the college.	Some impact data are gathered, but they are based on measures that have little relevance for the community partners, and/or they are not shared and/or used for quality improvement.	Measures of community impact have been established cooperatively between the college and community partners; data based on those measures are consistently gathered and analyzed and shared across the college and with community partners.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENT	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
6. Interfacing with Institutional Research to draw on campus data that will assist with assessment of community engagement (e.g., NSSE results, HERI faculty survey)	College data on community engagement are not analyzed in relation to other community engagement data collected by the campus.	There are intermittent and inconsistent efforts to understand college-level data in relation to institution-level data on community engagement.	The college works closely with Institutional Research to mine institutional data that will provide a deeper understanding of the community engagement data collected at the college level.	

**DIMENSION VIII: Curricular Pathways**

A primary feature of institutionalized community engagement in a college is having community engagement integrated in curricular structures and pathways so that all students have the opportunity to learn about and practice community engagement and master clearly articulated civic-learning outcomes.

*DIRECTIONS: For each of the components (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of intentional identification and development of leadership for community engagement. Once the current status of development has been established, then identify evidence of this status in the corresponding INDICATORS cell.*

COMPONENTS	STAGE 1 <i>Emerging</i>	STAGE 2 <i>Developing</i>	STAGE 3 <i>Transforming</i>	INDICATORS
1. Community engagement in the curriculum of majors and graduate programs	Community engagement is not part of the curriculum in degree programs.	Community engagement is sometimes integrated into the curriculum of certain courses, but it is based on faculty interests and not program commitments. Community engagement is integrated into some programs but not across the college.	Community engagement is integrated into all of the degree programs in the college, making it available to all students and making it a curricular signature of the college.	

**Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement at the Level of the College Within a University**

COMPONENTS	<b>STAGE 1</b> <i>Emerging</i>	<b>STAGE 2</b> <i>Developing</i>	<b>STAGE 3</b> <i>Transforming</i>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
2. Community engagement in college minor	There is no minor in community engagement.	If there is faculty support, students are able to independently construct a minor in community engagement.	There is a minor in community engagement in the college that is available to all students in the college, across departments.	
3. Community engagement graduate certificate	There is no community engagement graduate certificate.	Graduate students can independently seek out CE courses and present their coursework on their CV.	There is an established community engagement graduate certificate that is available to all graduate students across the college and is structured so that courses in the certificate can count as electives in the various graduate programs.	
4. Completion of a community engagement minor or graduate certificate appears on the official transcript.	The official transcript does not record a community engagement minor or graduate certificate.	There are efforts underway to work with the registrar to have the official transcript record a community engagement minor or graduate certificate.	The official transcript records a community engagement minor or graduate certificate.	