

DEC Guidelines for Evaluating Community Engaged Research, Teaching, and Service

Developed by CCSU Faculty Senate Community Engagement Committee

Individual faculty, DEC's, Deans and other evaluative bodies frequently have questions about what constitutes community engagement and how to evaluate its quality. In an effort to answer those questions, and provide guidance to faculty members applying for renewal, tenure and promotions, as well as evaluators in that process, the CCSU Faculty Senate Community Engagement Committee offers the following guidelines. **It is not the position of the Community Engagement Committee that community engagement is required for renewal, promotion or tenure and these guidelines are not intended to alter the categories of evaluation in Article 4.11.9 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.**

Definition: The Carnegie Foundation defines community engagement as "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 for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006)." Such collaboration at CCSU may involve partnering with community-based institutions such as grass-roots organizations, private businesses, municipal or state agencies/institutions, and faith-based organizations.

Community engagement is not required for renewal, promotion or tenure, and these guidelines are not intended to alter the categories of evaluation in Article 4.11.9. However, if a faculty member does undertake such activity, the following information is designed to serve as a resource to the faculty member, DEC's and other evaluators in the renewal, tenure and promotion process. Faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure may use it as a tool for summarizing their community engagement activity. Departments and DEC's may use it to advise candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure on how best to present community engagement in their portfolio (i.e., address in the narrative summary, address via a bulleted list under the relevant evaluation category, etc...). However, it is not the position of the Community Engagement Committee that the candidate must address each question within a relevant category for the community engagement to be judged as high quality. Instead, a faculty member may use the questions to inform how they describe their particular activity, with the understanding that some questions may be more appropriate than others for assessing their specific community engagement activity. For example, an on-going creative activity that has been underway for only six months may not have been in place long enough to "achieve impact or change", but may adequately address enough of the other questions pertaining to creative activity to be considered meritorious.

Load Credit Activity

Assessing the nature of the activity

- Was a community partner involved in the planning and implementation of the activity?
- Is the university-community partnership a reciprocal one, in which both parties contribute knowledge and expertise to the activity?
- Are university students involved in the implementation of the activity in a manner that is aligned with the course objectives?
- Does the activity address a specific community need?
- Is there evidence of benefits and/or outcomes for the university students and the community partner?
- Is the university-community partnership a reciprocal one, where both parties contribute knowledge and expertise to the activity?
- Do the students acquire an understanding of existing scholarship on the activity that is aligned with the course objectives?
- Is there an opportunity for critical reflection by the students that is aligned with the course objectives?
- Was the community partner perspective sought in evaluating the activity?

Creative Activity

Assessing the nature of the partnership and the activity

- Was a community partner involved in the planning and implementation of the activity?
- Does the activity address a specific community need?
- Is there evidence that the activity benefits the university and/or scholar's discipline and the community partner?
- Is the university-community partnership a reciprocal one, where both parties contribute knowledge and expertise to the activity?
- Is the activity informed by existing scholarship/best-practices?
- Was the community partner perspective sought in evaluating the activity?
- Has the scholar co-authored any publications and/or presentations with the community partner?

Assessing the methodology for obtaining results

- Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions, and context of the work?
- Does the scholar effectively describe the rationale for the choice of methods?
- Does the scholar effectively apply the methods selected?
- Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?
- Is the level of methodological rigor appropriate to the discipline?
 - Has the scholar adequately demonstrated that the level of rigor is on par with good-quality scholarship in the discipline/field of study?

Assessing the results

- Does the scholar provide independent community-based validation of results or impact?
- Are the goals achieved or questions answered?
- Do the results make a substantive contribution to the discipline and the community?
- Do the results open new areas for further exploration and collaboration?
- Does the work achieve impact or change?
- Does the work make a contribution consistent with the purpose of the work over a period of time?

Assessing the communication of results

- Are outcomes communicated/disseminated to appropriate academic and public audiences?
- Does the scholar use appropriate forums (i.e., publication in scholarly journals or other peer reviewed venues, policy papers, evaluation reports, community and/or academic presentations, reports to community or legislative entities, etc.) for communicating work to the intended audiences?
- Does the scholar present information with clarity, quality, and integrity?
 - DEC's can develop their own criteria for evaluating this

Service

- Was a community partner involved in the planning and implementation of the activity?
- Is the university-community partnership a reciprocal one, where both parties contribute knowledge and expertise to the activity?
- Does the activity address a specific community need?
- Is the service activity aligned with the scholar's academic interests and experience?
- Is there evidence of benefits and/or outcomes for the university and the community partner?
- Is the university-community partnership a reciprocal one, where both parties contribute knowledge and expertise to enhance the efficiency or effectiveness of organizations served?
- Is there an opportunity for communicating in popular and non-academic media?
- Does the activity result in presentations or performances appropriate for the activity?
- Does the activity involve testing theoretical concepts and processes in real world-situations?
- Was the community partner perspective sought in evaluating the activity?
- Does the work achieve measurable impact or change?
 - Criteria for measuring this can be department-specific

Source material for this work:

- Holland & Janke (2012) as cited by Lorilee Sandman, Co-Director of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement(2014 UCONN presentation on engaged scholarship)
- National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement
- "Defining, Documenting and Evaluating Service: A Guide for Regional Campus Faculty"