CIC *Reports*

DRAFT

Engaged Scholarship: A Resource Guide

Revised November 29, 2005

Submitted to:

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)

Prepared by
CIC Committee on Engagement

Committee on Institutional Cooperation
1819 S. Neil Street, Suite D
Champaign, IL 68120-7271
www. cic. uiuc.edu

Executive Summary

Throughout their histories, the CIC institutions have been engaged with their communities, states and the nation in addressing important challenges. As we enter the next century, the issues faced by society and the world will require new relationships and new responses from higher education. Our particular contribution to serving the public will reflect what we already do in our classrooms, laboratories, on our campuses and in our communities but it will change us as well. Engagement is transforming: we are changed as society is changed. In that respect, our relationship is less contractual, more covenantal: enduring, driven by a shared vision and values, and reflecting a changing identity.

In the late 1990's the NASULGC Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities called upon public universities to renew their commitment to society and to redesign their teaching, research, service and extension, if appropriate, functions to become more productively involved with their communities within the context of the institutional mission and faculty reward structures.

The Commission concluded that "our tried-and-true formula of teaching, research, and service no longer serves adequately as a statement of our mission and objectives. The growing democratization of higher education, the greater capacity of today's students to shape and guide their own learning, and the burgeoning demands of the modern world require us to think instead of learning, discovery, and engagement."(

However, this conceptualization of engagement speaks to higher education as a social institution, but it is not sufficient to clarify the covenantal relationship between higher education and society—nor does it clearly translate into action at the institutional level. In particular, it does not address the principal constituencies either within the institution or those served by it. For change to occur, we need to be more clear in providing objectives relative to faculty roles and responsibilities, student learning environments, institutional benchmarks and outcome measures, definition(s) of engagement, and exemplars of engaged teaching/learning, research, and service. Thus, in 2002, the CIC appointed the Committee on Engagement to define engagement and identify a set of benchmarks member institutions can use in demonstrating their goals and values as engaged universities. The Committee developed the following definition of engagement:

Engagement is the partnership of 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.

In spring 2003, the CIC Committee and the NASULGC Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service of NASULGC agreed to work together to generate a set of possible benchmarks of engagement. Further, the North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission revised its Criterion 5: Engagement and Service accreditation standards by developing operational components and definitions of engagement, and recently the Carnegie Foundation introduced engagement as a new component of its classification system.

Not all CIC member institutions have developed a definition of engaged scholarship, nor have they developed shared meaning as to what constitutes engaged teaching/learning, research, and service. Therefore, the Committee on Engagement offers this resource guide to assist member institutions as they begin deliberative processes that may lead to a definition of engagement that is consistent with institutional mission, identity, and commitment, and a means of measuring and benchmarking engaged teaching/learning, research, and service. The guide offers exemplars of engaged scholarship and other resources that may be of assistance in the deliberative process.

Universities increasingly seek ways to be more relevant and to bring their knowledge base to bear on social and economic problems, and to offer leadership within society consistent with their core values of openness, integrity, and inclusion. Politicians and educational critics seek evidence that public universities are able to elevate their research to inform teaching missions and fuel their historical commitment to help meet the needs of society. Faculty and students are as committed to translating research to practice and to integrating teaching, research, and service to better serve the needs of society, as they are to investing in the foundational research and development that fuels applied scholarship.

Within this context, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation funded a Commission in the mid-1990s that brought together 25 current and former university presidents to examine whether universities were prepared to meet societal needs for the 21st century. The Commission called for America's public universities to renew their commitment to society and to redesign their teaching, research, service and, where appropriate, their extension functions to become more productively involved with their communities within the context of institutional missions and faculty reward structures. More recently, the North Central Association's Higher Education Commission included engagement as one of 5 criteria linked to accreditation. Finally, the Carnegie Foundation's revision of its system for classifying higher education institutions will include engagement as a component of its classification system .

Classifications, accreditation criteria, and national commissions collectively challenge higher education to: refocus its scholarship agenda to place students at the forefront; elevate the status of teaching; elevate public service, well beyond the current conception of public service that emphasizes a one-way transfer of university expertise to the public; and strengthen the covenant between American higher education and the American public. The growing democratization of higher education, the greater capacity of today's students to shape and guide their own learning, and the burgeoning demands of the modern world suggest that *learning, discovery, and engagement* may be more appropriate descriptors of faculty work than the current triad of teaching, research, and service.

Thus, the challenges for higher education go well beyond just viewing teaching and applied research in a more favorable light. They involve changes in how applied research, teaching, and service are valued within the context of institutional mission, student educational experiences, and faculty rewards. Because universities are communities of scholars, solutions to enhanced engagement must be anchored in scholarship. Within the context of community-focused research, student experiential learning, and scholarship-driven service, campus-community collaborations pose difficult challenges. They demand interdisciplinary cooperation, rejection of disciplinary turfism, changes in the faculty reward system, a refocusing of unit and institution missions, and the breakdown of firmly established and isolated silos. Simultaneously, higher education must continue to focus on accountability and evidential criteria, the hallmarks of scholarship, that are the defining characteristics of America's system of higher education.

This report aims to build on the important work of the Commission by defining engagement and offering suggested benchmarks and exemplars in order to serve as a practical resource guide.

Defining Engagement

The CIC Committee on Engagement was established in 2002 to provide strategic advice to the member universities on issues of public engagement. Its charge was to: 1) Frame what is meant by engagement; 2) Benchmark strategies for public engagement across the CIC; 3) Identify performance measures; and 4) Advise CIC Members on collaborative opportunities that could be included in the CIC strategic plan. The Engagement Committee also identified the following objectives: 1) Identify strategies to embed engagement into the student experience, including identifying activities that are not classroom based that can be reflected on the student's transcript; 2) Identify strategies to build engagement into the faculty reward system; and 3) Establish benchmarks that will help define higher education's contributions to society. Although these objectives were achieved, the Committee was asked to revise its report to de-emphasize benchmarks and instead to develop a set of exemplars of engaged scholarship for each of the traditional areas of professional responsibility: teaching, research, and service.

Institutions define engagement within the context of their mission, values, and goals. Each of these foundational elements varies across institutions. The committee drew upon existing definitions from Big Ten institutions (The Ohio State University, Michigan State University, The Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Wisconsin, see Appendix A), information from the Kellogg Commission, the North Central Association Commission on Higher Education, and the American Association of Colleges and Universities, to develop the heuristic definition of engagement presented in the Executive Summary.

Definitions standing alone, however, do not provide sufficient depth for institutions to weigh the extent to which they already incorporate engaged teaching, research, and service into their core values. Developing benchmarks for engagement is dependent on at least two key factors. First, there must be common agreement on the definition of engagement which responds to differences in missions and contexts of individual institutions. Second, there must be shared meaning derived from practice; that is, exemplars of engaged teaching, research, and service. Currently, neither of these factors enjoys public consensus on shared meaning. Shared meaning can be derived from experience. When an adequate pool of information is available, cross-institution deliberations may lead to common definition, agreed upon praxis, and perhaps, benchmarks that will be useful to most, if not all, members of the CIC.

The Committee on Engagement (Appendix D) recommends that as institutions engage in deliberative processes to generate their unique definitions of engagement, they discuss three proposed distinguishing common elements of engagement.

1. Engagement is *scholarly.* A scholarship-based model of engagement involves both the *act of engaging* (bringing universities and communities together) and the *product of engagement* (the spread of discipline-generated, evidence-based practices in communities).

2. Engagement *cuts across the mission* of teaching, research, and service. It is not a separate activity, but a particular approach to campus-community collaboration.

3. Engagement is *reciprocal and mutually beneficial.* There is mutual planning, implementation, and assessment among engagement partners.

Because engagement is scholarly, it provides a means for institutions to generate evidence of accountability. Ultimately, measurement of engagement can provide:

- a means of assessing an institution's fulfillment of its engagement/public service mission
- a management and planning tool for ensuring that academic units contribute to the institution's overall engagement commitment

- evidence of organizational support for engagement
- evidence of the institution's contribution to economic development and technology transfer data
- a basis for telling the engagement story and building support for higher education among legislators, donors, and the public
- a new engagement rubric for comparing peer institutions nationally

In addition, measuring engagement activities can provide units and departments with criteria for including scholarly engagement activities as part of the tenure and promotion processes, thereby achieving and fostering institutional change at the level of individual faculty and staff. As such, benchmarks may ultimately provide evidence of:

- reward systems for faculty and staff that include an engagement dimension
- curricular impacts of student engagement
- applications of the dissemination of research and transfer of knowledge;
- meaningful engagement with communities
- applications of the evidence of partnership satisfaction

Fundamental to defining engagement and developing performance measures is a commitment to anchor institutional engagement activities in scholarship. The Committee affirms that research, teaching, and service engagement activities should emphasize outcome or evidence-based approaches, using the full range of qualitative and quantitative methodologies available across the diverse disciplines that comprise the academy. Similarly, the creative arts also should be challenged to be fully embedded within engaged scholarship. Scholarship is the defining institutional characteristic of higher education, when higher education is conceptualized as a community of scholars. If engaged research, teaching and service are to be valued within higher education as well as by society, such activities must provide the kinds of evidence that illustrate accountability. Exemplars of engaged teaching, research, and service anchored in scholarship can be found on every CIC campus. Discussion of such exemplars may provide a mechanism for discourse about engagement within institutions that have not yet achieved a definition of engagement. In order to facilitate such deliberative process, the Committee selected descriptions of exemplary engaged research, engaged teaching, and engaged service. The exemplars are presented in Appendix B.

Thus, the Committee on Engagement has generated a heuristic definition of engagement, assembled exemplars of engaged teaching/learning, research, and service, and developed a set of aspirational benchmarks that are linked to major regional and national accrediting and classifying entities (Appendix E). With the assembled information in this Resource Guide, the CIC Committee on Engagement advanced three recommendations for CIC consideration.

Recommendation 1: The Committee recommends that each CIC member institution engage in a deliberative process to develop a definition of engagement that is consistent with its mission, its institutional identity, and institutional commitment.

Recommendation 2: The CIC Committee on Engagement should continue to consider a set of benchmarks and measures that reflect the wide range of engagement activities within the CIC institutions, especially in light of the engagement standards currently under development at the Carnegie Foundation on Higher Education and elsewhere.

Recommendation 3: The CIC Committee on Engagement should continue to meet as a peer group within the CIC, providing a valuable network for those working to advance engagement in the member universities, the CIC office should support annual meetings for the group, and the CIC office should support an email list and web page for the work of the committee.

Appendix A: Definitions of Engagement at CIC Institutions

Michigan State University

Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions. (Provost's Report on Outreach, 1993).

Definitions of Engagement Activities

- Outreach Research: Applied research, demonstration projects, participatory action research, capacity-building, evaluation and impact assessment studies and services, policy analysis, consulting and technical assistance, and technology transfer.

- Experiential Research Activities Student involvement in outreach research programs either as part of independent research credit courses, specialized courses in the undergraduate curriculum, or as volunteers. Examples include research programs in which students serve as trained data collectors, interventionists, instructors, or in other roles, with the common elements involving supervised training and on-going oversight by research faculty.

- Outreach Teaching: Credit Courses and Programs.

- Courses and instructional programs that offer student academic credit hours and are designed and marketed specifically to serve those who are neither traditional campus degree seekers nor campus staff. Such courses and programs are often scheduled at times and in places convenient to the working adult.

- Outreach Teaching: Non-Credit Classes and Programs. Classes and instructional programs, marketed specifically to those who are neither degree seekers nor campus staff, that are designed to meet planned learning outcomes, but for which academic credit hours are not offered. In lieu of academic credit, these programs sometimes provide certificates of completion or continuing education units, or meet requirements of occupational leisure. Programs designed for and targeted at faculty and staff (such as professional development programs) or degree-seeking students (such as career preparation or study skills classes) are not included. Examples include: a short-course for engineers on the use of new composite materials, a summer writing camp for high school students, a personal enrichment program in gardening, leisure learning tours of Europe, etc.).

- Experiential/Service-Learning. Civic or community service that students perform in conjunction with an academic course or program and that incorporates frequent, structured, and disciplined reflection on the linkages between the activity and the content of the academic experience. Other forms of experiential learning may include career-oriented practica and internships, or volunteer community service.

- Clinical Service. All client and patient (human and animal) care provided by university faculty through unit-sponsored group practice or as part of clinical instruction and by medical and graduate students as part of their professional education. For example, this may include medical/veterinary clinical practice, counseling, clinical or crisis center services, and tax or legal clinic services.

- Public Events and Information. Resources designed for the public include managed learning environments (museums, libraries, gardens, galleries, exhibits); expositions, demonstrations, fairs, and performances; and educational materials and products (e.g., pamphlets, websites, educational broadcasting, and software). Most of these experiences are short-term and learner-directed.

The Ohio State University

Outreach and Engagement is a meaningful and mutually beneficial collaboration with partners in education, business, public and social service. It represents
* that aspect of teaching that enables learning beyond the campus walls,
* that aspect of research that makes what we discover useful beyond the academic community
* that aspect of service that directly benefits the public.

Outreach and engagement: It represents that aspect of teaching that enables learning beyond the campus walls, that aspect of research that makes what we discover useful beyond the academic community, that aspect of service that directly benefits the public.
(Impact Ohio, Bobby Moser, 2002).

What is outreach and engagement? It is that process by which we bring the university's intellectual capital to bear on societal needs... The 'engagement' in outreach and engagement represents our renewed commitment to sharing and reciprocity with our community partners. An institution engaged with its community–however that community is defined–works to define its problems jointly, sets common goals and agendas, develops measures of success together, and pools or leverages some combination of university, public, and private resources.
(Connections, Bobby Moser).

The Pennsylvania State University

Penn State's vision of engagement involves the integration of teaching, research, and service to enable its faculty, staff, and students to address pressing societal challenges faced by its communities. This integration is intended to inform and invigorate each of the missions, while simultaneously encouraging faculty to cut across disciplinary lines to work reciprocally and in partnership with communities on problems of mutual concern. Fundamental to this vision is that scholarship represents a core value and output of the University, and should be evidenced and evaluated in all engagement activities.

University of Wisconsin

Outreach scholarship is conducted in all areas of the university's mission: teaching, research, and service. It involves the creation, integration, transfer and application of knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences. Outreach scholarship is regarded to be of high quality when there is evidence that it has resulted in significant outcomes.
(Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: University of Wisconsin Madison Council on Outreach)

Appendix B: Exemplars of Engaged Teaching, Research and Service

Exemplars of Engaged Teaching/Learning

FOSTERING STUDENT CITIZENSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT

Link to CIC Definition of Engagement: The Morgridge Center for Public Service Learning was created in 1996 through a generous endowment to advance student and university civic engagement by strengthening partnerships through public service, academic service-learning and community-based research to address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good.

Significance –The Morgridge Center infuses service-learning and community based research involving issues of importance to community partners into the academic curriculum and has grown the number of academic service-learning/community-based research courses from 30 ten years ago to more than 85 courses today enrolling 2100 students.

Relationship with the Community – The Center annually fosters more than 900 volunteer and/or academic service/learning/community-based based research opportunities each year. Projects and courses have focused on issues in Wisconsin as well as Africa, Asia and the Caribbean.

Scholarly Outcomes - The Center also has seven formal academic partnerships with schools, colleges and centers on campus. Its partnership with the School of Human Ecology, for example, has resulted in 12% of the school's courses now taught in a service-learning or community-based research format.

Benefits to the Partner – Service learning and community-based research courses have resulted in students providing ongoing and critical Spanish language medical translation services at an area health center and several clinics around the city, in improvements to a major retirement community in Madison, as well as helping to improve the efficiencies of dozens of local non-profit organizations. The center also runs the Wisconsin Idea Undergraduate Fellows program that supports innovative projects that bring together undergraduates, faculty/instructional staff and community organizations to address specific community needs while enhancing student learning. Finally, the Morgridge Center is a key player in a Campus Community Partnerships Center located in an ethnically diverse, economically challenged area to address needs identified by the leaders and residents of 10 neighborhoods in South Madison. For example, through one effort alone last year, the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program provided low income families help with filing 4,800 tax returns last year.

DESIGN DAY: MECHANICAL ENGINEERING DESIGN PROJECTS.

Link to CIC Definition of Engagement: Design Day provides opportunities for mechanical engineering students and faculty to partner with manufacturers to innovate changes in products and to mentor pre-college students about mechanical engineering. The annual creation of a device designed to enhance the quality of life for a specific disabled individual, combines engineering with curricular components focused on civic responsibility and democratic values.

Significance: Each fall and spring semester, students from junior and senior level Mechanical Engineering courses engage the community through public display and interpretation of their research and product development. Students work in teams to tackle a problem of their choosing, build fanciful yet practical devices, and are challenged to demonstrate and explain the work during the end-of-the-semester Design Day event. The senior-level students work with corporate, industry, and nonprofit partners to research and design a product and devise or adapt one for actual use. A minimum of one team per semester works with a school, health institution, or community nonprofit organization to create an adaptive mobility device, e.g., cycle, scooter, or mechanized chair, for use by a physically challenged individual or in a school setting dealing with special student populations. The curriculum related this project includes not only scholarship but also character development, leadership, and service. During the 2004-2005 academic year, approximately 155 ME students shared their research and designs through Design Day.

Relationship with Community: Corporate sponsors come from diverse industries including the automotive, food processing, plastics, energy distribution, and medical fields. Students interpret their results to the community partners, fellow students, faculty, and the public through open presentations and poster sessions. Another component of Design Day is participation by students from three to five area middle and high schools in engineering-type competitions coached and supervised by ME upper-class and graduate students. An additional aspect of the young students involvement is to award the People's Choice designations to the junior-level ME projects. The lead professor/coordinator works closely with middle and high school technology and science teachers in this process and utilizes representatives on the program's advisory board.

Scholarly Outcomes: In addition to the innovative changes in products and the invention of mobility devices for handicapped individuals, and the mentoring of pre-college students on Design Day, there is an annual report (75 pages) that summarizes all of the individual product improvements, the community partner, and the MSU team linked to each product. U.S. News and World Report's 2004 Edition of *America's Best Colleges* included Design Day in an unranked list of the ten best programs.

Benefits to the Partner: The Design Day Courses have educated more than 16 students since 1994. Over 400-senior level capstone projects have been completed for over 100 small, medium-sized and large manufacturers in over 30 different industries located in over 50 communities. Students have collaborated with manufacturers in 7 states and 1 province. Over 4,200 pre-collegiate (middle and high school) students have been introduced to the engineering profession, college life, and innovative thinking through their involvement with Design Day. Overall, through innovative changes in product design, ME students help to enhance lives in the municipalities where partner companies are located by stimulating economic development and community growth.

WONDERS OF OUR WORLD (WOW)

Link to CIC Engagement Definition: Wonders of our World (WOW) seeks to improve science education by training teachers, local scientists, parents, and undergraduate students to collaboratively provide elementary school children hands-on experiments in the classroom.

Significance: By middle school, many children turn away from science and lose interest. University faculty have been concerned that students are not prepared for college-level science courses. WOW supplements science education programming by increasing access to science materials, resources, and scientists at the University and other local science enclaves. Improved science instruction, collaboration, and resource access will increase student interest while bridging gaps in science achievement and college-level preparation. Increased enthusiasm and preparation facilitates greater access to the study of the Sciences in higher education and science-oriented occupations.

Relationship with the Community: Although this project first began its pilot in 1999 at an elementary school, it has expanded to include ten elementary schools in the region. WOW has also targeted local elementary schools, both urban and suburban, with the greatest need as measured by standardized achievement tests. Participating schools make a three-year commitment and have a Lead Scientist, Teacher Coordinator, volunteers, and 100 percent teacher participation in professional development workshops. The project largely hinges on the training of teachers, teacher collaboration, and dedication to increasing content knowledge. The program's efforts are supported by local businesses, charities, and the University's Department of Chemistry and College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences. WOW volunteers primarily consists of area scientists, parents with a strong science background or interest, university faculty and staff, and undergraduates. Volunteers attend 1-2 weeks of training and assist teachers in presenting and facilitating experiments to their students 3-4 hours per month. Teacher workshops are provided by Lead Scientists to train teachers in all aspects of the experiments (5-10 per unit), which are aligned with key science concepts, state and local school district curricular objectives, and the National Science Standards. They also organize specific projects selected by teachers as well as volunteer

training sessions.

Scholarly Outcomes: WOW provides faculty participants a model for student instruction. As a result, courses are becoming more interactive, inquiry-based, and hands-on in a real world context. This program has received support through private businesses and foundations.

Benefits to the Partners

Each year WOW serves more than 3,000 K-5 elementary students and 150 teachers with the assistance of more than 350 volunteers. Over 10,000 have been served in the past two years. Passing rates on the Ohio 4th Grade Science Proficiency test have generally increased 20-40% per school. Besides local-area scientists, volunteers include 60 parents, 15 faculty and staff, and undergraduates representing 42 majors. Experiments from the WOW website are being accessed by an average of 100,000 hits a month from people around the globe.

Exemplars of Engaged Research

PATHWAYS

Link to CIC Definition of Engagement: The partnership links university faculty and graduate students with community partners in an effort to demonstrate effective early interventions for families eligible for Early Head Start programs. Enhancing the quality of life for children residing in poor families ultimately benefits society by enhancing positive educational outcomes and family stability, diverting children away from the criminal justice system, and reducing health care costs.

Significance – Nationally, 3001 families were randomly assigned to either Early Head Start or any other community child care setting. 180 of these families resided in a Community Action Agency (CAA) EHS catchment area. Results will inform the Head Start Bureau and the CAA of effective and ineffective practices for home-based and center-based early interventions for low income families.

Relationship with the Community – The main objectives of the Pathways Project concerned enhancement of the

Benefits to the Partner – Results of the evaluation partnership enabled the CAA to enhance the quality of its home intervention programs, staff training programs, infant-toddler curriculum modules, and public accountability. In addition, findings lead to the establishment of innovative programs designed to enhance father involvement in early childhood development.

LEARNING TO GIVE

Link to CIC Definition of Engagement: The partnership links university faculty and graduate students from teacher education, educational psychology, educational administration, political science, and public policy and social research with the Learning to Give project staff and steering committee, the Council of Michigan Foundations, and such major funding organizations as the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the Lilly Endowment. From the beginning of the project in 1997, the MSU team with the LTG team and funders have used multiple formative and outcomes evaluation strategies to demonstrate the program's progress in meeting its objectives, student learning outcomes, teacher experiences, and school climate improvement.

Significance: The Learning To Give (LTG) Project seeks to help K-12 students understand the concepts of philanthropy, civic responsibility, and the common good. It is designed to encourage them to develop ideas, skills, and projects that build character and instill positive attitudes and behaviors toward citizenship and toward other people in their families, neighborhoods, schools, and communities. Funded by national and regional foundations with a $10 million investment, LTG is a thoughtfully complex project employing a comprehensive set of strategies: integrated curriculum development, assessment, in-service teacher training and professional development opportunities, pilot testing and field testing, supplemental materials creation, evaluation, and dissemination through a searchable Web-based presentation. The K-12 lessons, which utilize a variety of learning styles including service-learning experiences, are integrated with social studies, language arts, and science and math curricula. All curriculum materials have been designed to meet state and national educational standards and have been reviewed by an independent fairness review committee.

Relationship with the Community: The LTG project is built on the experience of teachers for writing, testing, and assessing the curriculum. The project has also provided professional development and in-service training not only on philanthropy teaching but also on writing curriculum, using computers, creating assessment tools. Besides a reciprocal, mutually beneficial relationship with the LTG staff and supporters, the MSU evaluation team has also interacted directly with classroom teachers, students, school administrators, field testers, and other stakeholders. As the project has grown, it has included national partners such as the National Council for the Social Studies, the National Center for Black Philanthropy, and the National Council of Nonprofit Associations.

Scholarly Outcomes: Across the nine-year project, the evaluation has incorporated analysis of student work, classroom observation, school climate surveys, teacher surveys, teacher interviews, student surveys, school administrator and stakeholder focus groups and interviews, and standardized testing of philanthropic concepts. The evaluation team has used the growing body of data to prepare annual executive summaries across the data, technical reports containing all of the evaluation reports and the instruments, and presentations to the LTG steering committee and project staff.. The MSU team has also assisted the LTG project staff in reporting to the funding organizations when requested. Recently, the MSU team participated with the LTG partners in a presentation at an international research service-learning conference, a video version of which will be added to the growing body of information on the LTG Web site.

Benefits to the Partner: Based on results from this research over an 8-year span, LTG has helped teachers to transform their roles and the project is giving students a solid foundation of the basic concepts of philanthropy and the common good with almost all of the students participating in some form of voluntary service to their community at a rate of involvement almost twice that of most school children. The evaluation has assisted the LTG project in obtaining ongoing funding throughout its early developmental and testing years. A state-based project, LTG is moving in 2006 to a national applica-

tion across all 50 states, with a national steering board. The evaluation instruments will be available to the partners in a Web-based format for use by other states, universities, and school districts.

INITIATIVE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENTREPRENEURS IN AGRICULTURE.

Link to CIC Engagement – This project linked university scholars with community partners to develop and test methods of facilitating economic development by enabling producers to add value while meeting the needs of specialized and niche markets.

Significance – Commodity markets traditionally run tight margins. True partnerships in a value-added food chain respond more rapidly to markets and add value to products as they move more directly through the food chain. The result is consumer satisfaction at a premium price. This initiative is designed to provide high-end transformational education to people who are participants in the food chain.

Relation with the Community - The community consists of growers, processors, retailers, including chefs, niche and specialty markets and their consumers. It includes faculty in economics and in livestock, locally based specialists and graduate students. Entrepreneurship remains a strong driver bringing folks together. As part of this program, a special tool, MarketMaker™, was designed that provides a "one-stop shop" for producers and food retailers. Through the website, http://web.extension.uiuc.edu/iidea/projects/marketmaker.htm, an interactive mapping system can be accessed that locates businesses and markets of agricultural products. The site is rich with demographic and business data that the user can query against to find supply chain partners, location of food consumers and how food related purchasing decisions are made.

Scholarly Outcomes – This project including MarketMaker™ has evolved through applied research by Extension filed and campus-based staff in working with both producers and retailers in niche markets located in urban areas and in neighborhoods characterized by ethnic or cultural diversity. This has helped both producers and retailers better serve niche markets. This project has also enabled both campus and field based staff develop more relevant offerings for students and other stakeholders. The university partner has been successful in obtaining grants totaling $575,000. In addition, they have pending grants, contracts and proposals totaling $882,500. The IDEA team has received a state Team Research Award.

Benefits to the Partners – Producers are better able to assess "what it takes" to serve niche or custom markets and whether they are willing to adapt their production to meet the needs of such markets and assess the extent to which such markets are available or can be made available. Suppliers and retailers are better able to serve and meet the demands of local customers. Customers benefit by being able to purchase foodstuffs which meet their desires and preferences. University faculty and staff have a sounder basis for recommendations and work with clientele in the areas of enterprise and economic development. Local communities and states benefit from improved economic climates.

Exemplars of Engaged Service

DENTAL OFFICE ON WHEELS

Link to CIC Definition of Engagement.

Significance

Relationship with Community

Scholarly Outcomes

Benefits to the Partner

In a unique public-private partnership, the School of Dentistry teamed with an area HMO to convert a 37-foot Winnebago into a dental- office-on-wheels that travels the state to provide preventative and restorative care to patients enrolled in the states public health care programs. Qualified dental and dental hygiene students treat patients under supervision of the University of Minnesota faculty dentists. The mobile dental unit operates 45 weeks each year. In FY2005, students and faculty will spend 12 weeks in Greater Minnesota, with the remainder of time spent visiting communities within the 7-county metropolitan area and/or within a one-day driving distance of the Twin Cities. The mobile dental unit is owned and operated by UCare Minnesota.

LAW SCHOOL WORKERS' RIGHTS CLINIC

Link to CIC Definition of Engagement.

Significance

Relationship with Community

Scholarly Outcomes

Benefits to the Partner

The new Workers' Rights Clinic is a unique collaboration between students at the University of Minnesota Law School and the Twin Cities Religion and Labor Network. The clinic has the twin aims of providing direct legal services to low-wage and immigrant workers and addressing workplace problems in a more systemic way-through community organizing and education on workplace rights. To carry out this mission, clinic students work with community organizations, churches, and labor unions. As a result of this collaboration, students learn new ways of approaching problems, and workers facing unpaid wages, discrimination, and other abuses are able to turn to one place where their workplace issues will be addressed creatively and comprehensively.

SMALL TOWN DESIGN INITIATIVE

Link to CIC Definition of Engagement: These project involve direct interaction with communities to address critical aspects of community and economic development in small towns (15,000 and less). Students interact with community members as they vision transformations in community landscapes, environmental concerns, use of open spaces, and general issues related to community ecosystems. As a result, students become part of the participatory processes that are implicit to democratic values and civic responsibility. **Significance:** The Small Town Design Initiative (STDI) addresses physical environmental challenges and quality of life issues in small towns. Using the STDI process, multidisciplinary faculty, staff and landscape architecture students work in partnership with community members to help small towns and communities with populations of 500 to 15,000 reinvent commercial or other public areas, while also preserving character and history. (A companion initiative, the Community Design Program, is available to communities with populations over 15,000.). The objectives of the STDI are to: (1) work with communities to develop environmental design ideas for local issues and opportunities, (2) build consensus, (3) generate ideas, (4) attack a challenging environmental concern, (5) act as a bridge between communities and consulting design professionals, (6) provide for in-community student learning, and (7) provide a creative and scholarly work outlet. Design elements include: downtown streetscapes, parks, bikeways and trails, open space systems, industrial/commercial development, signs, agricultural land preservation, ecosystem management, and residential development. Representatives of a community, such as a community organization, make application to the STDI project, via a downloadable application on the project's Web site. The organization answers some questions about its community concerns, opportunities, problems, vision for itself in ten years, and details of the proposed project, and provides letters of support, project sponsors, and contact information.

Relationship with Community: A series of five meetings is attended by community residents, business owners, and local and state government officials such as city planners and Department of Transportation representatives. At these meetings, faculty and students listen to community members as they create through their words a picture of what they want

their community to look like in the next ten years. The Landscape Architecture students then turn the community's creative input into visual design images, planning design ideas, and written reports that will help the community focus in on ways to redesign and revitalize the neighborhood's built environment. Students and faculty then distill the design images into about 30 before and after images and details of some key locations within the neighborhood, which they show to the community at a final meeting. These final images are designed to reflect the community's consensus on what it wants to look like in ten years.

Scholarly Outcomes: The STDI provides an opportunity for identifying and undertaking multidisciplinary scholarly research on topics such as effective community participation, and the relationships among the physical environmental design, community social capital, community health, and social policy development and review processes. An excellent service-learning opportunity and capstone experience for MSU landscape architecture students. Faculty at other universities can draw on the STDI's publications, poster, and Web site information to develop similar programs elsewhere.

Benefits to the Partner: In this collaborative process, knowledge and expertise are exchanged between the university community and community participants comprising residents, business owners, and government officials. Since 2001, the STDI has helped 35 communities in 22 counties plan for brighter futures through improved infrastructures, more inviting commercial districts and attractive living spaces. Communities develop environmental design ideas related to local issues and opportunities and communities build consensus on what they want to look like in ten years.

Appendix C: Resources Used to Frame the Committee on Engagement Report

C.1 COUNCIL ON EXTENSION, CONTINUING EDUCATION, AND PUBLIC SERVICE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND GRANT COLLEGES.

CECEPS Benchmarking Task Force: Qualities of Engagement

Engagement brings the university's resources to bear on societal needs.

Engagement is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service.

Engagement implies reciprocity, whereby both the institution and partners in the community both benefit and contribute.

Engagement blends scientific knowledge from the university with experiential knowledge from the community to establish an environment of co-learning.

Engagement involves shared decision making.

Engagement is a practice that strengthens faculty, enhances the education experience for students, and multiplies the institution's impact on external constituencies.

Engagement is actively listening to all stakeholders that reflect the diversity of our communities–especially including those stakeholders who have not been engaged before.

A university is engaged when stakeholders see the institution as the resource of choice when dealing with an issue or problem.

Engagement measures its effectiveness through traditional measures of academic excellence, but also evaluates its work resultant to the impact and outcomes on the communities and individuals it serves.

C.2 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

American Association of State Colleges and Universities:

Community Engagement: The publicly engaged institution is fully committed to direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit.

Questions for campus leaders (Votruba, 2003).

1. To what extent is community engagement part of the campus mission/vision statement (including mission statements of the college, department, and school)?

Appendix C: Resources Used to Frame the Committee on Engagement Report

2. Is campus and community interaction institutionalized? Are campus leaders active and visible in community educational, civic, and cultural life?

3. Is the ability to lead in the community engagement arena a criteria for the selection and evaluation of key campus leaders including the president, provost, deans and chairs?

4. Does the campus have adequate infrastructure to support the community engagement mission?

5. Do campus policies and procedures serve to either enhance or inhibit faculty involvement in community engagement efforts?

6. Do faculty and unit-level incentives and rewards support community engagement?

7. Is there a clear expectation that each academic unit is responsible for serving the full breadth of the teaching, research, and engagement mission?

8. Does the process of faculty recruitment, orientation, and on-going professional development make clear that community engagement is an important element of the overall academic mission?

9. Does the campus planning and budgeting process reflect the importance of the community engagement process?

10. Is community engagement build into the curriculum?

11. Do campus communications and key communicators reflect the importance of community engagement?

12. Are campus facilities and environment designed to welcome community involvement?

Appendix C: Resources Used to Frame the Committee on Engagement Report

C. 3 BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCES

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bonnen, J. T. (1998). The land-grant idea and the evolving outreach university. In R. M. Lerner & L. A. K. Simon (eds). University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century. (Pps 25-70). New York: Garland.

Boyte, H. C. (2002). The politics of civic engagement. Academic Workplace, NERCHE. 1-7.

Commission on Higher Education (2003). The handbook of accreditation: Chapter 3.

Church, R. L., Zimmerman, D. L., Bargerstock, B. A., & Kenney, P. A. (2003). Measuring scholarly outreach at Michigan State University: Definition, challenges, tools. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement. 16, 141-152.

Denner, J., Cooper, C. R., Lopez, E. M., Dunbar, N. (1999). Beyond giving science away: How university-community partnerships inform youth programs, research, and policy. Society for Research in Child Development: Social PolicyReport, 13 (1).

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Fear, F. A., Rosaen, C. L., Foster-Fishman, P., & Bawden, R. J. (2000). Outreach as scholarly expression: A faculty perspective. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6, 21-34.

Fear, F. A., Bawden, R. J., Rosaen, C. L., & Foster-Fishman, P. G. (2002). A model of engaged learning: frames of reference and scholarly underpinnings. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement. 3, 55-68.

Fitzgerald, H. E. (2000). From inreach to outreach: Innovations in higher education. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6, 61-70.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Abrams, A., Church, R. L., Votruba, J. C., & Imig, G. L. (1996). Applied developmental science at Michigan State University: Connecting university and community via programs for children, youth, and families. Journal of Research on Adolescence. 6, 55-69.

Gentry, D. K. (2004). Purdue University Engaging Indiana: Report to the CIC institutions. West Lafayette, IN.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Holland, B. A. (Nov. 2001). Measuring the role of civic engagement in campus missions: Key concepts and challenges. Paper presented in ASHE Symposium, Broadening the Carnegie Classifications attention to mission: Incorporating public service.

Appendix C: Resources Used to Frame the Committee on Engagement Report

Heron, J., & Feason, P. (1997). A participation inquiry paradigm. Qualitative Inquiry, 3, 274-294.

Johnson, R. N., & Wamser, C. C. (1997). Respecting diverse scholarly work: the key to advancing the multiple missions of the urban university. Metropolitan Universities, 7, 4359

Kellogg Commision (2000). Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world. Washington, DC. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Kellogg Commission (2001). Returning to our roots: The engaged university. Executive summaries of the reports of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant
Universities. Washington, DC. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Klein, K. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1996). The challenge of innovation implementation. Academy of Management Review. 21, 1055-1060.

Lynton, E. A. (1995). Making the case for professional service. Washington, DC. American Association for Higher Education.
Meyerson, D., & Martin, J. (1987). Cultural change: an integration of three different views. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 623-647.

Michigan State University (1993). University outreach at Michigan State University: Extending knowledge to serve society: A report by the Provost's committee on university outreach. East Lansing, MI Michigan State University.

Michigan State University (1995). Points of Distinction: A guidebook for planning and evaluating quality outreach. East Lansing, MI. Michigan State University Outreach.

Ramaley, J. A. (2000). Embracing civic responsibility. AAHE Bulletin, 9-13.

Rosaen, C. L., Foster-Fishman, P. G., & Fear, F. A. The citizen scholar: Joining voices and values in the engagement interface. Metropolitan Universities.

Silka, L. (1999). Paradoxes of partnerships: reflections on university-community collaborations. Research in Politics and Society, 7, 335-359.

Simon, L. A. K. (1999). University Outreach: Realizing the promise through vision and accountability. In Best practices in outreach and public service monographs: The scholarship of engagement for the 21st century. (pps 23-28). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State Univresity.

Votruba, J. C. (2003). Plenary session: Defining public engagement. Outreach Scholarship Conference, Oct., Madison, WI.

UniSCOPE Learning Community. (2000). UniSCOPE 2000: A multidimensional model of scholarship for the 21st Century. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University

Appendix D: Members, Committee on Engagement

Barbara Allen (ex officio)
Director
Committee on Institutional Cooperation

Victor Bloomfield
Professor of Biohemistry
Associate Vice President for Public Engagement
University of Minnesota

John C. Burkhardt
Professor of Higher Education, Special Assistant to the Provost
Director, The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good
University of Michigan

Hiram E. Fitzgerald (chair)
University Distinguished Professor, Psychology
Assistant Provost University Outreach and Engagement
Michigan State University

Victor L. Lechtenberg
Professor of Agronomy
Vice Provost for Engagement
Purdue University

Howard Martin
Associate Vice Chancellor
Extended Programs, Dean of Continuing Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Bobby D. Moser
Dean, College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
Vice President, Outreach and Engagement
Ohio State University

David J. Nordloh
Professor of English
Associate Dean of the Faculties
Director of Undergraduate Program in English
Indiana University

Chet D. Rzonca
Associate Professor and
Dean, Continuing Education
University of Iowa

Dennis R. Campion
Professor of Animal Growth and Development
Associate Dean for Extension and Outreach
College of Agriculture, Consumer and Environmental Science
University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana.

Craig D. Weidemann
Vice President for Outreach
Pennsylvania State University

with assistance from:

Karen S. Bruns
Leader, OSU CARES and Outreach/Engagement
University Outreach and OSU Extension
The Ohio State University

Peyton Smith
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Extended Programs
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Wayne Smutz
Senior Director, Continuing and Professional Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Theodore R. Alter
Professor of Agriculture, Environmental and Regional Economics
The Pennsylvania State University

Appendix E: Possible Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicators

Linking engagement to the North Central Association's revised criteria, specifying scholarly engagement qualities, and providing a conceptual model for assessing engagement within and between institutions and disciplines provides the framework for generation of the following framework for discussion of engagement benchmarks and outcome indicators.

These benchmarks and outcomes are meant to be possible indicators for CIC institutions to consider in a deliberative process focusing on the meaning and practice of engaged scholarship at each campus. In this regard, each institution will be at a different place in realizing its goals. The benchmarks and outcome indicators are meant to be illustrative and their relevancy will vary by CIC member.

1. Evidence of Institutional Commitment to Engagement
    - 1.1. The institution's commitment is reflected throughout its administrative structure.
    - 1.2. The institution's commitment is reflected in its reward structure for faculty and staff.
    - 1.3. The institution's commitment is reflected in its policies and procedures designed to facilitate outreach and engagement activities.
    - 1.4. The institution's commitment is reflected in its policies and procedures that are responsive to students.

2. Evidence of Institutional Resource Commitments to Engagement
    - 2.1. The institution shows evidence of leadership for engagement and outreach activities.
    - 2.2. The institution shows evidence of financial support for engagement through its budgetary process.
    - 2.3. The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff time is devoted to outreach and engagement activities.
    - 2.4. The institution includes engagement activities as part of its programs for faculty, student and staff development.

3. Evidence that Students are Involved in Engagement and Outreach Activities
    - 3.1. The institution shows evidence that engagement is both an implicit and an explicit component of the curriculum and co-curricular activities.
    - 3.2. The institution shows evidence that it attends to diverse communities, peoples and geographic areas.
    - 3.3. The institution shows evidence that students are engaged in projects and programs that are centered in communities.
    - 3.4. The institution provides educational opportunities that clarify the engaged nature of research and scholarship.

4. Evidence that Faculty and Staff are Engaged with External Constituents
    - 4.1. The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff are involved in scholarly activities related to the institution's engagement mission.
    - 4.2. The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff are engaged in community well being and economic development initiatives in partnership with external constituents.
    - 4.3. The institution shows evidence that there is translation and transfer of new knowledge to external audiences.
    - 4.4. The institution has policies regarding intellectual property rights that foster the availability of knowledge and research as a public good.

Appendix E: Possible Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicators

5. Evidence that Institutions are Engaged with their Communities
   - 5.1. The institution shows evidence that it has established university-community partnerships with diverse entities.
   - 5.2. The institution shows evidence that it participates in environmental scanning in order to determine critical social needs.
   - 5.3. The institution shows evidence that communities have access to and use university resources and programs.
   - 5.4. The institution shows evidence that its partnerships strive to improve community well being.

6. Evidence of Assessing the Impact and Outcomes of Engagement
   - 6.1. The institution shows evidence that it has assessment tools and assessment plans developed in collaboration with external partners.
   - 6.2. The institution shows evidence that its experiential learning programs are evaluated in partnership with constituents served.

7. Evidence of Resource/Revenue Opportunities Generated through Engagement
   - 7.1. The institution shows evidence that it generates additional tuition and fee revenues from educational experiences that serve external audiences.
   - 7.2. The institution shows evidence that it generates economic impact from its engagement activities.

Appendix E: Possible Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicators

I. Evidence of Institutional Commitment to Engagement	Possible Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
1.1. The institution's commitment is reflected throughout its administrative structure.	Engagement/outreach is acknowledged by the institution's governing body as a component of the institution's core mission by the institution's governing body. Engagement/outreach is an acknowledged component of the institution's academic governance system. Units (colleges, departments, schools, centers, institutes) include engagement/outreach in their mission statements, structure and strategic plans.
1.2. The institution's commitment is reflected in its reward structure for faculty and staff.	Engagement/outreach is a clearly identified component of the reward structure for faculty and academic staff.
1.3 The institution's commitment is reflected in its policies and procedures designed to facilitate outreach and engagement activities.	Institutional policies and structures facilitate student, faculty and academic staff access to community-based/applied research opportunities with external partners. Institutional policies and structures facilitate student, faculty, and academic staff access to innovative and non-traditional learning environments. There is evidence of program sustainability, where justified. Institutional policies and structures facilitate development of interdisciplinary team-taught courses focused on social issues.
1.4 The institution's commitment is reflected in its policies and procedures that are responsive to students.	Institutional policies and structures encourage the development of credit instructional or certificate programs (distance education, online, summer, evening, weekend). Institutional policies and structures encourage the development of non-credit instructional or certificate programs. There is evidence that individuals are served by executive, continuing education/extension programs. Student services, both virtual and face-to-face, are conveniently available to all students.

Appendix E: Possible Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicators

2. Evidence of Institutional Resource Commitments to Engagement	Possible Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
2.1. The institution shows evidence of leadership for engagement and outreach activities.	There are individuals in central administration responsible for advancing engagement/outreach activities. There is an individual in each school/college responsible for advancing school/college/units engagement/outreach activities.
2.2 The institution shows evidence of financial support for engagement through its budgetary allocations.	There are indicators of the dollars invested in outreach and engagement activities: - University funds directed to engagement activities. - Number of faculty and staff with significant engagement assignments. - Number of Engagement/Outreach Fellows, Scholars, Chaired Professorships. - Amount of funds available in the form of seed grants for engagement activities. - Funds available to support curricular innovations involving engagement activities.
2.3 The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff time is devoted to outreach and engagement activities.	There are opportunities for faculty, students and academic staff to document and report the proportion of time they devote to each of the three engagement domains (research, teaching, service).
2.4 The institution includes engagement activities as part of its programs for faculty, student and staff development.	There are opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to participate in events that introduce university personnel to potential community partners (e.g., bus tours that take university personnel throughout the state). There are opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to participate in leadership training programs.

Appendix E: Possible Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicators

4. Evidence that Faculty and Staff are Engaged with External Constituents	Possible Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
4.1 The institution shows evidence that faculty and academic staff are involved in scholarly activities related to the institution's engagement mission.	There is evidence that faculty/academic staff are engaged in outreach/engagement research. There is evidence that faculty outreach/engagement activities are integral components of tenure and promotion portfolios There is evidence that faculty/academic staff are involved in technology transfer. There is evidence that faculty/academic staff are involved in clinical experiences. There is evidence that faculty participate in outreach/engagement instruction. There is evidence that faculty participate in outreach/engagement service. There are research projects in which community partners are participants as well as subjects.
4.2 The institution shows evidence that faculty and academic staff are engaged in community well being and economic development initiatives in partnership with external constituents.	There are faculty/academic staff involved in community economic development activities. There are faculty/academic staff involved in civic engagement activities. There are faculty/academic staff receiving internal seed grants related to community and economic development, amount of extramurally funded dollars generated as a result of internal seed grant funding. There are interdisciplinary projects addressing key issues related to community well being. There are faculty involved with community partners on issues related to the wise use of resources and quality of the environment.
4.3 The institution shows evidence that there is translation and transfer of new knowledge to external audiences.	There are faculty participating on regional, state, national, and international advisory bodies. There are training programs related to technology transfer. There are training programs delivered through distance education or on-line instruction, or that are conducted "off campus." There are new start-up companies and private businesses generated from university-community partnerships or from university-initiated research. There are companies (community partners) served by technical assistance.
4.4. The institution has policies regarding intellectual property rights that foster the availability of knowledge and research as a public good.	There are patents/licenses issued for intellectual property. There are established policies regarding copyright and royalty distribution. The university participates in the establishment of business incubators.

Appendix E: Possible Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicators

5. Evidence that Institutions are Engaged with their Communities	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
5.1. The institution shows evidence that it has established university-community partnerships with diverse entities.	There are opportunities for faculty to serve as external members on advisory boards and panels, community and business boards and panels, and to engage senior leadership with local government officials. Efforts are made to assess community needs locally, nationally, and internationally. There is evidence that university expertise is readily available to the community.
5.2 The institution shows evidence that it participates in environmental scanning in order to determine critical social needs.	The university can document geographic areas impacted and number of communities served by engagement projects.
5.3 The institution shows evidence that communities have access to and use university resources and programs.	University policies encourage visitors to campus facilities such as museums, performing arts centers, science expositions and other educational and participatory engagement activities. Universities encourage use of campus facilities for conferences and meetings. Universities have policies that reflect "open door," "public space," portal entry" to the campus and its resources. There is evidence that universities provide opportunities for students to respond to community-initiated requests for their involvement in community programs.
5.4 The institution shows evidence that its partnerships strive to improve community well being.	The institution documents resources generated for the public as a result of university-community partnership activities. University-community partnerships are located in diverse geographic areas. University-community partnerships involve minority led businesses. University-community partnerships involve human service agencies. There is evidence of community partners' satisfaction with processes and results from university- community partnerships. There are cooperative arrangements with other institutions of higher education that engage external constituents. There are stories in all forms of media about university-community partnership projects. There are partnerships and in-service activities for Preschool-16 teachers. There is evidence of institutional involvement in business and industrial professional organizations.

Appendix E: Possible Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicators

6. Evidence of Assessing the Impact and Outcomes of Engagement	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
6.1 The institution shows evidence that it has assessment tools and assessment plans developed in collaboration with external partners.	Performance standards and annual reporting procedures include documentation of the effectiveness of university-community partnerships from the community's perspective. Continuing education, outreach and extension activities are evaluated, including outcome-based or impact assessments.
6.2 The institution shows evidence that its experiential learning programs are evaluated in partnership with constituents served.	Program evaluation is a component of course-based service learning courses and programs. The office of service learning obtains feedback from community placement partners.

7. Evidence of Resource/Revenue Opportunities Generated through Engagement	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
7.1 The institution shows evidence that it generates tuition and fee revenues from educational experiences that serve external audiences.	Revenue generated from non-credit courses delivered to external audiences. Revenue generated from credit courses delivered to external and nontraditional audiences. Revenue generated from clinical services. Revenue generated from on-line instruction. Revenue generated from corporate and government training programs and/or contracts for services. Revenue generated from Federal grants that involve an engagement component.
7.2 The institution shows evidence that it generates economic impact from its engagement activities.	Amount of money generated in support of engagement teaching, research and service activities regionally, statewide, nationally, and internationally. The institution assesses changes in public attitudes toward the value of higher education as a public good, in the context of economic impact. Estimates of the cost-savings accrued as a result of community-based research and outreach activities.