

CREATING COMMUNITY-ENGAGED DEPARTMENTS: SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

KEVIN KECSKES, PH.D.
ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST FOR ENGAGEMENT
DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS
CO-DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

Creating Community-Engaged Departments (hereafter referred to as the *Rubric*) is designed to assess the capacity of a higher education academic department for community engagement and to help its members identify various opportunities for engagement. This self-assessment builds upon existing and/or validated prior work (Furco, 2000, 2003; Gelmon & Seifer et al., 2005; Kecskes & Muyllaert, 1997; Kecskes, 2006).¹ While many of these instruments have been developed primarily for institution-wide application, and some have been applied to academic units including colleges, schools, departments and programs, this *Rubric* has been developed solely for use in academic departments. This approach is based on advice from key informant interviews and the recognition of the importance of the role of academic departments in the overall institutionalization of community engagement in higher education (Battistoni et al., 2003; Furco, 2002; Holland, 2000; Morreale & Applegate, 2006; Saltmarsh & Gelmon, 2006; Zlotkowski & Saltmarsh, 2006).

The *Rubric* is structured along six dimensions, which are considered by most community engagement experts to be key factors for the institutionalization of community engagement in higher education academic departments (Battistoni et al., 2003; Gelmon & Seifer et al., 2005; Holland, 1997; Wergin, 1994, 2003; Zlotkowski, 2005).

Each dimension is composed of several components that characterize the dimension. For each component, a four-stage continuum of development has been established. Progression from *Stage One: Awareness Building* toward *Stage Four: Institutionalization* suggests that a department is moving closer to the full institutionalization of community engagement within the academic unit (Furco, 2000, 2003; Kecskes & Muyllaert, 1997).

The conceptual framework for the *Rubric* is based largely on three knowledge sources: 1) the prior self-assessment rubric, matrix and benchmark instruments cited above; 2) various literature sources that discuss the critical elements for institutionalizing community engagement in higher education; and 3) key informant interviews that provided foundational information for the development and enhancement of this *Rubric*. In particular, the author wishes to express

¹ The author expresses gratitude to Andrew Furco; Sherril Gelmon, Sarena Seifer and Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH); and Julie Muyllaert and Washington Campus Compact for their permission to use and adapt their rubric, self-assessment, or benchmark instrument to assist the development of this departmental self-assessment rubric.

gratitude to the key informants and to the organizations that hold copyright on the source instruments.²

DIMENSIONS AND COMPONENTS OF THE *RUBRIC*

The self-assessment *Rubric* contains six dimensions; each includes a set of components that characterize the dimension. The six dimensions of the *Rubric* and their respective components are listed below:

DIMENSIONS	COMPONENTS
I. Mission and Culture Supporting Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mission ▪ Definition of Community Engaged Teaching ▪ Definition of Community Engaged Research ▪ Definition of Community Engaged Service ▪ Climate and Culture ▪ Collective Self-Awareness
II. Faculty Support and Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Faculty Knowledge and Awareness ▪ Faculty Involvement and Support ▪ Curricular Integration of Community Engagement ▪ Faculty Incentives ▪ Review, Promotion, and Tenure Process Integration ▪ Tenure Track Faculty
III. Community Partner and Partnership Support and Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Placement and Partnership Awareness ▪ Mutual Understanding and Commitment ▪ Community Partner Voice ▪ Community Partner Leadership ▪ Community Partner Access to Resources ▪ Community Partner Incentives and Recognition
IV. Student Support and Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student Opportunities ▪ Student Awareness ▪ Student Incentives and Recognition ▪ Student Voice, Leadership & Departmental Governance
V. Organizational Support for Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administrative Support ▪ Facilitating Entity ▪ Evaluation and Assessment ▪ Departmental Planning ▪ Faculty Recruitment and Orientation ▪ Marketing ▪ Dissemination of Community Engagement Results

² Richard Battistoni, Providence College; Amy Driscoll, consulting scholar, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Andrew Furco, University of Minnesota; Sherril Gelmon, Portland State University; Barbara Holland, National Service-Learning Clearinghouse; Steve Jones, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis; John Saltmarsh, University of Massachusetts, Boston; Sarena Seifer, Campus-Community Partnerships for Health; Jon Wergin, Antioch University; and Edward Zlotkowski, Bentley College.

<p>VI. Leadership Support for Community Engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budgetary Allocation ▪ Department Level Leadership ▪ Campus Level Leadership from Departmental Faculty ▪ National Level Leadership from Departmental Faculty
---	---

Each dimension has been divided into four phases of development. The first is an “awareness building” phase; the second is a “critical mass building” phase; the third is a “quality building” phase; and finally, the fourth is an “institutionalization” phase. The four "phases" are based on the scholarly literature on best practices with respect to commitment to community engagement (Furco 2000, 2003; Gelmon & Seifer et al., 2005; Holland, 1997; Kecskes & Muyliaert, 1997).

Departments may be in different phases of development for each of the six dimensions of the Rubric. The results of the self-assessment can be used to offer a profile of current departmental engagement and identify opportunities for change. The *Rubric* may also be used repeatedly to track progress and establish a longitudinal profile of the academic department’s developing capacity for community engagement over time.

DEFINITIONS

Three terms used in this self-assessment are particularly important to define:

1) *Community Engagement*: Community Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification: Community Engagement, 2007). This engagement may be described in the following various ways: community service, service-learning, community-based learning, community-based participatory research, training and technical assistance, capacity-building and economic development, among others. Community engagement is not necessarily scholarship. For example, if a faculty member devotes time to developing a community-based program, it may be important work and it may advance the service mission of the department, but it may not be "scholarly" unless it includes dimensions that are characteristic of scholarship (Commission on Community Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005; Gelmon & Seifer et al., 2005).

2) *Community-engaged scholarship*: Teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement that involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community and has the following characteristics: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, new knowledge creation, effective presentation, reflective critique, rigor and peer-review (Commission on Community Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005; Gelmon & Seifer et al., 2005; Lynton, 1995).

3) *Academic department* describes a formal cohort of individuals organized around a common academic subject matter, theme or discipline in higher education. In the *Rubric*, the term academic department is used interchangeably with “academic unit,” “department,” and “unit.” In some European-influenced higher education systems, the term academic department may equate with the term “college.” In some Asia-Pacific higher education systems, the term academic

department may equate with the term “faculty” or “faculties” (Personal communication with Wayne Delaforce, 2/29/08).

USING THE *RUBRIC*

The *Rubric* is intended to be used as a tool to measure development of community engagement by academic departments. The results of this self-assessment can provide useful information and help identify those components or dimensions of community engagement that are progressing well and those which may need some additional attention. By using the tool at different points in time, departments can measure the progress they are making.

The *Rubric* provides departments with a wide and flexible range of opportunities to increase their community engagement activities. The *Rubric* recognizes that community engagement is largely a function of a campus’ and a department’s unique character and cultures. For that reason, in some cases, individual components of the *Rubric* may not be applicable in certain departmental settings. In other cases, the *Rubric* may not include some components that may be key to a department’s institutionalization efforts in which case a department may wish to add components or dimensions to the *Rubric*. What is most important is the overall status of the department’s institutionalization progress rather than the progress of individual components.

General Instructions for Completion of the Self-Assessment *Rubric*: While there is value in the *Rubric*’s being completed by an individual familiar with the academic department, the self-assessment is most effective when completed by a departmental team. Furthermore, the self-assessment is ideally completed as a two-phase process. First, individual team members review the assessment independently and complete it in a draft format. Then, team members come together and the final summary self-assessment is completed through team conversation and discussion. This provides an opportunity to think through issues about community engagement as a team, which ideally will help to build departmental knowledge about contexts and practices. A response should be provided for every component. Generally, it is not recommended that partial stage scores be given. In other words, a department should not state that for a particular component, the department is “between” stage one and stage two. If the department has not fully reached stage two (“quality building”), then the department is not presently at stage two, and should thus be designated at stage one (“awareness building”) in the self-assessment for that particular component. What is most important is that the results of the self-assessment are used by departmental faculty and staff to build awareness for community engagement efforts at the unit level and to decide whether and how to move forward. Finally, the *Rubric* should be viewed as only one assessment tool for determining the degree and kind of integration of community engagement into the activities of the department. Other indicators should also be observed and documented to ensure that a department’s effort to advance community engagement is conducted systematically and comprehensively (Furco, 2000, 2003; Gelmon & Seifer et al., 2005; Kecskes & Muyliaert, 1997)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to acknowledge the following individuals for their assistance in reviewing and refining the components of the self-assessment rubric: Douglas Morgan, Portland State University; Peter Collier, Portland State University; Sherwin Davidson, Portland State

University; Barbara Holland, National Service-Learning Clearinghouse; Marcus Ingle, Portland State University; Craig Shinn, Portland State University.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agre-Kippenhan, S. and Charman, E. (2006). Engagement in the arts: Commitment to an urban experience. In K. Kecskes (Ed.), *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good* (pp. 89-107). Boston: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Applegate, J., and Morreale, S. (2001). Creating engaged disciplines. *The AAHE Bulletin*, 16, pp. 7-9.
- Bell, R., Furco, A., Ammon, M.S., Muller, P., and Sorgen, V. (2000). *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Findings from a Study of the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium*. Western Region Campus Compact Consortium. Bellingham WA: Western Washington University.
- Battistoni, R. M., Gelmon, S. B., Saltmarsh, J. A., Wergin, J. F., and Zlotkowski, E. (2003). *The engaged department toolkit*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Campus Compact. (2003). The Indicators of Engagement. Retrieved March 2, 2008 from <http://www.compact.org/indicators/detail.php?id=14>
- Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification: Community Engagement, 2007. Retrieved March 2, 2008 from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/dynamic/downloads/file_1_614.pdf
- Commission on Community Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005. Retrieved March 2, 2008 from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Commission%20Report%20FINAL.pdf
- Edwards, R. (1999). The Academic Department: How Does it fit into the University Reform Agenda? *Change*, September/October, 17-27.
- Furco, A. (2000, 2003 rev.). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Furco, A. (2002). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 6, 39-67.
- Furco, A., Muller, P., and Ammon, M.S. (1998). *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Findings from a Study of the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Furco, A. and Shumer, R. (2000). Developing a self-assessment instrument for higher education. In Kecskes, K (Ed.), 4th Annual "Continuums of Service" Conference Proceedings,

retrieved June 30, 2006 from

<http://www.acadweb.wvu.edu/campcomp/pdf/4thCOSAnnualProceedings.pdf>

- Gelmon, S.B., Seifer, S.D., Kauper-Brown, J., and Mikkelsen, M. (2005) Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: Institutional Self-Assessment. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.
- Gelmon, S.B., Holland, B.A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., and Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing Service-Learning and Civic Engagement: Principles and Techniques*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Holland, B.A. (1997). "Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors." *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning*, Fall, p.30-41.
- Holland, B.A. (Fall, 2000). Institutional impacts and organizational issues related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue, 52-60.
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kecskes, K. (2004). Engaging the Department: Community-Based Approaches to Support Academic Unit Coherence. *The Department Chair*, 15(1), 7-9.
- Kecskes, K. (2008). Engagement in the disciplines. *The Department Chair*, 18(3), 16-18.
- Kecskes, K., Gelmon, S.B., and Spring, A. (2006). Creating engaged departments: a program for organizational and faculty development. *To Improve the Academy*, 24, 147-165.
- Kecskes, K., Ed. (2006). *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishers.
- Kecskes, K. and Muyliaert, J. (1997). *Continuums of Service Benchmark Worksheet*. Western Region Campus Compact Consortium Request for Proposals. Retrieved May 19, 2008 from <http://www.wacampuscompact.org/documents/COSBenchmarkTool1997.pdf>
- Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Morreale, S. and Applegate, J. (2006). Engaged disciplines: How national disciplinary societies support the scholarship of engagement. In K. Kecskes (Ed.), *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good* (pp. 264-277). Boston: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Ramaley, J. A. (2005). Scholarship for the public good: Living in Pasteur's quadrant. In Kezar, et al. (Eds.) *Higher education for the common good: Emerging voices form a national movement*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 166-182.

- Rice, R. E. and Richlin, L. (1993). Broadening the conception of scholarship in the professions. In Curry, L., Wergin, J., & Associates (Eds.), *Educating Professionals*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Saltmarsh, J. and Gelmon, S.B. (2006). Characteristics of an engaged department: Design and assessment. In K. Kecskes (Ed.), *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good* (pp. 27-44). Boston: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Wergin, J. (1994). *The collaborative department*. Washington DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Wergin, J. (2003). *Departments that work: building and sustaining cultures of excellence in academic programs*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2000). Service-Learning research in the disciplines. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall 2000, 61-67.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2005). The disciplines and the public good. In Kezar, et al. (Eds.) *Higher education for the common good: Emerging voices form a national movement*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 146-165.
- Zlotkowski, E. and Saltmarsh, J. (2006). The engaged department in the context of academic change. In K. Kecskes (Ed.), *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good* (pp. 278-289). Boston: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Zlotkowski, E., Longo, N., and Williams, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Students as colleagues*. Providence: Campus Compact.

CREATING COMMUNITY-ENGAGED DEPARTMENTS: SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

DIMENSION I: MISSION AND CULTURE SUPPORTING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Primary components for institutionalizing community engagement in academic units are the development of a department-wide mission, definitions, and organizational culture for engagement that provide meaning, focus, emphasis, and support for community-engaged efforts (Holland, 2000; Zlotkowski, 2000).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the six components (rows) below, place a circle around the cell that best represents the unit's CURRENT status of development.

	STAGE ONE <i>Awareness Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE FOUR <i>Institutionalization</i>
MISSION ^{1, 2, 3, 4}	The formal mission of the academic unit does not directly mention or indirectly allude to the importance of community engagement.	The formal mission of the academic unit indirectly alludes to the importance of community engagement (e.g., suggests "application of knowledge," "real-world teaching," etc.)	The formal mission of the academic unit directly mentions community engagement and may also indirectly allude to its importance (e.g., suggests "application of knowledge," etc.) yet it is not viewed as a central or primary focus area.	Community engagement is directly mentioned, highlighted and/or centrally located in the department's formal mission. Community engagement is clearly part of the primary focus area of the unit (e.g., present in planning docs)
DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY-ENGAGED TEACHING ^{1, 2, 4}	There is no unit-wide definition for community-engaged teaching (including definitions for the terms "service-learning" or "community-based learning").	There are generally-understood and accepted notions of community-engaged teaching that are used inconsistently to describe a variety of experiential or service activities.	There is a formal definition for community-engaged teaching in the unit, but there is inconsistency in the understanding, acceptance and application of the term.	The unit has a formal, universally accepted definition for community-engaged teaching that is applied consistently in departmental courses.
DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY-ENGAGED RESEARCH ^{1, 3, 4}	There is no unit-wide definition for community-engaged research (including definitions for the terms "community-based research" or "participatory action research").	There are generally-understood and accepted notions of community-engaged research that are used inconsistently to describe a variety of experiential or service activities.	There is a formal definition for community-engaged research in the unit, but there is inconsistency in the understanding, acceptance and application of the term.	The unit has a formal, universally accepted definition for community-engaged research that is understood consistently in the department.
DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SERVICE ^{1, 4}	Community engagement is not acknowledged as an essential component of service or professional practice.	There are generally-understood and accepted notions of community-engaged service that are used inconsistently to describe a wide variety of activities.	There is a formal definition for community-engaged service in the unit, but there is inconsistency in the understanding, acceptance and application of the term.	The unit has a formal, universally accepted definition for community-engaged service that is applied consistently as an essential component of service or professional practice.
CLIMATE AND CULTURE ⁴	The organizational climate and culture of the department is not supportive of community engagement.	A few faculty/staff concur that the organizational climate and culture of the department is supportive of community engagement.	Many faculty/staff concur that the organizational climate and culture of the department is supportive of community engagement.	Most faculty/staff concur that the organizational climate and culture of the department is highly supportive of community engagement.
COLLECTIVE SELF-AWARENESS AND ACTION ⁴	Faculty and staff in the unit do not collectively assess the practices of community engaged teaching, research, or service.	Infrequently, faculty and staff in the unit collectively assess the practices of community engaged teaching, research, or service and may occasionally adjust practices toward improvement.	Periodically, faculty and staff in the unit collectively assess the practices of community-engaged teaching, research or service and generally adjust practices as needed to continually improve those practices.	Regularly, faculty and staff in the unit collectively assess the practices of community engaged teaching, research, and service and proactively adjust practices as needed to continually improve those practices.

Adapted by Kevin Kecskes, Portland State University, 2008. Components based on the (1) Gelmon, Seifer et al., Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment, 2005;(2) the Furco Service-Learning Institutionalization Rubric, 2003;(3) the Kecskes Characteristics of Engaged Departments Matrix, 2006; (4) and key informant interviews, 2008.

DIMENSION II: FACULTY SUPPORT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

One of the essential factors for institutionalizing community engagement in academic departments is the degree to which faculty members are involved in implementation and advancement of community-engaged efforts in the unit (Battistoni et al., 2003; Kecskes, 2006, 2008; Wergin, 1994, 2003).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the six components (rows) below, place a circle around the cell that best represents the unit's CURRENT status of development.

	STAGE ONE <i>Awareness Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE FOUR <i>Institutionalization</i>
FACULTY KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS ^{1, 2, 3}	Faculty members do not know what community engagement is or how it can be integrated into teaching, research, or service.	A few faculty members know what community engagement is and understand how it can be integrated into teaching, research, or service.	Many faculty members know what community engagement is and can articulate how it can be integrated into teaching, research, and/or service.	Most faculty members know what community engagement is and can articulate how it can be integrated into teaching, research and/or service.
FACULTY INVOLVEMENT & SUPPORT ^{1, 2}	Faculty members do not support or advocate for community engagement; faculty do not support for the infusion of community engagement into the unit's mission or into their own professional work.	A few faculty members are supportive of community engagement; a few advocate for integrating it into the unit's mission and/or their own professional work.	Many faculty members participate in community engaged teaching, research, or service and support the infusion of community engagement into both the unit's mission and the faculty members' individual professional work.	Most faculty members participate in community engaged teaching, research, or service and support the infusion of community engagement into both the unit's mission and the faculty members' individual professional work.
CURRICULAR INTEGRATION ⁴	There are a few or no elective and no required community-based learning courses integrated into the curriculum of the major.	There are some elective, but only a few required, developmentally appropriate community-based learning courses integrated into the major curriculum.	There are multiple elective and many required, developmentally appropriate community-based learning courses integrated into the major curriculum.	The entire curriculum for the major is intentionally and consistently infused with developmentally appropriate elective and required community-based learning course requirements.
FACULTY INCENTIVES ^{1, 2}	Within the unit, faculty members are not encouraged to participate in community engagement activities; no incentives are provided (e.g., mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for conferences, etc.) to pursue engagement activities.	Faculty members are infrequently encouraged to participate in community engagement activities; a few incentives are provided (e.g., mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for conferences, etc.) to pursue engagement activities.	Faculty members are frequently encouraged and are provided some incentives (mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for scholarly conferences, etc.) to pursue community engagement activities.	Faculty members are fully encouraged and are provided many incentives (mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for conferences, etc.) to pursue community engagement activities.
REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCESS INTEGRATION ^{1, 3}	The review, promotion, and tenure process at the departmental level does not reward community-engaged research and scholarship in which a faculty member is involved in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community.	The review, promotion, and tenure process at the departmental level provides little reward for community-engaged research and scholarship in which a faculty member is involved in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community.	The review, promotion, and tenure process at the departmental level modestly rewards community-engaged research and scholarship in which a faculty member is involved in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community.	The review, promotion, and tenure process at the departmental level clearly and consistently rewards community-engaged research and scholarship in which a faculty member is involved in one or more mutually beneficial partnership(s) with the community.
TENURE TRACK FACULTY ¹	None of the community-engaged faculty hold tenure track positions.	A few of the community-engaged faculty hold tenure track positions.	Many of the community-engaged faculty hold tenure track positions.	Most of the community-engaged faculty hold tenure track positions.

Adapted by Kevin Kecskes, Portland State University, 2008. Components based on the (1) Gelmon, Seifer et al., *Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment*, 2005;(2) *the Furco Service-Learning Institutionalization Rubric*, 2003;(3) *the Kecskes Characteristics of Engaged Departments Matrix*, 2006; (4) and key informant interviews, 2008.

DIMENSION III: COMMUNITY PARTNER AND PARTNERSHIP SUPPORT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

An important element for institutionalizing community engagement in academic departments is the degree to which the unit nurtures community partnerships and encourages community partners to play a role in advancing engagement efforts (Agre-Kippenhan & Charman, 2006).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the six components (rows) below, place a circle around the cell that best represents the unit's **CURRENT** status of development.

	STAGE ONE <i>Awareness Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE FOUR <i>Institutionalization</i>
PLACEMENT AND PARTNERSHIP AWARENESS ⁴	Faculty in the department can not identify community agencies where unit-related work or internship placements occur or that partner consistently with the academic unit.	Faculty in the department can identify community agencies that periodically host unit-related work sites or internship placements.	Faculty in the department can identify community agencies that regularly host unit-related work sites, community-based or service-learning courses or internship placements.	Faculty in the department can identify community agencies with which they are in sustained, reciprocal partnerships. The collaborations, based on long-term relationships and trust, are mutually beneficial, include resource and power sharing, etc.
MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND COMMITMENT ^{1, 2, 3}	There is no understanding between departmental and community representatives regarding each other's long-range goals, needs, timelines, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities.	There is some understanding between unit and community representatives regarding each other's long-range goals, needs, timelines, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities.	There is good understanding between departmental and community representatives regarding each other's long-range goals, needs, timelines, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities.	There is deep, mutual understanding between departmental and community representatives regarding each other's long-range goals, needs, timelines, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities.
COMMUNITY PARTNER VOICE ^{1, 2}	Community partners are not invited to express their needs, goals, resources, and capacity.	Community partners are rarely invited to express their needs, goals, and capacity.	Community partners are often invited or encouraged to express their needs, goals, resources, and capacity.	Community partners are routinely invited or encouraged to express their needs, goals, resources, and capacity.
COMMUNITY PARTNER LEADERSHIP ^{1, 2, 3}	There are no opportunities for community partners to assume leadership roles in unit activities (e.g., serve on advisory and faculty hiring or review committees, facilitate student reflection, instruct, collaborate on research).	There are a few opportunities for community partners to assume leadership roles in core unit activities (e.g., serve on advisory and faculty hiring or review committees, facilitate reflection, instruct, collaborate on research).	There are many opportunities for community partners to assume leadership roles in core unit activities (e.g., serve on advisory and faculty hiring or review committees, facilitate student reflection, instruct, collaborate on research).	Community partners assume leadership roles in core unit activities (e.g., serve on advisory and faculty hiring and review committees, facilitate student reflection, instruct, collaborate on research).
COMMUNITY PARTNER ACCESS TO RESOURCES ¹	Community agencies do not access unit faculty and/or students as resources for their work through course-based projects, research, etc.	Community agencies rarely access unit faculty and/or students as resources for their work through course-based projects, research, etc.	Community agencies occasionally access unit faculty and/or students as resources for their work through course-based projects, research, etc.	Community agencies frequently access unit faculty and/or students as resources for their work through course-based projects, research, etc.
COMMUNITY PARTNER INCENTIVES AND RECOGNITION ^{1, 4}	The very few, if any, community agencies that partner consistently with the academic department are not provided incentives for their involvement in the unit's community engagement activities.	Community partners are rarely provided incentives for their involvement in the unit's community engagement activities (e.g., adjunct faculty status, compensation, continuing education credits, recognition events, etc).	Community partners are occasionally provided incentives for their involvement in the unit's community engagement activities (e.g., adjunct faculty status, compensation, continuing education credits, formal recognition ceremonies, etc).	Community partners are frequently provided many incentives for their involvement in the unit's community engagement activities (e.g., adjunct faculty status, compensation, continuing education credits, formal recognition ceremonies, etc).

Adapted by Kevin Kecskes, Portland State University, 2008. Components based on the (1) Gelmon, Seifer et al., Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment, 2005;(2) the Furco Service-Learning Institutionalization Rubric, 2003;(3) the Kecskes Characteristics of Engaged Departments Matrix, 2006; (4) and key informant interviews, 2008.

DIMENSION IV: STUDENT SUPPORT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

An important element for institutionalizing community engagement in academic departments is the degree to which students are aware of and play a leadership role in the development of community engagement efforts (Zlotkowski et al., 2006).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four components (rows) below, place a circle around the cell that best represents the unit's CURRENT status of development.

	STAGE ONE <i>Awareness Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE FOUR <i>Institutionalization</i>
STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES 1, 2, 3	Opportunities do not exist for students in the major to engage with community; formally through courses and research endeavors, or informally through unit-sponsored student clubs and other “public work” opportunities.	A few opportunities exist for students in the major to engage with community; formally through courses and research endeavors, or informally through unit-sponsored student clubs and other “public work” opportunities.	Many opportunities exist for students in the major to engage with community; formally through required and elective courses and research endeavors, and/or informally through unit-sponsored student clubs and other “public work” opportunities.	Numerous options and opportunities exist for students in the major to engage with community; formally through required and elective courses and research endeavors, as well as informally through unit-sponsored student clubs and other “public work” opportunities.
STUDENT AWARENESS 1, 2, 3	No students in the major are aware of community engagement opportunities because there are no coordinated and publicized, department-supported mechanisms for informing students about them (e.g., community-based learning course listings in the schedule of classes, job postings, volunteer opportunities, community-engaged research assistantships, etc).	A few students in the major are aware of community engagement opportunities because there are some coordinated and publicized, department-supported mechanisms for informing students about them (e.g., community-based learning course listings in the schedule of classes, job postings, volunteer opportunities, community-engaged research assistantships, etc).	Many students in the major are aware of community engagement opportunities because there are many coordinated and publicized, department-supported mechanisms for informing students about them (e.g., community-based learning course listings in the schedule of classes, job postings, volunteer opportunities, community-engaged research assistantships, etc).	Most students in the major are aware of community engagement opportunities because there are numerous coordinated and publicized, department-supported mechanisms for informing students about them (e.g., community-based learning course listings in the schedule of classes, job postings, volunteer opportunities, community-engaged research assistantships, etc).
STUDENT INCENTIVES AND RECOGNITION 1, 2, 4	The department does not have any formal or informal incentive or recognition mechanisms in place for students to engage with community (e.g., community engagement notation on transcripts, scholarships, annual awards, stories on the unit website and in unit newsletters, verbal encouragement, etc).	The department has a few formal or informal incentive or recognition mechanisms in place for students to engage with community (e.g., community engagement notation on transcripts, scholarships, annual awards, stories on the unit website and in unit newsletters, verbal encouragement, etc).	The department has many formal incentive and recognition mechanisms in place for students to engage with community (e.g., notation on transcripts, graduation requirement, scholarships, annual awards, etc). There are a few informal mechanisms in place (e.g., stories on the unit website and in unit newsletters, verbal encouragement).	The department has numerous formal incentive and recognition mechanisms in place for students to engage with community (e.g., notation on transcripts, graduation requirement, scholarships, annual awards, etc). There are many informal mechanisms in place (e.g., stories on the unit website and in unit newsletters, verbal encouragement).
STUDENT VOICE, LEADERSHIP & DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE 3, 4	There are no opportunities for students to exercise formal governance roles, including advising or leading community engagement activities associated with the department of their major.	There are a few opportunities available for students to exercise formal governance roles, including advising or leading community engagement activities associated with the department of their major.	There are many opportunities available for students to exercise formal governance roles, including advising or leading community engagement activities associated with the academic department of their major.	Numerous options and opportunities exist for students to assume formal governance roles, including advising or leading community engagement activities associated with the academic department of their major.

Adapted by Kevin Kecskes, Portland State University, 2008. Components based on the (1) Gelmon, Seifer et al., Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment, 2005;(2) the Furco Service-Learning Institutionalization Rubric, 2003;(3) the Kecskes Characteristics of Engaged Departments Matrix, 2006; (4) and key informant interviews, 2008.

DIMENSION V: ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

In order to institutionalize community engagement in academic departments the unit must invest substantial resources and support toward the effort (Wergin, 2003).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the eight components (rows) below, place a circle around the cell that best represents the unit's **CURRENT** status of development.

	STAGE ONE <i>Awareness Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE FOUR <i>Institutionalization</i>
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT ^{1, 2, 4}	The department head/chair does not understand community engagement.	The department head/chair has some understanding of community engagement.	The department head/chair mostly understands and supports community engagement.	The department head/chair fully understands and supports community engagement.
FACILITATING ENTITY ^{1, 2, 4}	There are no facilitating structures in place to support unit faculty, staff, students, and/or community constituencies in the implementation or advancement of community engagement.	A small amount of facilitating assistance is available to unit faculty, staff, students, and/or community constituencies in the implementation or advancement of community engagement.	Multiple, regularly available, yet informal facilitating structures are in place to assist unit and community constituencies in the advancement of community engagement (e.g., staff point person, engagement database, etc.).	There is a well known and used, formal facilitating structure (e.g., committee, staff liaison, databases, etc.) that assists unit and community constituencies in the advancement of community engagement.
EVALUATION & ASSESSMENT ^{1, 2, 3}	There is no systematic effort in place to account for the number or quality of community engagement activities occurring in the unit.	An initiative to account for the number and quality of engagement activities taking place throughout the unit has been proposed.	A systematic effort to account for the number and quality of community engagement activities has been initiated. Data feedback mechanisms are in place.	A systematic effort is in place to account for the number and quality of engagement activities. Data feedback mechanisms are well used.
DEPARTMENTAL PLANNING ^{1, 2, 4}	The unit does not have a formal plan for advancing community engagement in the department.	A few short- and long-range goals for engagement exist, yet they are not formalized into a unit plan.	Many short- and long-range goals for community engagement exist, yet they are not formalized into a unit plan.	Multiple goals for community engagement are formalized into an official unit planning document.
FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND ORIENTATION ^{1, 4}	Community engagement is absent in advertising materials, interview protocols, letters of offer, and orientation and training activities for new unit faculty and staff.	Community engagement appears inconsistently in advertising materials, interview protocols, letters of offer, and orientation activities for new unit personnel.	Community engagement regularly appears in advertising materials, interview protocols, letters of offer, and orientation activities for new unit faculty and staff.	Community engagement is prominent in advertising materials, interview protocols, letters of offer, and orientation activities for new unit faculty and staff.
MARKETING ⁴	Community engagement does not appear in unit marketing materials (e.g., websites, promotional brochures, etc).	Community engagement inconsistently appears in unit marketing materials (e.g., websites, promotional brochures, etc).	Community engagement appears regularly in unit marketing materials (e.g., websites, promotional brochures).	Community engagement appears prominently and consistently in unit marketing materials (e.g., websites, promotional brochures, etc).
DISSEMINATION OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT RESULTS ¹	No efforts have been made to share results of activities through diverse venues (e.g., community forums, web sites, presentations, articles, etc).	A few results of community engagement activities are shared through diverse venues (e.g., community forums, web sites, presentations, journal articles, etc).	Many results of community engagement activities are shared through diverse venues (e.g., community forums, web sites, presentations, journal articles, etc).	There are extensive efforts to share results of community engagement activities through diverse venues (e.g., community forums, web sites, presentations, journal articles, etc).
BUDGETARY ALLOCATION ^{2, 3, 4}	There are no hard or soft (e.g., grants) funding sources that support the unit's community engagement activities.	Engagement is supported primarily, but not exclusively by soft funding (e.g., grants) from non-institutional sources.	Engagement is substantially supported in the unit's budget by both soft money from sources outside the institution and the unit's hard (internal) funding.	The unit's community engagement activities are supported primarily by hard (institutional) funding from the unit's budget.

Adapted by Kevin Kecskes, Portland State University, 2008. Components based on the (1) Gelmon, Seifer et al., *Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment*, 2005;(2) the Furco Service-Learning Institutionalization Rubric, 2003;(3) the Kecskes Characteristics of Engaged Departments Matrix, 2006; (4) and key informant interviews, 2008.

DIMENSION VI: LEADERSHIP SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

An important element for gauging the institutionalization of community engagement in academic departments is the degree to which faculty in the unit exercise leadership toward that end at the unit, campus, and national levels (Morreale & Applegate, 2006).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the three components (rows) below, place a circle around the cell that best represents the unit's CURRENT status of development.

	STAGE ONE <i>Awareness Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE FOUR <i>Institutionalization</i>
DEPARTMENT LEVEL LEADERSHIP ^{1, 2}	None of the highly respected, influential faculty members in the unit supports community engagement activities in the unit (e.g., support the integration of community-engaged research into the department's formal review, tenure, and promotion process, ensure that regular and open discourse about community engagement activities occurs at departmental meetings, assist in the planning and implementation for unit-supported community engagement efforts).	The department chair and/or a few of the highly respected, influential faculty members in the unit support community engagement activities in the unit (e.g., support the integration of community-engaged research into the department's formal review, tenure, and promotion process, ensure that regular and open discourse about community engagement activities occurs at departmental meetings, assist in the planning and implementation for unit-supported community engagement efforts).	The department chair and/or many of the highly respected, influential faculty members in the unit strongly support and advocate for community engagement activities in the unit (e.g., support the integration of community-engaged research into the department's formal review, tenure, and promotion process, ensure that regular and open discourse about community engagement activities occurs at departmental meetings, assist in the planning and implementation for unit-supported community engagement efforts, etc).	The department chair and/or most of the highly respected, influential faculty members in the unit strongly support and advocate for community engagement activities in the unit (e.g., support the integration of community-engaged research into the department's formal review, tenure, and promotion process, ensure that regular and open discourse about community engagement activities occurs at departmental meetings, assist in the planning and implementation for unit-supported community engagement efforts, etc).
CAMPUS LEVEL LEADERSHIP FROM DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY ^{1, 2}	None of the faculty from the unit advocates for engagement activities through their involvement as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance, strategic planning and curriculum committees, etc.	A few of the faculty from the unit advocate for engagement activities through their involvement as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance, strategic planning and curriculum committees, etc.	Many of the faculty from the unit advocate for engagement activities through their involvement as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance, strategic planning and curriculum committees.	Most of the faculty from the unit advocate for engagement activities through their involvement as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance, strategic planning and curriculum committees.
NATIONAL LEVEL LEADERSHIP FROM DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY ⁴	None of the faculty in the unit demonstrates national disciplinary association leadership (e.g., serving on influential committees, as publication editors, providing special interest group and conference planning leadership).	A few of the faculty in the unit demonstrate national disciplinary association leadership (e.g., serving on influential committees, as publication editors, providing special interest group and conference planning leadership).	Many of the faculty in the unit demonstrate national disciplinary association leadership (e.g., serving on influential committees, as publication editors, providing special interest group and conference planning leadership).	Most of the faculty in the unit demonstrate national disciplinary association leadership (e.g., serving on influential committees, as publication editors, providing special interest group leadership, integrating into conference planning committees, etc).