

Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

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

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

Resources Consulted:

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

Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

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

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

Resources Consulted:

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

Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

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

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

Resources Consulted:

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

Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

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

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

Resources Consulted:

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

Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

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

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

Resources Consulted:

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

Tools for the Institutionalization of Public Engagement

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

VI. Systems				
Name of Tool	Purpose	Elements of Tool (abbreviated version)	Measurement Type	Web Location
Carnegie Classification: Community Engagement (2010)	Provides institutions with a classification to demonstrate their commitment to community engagement	1) Foundational Indicators: Institutional Identity and Culture, Institutional Commitment; 2) Categories of Community Engagement: Curricular, Outreach & Partnerships,	Qualitative and quantitative	http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213
Comprehensive Assessment for the Scholarship of Engagement (CASE); (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999)	Presents an assessment process through which evidence of campus engagement is documented to develop and implement a comprehensive engagement plan	<u>Principles:</u> 1)community engagement is consistent with its mission; 2)continuous, authentic, and meaningful involvement of community; 3)learning at the center; 4)community engagement present in all areas; 5)infrastructure supports the community engagement; 6)active leadership for community engagement at all levels of the organization; 7)supporting interdisciplinary work on community issues; 8)flexibility, responsiveness, and sensitivity to external constituencies; 9)scholarship of engagement is visible both internally and externally; 10) promoting a culture of service	quantitative measures based on ratings received after a variety of activities	http://people.brandeis.edu/~burack/Supplemental_Materials_Civic_Engagement_2006.pdf
Monitoring Evaluation Research Process (n.d.)	Gathers standardised data from the eight participating campuses to provide evidence to lobby the South African National Department of Education to prioritise SL in higher education.	not available	Templates: Described the intended learning outcomes of each SL module; Logic models: set out the approach for analysis of the potential outcomes for each of the parties involved	not directly accessible but see a description and critique of this assessment tool: http://www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/documents/14/Acta_Academica_Supplementum_2005%283%29/13018-07_Mitchell_et_al.pdf

Resources Consulted:

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