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Increasingly, universities are being 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 designed to facilitate community engagement, it is important to account for the significant variation in community engagement and quality of that engagement that exists across units of a university. The argument can be made that the unit of a school or college within the university should be developed as the locus of faculty and student engagement. Colleges or schools within a university often have their own well-developed mission and goals embracing community engagement, can been seen as labs for trying new ideas, pathways, or strategies for engagement, and have their own natural disciplinary-related base within the community for engagement. Drawing on a review of the literature, this study examines organizational components at the college level that support community engagement and contribute to the creation of a culture of engagement in a college. Based on the literature and the practical experience of the authors, an organizational assessment rubric for supporting and rewarding community-engaged scholarship was designed and piloted with four colleges at four separate research universities for the purposes of self-assessment and strategic planning.

**Literature Review**

While there is a wealth of literature on institutionalizing community engagement in higher education (Furco & Miller, 2009; Moore & Ward, 2010; Saltmarsh, et. al., 2009; Sandmann, Thornton, & Jaeger, 2009: Warnick, 2007; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008: Wergin, 2006), and there is also a body of literature on institutionalizing community engagement in an academic department (Aminzade, 2004; Battistoni, 2003; Kecskes, 2006; Saltmarsh and Gelmon, 2006), there is little available literature on institutionalizing community engagement in a college or school within a university (Dana and Emihovich, 2004). This study contributes to the literature on institutionalizing community engagement in a college or school at a research university.

Community engagement in the context of this study refers to relationships that connect the intellectual resources of the college with knowledge resources 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 trans-disciplinary (knowledge transcending the disciplines and the college) and asset-based (valid and legitimate knowledge exists outside the college). Trans-disciplinary and asset-based frameworks and approaches impact both pedagogy and scholarship. They also inform an organizational logic such that colleges 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 the 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 research, and on faculty, deans, and chairs. For many colleges, the academic culture, and the incentives for faculty conveyed through that culture, emphasizes the importance of research and creative activity.

Drawing on the literature and practice (Academic Review and Engagement, 2013; Doberneck, et. Al, 2010; Gurgevich et. At. 2003; Hyman, et. Al, 2002; Ellison and Eatman, 2008; Stanton 2008; Stanton, 2012), for the purposes of this project and paper, we focus on a definition of community-engaged scholarship characterized by creative intellectual work based on a high level of professional expertise, the significance of which peers can validate, and which enhances the fulfillment of the mission of the campus/college/department. Community-engaged scholarship is not considered to be synonymous with community-engaged research, and can be demonstrated in teaching, research and creative activities, and in service. Scholars who practice community-engaged scholarship (CES) often do so within institutional contexts in which standards and incentives for career advancement have not kept pace with changes in knowledge production and dissemination. Many campuses are reconsidering and revising reward structures to provide recognition for new forms of scholarship, including community-engaged scholarship (O’Meara, Eatman, and Peterson, 2015).

The rationale for focusing on a school/college is similar to that of a department. As academic units, the school/college, like the department, are as Ellison and Eatman (2008) say, “where tensions arise about publicly engaged scholarship at the point of promotion and tenure. They are where all the work of promotion gets done and where the potential for real change is greatest” (p. v.). Further, Holland (2009) points out that, in a large research university, it might be easier to start institutionalization with a small unit, like a school/college. Some scholars believe that a more local, place-based approach is crucial to sustaining community engagement in higher education because it can demonstrate for stakeholders the relevance of disciplinary knowledge to communities (Byron, 2016; Kecskes, 2006, Saltmarsh et al., 2009).

There is a quarter-century of practice and a significant body of literature contributing to an understanding the kind of infrastructure needed to advance community engagement ay the institutional or campus level. We draw on that practice and literature to adapt it 1) for the unique context of a college or school within a university, and 2) for support of community engaged scholarship (CES), not community engagement writ large. The kind of support discussed here is aimed at CES and therefore focuses on supporting and advancing work of scholars (with a particular focus on faculty and graduate students), and staff, administrators, and community partners involved with generating CES. Regarding faculty, the focus is on faculty scholarship and their role as scholars; it includes their roles in teaching and learning and in service to extent that for many community-engaged scholars, those faculty roles are closely interwoven and integrated. Literature also points to the need to integrate CES into graduate studies in order to prepare and socialize the next generation of community-engaged scholars (Aminzade, 2004; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara, 2016; Moore & Ward, 2010). Here, we focus our attention on the academic culture of the college, and thus, a key artifact of culture, policies related to faculty rewards, and more specifically, to promotion and tenure.

As Tierney and Perkins (2015) observe,

the professional reward structure needs to shift. Institutions need a diversity of routes to academic excellence and some of them will pertain to being involved outside the ivory tower…Academic work needs to have an impact in order to provide society’s return on investment…For that to happen, the reward structure and those practices that socialize faculty need to shift in a way that supports engagement rather than disdains it (p. 186).

Imagining America – a network of colleges, universities, and community partners dedicated to publicly-engaged scholarship, particularly in the arts, humanities, and design – produced a 2008 report, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university,* based on a series of structured interviews with over 30 publicly-engaged scholars that included faculty, deans, department chairs, provosts, presidents and center directors. The report outlined a set of recommendations that serve as a road map for colleges and universities interested in creating institutional, cultural, and policy change to support CES. Recommendations focused on faculty rewards and academic culture included: 1.) define CES; 2.) create policy based on a continuum of scholarship that that equally values traditional scholarship and CES 3) recognize indicators of excellence in CES, specifically interdisciplinarity, intercultural engagement, impact in multiple arenas, and integration across key area of faculty work (teaching, research, and service); 4.) recognize a broad range of scholarly artifacts that count (i.e. beyond scholarly journal publications); 5.) create guidelines that can be used by tenure applicants and reviewers to clarify what counts as evidence of CES; 6.) provide professional development on how to present CES in professional portfolios; 7.) recognize community partners as peers in peer review; 8.) create a pathway for junior faculty and graduate students interested in CES; and 9.) create specific guidelines for promoting community-engaged scholars to the level of full professor.

On some campuses, campus leaders are working with faculty to revise faculty reward policies. For example, at Syracuse University, with strong administrative leadership and faculty commitment, the faculty and administration went through a five-year process that led to a revision of the promotion and tenure guidelines resulting in language that explicitly incorporates community engagement into the reward policies of the campus (Syracuse University, n.d.). Similarly, in its *Academic Plan 2011,* the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) set forth the strategic priority of building engaged scholarship into the core culture of the campus and throughout all academic units through the revision of promotion and tenure policies.

The vision of CES emerging within a School/College can inspire action, but it is unlikely that vision alone will provide an action plan aligned with the core functions and organizational features of a School/College. In considering how to implement an actionable plan within a college/school of a university, we used our experience as university faculty, staff, and administrator, and the emergent literature, to identify key structural components of a college or school that can contribute to fostering CES. We sought feedback from colleagues with expertise in CES and deep understanding of universities to identify components at similar levels of importance, that were clearly distinguished from one another, and that play a key role in advancing a vision for CES within a School/College. The following sections detail a set of areas that the literature suggests are essential to institutionalizing community engagement.

The Literature on Institutionalizing Community Engagement

*Mission, Vision, and Leadership*

Developing a mission and vision for community engagement is tied directly to leadership and direction. A review of successful Carnegie Community Engagement applications points to the need for more attention to the development of clear community engagement definitions and strategic plans specifically for engagement (Holland, 2009). Others have also pointed to the importance of creating clear definitions for CES that are aligned across academic units from departments to colleges/schools to the university as a whole (Crookes, Else, & Smith, 2015; Dana & Emihovich, 2004; Kecskes, 2006; O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh & Giles, 2010).

Leadership support for the institutionalization of CES and the personal engagement of leaders is essential (Holland, 2009; Sandmann & Plater, 2009). Sandmann & Plater (2009) identified four stages of engaged leadership: “(1) interpreting institutional mission to reflect engagement with communities…; (2) defining specific objectives and goals to implement the mission; (3) articulating the means and priorities for taking action; and (4) manifesting commitment through personal interaction (p. 15). Dana and Emihovich emphasize the importance of seizing the right moment to advance community engagement and the power of having a clearly articulated vision and the creation of rituals to mark and celebrate CES (Dana & Emihovich, 2004).

Community engagement can be fragile if a single, often transient, leader (president, chancellor, provost) is the one associated with a commitment to campus engagement. Leaders, need to foster the capacity of others, across the campus, including having CES in job descriptions, and building a wider community of engagement (Moore & Ward, 2010).

*Visibility and Communication*

A significant component of the foundational indicators section of the Carnegie Community Engagement Application requires campuses to document how community engagement is made visible through key communication functions from campus websites, to press releases, and presidential addresses. Reflecting on the institutionalization of CES in the College of Education at the University of Florida, Catherine Emihovich discussed how she never missed an opportunity to talk about CES in public addresses and written documents (Dana & Emihovich, 2004). This helped to catalyze conversations and raise awareness about CES. Further, a rhetoric of community engagement helps scholars feel supported even when some of the policies are lacking (Moore & Ward, 2010). Emihovich also reflected on the value of creating cultural markers through awards and signature events to celebrate CES (Dana & Emihovich, 2004).

Other critical opportunities for raising the visibility about CES are student recruitment and admission materials and criteria as well as faculty and staff recruitment and hiring materials such as job announcements and descriptions (Dana & Emihovich, 2004; Ellison & Eatman, 2008).

*Recognition*

Recognition for CES is an important dimension for creating a culture of engagement. We draw the distinction between recognition and rewards to draw attention to two things: one is that recognition cannot and should not be a substitute for rewards, and second that recognition is associated with making visible and celebrating CES in public ways. On the first point, there is tendency for campuses that are working to advance community engagement to create a set of recognition possibilities, such as annual awards, that are relatively easy to do, and to put off or avoid revising the reward policies, which is much more difficult to do. Similarly, recognition can come in the form of making CES count, in annual faculty reports, reports that are often tied to merit pay increases. These, too, are tangible and more public forms of recognition that can complement, but are not a substitute for faculty rewards.

While recognition can take many forms, a few of the most common and impactful can be centered at the school/college level. Centering recognition in the school/college can allow more people across a campus to be recognized. Since many faculty relationships are within their academic units, recognition at this level is often more personal and creates more of a culture of support for CES work within existing working relationships. Some ways that recognition can occur include funding, for example, seed funds to catalyze and support CES (Aminzade, 2004; Dana & Emihovich, 2004; Moore & Ward, 2010); awards and celebrations for CES (Dana & Emihovich, 2004); and clear ways to document CES in annual merit reviews (O’Meara, 2016). Taken together, these forms of recognition raise the visibility of CES, bring legitimacy to the work, help to create a community of scholars, and promote equality through reward and recognition (Crookes, Else, & Smith, 2015; Moore & Ward, 2010).

*Policies Related to Faculty Work*

Rewards are the policies and criteria that constitute what is valued in the core academic culture of the unit, in this case a college. Policies are artifacts of culture and often underpin what happens organizationally behind the scenes. In crafting policies supportive of CES, school and college leadership teams should consider a set of guiding questions. What are the criteria for promotion and tenure, and do the criteria specifically articulate CES as core academic work, i.e. as research and teaching, and not singly as service or outreach? Is there a culture among the faculty such that the policies are enacted in ways that value CES? Do the guidelines for promotion of faculty articulate CES across the faculty roles of research, teaching, and service? Advancing CES does not mean that all faculty will be involved with CES, but that those who are doing CES or aspire to do CES will be recognized and rewarded for their community engaged teaching, research and creative activities.

A review of practices at campuses nationally indicates that in order to expand and strengthen community-engaged scholarship, the work of faculty in this area needs to be documented, recognized and rewarded (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Through interviews with 20 engaged scholars at U.S. research institutions, Moore and Wood (2010) found that when institutions expressed sincere support for CES, and it was not backed with promotion and tenure policies that valued it, then traditional scholarship was privileged. To cope, engaged scholars positioned their work as traditional scholarship or made sure they had enough traditional scholarship in addition to CES in order to get tenure (Moore & Ward, 2010).

When institutional policies are silent on engagement, they create disincentives for faculty to undertake community engagement across their faculty roles and often punish them when they do (O’Meara, 2016). Silence perpetuates what O’Meara (2016) has identified as “inequality regimes” of power, privilege, and oppression where traditional scholarship is privileged and faculty agency over their own professional pathway is severely limited. O’Meara argues that "we need interventions (institution wide and department focused) that disrupt or dismantle organizational practices that reinforce inequalities and help faculty navigate and craft meaningful careers in higher education organizations" (p.104). We would add the need for college-wide interventions. Institutions need to create what Sturm (2007) calls an “architecture of inclusion” empowers community-engaged scholars to develop fully as professionals in the academy (O’Meara, 2016).

For example, the *Academic Plan 2011,* the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) set forth the strategic priority of building engaged scholarship into the core culture of the campus and throughout all academic units.

[T]he recommendations of the Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and

Practices… should be adopted. In that report faculty engagement is defined as

―scholarly, creative or pedagogical activities for the public good, directed toward

persons and groups outside the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Such

activities (in the form of research, teaching, and/or service) develop as collaborative

interactions that respond to short and long-term societal needs… The University should

adopt an explicit policy stating that although engaged scholarship need not be a

prerequisite for promotion and tenure, excellence in such scholarship will be

acknowledged and rewarded. Each academic unit should review and revise its tenure and

promotion criteria to include engaged scholarship and activities as appropriate for their

discipline (p. 23).

This language highlights the importance of aligning reward policies between the department, college and institutional levels to build a culture of engagement.

*Scholarship in Public* emphasized the concept of a continuum of scholarship as an organizing framework for revising promotion and tenure policies to support CES. When drafting policy language on CES, it is important to ensure that it cuts across the key areas of faculty work – teaching, research, and service – and recognizes a diverse body of possible evidence of impact (Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Holland, 2009; O’Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh & Giles, 2011; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). Dana and Emihovich (2004) point out that

the educational research community has never seriously grappled with the concept of "impact" within the practitioner community as a measure of achievement comparable to the sheer volume of output in the form of articles, monographs, and books that few practitioners may ever read" (p. 44).

Across the country, many campuses are at some stage of reconsidering and revising their reward structures to provide recognition for new forms of scholarship and the scholars who are producing it. And this is critical as new young scholars, with training, goals, and values significantly different from traditional models begin their careers in our academic institutions. Further, there are an increasing number of scholars coming into the academy, often much more diverse in every way from the faculty currently on campus, who have significant interest in emerging from of scholarship such as digital scholarship, interdisciplinary scholarship, and CES (Dana & Emihovich, 2004; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara et al., 2011.)

Since colleges and schools within a university have their own disciplinary expertise and have faculty peer-review systems as part of a promotion and tenure process, having policies at the school and college level in explicit support of CES is critical.

*Capacity Building Infrastructure for Support and Sustainability*

Administrative centers for community engagement play a key role in facilitating and sustaining community engagement in higher education (Quanranto & Stanley, 2016; Sandmann & Plater, 2009; Strand et al., 2003). In their review of fifty-six successful Carnegie Community Engagement Classification applications, Sandmann and Plater (2009) identified three unique models for community-engagement centers: coordinating centralized centers, diffused networked units, and hybrid coordinated units. A capacity-building structure within a school or college could serve as a centralized coordinating structure for that school or college and it might also be connected to a network of similar centers across campus or a larger centralized center for the entire university.

Community-engagement centers play a facilitative role by mobilizing resources; building and maintaining campus-community relationships; recruiting and managing participation of faculty and students; bringing relevant expertise and resources together around projects; creating criteria and processes for undertaking and implementing research projects; creating sustainability mechanisms; and ensuring that research is directed toward social change goals (Sandmann & Plater, 2009; Strand et al., 2003). The relationship building that goes into CES and maintaining campus-community partnerships is time-consuming, making the role of a staffed center critical to success.

Centers also facilitate essential professional development for CES scholars to increase awareness and understanding, create a community of scholars, and increase participation (Holland, 2009). O’Meara (2016) emphasizes the importance of helping CES faculty “navigate and craft meaningful careers in higher education organizations" (p.104) that may privilege traditional scholarship. Centers play a role in helping do this by providing professional development, building community, and allocating resources. Centers may also facilitate mentoring among community-engaged scholars, an important element of professional community-building and sustained engagement (Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Moore & Ward, 2010).

Another aspect of infrastructure to support CES is personnel. A college or school can assess the appropriate level of fiscal support to designate a position or part of a position to facilitate CES. This may take the form of an administrative position or a faculty member with particular expertise who is released from other duties to mentor and guide this work.

No matter the form of infrastructure, it is important that the structural components of a school/college that promote CES (e.g., a center, dedicated personnel, etc.) be adequately funded. A serious, systemic approach to CES involves adequate resources being designated to this effort. For example, key to capacity-building is the disbursement of stipends or seed money for engaged research or course development (Aminzade, 2004). Availability of funding helps to sustain projects and serves as evidence of recognition and legitimization of CES (Moore & Ward, 2010). Additionally, it is important that funding be made available for faculty and graduate students to attend CES conferences because these are non-disciplinary conferences and most faculty will use annual faculty development funds for their disciplinary conferences.

*Assessment*

Recognizing the multiple foundational components that build and sustain a culture of community engagement – from mission and vision, to curricular pathways and faculty support, and mutually-beneficial campus-community partnerships – Furco and Miller (2009) emphasize the importance of assessing and benchmarking each component to track and facilitate success. The development and implementation of assessments are strengthened at the school or college level since those units have their own governance structures and cultures.

Furco and Miller (2009) identified several categories of assessment focused on institutionalization that range in complexity and serve varied purposes. Self-assessments, indicators, and checklists are internally focused and help to locate where a school or college may be in the institutionalization process; benchmarks, rubrics, and matrices are more formal assessments that require empirical data and examine levels or stages of institutionalization. System approaches include a “battery of instruments, procedures and approaches to provide a more comprehensive assessment” (p. 50). Systems may be focused on all foundational elements of institutionalization or a specific element, such as service-learning or CES. Similarly, there are numerous tools for measuring community engagement practice and student learning outcomes, such as IUPUI’s *Civic-Minded Graduate Scale*.

To be effective with any approach to assessment, Furco and Miller (2009) highlight the importance of clearly defining terms, like community engagement or community-engaged scholarship. This may look different in different academic disciplines so clarity at the local level of a school or college is key. You cannot assess that which you cannot define. Similarly, it is important to understand the purposes of any assessment as that will inform the methods used, stakeholders involved, and timing.

*Career Pathways*

Critical to the ongoing and long-term success of CES is the creation of a pipeline or pathway for faculty and student scholar-practitioners from graduate school into their careers (Aminzade, 2004; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Gillette, 2017; 2018; Moore & Ward, 2010; O’Meara, 2016). David Scobey says, “we have to develop a picture of the successful trajectory of an academic career as a public scholar” (In Ellison & Eatman, 2008, p. 21). Because scholarly trajectories are often centered on disciplinary-specific activities and expertise, having clear pictures of such a trajectory within a college or school can transform a culture and provide visible, accessible models for emerging scholars. Drawing from the Engaged Department model, Kecskes (2006) suggests that faculty and students alike should be thinking about what and how their disciplines can contribute to the common good. Students in the Sociology department at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities are encouraged to “think critically about the role of sociological knowledge in the contemporary world and to reflect on how the knowledge, skills, and insights of the sociological enterprise can be used and applied in their lives and careers outside of the university" (Aminzade, 2004, para. 4). Students also receive a community scholar designation on their transcripts. Similarly, Gillette (2018) discusses the importance of a College of Education as a unit of community engagement that prepares teachers who are “justice oriented, urban ‘insiders’ who would teach in their home community, act from an ethic of care, and prioritize trust and relationship building with students, families, and community members”(p. 119).

Organizations like Imagining America and the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement promote academic pathways for graduate students by offering awards, scholarships for conference participation, and access to mentors and graduate student networks. The Imagining America *Publicly* *Engaged Scholars Study* ( see <https://imaginingamerica.org/initiatives/engaged-scholars-study/>)

is aimed at “deepen[ing] our understanding about the career arc for publicly engaged scholarship and practice.” Preliminary findings from the study point to seven profiles of engaged scholars: 1.) the scholar motivated by personal values and involvement with their local community; 2.) the local artist “who uses the community as a ‘canvas;’” 3.) the K-12 teacher who enters the academy and takes on an active research role; 4.) the community-engaged professional which includes center directors within higher education; 5.) the “interdisciplinarian” who pulls from many disciplines to enhance community-engaged work; 6.) the activist who “uses the university as a platform to further pursue their activism;” and 7.) the “engaged pragmatist,” who sees this as the direction in with higher education is moving and wants to be a step ahead. The purpose behind creating these profiles is to help higher education leaders understand what motivates and drawn community-engaged scholars to inform recruitment and program development.

Although the eight components of a School/College that can be instrumental in advancing CES are thoughtfully grounded in higher education literature and practice as well as in research regarding CES, this is not intended to be a comprehensive list. Others may identify key components within their particular university setting. In addition, the components we’ve identified are not independent or mutually exclusive. The components overlap in function and in practice. However, we believe these eight areas to be highly impactful for guiding School/College leaders in assessing their own level of engaged scholarship and for identifying pathways to for advancing CES.

**The Design of the Rubric**

To assist colleges and schools within universities to advance community engaged scholarship, we have developed an assessment and planning rubric that aligns with the components of a School/College described above. The rubric’s purpose is to serve as a tool for self-reflection and planning as academic units trying to enact practices in support of CES to consider their own local context, the strengths and values of their faculty, and their resources.

For the purpose of the rubric design, we use the definition of community engaged scholarship outlined earlier in the paper. Scholarshipis community engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships and addresses public purposes. The rubric defines community-engaged scholarship in this way:

Community engagement in the context of this rubric 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 trans-disciplinary (knowledge transcending the disciplines and the college) and asset-based (valid and legitimate knowledge exists outside the college). Trans-disciplinary and asset-based frameworks and approaches impact both pedagogy and scholarship. They also inform an organizational logic such 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…scholarshipis community engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships and addresses public purposes. Community-engaged scholarship 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. Community-engaged scholarship meets the standards of research when it involves inquiry, advances knowledge, is disseminated, and is open to review and critique by relevant academic, community, 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, policy makers, 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.

A number of the components of the rubric have been adapted from O’Meara ([2016](#_ENREF_10)) and draw significantly on research from the widely known rubric developed by Furco ([2002](#_ENREF_8)). While the Furco rubric is grounded in research literature about institutionalizing service-learning, it is revised and extended here to be relevant to all aspects of CES in research, teaching and service.

The self-assessment rubric contains eight dimensions based on the literature described earlier in the paper, each of which includes a set of components, representing aspects of the operationalization of the dimension. Ewell has written that in order to achieve transformative organizational change, what is needed is working on multiple components of an institution simultaneously (Ewell, 1998).

To achieve the institutionalization of community engagement into the culture of a college, there is no single intervention that will create an organizational environment where engaged scholars will thrive. Multiple actions in multiple areas need to be attended to at the same time. The rubric is designed based on the literature and practice. The eight dimensions of the rubric identify broader strategic areas and the components within each dimension indicate activities that are aimed at operationalizing the dimensions.

| DIMENSION | COMPONENTS |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Leadership and Direction | * Hiring criteria for dean and chairs * Leadership development opportunities for dean and chairs * Faculty council that meets regularly and advises college decision-making on engagement and resources * Advisory Leadership Council that includes community partners, faculty, staff, and students |
| 1. Mission and Vision | * Articulation in Mission and Vision Statements * Definition of community-engaged scholarship * Strategic Planning * Alignment with Institutional Mission * Alignment with Educational Innovations * Alignment with Accreditation * Alignment with complimentary strategic priorities (i.e., diversity, inclusion and equity; student success; engaged learning through high impact practices) * Funding priority |
| 1. Visibility and Communication | * Positioning engaged scholarship on the web, via u-tube clips, in college and department publications, and reports to Executive Administration * (faculty) Hiring—job descriptions that emphasize community-engaged scholarship * (students) Recruitment and admissions criteria that are explicit about valuing community engagement * Membership and participation by dean, chairs, faculty, staff, and students in networks focused on advancing community engagement |
| 1. Recognition | * College awards for community-engaged scholarship * Engaged department award * Annual Faculty activity report – data collected on CES * Annual faculty activity reports that allow faculty to get credit for mentoring for CES * A place for CES in official college CV form * Merit pay criteria that recognizes CES |
| 1. Rewards | * CES is valued in promotion and tenure: via definitions of scholarship, criteria, documentation, peer review * Community engagement included in evaluation criteria for term contracts for NTT faculty * Sabbaticals – CES encouraged for sabbaticals * Post-Tenure Review – CES and teaching and learning valued in post-tenure review criteria |
| 1. Capacity-Building Infrastructure for Support and Sustainability | * Administrative assistance – staffing to support community engagement * Dedicated operational budget * Assistance developing partnerships, memoranda of understanding with community partners * Faculty development programs for integrating community engagement into scholarship and teaching * Training for personnel review committee members on evaluating community-engaged scholarship * Formal and informal mentoring programs * Stipends or course release for seeding engaged research or course development * Structured opportunities for faculty to connect with community partners * Writing retreats and assistance finding places to submit CES for publication * Assistance with grant-writing to support community engagement * Conference support for faculty and graduate assistants (in addition to faculty development resources for disciplinary conferences) * Interfacing with other engagement units on campus |
| 1. Assessment | * Data collected and assessed on faculty engaged scholarship * Data collected and assessed on community-engaged courses * Data collected and assessed on community engagement learning outcomes * Data gathered and assessed on community perceptions of partnerships * Measures established and data gathered and assessed on community impacts * Interfacing with Institutional Research to draw on campus data that will assist with assessment of community engagement (e.g., NSSE results, HERI faculty survey) |
| 1. Curricular Pathways | * Community engagement in the curriculum of majors and graduate programs * Community engagement in College minor * Community engagement graduate certificate * Completion of a CE minor or graduate certificate appears on the official transcript. |

**Dimensions of the Rubric**

*Leadership and Direction*

The literature on community engagement emphasizes the importance of leadership in supporting community engagement. At the level of the college, this means that leadership by the Dean (and associate deans) and department Chairs is critical. This can be achieved more quickly and reach greater depth and pervasiveness if the individuals who are hired into the positions of leadership have some background in community engagement, and that the job descriptions for hiring the Dean and Chairs includes criteria around community engagement. Regardless of previous experience, it will be important to have leadership development opportunities for the Dean and Chairs so that they remain current on developments in the field, on best practices, and on how to exercise leadership from the top that builds leadership from the bottom in the college. The administrative leadership in the college can be fostered by the faculty governing body, which may establish a standing committee on community engagement to provide guidance for the college on advancing community engagement. The administrative leadership of the college is also in a position to model collaboration by establishing an advisory council for the college that includes among its members the Deans, a representative of the chairs, faculty, staff, community partners, and students. By intentionally building community engagement into the role of leadership in the college, it will not be person-dependent and has a greater likelihood of being deepened and sustained.

*Mission and Vision*

In order for community engagement to be central to the culture of the college, it will need to be clearly articulated in the mission and vision of the college. It is difficult in mission driven institutions to advance any activity that is not clearly aligned with the mission. Further, if those in the college do not see community engagement as in their own self-interest – in advancing the mission, in improving teaching and learning, in doing more meaningful and impactful research – then it will be difficult to view community engagement as more than a peripheral activity. It will also be important, more at an operational level, to have a clear and conceptually concise definition of community engagement. This is important so that it is clearly understood what is, and what is not, considered community engaged scholarly work. With a clear mission and definition, then the goal is to align the work of community engagement in the college with the larger institutional mission, with accreditation standards (like demonstrating contributions to the public good) with other institutional innovations (like improving teaching and learning), and with other institutional priorities (such as increasing student and faculty diversity, or increasing student persistence and graduation rates). If community engagement is positioned as core to the work of the college, then college and institutional fundraising for the college will be explicit about seeking grants and donors that will support the work.

*Visibility and Communication*

When community engagement is part of the identity of the college, it is made visible both internally on campus and to external stakeholders. It is positioned in a way that tells the story of the college, in data and reports and in narratives about the work of students and faculty. It is part of the way the college expresses it values and indicates the knowledge and skills that are valued by the college when recruiting faculty. It is part of the way that it markets itself to parents, guardians, and students, indicating what can be expected in the education experience for students. As a way of striving toward greater excellence in community engagement, the leadership in the college shares its work with others and learns from others through networks, nationally and internationally, focused on community engagement in higher education.

*Recognition*

Recognition and rewards (the next dimension) are concrete expressions of the value of community engagement in the college. Recognition is more structural, and typically easier to implement. Rewards are associated with cultural change, and present greater obstacles for implementation. Recognition aims at awards (and the prestige and visibility that come with them). Colleges can encourage community engagement by including it as part of annual faculty reporting and by encouraging mentoring as an activity valued by the college. Tying merit pay to community engagement also signals the importance of community engagement as faculty work valued by the college. Recognitions are not a substitute for rewards but can serve as an important compliment to them.

*Rewards*

The policies and criteria that constitute the basis for faculty review and promotion are artifacts of the core academic culture of the college. The guidelines for faculty review express a common set of beliefs and values as well as underlying assumptions, epistemic orientations, and interpretive frameworks. Often guidelines are not explicit, allowing the culture to operate outside of codifying of expectations. Yet, when there are not explicit incentives for faculty to do community engagement as part of their faculty roles, then there are disincentives. Further, when the culture of faculty work positions community engagement as work that is understood as only to be included in the faculty’s service role, it is not tied to faculty work generating knowledge or faculty work in teaching and learning. Reward structures that explicitly articulate community engaged scholarly work across the faculty roles create a process of fairness for faculty who identify as community engaged scholars. The goal is to establish guidelines and a culture that recognize community-engaged scholarship and allow community engaged scholars to thrive and excel (not to merely survive and delay their work until after promotion). Making community engaged scholarship explicit in rewards policies for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty is a matter of fairness, not an attempt to devalue the work of scholars who do not employ collaborative and participatory epistemological approaches to research, creative activity, and teaching and learning.

*Capacity-Building Infrastructure for Support and Sustainability*

While more and more faculty coming out of graduate school and into the professoriate have had some experience with community engagement and are more experienced with collaborative knowledge generation, many faculty have not been exposed to community engagement as part of their professional preparation or socialization in their discipline. In order to be able to operationalize community engagement, faculty will need to develop the capacity to be able to integrate it into their care academic work. The more opportunities there are for faculty to participate in faculty development that is oriented around their discipline, the more beneficial it will be. While the campus as a whole may have a coordinating infrastructure that offers faculty development for community engagement, the college should explore whether that infrastructure is adequately meeting its needs. The closer community engagement capacity building is to the culture of the college, in areas like mentoring, training for personnel review committees on evaluating community engaged scholarship, and grant seeking and writing support, the more these activities should be implemented in the college.

*Assessment*

We measure what we care about. If the college values community engagement, and if it models best practices of community engagement, then there will be multiple mechanisms for systematically assessing its results and outcomes. Assessment can reveal how deep and pervasive community engagement is in the college. It can demonstrate how it is impacting student learning. It can help to determine how community partners perceive the engagement of the college and attempt to understand what difference the college’s engagement is making in the communities it interfaces with. Assessment is an essential means for understanding impact and for improving practice.

*Curricular Pathways*

A central way that community engagement impacts the academic experience of student is through its incorporation into the curriculum. When community engagement is part of the college’s identity and culture, there should be opportunities for every student to have community engagement as part of courses in their undergraduate major or graduate program. There can also be opportunities for undergraduates to complete a minor in community engagement as a way of doing more in-depth community engagement as part of their academic study. Similarly, graduate student across the college could achieve a graduate certificate in community engagement in order to deepen their knowledge and skills as engaged scholars and to enhance employment opportunities post-graduation. In all cases, there should be clear pathways through the curriculum for students at any level to pursue and deepen their community engagement through their coursework.

Finally, each dimension of college engagement intersects with, reinforces, and enhances the other. The rubric is designed to allow colleges to assess the cultures, structures, policies, and practices that can be implemented to advance community engagement as a core academic identity. College level engagement is a compliment to individual faculty engagement, departmental engagement, and institutional engagement, and when done well, can enhance all of these. As an inventory of engagement in the college, the rubric makes visible an architecture for community engagement, and provides a blueprint to guide the college in building, deepening, and sustaining community engagement. An example of one component of the rubric (Leadership

**Stages of Progress**

Under each dimension of the rubric, for each component, college working groups determined the stage of progress that best represented the level of college engagement, based on evidence examined. The Rubric provided three stages of progress: Emerging, Developing, and Transforming, and left space for identifying evidence for making their assessment.

The stages on the rubric are:

***Stage One: 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 Two: 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 Three: Transforming***—At this stage a college has fully institutionalized community engagement into the fabric of the college, 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.

As an example, for the dimension of Leadership, and the component of “hiring criteria for deans, associate deans, and department chairs,” the working groups were instructed to identify the stage of development based on the evidence examined:

**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.*

| COMPONENTS | **STAGE ONE**  ***Emerging*** | **STAGE TWO**  ***Developing*** | **STAGE THREE**  ***Transforming*** | **INDICATORS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** Hiring criteria for dean, associate deans, and department chairs | There are no criteria around community engagement in the qualifications 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 it is largely rhetorical and applied inconsistently. | The college has clear criteria for community engagement as a qualification for hiring of the dean and chairs and it prioritized and applied consistently. |  |

**Piloting the Rubric**

The goal of this project and the pilot is to contribute to the literature on community engagement and the advancement of community engaged scholarship by focusing on the college as the unit of engagement. We do this by attending to the organizational elements of colleges that foster a culture of engagement, and by developing an assessment instrument for colleges to assesses the structures, policies, and practices that they have in place to advance community engaged scholarship.

**Methodology**

The colleges within research universities chosen for the pilot (four campuses) could be in any academic area. Criteria for selection in to the pilot were:

* the campus was classified by the Carnegie Foundation as Community Engaged (indicating a third-party verification of institution-wide commitment to community engagement)
* the researchers had a campus informant – a person in a position to be able to identify possible College units that could participate in the pilot study (there is no national data set or record that indicates which colleges in a university are incorporating community engagement into their academic activities. Therefore, we needed a trusted informant on the campus who could assist in identifying potential colleges and make contacts with those colleges).

Based on these criteria, four colleges we chosen for the study:

* College of Arts and Humanities at Weber State University
* College of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers University, Newark
* College of Arts and Sciences at Drexel University
* College of Health and Human Sciences at University of North Carolina Greensboro

Colleges were invited with the expectation to participate in an initial virtual meeting and one virtual cohort meeting part way into the pilot. Colleges in the pilot were asked to form a working group that would implement the assessment process. The invitation to the colleges stated that “we are asking for your participation only if it makes sense for advancing community engagement on your campus. We are not in a position to offer any financial resources to the participating colleges, so there has to be an inherent self-interest on the part of the participating colleges that this will assist them in advancing community engagement as one of their goals. What we want to learn is the effectiveness of the self-assessment rubric, how we can improve it, and what process work best in implementing it.” From January through April 2017, cohort colleges implemented self-assessment using the rubric. Between April and June, researchers visited each of the campuses to meet with those responsible for implementation within the college. Finally, each college was asked to submit a final report and were provided a template for “Structured Data Gathering:”

1. Who was involved in planning/decision making on implementation of the rubric? How were those participants chosen? What was there role?

2. What were the roles of college and university leadership in decision-making and implementation of the project? (Dean, Associate Deans, Chairs)

3. What organizational structures (committees, leadership, governance groups, etc.) were consulted with during the process? How were they involved?

4. How was rubric introduced to the College community? What expectations were established for participation in its implementation?

5. How was implementation of the rubric structured? Who played a role? What current structures or activities in the college were used? What accountability or feedback was established?

6. What was the impact of the implementation process?

7. What were some outcomes from the process?

During June, we held one last virtual meeting with the entire cohort. Our aim with the pilot campuses was to gather information about the rubric and the implementation process. The goal of the pilot was to refine the rubric for dissemination to the field.

**The College Working Group**

For two of the four colleges in the pilot, an Associate Dean of the college took the lead in organizing the effort. At one college, the process was organized by a senior Assistant Dean. In the fourth college, the process was initiated by the dean and organized by the community engagement center director who was also a faculty member in the college. One college had faculty representatives on their team from each department in the college. At one college, a total of 12 faculty participated in two meetings that were held, but with not the same faculty at both meetings. One college team included six faculty members from various disciplines and the director of campus center for community engagement. At the fourth college, the working group included two faculty members, two associate deans, and the community engagement center director who also held faculty rank in the college.

Each working group approached the process somewhat differently, but the common pattern was to have an initial meeting, determine the data needed to address the areas in the rubric, divide the work into smaller teams, and come back with as an assessment. A final meeting was held to formulate recommendations based on the findings. For example, one college describe their process in this way: “The committee was initially introduced to the rubric and determined the utility of the process and rubric tool. All faculty members were in agreement that the tool has potential for a formative and substantive evaluation. The first committee meeting was scheduled for a three hour block which allowed the members to identify the data needed, determine the indicators and develop a plan to delegate the review. Two members were assigned to each dimension and independently coded the data. A final three hour working meeting reviewed each dimension and criteria. The reviewers discussed their assessment and the members asked clarifying questions or contributed to the final assessment. Additionally, the committee as a group made rubric-and [college]-specific recommendations.”

**Findings**

Implementing the Rubric revealed ways in which Institutional community engagement infrastructure could be better connected to College community engagement activity and faculty. There was a tendency for faculty who identified as community engaged scholars to build relationships with the Campus community engagement center, often participating in its activities and making use of its resources, but not connecting that work back to their college. In more than one case this led to a recommendation that the college formalize the designation of a college liaison to the center.

Use of the rubric also revealed ways in which the College as a unit could better be supporting faculty engagement in alignment with institutional efforts. For example, strategic efforts being pursued at the institutional level to revise faculty rewards so as to better recognize and value community engagement as legitimate scholarly work was often not being reinforced or translated into college documents and processes.

In most of the colleges, Deans discovered a new role; moving from being supportive to actively working with faculty to advance community engagement. Deans reported gaining a deeper understanding of the kinds of resources and supports faculty needed to be able to pursue community engagement in their research and teaching. Deans who had relied on the institutional infrastructure of the community engagement center to advance the work of community engagement now understood the importance of a complimentary role for the college to advance that agenda.

Working groups reported that the rubric revealed significant unevenness across departments in a College. This provided an opportunity for reflection on the implications of uneven quality and depth of community engagement for student learning, for junior faculty trying to read the cultural tea leaves in the college as they prepared for promotion and review, for attracting student to the college, and for faculty and staff hiring. This kind of reflective process led two of the colleges to explicitly envision a role for the college to be model for community engagement as a way of assisting other colleges on the campus to go through their own assessment process.

Three of the four colleges were situated in an institutional environment with a robust infrastructure for community engagement. In all of those colleges, there were a number of areas in the rubric where it was felt that the activities of the community engagement center were better situated in the center and not in the college. For example, it was deemed to be duplicative for the college to establish an advisory council of administrators, faculty, staff, community partners, and students: This was best done through the center. Additionally, for faculty development activity conducted by the center, it was best that that activity was offered through the center, but the college could do a better job of partnering with the center to help build greater faculty capacity for community engagement for college faculty. The more the issue was seen as a college issue, the more there should be a role for the college; for example, one campus noted the importance of “training for personnel review committee members on evaluating community engaged scholarship” was a primary issue for the college that could be done in collaboration with institutional wide training opportunities.

Two of the colleges reported that the assessment process revealed the importance of faculty mentoring within the college. Mentoring of junior faculty was an activity best done within the college and was a way of making visible and recognizing the expertise of the more senior faculty doing community engagement while at the same time providing significant and meaningful additional support for junior faculty. It was a way of reinforcing and building a deeper culture of engagement in the college. An example of this one campus recommending that the college “formalize mentor roles” in order “to help mentor new faculty and to develop ourselves and leaders/experts within our respective disciplines/fields.”

It should be noted that after going through the process of using the rubric to gather data about community engagement in the college, and using that data as of evidence for institutionalization of community engagement in the college, all of the colleges determined that they were in the early stages of the rubric, mostly in Stage One: Emerging. This in itself, for most of the colleges, provided an awakening among the working group members and the deans for a renewed commitment to community engagement and targeted, strategic efforts to advance engagement in the college.

**Readiness**

The campuses in the pilot were selected because there were indicators that they were already doing substantive community engagement work. It became clear that indicators of campus-wide engagement may not filter down to college level engagement, and it raised the question about “readiness” to undertake the rubric assessment. We saw “readiness” as being different from a critical assessment of whether the rubric could be a useful tool for advancing college engagement. Early in the process, colleges raised critical reflective questions, such as in the context of being in the shadow of a flagship institution, what does that mean for “performance anxiety” and “fear of erosion of scholarly standards” as we approach the rubric? On another campus, there was initial resistance from faculty – often the faculty who were the most engaged – because of questions about how the results of the assessment were going to be used.. More than one college raised questions about the relationship of this project to other structures of engagement within and outside the college. All of these were crucially self-reflective questions that the colleges used to clarify their commitment to participating in the pilot.

The issue of readiness emerged early in the recruitment process as we reached out to colleges identified by local informants to invite participation in the pilot. In one college, the identified dean was concerned with the amount of time the process would take, the personnel hours, and competing priorities for those personnel and time (accreditation processes going on that same academic year). Had the college be at a different level of readiness, then the evidence gathered for accreditation might have had greater overlap with evidence gathered for engagement, and the process might not have seemed so onerous, or perhaps might have been seen as mutually reinforcing. On another campus, there was early on a concern that going ahead with the rubric may exacerbate some underlying tensions that had emerged in the college that community engagement was being driven from the top administration of the university and had not reached the faculty in a way that they were embracing it. There was a conversation on campus among faculty that framed the community engagement work as a zero-sum equation – if community engagement was being valued, then what I do is not going to be valued. The same college faculty thought that the dimension of faculty rewards was a problem, and that they did not want to address this – doing so was moving too fast for them.

Questions of readiness also emerged for us when a college would challenge the definition we were using for community engagement, indicating for us a lack of conceptual clarity around community engagement. For example, one college shared the input from faculty that scientists who receive NSF grants have a “broader impact” statement, and the researchers have to include engagement with the community, but the type of engagement they propose would not fit the definition in the rubric. This is largely correct, in that NSF broader impacts is heavily focuses on the dissemination of scientific knowledge to the public, not the involvement of the public in the generation of scientific knowledge. Not all public scholarship is public engaged scholarship, and the rubric is aimed at community engagement, not the sharing of academic knowledge with the public per se. As another example, for one college, the faculty recognized that community engagement was inconsistent and disjointed across the college, with some departments being deeply engaged. This led to the view that the engaged department might be the more correct level to assess. From our perspective, the engaged department work can be an important initiative that can lead to deeper institutionalization of community engagement, and there are rubrics that exist for assessing engaged department work (Kecskes (n.d.)). But the rubric was specifically for the college as a unit, not the department. Not all colleges, regardless of the engagement profile of the entire campus, may be ready to undertake college level engagement.

**Recommendations on Revising the Rubric**

For all of the colleges, there were parts of the rubric that seemed to resonate more strongly with the development of community engagement in the college than other. Overall, the college found that the dimensions of the rubric established a broad organizational perspective on community engagement that proved useful for strategically thinking about engagement. Again, depending on unique aspects of the college, there seemed to be dimensions that were missing. For example, one college recommended that a “co-curricular criterion be added” because the college had “several examples of co-curricular, discipline specific, opportunities” for community engagement.

There was a general perception that assessment can be controversial. Depending on the institutional culture, assessment can be viewed as something that is imposed by administration on the faculty to be used for punitive purposes. This can lead to resistance to assessment, and there were hints of that resistance in more than one college. It was recommended by the cohort of colleges that shifting the terminology away form an “assessment rubric” to an “inventory” would help to alleviate some of the anxiety in taking on such a substantive assessment effort.

It was also recommended that a more nuanced scale would be helpful; for example, creating a 5-point scale across the three stages of emerging, developing, and transforming. The working groups saw a more nuance scale as better able to capture some of the important community engagement work in the college and better refine planning efforts to advance community engagement.

It was also suggested that some components of the rubric could be assessed as “not applicable.” While the component may be an important consideration for college engagement, colleges noted that it is important to recognize that some activities are and should be done by the institutional coordinating infrastructure for engagement, and that duplication of activities is not an efficient or effective strategy.

Further, colleges noted that partnerships with the community are absent from the rubric and should be incorporated to enact authentic reciprocity in the assessment process. As with all partnership work, community partners need to be brought in at the design stage. This was an oversight on our part as we put together the rubric. If community partners were putting together a rubric for institutionalizing community engaged scholarship in in a college, what components would be considered essential?

Finally, participating colleges noted the need for an assessment of developmental activities such as “courses being developed”, “discussions that were occurring”, and “intentions that were being set” was missing from the rubric. Even though not yet implemented, there were activities going on that were evidence of a trajectory toward deeper engagement. Many believed that the rubric did not capture the space between the stages of “emerging” and “developing” and they believed that important activities occurred in that space. As one college participant noted, “First steps or baby steps need to be captured.” The recommendation was that the rubric needed more nuance.

**Discussion**

As societal problems become more complex, many universities have focused on community engaged scholarship as a way to use intellectual and scholarly capacity to address those concerns. Centers for community engagement have become more common in universities and, in some places, faculty have been encouraged to shift their scholarly work to focus on concerns within their community. Strengths of university-wide initiatives of CES include the transdisciplinary nature of community problems and solutions and the considerable human capital and resources that a university can bring to the table. However, as large, complex organizations, universities often struggle with campus wide initiatives and have variable participation across academic units. With their own mission and vision, access into disciplinary-based community partners, and an adaptability that may elude a larger organization, we suggest that schools/colleges within a university may be a powerful place to advance the work of CES. This study sought to support colleges/schools within universities to advance CES within their academic units through the use of an assessment and planning rubric.

Strong support and vision for CES has emerged from national groups such as Carnegie Foundation and Imagining America. Many campuses have taken up this challenge and included CES as part of their strategic plan and campus infrastructure. The Colleges included in our study are parts of campuses where CES is accepted and encouraged. However, the pathway to coordinated, successful implementation of CES is often unclear. Academic leaders, both faculty and administrators, can use structured guidance on practices that support CES. The teams from the four campuses involved in this study expressed the need for assistance with identify next steps in their developing support for CES. All four colleges formed study teams to use the rubric as a way to advance a structured conversation about the status of their CES and to identify next steps.

Although all four colleges were on supportive campuses with identifiable institutional supports, the teams confirmed a need for expertise and guidance on their reflection and planning. The presence of existing support and a readiness to engage with the work of CES seem to be important pre-cursors to successful use of the assessment and planning rubric. It seems that reflection and planning at the college/school level may be dependent on prior work and commitment to the initiative. In this case, college or schools that have debated and embraced CES, provided some infrastructure including knowledgeable colleagues, and have taken prior action, seemed capable of reflecting on the current status of CES. Purposefully, we did not include colleges that were in the beginning stages of embracing CES. The use of an assessment and planning tool for an academic unit still debating whether to advance CES, struggling to define CES for themselves, and with little existing infrastructure to support CES may be limited. Future work with colleges at the beginning stages of CES will provide insight into the type of support these academic units need as they take up the work of CES.

The campuses that did participate found the rubric useful in planning their next steps for CES. To underscore the importance of reflection on this process, each of the campus teams that participated expressed surprise with areas in which they were still at the beginning stages of CES implementation despite strong existing support and activity. The reflection process allowed them to build greater capacity through strengthening relationships based on common purpose and through underscoring the need for mentorship for faculty who are committed to CES but for whom CES was not a part of their academic training. Overall, this study confirmed the need for a reflection tool within academic units as a way to refine and focus practices in support of a common goal.

Our study also indicates the importance of developing models for shared leadership within academic institutions to advance priorities. Several of the Deans of participating campuses indicated their support for CES, but reliance upon existing institutional infrastructure for advancing this work. Campus teams representing various departments and faculty or administrative roles were in a strong position to make recommendations for advancing CES. The deans played a leadership role in making this work possible through their support; however, the need for engaging others as leaders with critical expertise and perspectives was clear in the work on the four campuses.

An important impetus for our study was the unevenness of participation in CES across campuses that have been held up as models for CES. Our goal was to create a reflection and planning tool for academic units within universities to advance their CES within their disciplines. An unexpected finding was that the unevenness in participation also exists across departments within college or schools. It’s unclear whether the process we asked the campus groups to engage in will address this unevenness or whether diverse levels of implementation are a part of any initiative since universities and their colleges/schools are large, complex organizations.

As a result of our work on four campuses and further refinement of the reflection and planning rubric, we would encourage more colleges/schools to engage in self-assessment and purposeful planning, even when their campuses are considered highly engaged. Further research could be conducted examining the use of the rubric across multiple colleges at a single university. In fact, one of the colleges participating in the pilot study did so with the intent of becoming a model for the other colleges at the university so as to eventually have all colleges become deeply engaged colleges. Further research could also look at the implications of creating communities of practice made up of colleges implementing the rubric both within a single university and across universities. Additionally, our pilot study raised interesting questions about infrastructure for community engagement that could be explored further: How should an institution-wide coordinating infrastructure interface with colleges to advance community engaged scholarship, and to what extent, given their core academic focus, should colleges establish internal infrastructure to support community engaged scholarship?

In order to encourage use of the rubric for both practice and for research, the rubric is made publicly available for use by colleges within a university in this issue of the *eJournal of Public Affairs.* We recommendcampuses use the findings from the study to adapt the rubric to their own organizational context.
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