FINAL DRAFT: September 21, 2004

Final Report and Recommendations

Defining and Benchmarking Engagement

Prepared for

Committee on Institutional Cooperation
Members' Committee (Chief Academic Officers)

Prepared by

CIC Committee on Engagement

in collaboration with

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service Benchmarking Task Force

The Engaged University

Universities are under increasing pressure to be more relevant and to bring their knowledge base to bear on social and economic problems. Politicians and educational critics contend that public universities are too focused on "basic research," have drifted too far from their teaching missions, and are no longer focused on their historical commitment to help meet the needs of society. This criticism has been especially leveled at publicly-funded "Land Grant" and "Research One" universities, where basic research is viewed as the driving force for faculty promotion and reward.

Facing this criticism and the growing trend that public support for higher education is tied to expectations that universities become more engaged with society, Ernie Boyer and other educational reformists have articulated a new vision for American higher education. They argued that it was time for higher education to renew its emphasis on the student-oriented mission; to renew its covenant with society; and to embrace the problems of society through reciprocal university-community partnerships.

In order to create a university culture to accomplish this vision, Boyer challenged higher education to broaden its definition of scholarship to include the *scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching*. The intent is to elevate the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application to the same level as the scholarship of discovery (basic research), especially with respect to faculty roles and responsibilities.

Within this context, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation funded a National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges Commission in the mid-1990s to examine whether Land Grant and public universities were prepared to meet societal needs for the 21st century. The so-called Kellogg Commission, composed primarily of 25 current and former university presidents, also called for America's public universities to renew their commitment to society and to redesign their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become more productively involved with their communities within the context of the institutional mission and faculty reward structure.

To accomplish this, the Commission challenged higher education to: refocus its scholarship agenda to place students at the forefront; to elevate the status of teaching; and to elevate public service, well beyond the current conception of public service that emphasizes a one-way transfer of university expertise to the public. The Commission stated 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*.

This charge necessitates enormous change within universities going well beyond just viewing teaching and applied research in a more favorable light. Building successful university-community collaborations poses 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 break down of firmly established and isolated "silos."

However, the Kellogg Commission's definition of engagement does not easily translate into clear objectives relative to faculty roles and responsibilities, student learning environments, or institutional benchmarks and outcome measures.

Defining and Benchmarking Engagement

In order to encourage CIC institutions to become more engaged, the CIC Committee on Engagement was established in 2002 to provide strategic advice to the CIC Member's Committee 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' Committee 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's 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.

To provide a basis for generating benchmarks to allow CIC institutions to monitor their effectiveness in achieving the goals of "engaged universities," the Committee drew on several member institutions' definitions of outreach and engagement and other national resources to develop the following definition:

> *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 on Engagement and the Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service of the National Association for State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges agreed to work together. Our goal is to generate benchmarks that all Research One universities can use to assess institutional effectiveness in meeting commitments to engagement in the service of society.

Simultaneously the North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission was revising its "Criteria 5: Engagement and Service" accreditation standards by developing operational components and definitions of engagement, and establishing engagement benchmarks. As the accrediting body for the largest number of American higher education institutions (including the Big Ten), creating a set of CIC/Research One university benchmarks and outcome indicators

consistent with the new standards will also make it easier to adequately document institutional engagement and public service.

Measurements of outreach/engagement activities can also provide central administration and schools/colleges with:

- 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;
- 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; and
- A new engagement rubric for comparing peer institutions nationally.

In addition, measuring outreach/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 will 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; and
- Applications of the evidence of partnership satisfaction.

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 the following recommended engagement benchmarks and outcome indicators.

Recommendations for Engagement Benchmarks and Outcome Indicator Categories

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 non-traditional student needs.

2. Evidence of Institutional Resource Commitments to Engagement

2.1. The institution shows evidence of senior 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.

3. Evidence that Students are Involved in Engagement and Outreach Activities

   3.1. The institution shows evidence that engagement is an implicit 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 applied projects and programs.

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 vitality 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 shows evidence that there are policies regarding intellectual property rights that foster the transfer and application of knowledge and research.

5. Evidence that Institutions are Engaged with their Communities

   5.1. The institution shows evidence that it participates in environmental scanning in order to determine critical social needs.
   5.2. The institution shows evidence that it has established university-community partnerships with diverse entities.
   5.3. The institution shows evidence that communities have access to and use university resources.
   5.4. The institution shows evidence that it improves community vitality.

6. Evidence of Resource/Revenue Opportunities Generated through Engagement

   6.1. The institution shows evidence that it generates additional tuition and fee revenues from non-traditional educational experiences that serve external audiences.
   6.2. The institution shows evidence that it generates economic impact from its engagement activities.

7. Evidence of Assessing the Impact and Outcomes of Engagement

> 7.1. The institution shows evidence that it has assessment tools and assessment plans developed in collaboration with external partners.
> 7.2. The institution shows evidence that its experiential learning programs are evaluated in partnership with the constituents served.

Follow-up Recommendations to the CIC Members' Committee

The Committee on Engagement believes that much more needs to be done to advance the benchmarks and outcome indicators. The Committee therefore urges the Members' Committee to accept the following recommendations and to charge the Committee on Engagement to complete the following tasks by August 2007. If so charged, the CECEPS subcommittee will be invited to continue its partnership with the CIC so that the specified tasks can be assessed nationally within the context of a broader range of all Research One and major Land Grant institutions.

Recommendation 1: Adopt the proposed engagement benchmarks and indicators, and charge the CIC Committee on Engagement to conduct a three-year evaluation of the benchmarks involving institutions represented on this committee. (Tables 1-7 contain a recommended set of qualitative and quantitative outcome indicators tied to the benchmarks that can be used to assess outreach and engagement.)

Recommendation 2: Identify "best practices" and prepare a brief that summarizes standards of practice, including institutional support mechanisms and institutional barriers for outreach and engagement activities.

Recommendation 3: Further develop the CIC Web site as a resource consisting of scholarship of engagement published literature, and links to Research One University outreach and engagement web pages, including on-line approaches to publishing and information exchange.

Recommendation 4: Pursue the University of Minnesota (internal learning communities on the scholarship of engagement) and University of Michigan (promoting community dialogue on the value of higher education for the public good) proposals with the Kellogg Foundation in the context of CIC supported initiatives.

Table 1: CIC-CECEPS Engagement Benchmarks Matrix

The University can provide:

I. Evidence of Institutional Commitment to Engagement	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 an acknowledged component of the institution's core mission by institution's governing body. Engagement/outreach is defined in the university's mission statement and strategic plans. Proportion of units (colleges, departments, schools, centers, institutes) that include engagement/outreach in their mission statements 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 facilitate rapid faculty and academic staff access to community-based/applied research opportunities with external partners.
1.4 The institution's commitment is reflected in its policies and procedures that are responsive to non-traditional student.	Number of credit instructional or certificate programs (distance education, online, summer, evening, weekend). Number of non-credit instructional or certificate programs. Number of team-taught courses focused on social issues to be approached in an interdisciplinary fashion. Number of people served by continuing education/extension programs.

Table2: CIC-CECEPS Engagement Benchmarks Matrix

The University can provide:

2. Evidence of Institutional Resource Commitments to Engagement	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
2.1. The institution shows evidence of senior leadership for engagement and outreach activities.	There is an individual in central administration responsible for overseeing the university's engagement/outreach activities. There is an individual in each school/college responsible for overseeing the school/college/units engagement/outreach activities.
2.2 The institution shows evidence of financial support for engagement through its budgetary process.	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 curriculum 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 and academic staff to document and report the proportion of time they devote to each of the three engagement domains (research, teaching, service).

Table 3: CIC-CECEPS Engagement Benchmarks Matrix

The University can provide:

3. Evidence that Students are Involved in Engagement and Outreach Activities	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
3.1 The institution shows evidence that engagement is an implicit component of the curriculum and co-curricular activities.	Number of undergraduate learning communities Number of study abroad programs. Proportion of undergraduate students enrolled in study abroad courses. Number of students involved in course-based service learning/civic engagement research programs. Proportion of students participating in course-based service learning/civic engagement placements. Number of student organizations that include an engagement component. Number and scope of alternative spring break and other student/faculty organized volunteer programs. Evidence of greater student involvement in institutional governance. Proportion of students enrolled in distance education programs/courses. Proportion of graduate students involved in professional programs that prepare them for professional employment (practicum, internships, etc.). Evidence of changes in employment opportunities for students. Number of interdisciplinary educational programs at the undergraduate level. Number of interdisciplinary graduate programs.
3.2 The institution shows evidence that it attends to diverse communities, peoples and geographic areas.	Types of experiences that foster development of democratic values. Number and types of programs focusing on issues related to diversity. Number and types of programs that deal with urban or rural economically disadvantaged areas for populations.
3.3. The institution shows evidence that students are engaged in applied projects and programs.	Number of community-based research opportunities for undergraduate students Proportion of undergraduate students enrolled in independent or directed study courses involving applied research. Proportion of graduate students enrolled in graduate programs with significant outreach teaching, research, and/or service components.

Table 4: CIC-CECEPS Engagement Benchmarks Matrix

The University can provide:

4. Evidence that Faculty and Staff are Engaged with External Constituents	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
4.1 The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff are involved in scholarly activities related to the institution's engagement mission.	Proportion of the faculty/academic staff engaged in outreach/engagement research. Proportion of the faculty tenured and promoted in large part as a result of their outreach research, teaching and engagement scholarship. Proportion of the faculty/academic staff involved in technology transfer. Proportion of the faculty/academic staff involved in clinical experiences, creative activities, and other engaged scholarship activities. Proportion of the faculty participating in outreach/engagement instruction. Proportion of the faculty participating in outreach/engagement service. Proportion of academic departments that include outreach/engagement teaching, research, and service among their criteria for evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure. Number of research projects in which community partners are participants as well as subjects.
4.2 The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff are engaged in community vitality and economic development initiatives in partnership with external constituents.	Proportion of faculty involved in community economic development activities. Proportion of faculty involved in civic engagement activities. Number of faculty receiving internal seed grants related to community and economic development. Amount of extramurally funded dollars generated as a result of internal seed grant funding. Number of interdisciplinary projects addressing key issues related to community vitality. Number of 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.	Number of faculty participating on regional, state, national, and international advisory bodies. Number of training programs related to technology transfer and the number of people served. Number of training programs involving distance education or on-line instruction. Number of training programs conducted "off campus." Number of new start-up companies and private businesses generated from university-community partnerships or from university-initiated research. Number of new start-up companies generated from university-community partnerships or from university-initiated research. Number of companies (community partners) served by technical assistance.
4.4. The institution shows evidence that there are policies regarding intellectual property rights that foster the transfer and application of knowledge and research.	Number of patents/licenses issued for intellectual property. There are established policies regarding copyright and royalty distribution. Number of patents, licenses generated annually.

Table 5: CIC-CECEPS Engagement Benchmarks Matrix

The University can provide:

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 participates in environmental scanning in order to determine critical social needs.	Number of external members on advisory boards and panels. Number of faculty/academic staff/administrators serving on community and business boards and panels. Surveys conducted to assess community needs.
5.2. The institution shows evidence that it has established university-community partnerships with diverse entities.	Geographic areas impacted and number of communities served by engagement projects. Number of partnerships and in-service activities for Preschool-16 teachers. Evidence of institutional involvement in business and industrial professional organizations.
5.3 The institution shows evidence that communities have access to and use university resources.	Number of visitors to campus facilities such as museums, performing arts centers, science expositions and other educational and participatory engagement activities. Number of conferences/meetings using on-campus facilities.
5.4 The institution shows evidence that it is improves community vitality.	Documentation of resources generated for the public as a result of university-community partnership activities. Number of university-community partnerships located in urban, rural, and suburban areas. Number of university-community partnerships with minority led businesses. Number of university-community partnerships with human service agencies. Number of people/organizations served by community-based programs. Evidence of community partners' satisfaction with process and results from university- community partnerships. Number of cooperative arrangements with other institutions of higher education that engage external constituents. Number of stories in media (all forms) about university-community partnership projects.

Table 6: CIC-CECEPS Engagement Benchmarks Matrix

The University can provide:

6. Evidence of Resource/Revenue Opportunities Generated through Engagement	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
6.1 The institution shows evidence that it generates tuition and fee revenues from non-traditional 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.
6.2 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. Assessed changes in public attitudes toward the value of higher education for the public good. Estimates of the cost-savings accrued as a result of community-based research and outreach activities.

Table 7: CIC-CECEPS Engagement Benchmarks Matrix

The University can provide:

7. Evidence of Assessing the Impact and Outcomes of Engagement	Quantitative and Qualitative Outcome Indicators Customized to Discipline and Institution
7.1 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 show evidence of evaluation, including outcome-based assessments.
7.2 The institution shows evidence that its experiential learning are evaluated in partnership with constituents served.	Program evaluation is an implicit component of all course-based service learning courses programs. The office of service learning obtains feedback from all community placement partners.

Bibliographic Sources Used to Frame the Report

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*. 1, 6, 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 Policy Report, 13 (1).

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outrach*. 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.

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, 43-59

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: 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 1

Core Ideas Underlying CIC Committee on Engagement Actions

The Higher Learning Commission: North Central Association:
Criterion 5: Engagement and Service

The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations
The organization's commitments are shaped by its mission and its capacity to support those commitments.
The organization practices periodic environmental scanning to understand the changing needs of its constituencies and communities.
The organization demonstrates attention to the diversity of the communities it serves.
The organization's outreach programs respond to identified community needs.
In responding to external constituencies, the organization is well-served by programs such as continuing education, outreach, customized training, and extension services.

The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.

The organizations' structures and processes enable effective connections with its communities.
The organization's co-curricular activities engage students, staff, administrators and faculty with external communities.
The organization's educational programs connect students with external communities.
The organization's resources (physical, financial, and human) support effective programs of engagement and service.
Planning processes project ongoing engagement and service.

The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service

Collaborative ventures exist with other higher learning organizations and education sectors (e.g., K-12 partnerships, articulation arrangements, 2 + 2 programs).
The organization's transfer policies and practices create an environment supportive of the mobility of learners.
Community leaders testify to the usefulness of the organization's programs of engagement.
The organization's programs of engagement give evidence of building effective bridges among diverse communities.
The organization participates in partnerships focused on shared educational, economic, and social goals.
The organization's partnerships and contractual arrangements uphold the organization's integrity.

Internal and External constituencies value the services the organization provides.

The organization's evaluation of services involves the constituencies served.
Service programs and student, faculty, and staff volunteer activities are well received by the communities served.
The organization's economic and workforce development activities are sought after and valued by civic and business leaders.
External constituents participate in the organization's activities and co-curricular programs open to the public.
The organization's facilities are available to and used by the community.
The organization provides programs to meet the continuing education needs of licensed professionals in its community.

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.

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)?
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?

Definitions of Engagement Activities Michigan State University Outreach Measurement Instrument

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. Examples include: a weekend MBA program, an off-campus course in Nursing offered in a rural area, an online doctoral program in beam physics for laboratory professionals, etc.

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.

Appendix 2

CIC and CECEPS Committee Members

Final Report Writing Subcommittee:

Hiram E. Fitzgerald, CIC	Michigan State University
Peyton Smith, CIC	University of Wisconsin-Madison
Pat Book, CECEPS	Kent State University
Krista Rodin, CECEPS	University of Connecticut

Members, CIC Committee of Engagement

Victor Bloomfield
Interim Dean, The Graduate School
University of Minnesota

John C. Burkhardt
Professor, School of Education
University of Michigan

Hiram E. Fitzgerald (Chair)
Assistant Provost, University Outreach and Engagement
Michigan State University

Don K. Gentry
Vice Provost for Engagement
Office of Engagement
Purdue University

(Now: Victor L. Lechtenberg
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, Department of Agriculture
Vice Presidenet, Outreach and Engagement
Ohio State University

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

Chet D. Rzonca
Dean, Continuing Education
University of Iowa

Steven F. Schomberg.
Vice Chancellor for Public Engagement and Institutional Relations
University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign.

Craig D. Weidemann
Vice President for Outreach
Pennsylvania State University

with assistance from:

Karen S. Bruns
Leader, OSU CARES
The Ohio State University

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

Barbara Allen, ex officio
CIC Central Office

Members CECEPS Benchmarking Task Force

Sharon Anderson
North Dakota State University

Linda Kay Benning
Associate Director, Extension and Outreach
NASULGC

Bob Bringle
Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianpolis

Carolyn C. Dahl
Dean, College of Continuing Education
The University of Alabama

Hiram E. Fitzgerald,
Assistant Provost for University Outreach and Engagement
Michigan State University

Stephen B. Jones
Vice Chancellor
North Carolina State University

Krista Rodin
Dean, College of Continuing Education
University of Connecticut

Lorilee Sandman
University of Georgia

Steven F. Schomberg.
Vice Chancellor for Public Engagement and Institutional Relations
University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign.

Craig D. Weidemann
Vice President for Outreach
Pennsylvania State University

Richard Wooton
Director, Extension and Outreach
NASULGC