

# Carnegie Community Engagement Classification:

Overview, Documentation Framework, & Best Practices

Jerald H. Walz  
Graduate Assistant  
Office of Engagement  
Virginia Tech

- I. Overview
  - a. Elective Classification
    - i. Voluntary participation
    - ii. Institutional classification
    - iii. Evidence-based documentation
    - iv. Five-year cycle
  - b. Classification Definition
    - i. "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"
    - ii. Purpose: "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."
  - c. 2015 Reclassification
    - i. For institutions receiving initial classification in 2006, 2008
    - ii. PDF of documentation framework available
  - d. Application Fee
  - e. Timeline
    - i. January 2013 announcement of 2015 process
    - ii. June 30, 2013 deadline of request for application and fee payment
    - iii. April 15, 2014 application due
    - iv. December 2014 review process completed, notification
    - v. January 2015 results announced
- II. Documentation Framework
  - a. General instructions
    - i. Current community engagement commitments & activities
    - ii. Changes since last certification
    - iii. Evidence-based
    - iv. Depth & quality w/in sustainable institutional context
    - v. AY 2012-2013
    - vi. Provide web links
  - b. Applicant contact information
  - c. Community Engagement definition & purpose (see above)

d. Foundational Indicators

i. President's Leadership Statement

1. Cover letter
2. Excerpts from public statements

ii. Institutional Identity and Culture

1. Institutional definition of engagement
2. Engagement specified as priority in foundational documents
3. Changes related to engagement since 2006
4. Changes in executive leadership since 2006 & implications for engagement

iii. Institutional Commitment

1. Coordinating infrastructure & changes
2. Internal budgetary allocations & changes
3. External budgetary allocations & changes
4. Fundraising activities & changes
5. Investment externally for engagement, funding source & use
6. Tracking or documentation mechanisms
7. Assessment & measurement mechanisms
8. Current findings
9. Impact on students – one key finding
10. Impact on faculty – one key finding
11. Impact on community – one key finding
12. Impact on institution – one key finding
13. Support for professional development, changes, results
14. Hiring faculty committed to engagement
15. Changes to P&T rewarding engagement
16. Definition of faculty scholarly work for engagement
17. Institutional Policies for P&T rewarding engagement
18. Teaching & learning as form of engagement
19. Scholarship as form of engagement
20. Service as form of engagement
21. College/School and/or department policies for P&T & engagement
22. Professional development for reviewers of P&T dossiers
23. Progress to revise P&T guidelines regarding engagement
24. Involvement of students in engagement
25. Engagement & student transcripts
26. Connection to diversity & inclusion
27. Student retention & success

e. Categories of Community Engagement

i. Curricular Engagement – teaching, learning, and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration (i.e. “service learning”)

1. Institutional description of service learning & changes
2. Table showing numbers of courses, departments, faculty, and students involved in service learning and corresponding changes
3. Description of data collection for #2
4. Description of institutional learning outcomes for engagement, assessment, and results
5. Table showing curricular activity, engagement integration, changes, & web link for student research, student leadership courses, internships/co-ops, study abroad, and other areas.
6. Table showing curriculum area, engagement integration, changes, & web link for core, general education, first year experience, and capstone courses
7. Examples of how faculty used community based teaching & learning and how used for research to improve teaching & learning through scholarship
8. Overall changes and trends related to curricular engagement

ii. Outreach and Partnerships

1. Changes to outreach programs
2. Changes regarding institutional resources
3. New and continued partnerships (use template grid)
4. Comparison of partnership grid with previous application
5. Actions to deepen or improve partnership practices & relationships
6. Assessment of partnerships & learning occurred
7. Faculty collaboration with partners to co-create knowledge
8. Overall changes related to outreach & Partnerships

f. Wrap-up

- i. Any additional changes
- ii. Suggestions or comments

g. Permission to use application for research purposes

III.

Best Practices

- a. Define engagement
- b. Compelling alignment of mission, marketing, leadership, traditions, recognitions, budgetary support, infrastructure, faculty development, and strategic plans
- c. Definitions and processes for identifying and tracking activities of engagement

- d. Engagement embedded in faculty roles & awards (as opposed to an “add-on”)
- e. Assessment. Assessment. Assessment.
- f. Develop substantive roles for community participants – reciprocity
- g. Describe what actually occurs, as if the report would be audited
- h. Consult with colleagues at other institutions
- i. Appoint a taskforce, chaired by someone familiar with engagement or extension
- j. Taskforce members should have connections throughout the university and with engagement partners
- k. Schedule regular task force meetings
- l. Reach out to leaders in units across campus
- m. Debate key issues of inclusion, exclusion, interpretation
- n. Check numbers and assumptions
- o. Clarify expectations about documentation – talk directly with Carnegie
- p. Be flexible but pay careful attention to details

## References

- Carnegie Foundation. (2013). Classification description: Community engagement elective classification. Retrieved from [http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community\\_engagement.php](http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php)
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie’s community engagement classification: Intentions and designs. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(1), 38-41. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/elibrary/Driscoll.pdf>
- Zuiches, J. J. et al. (2008). Attaining Carnegie's Community-Engagement Classification. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(1), pp. 42-45. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/elibrary/zuiches.pdf>