EMBEDDING AN ETHIC OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

A LITERATURE REVIEW OF ACADEMIC SOURCES

Prepared by Katalin Eve Koller, PhD Candidate and CCEC-WG Research Associate
With contributions from:
Shumaila Hemani, PhD Candidate and CCEC-WG Research Associate
Patricia Ballamingie, Maeve Lydon and David Peacock
Last updated: May 7, 2018

CFICE Ottawa, Ontario **CFICE@carleton.ca** http://carleton.ca/communityfirst/

Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE), a major SSHRC-funded project, aims to strengthen Canadian communities through action research on best practices of community-campus engagement. We ask how community-campus partnerships can be done to maximize the value created for non-profit, community based organizations in four key areas: poverty, community food security, community environmental sustainability, and reducing violence against women.

This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through the Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement Project.

To cite this document, please reference DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22215/cfice-2018-01

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
Outline of the Paper 2
A Brief History of Community-Campus Engagement in Canada 2
Culture Change at PSIs: Embedding an Ethic of CCE 4
Mission, Terminology & Language Alignment 5
Boundary Spanning, Multi-Scalar Leadership 7
Organizational Infrastructure 8
Embedded Supports for Engaged Faculty 9
Government policies for CCE 10
Internal and External Funding Pathways 11
Representing CCE Impact 11
Self-Assessing Institutional Engagement 14
Levels of Commitment to Engagement (The Holland Matrix) 16
Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification 19
The EDGE Tool 21
Irish Community Engagement 22
Works Cited 24
APPENDIX A: Levels of Commitment to Engagement (The Holland Matrix) 27
APPENDIX B: The EDGE Tool 28

Introduction

In 2012, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) announced the successful funding of the *Community-First: Impacts of Community Engagement* (CFICE) Partnership Grant, valued at $2.5 M distributed over seven years (2012-2019). Co-managed by Carleton University and the Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning (CACSL), the project represents a collaboration of over twenty post-secondary institutions and sixty community partners. The project's main research question is: "*How can community campus partnerships be designed and implemented to maximize the value created for non-profit, community-based organizations"* (CFICE, 2016)*?* After four years of sector-specific work that supported demonstration projects across five key hubs, CFICE has entered its second phase of cross-sectoral work, which focuses on "*changing* the partnership policies and practices of non-profits, post-secondary institutions, and funders to create more effective and valuable community-campus partnerships" (CFICE, 2016, emphasis in original).

It is from this work that the purpose for this literature review arises. The Aligning Institutions for Community Impact Working Group (AICI-WG) brings together community partners, institutional representatives and funders to address barriers to effective community-campus engagement (CCE) at post-secondary institutions (PSIs), community-based organizations (CBOs) and funding agencies. This collaborative work is expected to encompass at least three jointly-produced projects that (1) address assessment of CCE and planning for culture change at PSIs; (2) improve funding pathways for communities and PSIs to support 'Community First' CCE; and, (3) connect CCE practitioners and projects and enable sharing of resources, practices, and information through a Canadian CCE network. The intention of this paper is to survey the existing academic literature to familiarize the AICI-WG with current research related to policies and assessments of CCE that are conducive to supporting culture change within PSIs to support the work of CCE to produce positive social impacts. These findings will provide a foundation upon which the AICI-WG can approach the question *how might 'Community First' approaches to community-campus engagement (CCE) be more effectively embedded within post-secondary institutions?* Therefore, for the distinct purposes of this review, this question is taken up from the position of an institution of higher education that seeks to engage authentically, in mutuality and reciprocity, with the broader society or community to co-create culture change in higher education. It also touches on various government policies and funding mechanisms to that provide the socio-political contexts for these changes. Importantly, this means that these initial findings privilege a PSI perspective related to embedding CCE through efforts to shift internal institutional culture. This question is based upon the assumption that for PSIs to sustain an ethic of community engagement, there must exist a solid values-based framework and relationships upon which to build policies and practices that support the establishment, development, and maintenance of engaged people, projects, and partnerships. In other words, the AICI-WG strives for effective 'Community First' CCE, embedded in institutional structures and functions, as an ethic and practice of engaged campuses.

Throughout this paper, community engagement (CE) will refer to all activities associated with community service-learning, engaged scholarship, community-based research, and community-campus partnerships. The term institution will most often be used to refer to higher education facilities [i.e., post-secondary institutions (PSIs) including both universities and colleges], but the term campus may occasionally be used as well. When 'community' is used, it is meant in the abstract to refer predominantly to groups within civil society (grassroots citizen groups, not-for-profit organizations, etc.),

the public sector (governments, associations, etc.), and the private sector (small businesses, community economic development organizations, Indigenous-owned companies, etc.), that embrace a notion of public good and societal benefit in their mandate. CFICE and the AICI-WG partners continue to work toward co-defining a definition of community that encompasses the complexity of 'community' in respect and recognition of the risks of essentializing communities as homogenous, thereby excluding certain voices while privileging others. For the purposes of this paper, it is necessary to use the term 'community' in the abstract as our focus is culture change within PSIs that advances an internal, institution-wide CCE ethic. This is not intended to privilege the university over the community, but rather, is a product of the way the research question is framed.

Aside from a brief introduction to the Canadian context of CCE, we will not go into detail herein about the various mechanisms used to pursue the goals served by these partnerships, nor the critiques of community-campus engagement.

Outline of the Paper

The next section introduces the CCE movement in Canada to serve as a backgrounder to contextualize the work of the AICI-WG. Then, the concept of embedding CCE within institutions (and the corresponding requirement for culture change) will be introduced and defined in preparation for an in-depth examination of the key elements for embedding a 'Community First' ethic of community engagement in higher education institutions. The areas to be covered include: mission, terminology, leadership, infrastructure, faculty, funding, and voice. This discussion is followed by a detailed examination of three popular self-assessment approaches: (1) the Levels of Commitment to Engagement matrix developed by Barbara Holland in 1997; (2) the elective Community Engagement Classification developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 2009; and, (3) the EDGE Tool, developed by the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement in the United Kingdom in 2008. Finally, Campus Engage Ireland's new set of indicators (Campus Engage, 2015) and metrics (draft version, unpublished) for CCE will be outlined noted as a current attempt to assist PSIs value, and also measure the effectiveness of, CCE.

A Brief History of Community-Campus Engagement in Canada

An ethic of CCE in Canada goes as far back as the 1874 Ontario Agricultural College, the founding college of the University of Guelph, and the 1930 extension efforts of the University of Alberta to connect with community members through campus radio programmes. Throughout the twentieth century, various sites across the country engaged in participatory action research (PAR) projects that had lasting social impacts: the fisheries cooperatives at St. Francis Xavier University; the Workers Education Association at University of Toronto in the 1930s and 1940s; and, the women's research initiatives in Vancouver in the 1970s and 1980s (CBRC, 2016).

In recent times, faculty, students, and administrators have begun to push for more collaboration with the broader public from diverse sectors, including with Indigenous communities, all levels of government, businesses, non-profit organizations and a broad array of community groups. There are several drivers for this change: students seek opportunities for grassroots learning that will be relevant to their studies and their life post university, while faculty seek a meaningful way to engage with broad-

level social issues and to enhance research and teaching. Paralleling this push is the pull by government, funding agencies and the broader public for greater accountability and relevance from institutions of higher learning, as publicly- funded entities. Additionally, communities of place or identity seeking avenues for knowledge production and dissemination look to PSIs as public assets to be accessed for assistance in addressing pressing social issues (CBRC, 2016). This mutual desire to work together in the co-creation of new knowledges, or to *democratize* knowledge (Johnston, 2012), has led to a strong community engagement movement in higher education in Canada. Although there is no formal framework linking the efforts of various PSIs, non-academic partners, and communities across the nation, several key initiatives have propelled the movement forward (CBRC, 2016).

Between 1998 and 2012, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) sponsored community-campus research partnerships through Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) grants. CURA sought primarily to “promote the sharing of knowledge, resources and expertise”; to “enrich research, teaching methods and curricula”; to “reinforce community decision-making and problem-solving capacity”; and, to “enhance students’ education and employability by means of diverse opportunities to build their knowledge, expertise and work skills” (Canada, Community-University Research Alliances, 2013). The program offered $200,000 grants for up to five years.

In 2008, the Pan-Canadian Coalition on Community-Based Research was born out of CUExpo, a biannual forum for CCE practitioners and scholars, and evolved over time to become Community-Based Research Canada (CBRC), a national champion and facilitator of community-based research. CBRC is now a non-profit organization with board members from across Canada and core funding from member universities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and individuals. The organization hosts a website that provides opportunities for networking, disseminating learning resources, sharing best practices, and posting member profiles to build connections (Spilker, Nagel, Robinson, Brown, & Tremblay, 2016). A few years later at the 2012 Congress of the Social Sciences and Humanities, a group of community and university partners launched the Community-Campus Collaboration Initiative (CCCI). The Hon. David Johnston, Governor General of Canada, was there to commemorate the event, delivering an inspiring speech about the need to democratize knowledge production that propelled the grassroots CCE movement forward.

Meanwhile, as CURA drew to a close, the Canadian government’s Economic Action Plan 2012 made a commitment to invest $37 million annually to enable the national granting councils to support industry-academic research partnerships, starting in the 2012-13 fiscal year (Government of Canada, 2012). This investment enabled the launch of SSHRC’s Connections Program, the replacement for CURA though framed somewhat differently, with priorities on increasing the accessibility and “multidirectional flow of…knowledge among researchers and between the campus and the larger community”. Connection Grants of $7,000 - $50,000 are awarded to individuals and teams for one year to support targeted knowledge mobilization initiatives between universities and their non-academic partners, while Partnership Development Grants ($75,000 - $200,000 over 1-3 years) and Partnership Grants ($500,000 - $2.5 MIL over 4-7 years) support formal partnership agreements with research, research training, and knowledge mobilization (Canada, 2016).

A SSHRC Partnership Grant supports the work of CFICE, representative in 2016 of perhaps the largest initiative ever in Canada, in scope, funding, and representation, to tackle the question of how best to develop the CCE movement in Canada. Moving forward in the next section, this paper turns to its main

goal of reviewing the literature related to embedding 'Community First' CCE into PSIs to support the work of the AICI-WG.

Culture Change at PSIs: Embedding an Ethic of CCE

Barbara Holland defines community engagement in the academic setting as "a collaborative enterprise based on mutually beneficial knowledge exchange relationships between higher education and external communities" (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 86). The foundation of an institutional culture supportive of community engagement is one that authentically internalizes the concept of reciprocity in its approach to relationships outside the institution: "Reciprocity specifically signals a shift in campus-community partnerships towards relationships that are defined by a multidirectional flow of knowledge and expertise in collaborative efforts to address community-based issues" (Saltmarsh, et al., 2009, p. 11).

The process that leads to an institutional culture shift toward shared authority and power, genuine collaboration, and shared expertise, involves an "epistemological shift that values not only expert knowledge that is rational, analytic, and positivist but also a different kind of rationality that is more relational, localized, and contextual and favors mutual deference between laypersons and academics" (Saltmarsh, et al., 2009, p. 22). Because community engagement is necessarily grounded in the local, it will reflect the diverse histories, geographies and socialities of place, requiring that efforts be "adapted to local landscapes and in accordance with context-specific outcomes" (Dugan, 2015, p. 73). Therefore, institutional strategies must be specific to the unique needs of individual institutions and communities, as well as their shared histories (Holland B. , 1997; Shrader, Saunders, Marullo, Benatti, & Weigert, 2008).

A transformational culture shift occurs "when shifts in the institution's culture have developed to the point where they are both pervasive across the institution and deeply embedded in practices throughout the institution" (Saltmarsh, et al., 2009). Similarly, "the successful diffusion of an idea or practice across an academic organization, that is, institutionalization, means it has moved from the margins of the institution to its core. In other words, the innovative idea is no longer considered peripheral" (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 85). In this way, the successful embedding of community engagement refers to the integration of the ethics of CCE, including reciprocity and mutuality, into the everyday practices of institutes of higher learning (Shrader, Saunders, Marullo, Benatti, & Weigert, 2008).

There is a growing literature base of what denotes successful embedding of community engagement in PSIs. Shrader et al. (2008) propose that best practices of an engaged campus encompass curriculum integration, organizational structure, faculty roles and rewards, student engagement, and community partnering. Likewise, Andrew Furco (2010) suggests that an authentic mission, faculty buy-in, centralized engagement units, supportive academic policies, adequate external funding, student buy-in, inclusive faculty workloads, and an engaged philosophy lead to an engaged campus. Davyyd Greenwood (2007) contends that institutional policies and resources that recognize and encourage engaged teaching and learning are critical to ensure that engagement efforts are not marginalized within the broader institution.

Although the terms are not always the same, most scholars agree that aligning an institution's mission, terminology, strategic planning, promotion and tenure policies, organizational structure and

governance, faculty workloads, curricula, and funding pathways to embrace the community engagement ethic is key to enabling culture change. In the following sections we will unpack these elements, as well as explore best practices related to sustaining an institutional ethic of CCE that encompass leadership, impact, and measurement.

Mission, Terminology & Language Alignment

Holland highlights the important role the institutional mission plays in positioning community engagement as a sustainable ethic. She recommends that "for the service movement to be sustained and institutionalized, each institution must develop its own understanding of the degree to which service is an integral component of the academic mission" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 30). Although Holland makes this point in reference to sustaining the service movement specifically, it is relevant for understanding the role a PSI's mission plays in advancing an ethic of CCE among institutional actors. To shed light on this, Jennifer Dugan (2015) argues that it is *how* missions are interpreted and utilized in the present moment that matters, not necessarily *what* the mission says – for mission statements are often historical and require "leadership, vision and support to find present-day value" (p. 77). Furthermore, Dugan advocates for the harnessing of outward-oriented mission statements for attention to the creation and maintenance of viable internal pathways for engagement (Dugan, 2015).

Engagement definitions and plans are particularly important for building buy-in from faculty, staff and administration. Holland notes: "it is difficult to institutionalize engagement beyond early adopters unless non-participating faculty and staff can see the agenda and intended directions, along with a plan for monitoring and reporting outcomes, costs, and benefits" (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 92). Often, engagement goals are stipulated within the institution's broader strategic plan, but when a centralized unit exists, specific engagement plans are created and put to use. Regardless of where engagement goals are represented, their inclusion in a PSI's planning process is proven to have an enhancing effect on engagement activities (Holland B. A., 2009).

This corresponds with *Becoming an Engaged Campus,* a 'how-to' book targeted to post-secondary institutions of all shapes and sizes: colleges; research institutions; comprehensive universities and more. In it, the authors recommend aligning the institution's 'foundational documents', such as its mission, vision, and strategic plan, as well as its support infrastructure, such as academic and financial policies and procedures, to provide a strong base for enhancing community engagement practices, similar to how a for-profit business would strategically align its organizational behaviour to meet priority goals (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011).

Beere et al. stipulate that "agreed-upon definitions are prerequisite for meaningful dialogue and debate", noting that "in order for the campus to engage in rich and productive discussions – to avoid miscommunicating – the faculty, staff, and administrators must have a shared understanding of terms and definitions" (p. 13). For instance, there are a variety of terms to denote the work PSIs conduct with outside groups, including: community engagement, community-engaged scholarship, community-based research, community-campus partnerships, public service, community service, civic engagement, outreach, regional stewardship, and so on. Which term is adopted is not as important as whether and how stakeholders ascribe to it. Without broad and repeated dissemination of the agreed-upon terms, institutions run the risk of impeding intra-campus communication while time and attention is diverted to arguing over terminology rather than doing the work (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011).

The terminology used is not only important for internal cohesion; it is also critical for positioning the institution to its partners and communicating the seriousness with which it approaches engagement with the community. In 2011, Kathleen Bortolin conducted a discourse analysis of the use of the word *community* in the twenty-five most recently published articles in the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* at the time of her study. Her intention was to discover the ways in which the research portrayed the group it intended to serve, as well as to "raise a critical awareness within the engagement community of how the language connected to the term community creates and reinforces certain understandings" (Bortolin, 2011, p. 49). What Bortolin found should be taken into consideration by every student, scholar, and administrator of community engagement. Her analysis revealed the underlying power dynamics that privilege the needs of the institution over that of the community and position the community as "a passive recipient of the university's more active agency in designing and implementing community-based projects" (Bortolin, 2011, p. 50). She illuminated several themes that reflected this privilege in her findings:

> Community as a means by which the university enhances its academic work; community as a recipient of influence by the university; community as a place which the university makes better; and community as a factor in the financial interest of the university (Bortolin, 2011, p. 50).

Bortolin points out the crucial point that although community engagement is linked to a philosophical approach for the co-creation of knowledge and the recognition of the value of non-academic expertise, that ethic is not being represented in academic publications by its discursive agents. Interestingly, there is also an inconsistency in regards to how the concept of community is approached in the title, keywords, abstracts, and body of academic articles. An in-depth look at an article's body of text reveals a privileging of the institution, while the title, keywords and abstracts often describe a much different dynamic, often through the use of terms such as 'reciprocity' and 'community voice'. Therefore, scholars and community partners alike should be wary of trusting the interpretation of 'community' represented by the short notes of an article, as the content could be much different. Given this evidence, Bortolin offers the following ultimatum to engaged scholars:

> If community-based engagement is intended to serve us, then let us make it clear to ourselves, our discourse community, and our partner communities that we are engaging in this pedagogy because of what it does for us and for our students. But if that is not our position, then we will have to adjust our lines of inquiry and our discourse to be sure we are engaging with communities with every effort to partner mutually with, and to the equal benefit of, our communities. Let us not say one thing and do another, as this weakens our voice, the integrity of the field, and the communities with which we partner (Bortolin, 2011, p. 56).

To Bortolin's point, the language that is used across the organization will escape the walls of the institution to affect external perceptions and relationships. Bortolin's argument exists parallel efforts by contemporary critical and anti-oppressive scholars to decolonize and democratize knowledge and knowledge creation (see Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Brown & Strega, 2005). Historically, Indigenous and marginalized communities were considered by Western research paradigms as subjects of research and therefore lacking the ability to create, practice, and evolve valuable knowledge systems. Fortunately, there are many CCE scholars today that recognize the oppressive effects of Eurocentric research practices that privilege Western epistemologies and significant efforts exist among higher education institutions in Canada to decolonize knowledge and knowledge creation such that the existence of

'multiple truths' is respected. In 2016, activist scholars intent on building relationships with communities in pursuit of collaborative, power-neutralized knowledge co-production do so in recognition of past injustice and the validity of community-based, localized, and Indigenous knowledges. This is evident in, for example, First Nations community health research and in Arctic climate change adaptation efforts. However, as Bortolin argues, it is one thing to position practice as inclusive, co-created, and equal and another to actively transgress the historically Eurocentric culture of an institution to enable the embedding of an ethic of reciprocal, mutual, and diverse knowledge creation. It is therefore crucial that institutions consider discourse, textual, verbal and visual, when developing a strategy to embed a 'community first' approach to CCE within PSIs.

Boundary Spanning, Multi-Scalar Leadership

One of the most critical elements of embedding 'Community First' approaches to CCE is leadership buy-in. Having a champion at the upper administrative level of the institution can ensure community engagement is promoted across the organization (Holland B. A., 2009). Indeed, "as managers of campus culture, institutional leaders played an important role in recasting their institutions as places that value reciprocal relationships with community partnerships" (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). That being said, too much rhetoric at the top can risk the project if it becomes associated with one person's agenda. Leadership support can come from the very top of the structure, the President or Chief Academic Officer, or a department head or dean (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). Unfortunately, it is rare for institutions to report having trustees or board members championing community engagement, and this can be a problem. These administrative functions often control the hiring process and outline the job requirements of top-level positions. Therefore, it is increasingly important that leaders at all levels are involved in the engagement project to promote its embeddedness in the institution's every day practices (Holland B. A., 2009). This also includes partners external to the institution, as leadership is also required at the government, union, and external funding agency level to promote buy-in and whole-system reform (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). Holland suggests that regularly reporting on engagement activities and ensuring speechwriters and communications teams have success stories to reference is a good way to increase the knowledge and involvement of leadership. Similarly, building engagement expertise directly into the job descriptions/hiring policies of key leadership positions is proactive and productive (Holland B. A., 2009).

However, it is not only at the executive level that leadership is required. Often, it is individual champions working directly with communities across disciplinary boundaries that assume a leadership role, whether explicitly or not. Jennifer Dugan finds that the institutional leadership of successfully embedded engagement strategies must have 'boundary-spanning' capacities. Dugan asserts that "if civic engagement is an institution-wide feature, then it requires mechanisms for institutional collaboration" (Dugan, 2015, p. 81). Likewise, Weert and Sandmann find that *boundary spanners* are the leaders most responsible for creating the conditions for a philosophical shift to two-way knowledge flow and construction. Indeed,

> Successful spanners were good listeners, effectively managed power, and maintained neutrality with community partners. In addition, they possessed a service ethic characterized by respect and a "community first" attitude. The perception of these spanners in the community was critical to understanding whether engagement was "for real" at these institutions. While their institutions were often seen as untrustworthy, effective spanners were viewed as being on the

> community's side and were seen as brokering mutually beneficial relationships. Ineffective spanners, on the other hand, reflected an orientation in which the institution dominated the agenda based on its own interests (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008, p. 97).

Spanners were therefore found to be ambassadors of engagement and absolutely key to building trust and establishing relationships. Considering that community partners scrutinize the behaviours of spanners in making up their minds about an institution, Weerts and Sandmann (2008) advocate for the creation of *engagement academies,* where boundary spanners could be recruited and trained to serve as brokers of the community first ethic in higher education.

Organizational Infrastructure

A common consideration for successful CCE at PSIs relates to the best institutional infrastructure: a centralized or decentralized model. A centralized model denotes a centrally organized unit responsible for leading engagement activities across the university. The mandate of the unit may be comprehensive in nature, or limited to promoting one aspect of the community engagement framework, such as service-learning. The decentralized model is reflective of a more organically shaped embeddedness, with community engagement projects and champions dispersed across the organization, which may or may not operate in coordination with one another. Holland stops short of recommending one option over the other, asserting that "in regard to institutionalization, the important aspects of infrastructure seem to be encompassed in the intentionality of design and the link (formal or informal) to core academic work of teaching and research" (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 90). However, according to Weerts and Sandmann, community partners are more likely to perceive an institution's engagement efforts positively when they have a centralized unit that can serve as a clearinghouse for engagement efforts – without restrictive gatekeeping or undue levels of bureaucracy!

This perspective is a direct response to the barriers to access often encountered by community members due to the complexity of institutional structures in higher education (Inman, 2010). Considering this, the co-authors highly recommend use of a centralized model to enable easier pathways for community members to engage (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Further in support of centralization, Dugan quotes a college president in her study as emphasizing the importance of central support and coordination to the institutionalization project:

> In an era of serious change marked by the absence of intellectual consensus, faculty members are apt to meet new demands with feelings of exhaustion and growing resentment, if there is not solid institutional consensus supporting the efficacy of transformation (Guarasci (2006), quoted in Dugan, 2015).

Becoming an engaged campus also promotes the reform of the institution's organizational structure so that engagement with civil society is integrated through targeted staffing and/or centres to support the work. But, this may or may not include the creation of centralized units that focus on community engagement initiatives, as there is no one template for success; various models exist and are reflective of the diverse needs of PSI and community partners in unique historical, geographical, and socio-political contexts (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). For instance, centralized units "not only provid[e] practical assistance, but also rais[e] visibility, off[er] the legitimacy conferred by a formal unit, and off[er] a venue for building interdisciplinary partnerships across departments" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 40). However,

Holland also points to the risk of centralized community engagement units stunting full integration, which can occur if/when members of the university community see the mandate of engagement as that of the designated office rather than a responsibility shared by all (Holland B. , 1997).

Other important infrastructure decisions include location in the organizational structure, access to executive level support, qualifications of leadership (whether academic or administrative, depending on the location/affiliation of the unit or projects), and mechanisms for the involvement of students, faculty, administration and community partners. Importantly, infrastructure design “has more apparent influence on the institutional reach and sustainability of engagement than do sources and amounts of funding” (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 90). Importantly, engagement units located off-campus in a location accessible to the community, can go a long way toward neutralizing community-campus power differentials, enabling meaningful community involvement, and advancing significantly institutional culture change. Although engagement offices located off-campus can risk dis-integration from PSI operations, the net benefit is enhanced CCE relationships (Reference Required).

Embedded Supports for Engaged Faculty

Providing faculty and staff with the tools they require to participate in CCE, including the provision of relevant professional development opportunities (such as the engagement academies suggested above) and the modification of reward structures for engaged scholarship, is critical to advancing culture change in higher education. In order to link engagement to scholarly activities, mechanisms must be embedded to ensure that engagement is recognized and rewarded. Indeed, Holland proposes that next to the institutional mission, “a faculty reward system seen by faculty as compatible and consistent with the institutional expectation for involvement in service” is imperative for embedding an ethic of engagement. Furthermore, community partners place high importance on the institutional support and recognition given to engaged faculty when judging an institution’s overall commitment to service (Holland B. , 1997, p. 39).

Unfortunately, the support of engaged scholarship promoted in many institutional missions is not found to be reflected in their promotion and tenure policies (Driscoll, 2009). A 2009 study found that many engaged campuses are “broadening categories of research in ways that provide legitimacy for community-engaged scholarship”, but continue to experience challenges over how to properly define engagement efforts in terminology and discourse. Similarly, “while promotion and tenure policies emphasize community engagement as a faculty service role, community engagement also is associated in some cases with an integrated faculty role across teaching, research, and service”. Finally, the study concluded that “promotion and tenure materials revealed little evidence that reciprocity is valued, assessed, or even authentically understood” (Saltmarsh, et al., 2009, pp. 14, 16, 18, 20). Effectively embedding the engagement ethic into formalized policies of promotion and tenure therefore, requires substantial attention.

However, promotion and tenure is not the only means through which faculty efforts are imbued with value. In a busy academic institution, opening the space for faculty to engage with communities as part of their workload is extremely important. Enabling this space is at once a means of recognizing and legitimizing engaged scholarship and could have as crucial an impact on faculty buy-in as formal rewards. This is because regularly, due to time constraints and the emphasis often placed on more traditional academic outputs (i.e. journal articles, edited volumes, conference presentations), engaged

scholars are forced to conduct their community engagement activities 'off the desk' (Sandmann, 2009). In her study of the lessons learned from four engaged campuses in the United States, Jennifer Dugan acknowledges that "there are few challenges more persistent than faculty workload issues, with or without the addition of civic engagement" (Dugan, 2015, p. 82). Dugan finds that workload questions are an important element in the successful governance of an institution's community engagement strategy and that there is no universal template for balancing engagement activities with traditional scholarship.

Similarly, Davydd Greenwood identifies the 'off the desk' nature of much engaged scholarship and what is often a corresponding climate of silent acceptance as a barrier to the broader integration of engagement across the institution. From his experience, engaged scholarship is relegated to individuals who are willing to conduct engagement activities on their own time, with little to no recognition or support from the broader organization, which eventually leads to burnout. Indeed, Greenwood argues that "unless a comprehensive deployment of [action research] throughout the operations of higher education institutions is accomplished, the teaching/learning of [action research] will remain a modest activity carried on by marginal individuals who never gain control of broader institutional agendas" (Greenwood, 2007, p. 251). Greenwood observes that,

> the common thread here is that [action research] activities are possible in public universities so long as they are voluntary, basically unfunded, and in no way require alterations in the administrative structures, administrative practices, general teaching approaches, or research practices of the institutions (Greenwood, 2007, p. 251; 256).

Clearly, acknowledging the tension between faculty workloads and the often 'extracurricular' or 'service-oriented' interpretation of CCE work is important for creating a climate where engaged scholarship is recognized, encouraged, and rewarded. Only when engaged scholarship gets placed 'on the desk' will it really be valued and embraced by faculty across the institution.

Government policies for CCE

PSI's construction of particular modes and strategies arise from the broader socio-political contexts, including the government policy settings for stimulating various kinds of knowledge exchange with external actors to the PSI. Jongbloed and Benneworth (2013) note that this policy interest in increasing and then measuring campus-community engagement has arisen within a wider and more dominant agenda to exploit PSI's knowledge capital to improve the international competitiveness of a nation's economy (p. 263). Governments are increasingly concerned to 'performance manage' their post-secondary systems, and the measuring of the PSI's economic, social and cultural outcomes is intrinsic to this governance.

Benneworth and Charles (2013) identify six kinds of policy intervention that governments have at their disposal to amplify community engagement activities in PSIs (p. 231). These include i) regulating the university mission, which is easier with new institutions, but can be used during periodic renegotiations, ii) core funding for mission (governments can build into their regular 'block' funding for teaching and research a proportion to be spent on community engagement) iii) providing additional funds for engagement activities alongside 'core' activities, sometimes called 'third stream' funding; iv) permitting PSIs to bid for (a proportion of) community development funds, in addition to social sector

organizations (in Alberta, for instance, we can see this in the Community Initiatives Fund; in other provinces there are 'social innovation' funds doing the same); specifying engagement outcomes required from core activities, such as community service-learning or work-integrated learning arising from teaching/student funds, or community partnered research funds; or vi) the creation of an intermediary platform (e.g. a commission, an organization) for the PSI sector to develop and disseminate coherent engagement policy with the sector in exchange for additional funding. Benneworth and Charles (2013) trace instances of all of these policies, in various combinations, as enacted across Australia, Canada (via federal CURA grants, now Partnership Grants), the UK, and the Netherlands.

Internal and External Funding Pathways

Holland (2009) finds that a healthy mix of both internal (PSI allocated) and external funding (government and private) is most beneficial. A balance between the two demonstrates a sustainable base within the institution, but also the respect and legitimacy of the project from outside funders and even community groups. Financial support from external partners also helps to enhance the credibility of community engagement, as a project's ability to attract external funding is a traditional metric for assessing its value to the institution (and to scholarship) (Holland B. A., 2009).

Tracking the impact of funding can be difficult, however, especially for larger institutions where any funds that touch the public could technically be considered as engagement. Smaller institutions often have an easier time of tracking funds and "in some ways, smaller institutions are advantages in institutionalization of engagement in that the work can be more focused and visible, and thus easier to observe, assess, and measure in terms of costs and benefits" (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 91). Additionally, the link between community-campus engagement and philanthropy is growing dramatically, as private funders seek ways to facilitate social impact through higher education/knowledge creation (Holland B. A., 2009). In Canada, the McConnell Foundation, among others, have a history of investing in community service-learning to bridge PSIs and communities, and more recently various social innovation programs to cultivate an entrepreneurial disposition amongst students in their attempts to solve complex social problems. These philanthropic funds have contributed towards the sustainability of CCE programs across Canada.

Representing CCE Impact

Along with promotion and tenure policies, curriculum is the hardest to change in any academic organization (Holland B. A., 2009). While engaged-learning opportunities may exist in piecemeal form in various departments or schools, truly embedding engaged-learning across disciplinary boundaries is only possible once the other elements discussed herein are implemented. Importantly, cross-curricular service-learning is often where community level impact happens the most. Therefore, it is key not only for its grassroots connection, but also for the development of a student body that will advocate for community-engaged scholarship in the future.

Enabling student voice is crucial, as is the creation of feedback mechanisms for community voice to be encouraged, legitimated, and acted upon (Holland B. A., 2009). In advocating for the importance of what he calls *action research*, Davydd Greenwood suggests that institutions "actively link multi-disciplinary teaching, research, and direct social action, in concert with extra-university stakeholders of many types and demonstrate [our] worth through actions in working with them to solve their most

pressing problems" (Greenwood, 2007). This 'linking' can take place organically through the ongoing maintenance of relationships or specifically through individual projects or partnerships. Often, community groups are represented on institutional boards or committees for symbolic purposes, but for "partnerships [to] truly be of demonstrable mutual benefit, […] partnerships must give the community shared responsibility" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 42). After all, the concept of culture change underpinning this paper's research question emphasizes a new philosophy that moves away "from an expert model of delivering university knowledge to the public and toward a more collaborative model in which community partners play a significant role in creating and sharing knowledge to the mutual benefit of institutions and society" (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008, p. 74). This epistemological shift takes time, with all partners learning new skills and behaviours, new ways of perceiving relations with one another and communicating needs, interests and ideas. As such, "reciprocal knowledge flow occurs through a long-term institutional socialization process that reshapes power relationships with communities" (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008, p. 97).

However, given the significant resources required for meaningful community engagement activities, the ability to define and measure the impact of these investments will become increasingly important, especially when champions must compete for limited funds (Driscoll, Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirming higher education's role in community, 2009). In an era of the neoliberalization of higher education, PSIs and their community partners will have to learn quickly how to evaluate and track the impact their efforts are having for purposes of reporting, recognition, and funding, or in other words, survival.

Regarding the assessment of impact, it is common for PSIs to use student learning as an indicator. Student impact is often measured through pedagogical changes and observations of student learning, including students making connections between curricular content and the reality facing communities (Driscoll, 2014). The focus on tracking impact on student learning at the expense of other forms of measurement that directly assess the impact on community partners or systemic change, is problematic. Stoecker and Tryon suggest that a focus on student outcomes makes sense for institutions, given that faculty reward, administrative promotion, and research funding is often based on "the satisfaction of their 'customer base' – the student" (Stoecker & Tryon, 2009, p. 4). What this means in practice is that institutions end up reporting on community impact as an extension of student learning outcomes, privileging the institution's perspective and limiting community voice. Indeed, "the consequence of this self-contemplation by institutions of higher education is that the voice of the community organization staff and community members mostly goes unheard" (Stoecker & Tryon, 2009, p. 5). Moreover, the focus on student impact fails to account for overall collective impact, including research impact and societal wellbeing.

Considering the challenges inherent to measuring the impact of community engagement efforts and the current neoliberal climate, Weerts and Sandmann question, somewhat provocatively, whether CCE is a modern-day public relations strategy to create a competitive advantage in the attraction of external funding and recognition. From a practical standpoint, the authors find that regardless of measurable impact, "engagement structures may exist simply to communicate a set of values about the importance of community and that the structures themselves may be more important than the outcomes (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008, p. 1000).

Another set of perspectives to understand the challenges in measuring the impacts of community engagement is offered in Paul Benneworth's (2013) edited volume, *University Engagement in Socially Excluded Communities*. Benneworth and Charles (2013) note that governance techniques such as indicators, classification rubrics and benchmarking exercises in system wide evaluation and impact frameworks all arise from the methods of New Public Management (NPM) and have not always worked to assist in the fruitful development of instruments and measures to stimulate community engagement (p. 223-224). To have real value for community engagement practices, performance measures require three criteria: they need to capture the resources made available to the community, capture in some way how external partners value the university activity, and clearly define what they mean by what is 'good' or excellent in engagement activity (p. 224). Further, a key consideration in developing an instrument or indicator for policy-makers must be its impact on the kinds of relationships already in place between campus and community within a specific locale. Engagement policies at a systemic level need to be flexible enough, or proposed with a 'deft, light touch' so that outcomes can be tailored to specific institutional contexts and strengths. Engagement policies and measurements should align with universities' core activities, and those they are already interested in and pursuing.

Clearly, the problem of how to measure the impact of community engagement activities requires significant attention. Jongbloed and Benneworth (2013) approach measuring community engagement activity from the perspective of policy-makers, who follow 'competing rationales' for measurement (p. 265). The institution-led approach, as outline below, is an attempt to directly improve the particular engagement mission of a university, or at least to manage the public perception of such engagement. A government-led approach instead is more concerned to indirectly improve societal engagement across the system through stimulating competition among universities. Government funding for engagement, however, is only likely to accompany the government led, system-wide approach of incentives and competitive comparison, which will involve the adoption of broad indicators for measurement not always appropriate to the particular engagement activities of a university.

In light of these two rationales of measuring community engagement, there is a "Copenhagen trade-off" (Jongbloed and Benneworth, 2013, p. 279) in measuring community engagement with the purpose of improving CCE in contrast with comparative and competitive assessment exercises related to funding. What remains to be accomplished in the measurement of community engagement, for the authors, is a consensus around what 'good' community engagement should be. They suggest, like for business engagement, that this must in some way be related to the volume, value, and independent review of this engagement activity (p. 281).

These dilemmas challenge the advancement of culture change within PSIs, especially considering the importance of data for defending the returns of community engagement activities and the problematic nature of authentically representing community impact. Fortunately, impact can be tracked and community voices harnessed using context-specific assessment models and collaborative mechanisms for co-evaluation. The question of how to meaningfully engage in the co-creation of an assessment process for locating culture change advancement in PSIs is of particular interest to the AICI-WG. As such, the next section of the paper will explore the various forms institutional self-assessment can take and survey three popular existing models in order to inform initial discussions regarding the co-creation of a CCE classification system for the Canadian context.

Self-Assessing Institutional Engagement

Whether seeking a snapshot of an institution's community engagement efforts at one point in time, self-assessing progress toward specified engagement goals, or attempting to define a measure of social impact, assessment and measurement of community engagement is a key element towards embedding an ethic of CCE in PSIs. Assessment is a challenging task when it comes to CCE, not only because of the diverse contexts, forms, geographies, and socialities the work takes place in and is shaped by, but also because "the nature of community engagement itself challenges some of the traditional values and indicators of academic prestige and performance" (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 86). In other words, the essence of CCE culture change requires out-of-the-box thinking about what outcomes are valued, whose perspectives are represented, and how progress is perceived and assessed. Because of the plurality of models and the variety of purposes engaged campuses have towards CCE, there is no 'one size fits all' solution to assessment. Rather, the choice of measurement tool must be decided upon carefully to suit the purpose at hand (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009).

Holland identifies three aims that approaches to measuring institutional commitment to engagement have in common. First, they strive to "estimate the optimum or desired level of engagement activity that aligns with institutional purposes and capacities". Second, they "direct attention to aspects of the academic organization that are essential to quality engagement", and third, they "identify specific areas of weakness where organizational change and capacity improvements are needed to support quality engagement (Holland B. A., 2009, p. 88). Writing in 2009, Andrew Furco and William Miller review over two dozen assessment approaches in their piece "Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement" to provide an overview of the different types and their prospective uses and weaknesses.

The varied approaches to self-assessing institutional engagement range from snapshots in time to detailed, system-oriented, data-driven classifications. Approximately one-third of self-assessment frameworks are checklists. Relatively easy and quick to complete, these tools merely scratch the surface, lacking opportunity for rich description and being highly subjective to assessor interpretation. Checklists are not appropriate for tracking progress over time and fail to provide a degree of institutionalization. Indicators can offer "a more robust picture of areas of specific engagement strengths and weaknesses", based as they are on a set of principles organized into measurable components representing certain themes (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009, p. 49). However, since using an indicator tool is dependent upon the presence or absence of certain components, with little room for interpretation, assessments based upon indicators can sometimes underestimate engagement efforts (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009).

Benchmarking approaches utilize more empirical data and introduce the notion of performance expectations based upon internal and/or external comparisons. These approaches are more formalized and are often used by accreditation boards or external review panels. Two-dimensional rubrics offer more than one point of reference and are useful for "measuring changes in engagement institutionalization over time and are especially useful for conducting multi-institution comparisons" (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009, p. 50). However, although rubrics are valuable for the in-depth analysis permitted by their scaled characterizations of

various elements, they may forfeit some of the benefits of a more comprehensive approach, not to mention they require significant time, energy, familiarity, and expertise to complete. (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009).

Matrices are like rubrics in that they are organized according to a set of engagement factors as one dimension and descriptive stages for determining level of culture change as the other dimension, against which elements of engagement are weighted. The description found at each level varies according to the set of circumstances and issues encountered at that position. As such, matrices are useful for action planning and "because they focus on broad dimensions of institutionalization rather than the levels of development for individual engagement components", they are more useful than rubrics for comprehensive engagement assessment (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009, p. 50).

Finally, there have been several systems tools developed for institutional self-assessment of CCE, the most popular of which is the Carnegie elective Community Engagement Classification. Systems assessments "encompass a battery of instruments, procedures, and approaches to provide a more comprehensive assessment, seeking to capture both the depth and breadth of an institution's engagement" (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009, p. 50). Systems assessments require substantial time and effort to conduct, utilizing as they do an array of quantitative and qualitative data analysis that is not limited to key stakeholder/partner interviews, historical documents, questionnaires and surveys, and policy, planning and programming procedures (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009).

However, there are critiques of systems tools that should not be overlooked. Jongbloed and Benneworth (2013) write that the classification systems such as Carnegie can inform wider governmental systems of measuring the impact of community engagement. However, communities themselves need a stronger voice in the articulation of both institutional classification systems and system-wide policies to measure and incentivize community engagement and open them up to independent community review. Furthermore, as Kimball and Thomas (2012) write:

> In their pursuit of a competitive advantage, e.g., with help from the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement classification, institutions of higher education can inadvertently dilute the complexity and controversy inherent in the construction and practice of community engagement by reducing it to a set of inventories (e.g., How many service-learning courses do we offer? How many of our students are engaged in service?), tag lines, and compelling human interest stories without critically examining the core values and strategies that undergird community engagement itself (Kimball & Thomas, 2012, p. 26).

This provocation aligns with feminist critiques that question what role community voice can have when assessments are conducted from within the institution, thereby privileging the voice of the institution and reinforcing existing power imbalances that value the university expertise over community-oriented knowledge (Van Deventer Iverson & Hauver James, 2014).

Regardless of which tool an institution chooses, Furco and Miller suggest key considerations be taken into account. These include defining key terms and interpretations to ensure a shared understanding of concepts and terminology for effective assessment; timing, to ensure the institution is using the correct

tool for its location on the continuum of culture change (i.e. for an institution that hosts a few community service-learning courses but lacks leadership buy-in or evidence of engagement in the mission, it may not be useful to undertake a systems classification); the purpose of assessment, be it grant writing, annual reporting, continuous improvement, impact, etc.; who the assessors are, what expertise they have, and whether they are from within or outside the institution; and, adaptation of the tool for the specific institutional context and terminology (Furco & Miller, Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement, 2009).

In the following sections, some of the most popular assessment approaches for self-assessing CCE culture change are described in detail. In addition to providing a survey of existing models, this overview details specific elements of engagement that might be considered most pertinent to assessing the location of engaged campuses on a culture change continuum. First, the *Levels of Commitment to Engagement* matrix developed by Barbara Holland in 1997 is unpacked. Then, the systems classification developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is analyzed in depth through findings garnered from its 2006 and 2008 application rounds in the United States. A brief description of the EDGE tool, a matrix developed by an alliance of universities in the United Kingdom is provided. Finally, the Campus Engage Ireland principles and metrics and noted.

Levels of Commitment to Engagement (The Holland Matrix)

In 1997, Barbara Holland developed a matrix that could be used by institutions to determine the degree to which they were prepared to respond/were responding to goals of community engagement (Appendix A). This was in recognition of the fact that the service movement in higher education had resulted in a variety of efforts across a diversity of institutional contexts, specific to the unique needs of institutions and their community partners. Often, an institution's service efforts evolved organically in response to the dynamic needs of the community, rather than deliberately as part of an established strategy for engagement. She argued that "for the service movement to be sustained and institutionalized, each institution must develop its own understanding of the degree to which service is an integral component of the academic mission" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 30). In order to effectively respond to the needs of broader society, institutions needed to adequately define what they saw as the role of scholarship and the institution in relation to the communities with whom they engaged.

Holland's tool is based upon the findings of twenty-three qualitative case studies conducted with as many American institutions between 1994 and 1997. The matrix "is meant to be a useful diagnostic tool to describe and interpret the dimensions, approaches, and levels of institutional commitment to community service-learning and, therefore, to facilitate institutional planning, decision-making and evaluation" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 34). This conceptual framework is not intended to judge right and wrong, but rather to assist institutions in identifying discrepancies between policy and practice; to identify the status of their efforts and to monitor progress toward institutionalization.

The case study findings identified seven key factors of an institution's infrastructure, communication, policy and participation that will be impacted/were impacted by community engagement efforts. An institution's expression of these factors – mission; promotion, tenure and hiring; organizational

structure; student involvement; faculty involvement; community involvement; and campus publications – were located on a continuum from low relevancy to full integration. By utilizing the matrix, an institution "should be able to match its organizational choices with these factors to test the linkage between goals and performance" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 35).

Regardless of the overall location of the PSI on the continuum, a clear mission was regarded as being of utmost importance to mobilizing sustained efforts towards culture change. The first factor considered in the matrix, an institution's mission is a direct reflection of what it views the role of higher education in civil society to be. Holland notes that, historically, it hasn't been uncommon for the mission of a university to make reference to service, but rarely do mission statements adequately define the meaning and nature of the institution's commitment to internal and external actors. Given the critical importance of the mission to the advancing an ethic of CCE, it is not surprising that the case studies that informed Holland's matrix found that "many of the problematic issues experienced at institutions striving to implement and sustain service-learning were linked to real or perceived mis-alignment of the campus mission and institutional actions regarding service" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 38). Therefore, the status of the remaining factors in the matrix are indicative of the extent to which the mission is embedded across the various domains. In other words, if a PSI's mission falls at the level of low relevancy for community engagement, it is unlikely that the remaining factors will reflect the presence of greater institutional commitment to engage.

The Holland continuum identifies four levels of institutional commitment expressed through the seven key factors: low, medium and high relevance, and full integration. PSIs with characteristics located on the low level of relevance do not see service as integral to their mission. These institutions place higher priority on specific instructional environments or research, and might only engage in community partnerships when the opportunity arises and the resources are made easily available. PSIs that find themselves located at the level of medium relevancy see engagement with the broader community as part of being a good, educated citizen. Institutions at this level often adopt the philosophy of "community service as evidence of good institutional citizenship and an ingredient in good community and public relations" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 36). These institutions might provide extracurricular community service activities for students and faculty and host some service-learning courses dependent upon self-motivation of faculty. Engagement at this level is not embedded, but rather piecemeal.

For PSIs located at the degree of high relevancy, mission statements recognize the value of community engagement to research and the role expertise in higher education can have in *studying* community problems. This outreach or one-way expert model of university-community interaction "features the support of service and service-learning through highly traditional and familiar scholarly roles that are compatible with traditional evaluation mechanisms" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 37). At this level, service learning opportunities for students are often tied to career/educational advancement (practica or internships) and service-learning curricular outcomes are distinct in separate courses and not integrated throughout curricula.

Finally, PSIs at the level of full integration engage with the community in setting and implementing the scholarly service agenda; these institutions "take an interactive and interdependent relationship with the community as a defining characteristic of the overall academic mission" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 37). Engagement at this level is characterized by two-way knowledge creation and flow, as well as deliberate strategies for supporting service-learning as a part of virtually every person's academic experience. This

includes strategies to recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship and to integrate community service-learning across the curriculum. Tellingly, the case study research found that PSIs that fell within the levels of high relevance or full integration had religious affiliations, or, if they were secular, relationships of historical interdependency with the surrounding community. Maeve Lydon further reflects on the critical importance of personal working relationships to institutional accountability and responsibility.

Generally, PSIs located at low and medium relevancy had reward systems that rarely recognized service contributions, whereas institutions at high relevancy and full integration noted discrepancies in the rhetoric surrounding promotion and tenure and the actual practices used. The factor of organizational structure takes into account the existence of centralized units with the mandate of facilitating CCE activities, such as service-learning centres or community engagement offices. The presence of these institutional units has a cumulative effective when locating an institution on the levelled continuum.

Expressions of student involvement are easily defined along a continuum of club-based service, to extra and co-curricular activities, to course-based service learning. Similarly, expressions of faculty involvement (a more individual measure than promotion, tenure and hiring) evolve from "traditional forms of individual scholarly agendas toward more interdisciplinary and collaborative work with other faculty, students and/or community partners" (Holland B. , 1997, p. 41). The factor of community involvement takes into account the extent to which the community has influence on the behaviour of the institution as well as the degree to which the community has access to the institution's "intellectual resources" (Ibid.). Finally, the factor of campus publications examined the communications, recruitment, planning, budget, and promotional materials of institutions to determine the extent to which they expressed a commitment to community engagement. Although this is not necessarily a definitive measure of an institution's level of commitment, it can provide a useful snapshot of how an institution represents itself to society (Holland B. , 1997).

Holland's matrix is a useful tool for assisting PSIs in self-assessing and monitoring their progress towards the goal of becoming an 'engaged campus'. However, this 1997 assessment initiative acknowledges that further attention is required as to what facilitates an institution's movement along the continuum, such as,

> unit and campus leadership; financial resources including internal allocations, external funding, and incentives; internal and external expectations and demands (governing bodies, legislatures, community interest groups, local crises); community history and goals; and institutional motivations (service-learning as social learning, as a tool for community relations, and/or as student career development and exploration, for example) (Holland B. , 1997, p. 45).

In comparison to Holland's matrix, the elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, to be discussed in the next section, is a systems-oriented tool that offers a documentation framework to enable the quantification and qualification of data related to engagement activities. The Carnegie elective classification evolved from previous models of institutional assessment, including the Holland matrix. Importantly, however, the Carnegie classification does not rank institutions nor ask that they specify their community engagement goals for purposes of measuring their progress year after year (Holland B. A., 2009).

Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification

In 2005, the American-based Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching announced a new classification for community engagement. The classification was the first in a series of new schema that resulted from Carnegie's re-examination of its traditional tools, and was intended for PSIs that engaged with the community. The term 'community engagement' was used intentionally to broadly encompass the many diverse activities an institution might interpret as service to, with, and for the community, however an institution chose to define community. The definition developed by Carnegie defined community engagement as the collaboration "between higher education institutions 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" (Driscoll, 2009, p. 6).

The vision for the community engagement classification was developed collaboratively by Carnegie colleagues and national engagement leaders. The documentation framework built upon previously existing mechanisms for benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement from Campus Compact, the Council of Independent Colleges, the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, as well as individual partner institutions. Primary and secondary research was undertaken to guide the development process (including of the Holland Matrix), drawing on best practices and lessons learned from engagement leaders, as well as the critiques and recommendations for embedding an ethic of community engagement from the academic literature (Driscoll, 2009).

Once a draft documentation tool was created, Carnegie sponsored a six-month pilot of the documentation process in thirteen partner institutions. Representatives of the pilot institutions first came together to review and revise the tool, then returned to their respective institutions for a six-month pilot, collecting as much information as possible. Upon completion of the pilot term, the representatives came together once more to compile their recommendations for revision. While the pilot institutions were challenged by several of the indicators, such as recruitment practices that prioritize community engagement expertise or promotion and tenure policies that reward engaged scholarship, they did agree that some of the documentation's indicators should apply to the assessment of an institution's level of commitment to community engagement regardless of the diversity of the institution. For instance, and similar to the Holland matrix, the classification should prioritize as indicators the level of commitment to community engagement specified in an institution's mission statement, as well as budgetary support and executive leadership buy-in and promotion. Amy Driscoll, the Carnegie project coordinator, found the resulting documentation tool "comprehensive, designed to capture the scope of institutional engagement, inclusive to affirm the diversity of approaches, and rigorous in promoting quality practices of community engagement" (Driscoll, 2009, p. 7). There were seventy-six successfully classified institutions in the inaugural round.

There are two major components to the documentation framework. The first, *Foundational Indicators*, requires that an institution demonstrate the extent to which it has embedded community engagement, evidenced by indicators of institutional identity and culture, which include mission, celebrations and rewards, promotion, and leadership, and indicators of commitment, which include strategic plan, infrastructure, professional development, assessment, community involvement and budget (Driscoll, 2009). These indicators also reflect the understanding that "community engagement is an element of

transformative institutional change and that institutional transformation is characterized by changes in institutional culture" (Saltmarsh, et al., 2009, p. 6).

In the second part, *Categories of Community Engagement,* applicants are asked to provide data, description, and examples that support the focus of their community engagement efforts, be it pedagogical, curricular, outreach, or partnerships. Data about curricular engagement activities may pertain to internships, service-learning, student research and leadership, and faculty scholarship. Data regarding outreach and partnership activities may include descriptions of particular initiatives, actions or agreements. (Driscoll, 2014; Driscoll, 2009)

A review of the classification process two years after its 2006 introduction revealed several areas for improvement should the tool live up to its intention to "encourage[s] important qualities such as mutuality and reciprocity" (Driscoll, 2009, p. 6). For instance, most applicant PSIs found it difficult to produce measured results of system-wide impact, drawing mostly upon individual course or program results as a means of institutional assessment. In addition to assessment practices, Driscoll calls the gap between the commitments made to community service within institutional missions and the lack of recognition and reward of engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure policies "disturbing" (Driscoll, 2009, p. 10).

Accordingly, Driscoll notes that institutions also encountered difficulty answering the question of how their community partners perceive their relationship, with many unable to define how communities were involved in setting the engagement agenda and what mechanisms existed to ensure reciprocity and systemic feedback throughout a project's lifespan. Driscoll acknowledges that "[t]hese levels of involvement with community clearly demand new understandings, new skills, and even a new way of conceptualizing community, and typically, with little advance preparation for faculty or administrators" (Driscoll, 2009, p. 11). Although the successful applicant institutions will benefit from their Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, through enhanced reputation from association with the Carnegie name and capacity garnered from the documentation experience, clearly, institutions have a long way to go in realigning their internal processes to better act in mutuality with their community partners (Driscoll, 2009).

A follow-up report conducted by Driscoll on the 2008 round, which awarded one-hundred and twenty institutions with the classification, revealed additional trends worthy of consideration. For instance, tracking and assessment was improved through the creation of databases and the use of faculty surveys and annual reports across institutions. Applicants included community visits, immersion and tours as part of the institution's professional development activities, and all applicants reported that they were tracking the impact of engagement on students, with variances in the actual data received (Driscoll, 2014).

Unfortunately, many institutions continued to face challenges concerning broad level assessment of community and institutional impact, providing mainly anecdotal evidence. This is troubling considering that measured impact is an important aspect of developing the rationale required to access resources to support engagement activities. Moreover, as PSIs begin to evaluate impact, it will be critical to involve community partners in a meaningful way. Similarly, "very little change [was] seen in the responses to questions probing mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships and seeking to strategies for assuring those qualities in the relations between higher education and community", even though Carnegie compiled

and made available to applicants evidence-based resources regarding methods for enhancing the reciprocity of community-campus partnerships (Driscoll, 2014, p. 12).

Writing in 2009, Barbara Holland offers some observations concerning the Carnegie elective Community Engagement Classification as well. She credits Carnegie for creating and mainstreaming a template for the quantification and qualification of community engagement data, stating that the developing database will enable insight into specific trends and best practices in community-campus engagement across the United States, were it publicly available. The classification is technically confidential and information from the annual application rounds is not currently available publicly.

The Carnegie elective Community Engagement Classification has also received various critiques, not least from Randy Stoecker, a well-known scholar in the field of community-engaged scholarship. In an interview with Stoecker, Natalia Khanenko-Friesen refers to how a "top-down approach to […] community-engaged scholarship projects, administration and reporting" in the United States have resulted in the development of "various 'tools' designed to 'measure' engagement and to evaluate its 'outputs'" (Khanenko-Friesen, 2015, p. 194).

In response to the question of whether the Canadian CCE movement should produce a means of institutional classification similar to (or based upon) the United States' Carnegie classification, Randy Stoecker responded as follows:

> The Carnegie Classification is a hollow shell. Universities fill out a bunch of forms with superficial information devoid of any evidence of real impact in order to get the shiny medal. But there is little of real substance behind it. If you want to have a national recognition framework, build it around actual impacts, not around how many bodies are engaged in how many hours of system-maintaining charity activities (Khanenko-Friesen, 2015).

Considering Stocker's response above, one can easily read his critique of the Carnegie classification as one of a top-down approach to assessment that privileges the interests of the institution over the interests of the community. In regard to that, Stocker questions "how can one define a mutual benefit between a university (usually a multimillion dollar institution) and a small marginalized community" (Khanenko-Friesen, 2015, p. 194)? This highlights a crucial point made by feminist engagement and women's studies scholars: How do we measure change when *change* itself is such a complex concept? The final section of this paper describes the collaborative approach taken by funders, PSIs, and the federal government in the United Kingdom to address this question through a process of national strategic alignment with the goal of improving public engagement in higher education.

The EDGE Tool

In 2008, the United Kingdom National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE-UK) launched a national initiative to inspire culture change in how UK universities engage with the public. The initiative was called Beacons for Public Engagement and was conceptualized in 2007 by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) in response to a perceived breakdown of public trust in scientific research. HEFCE is the body that funds and regulates universities and colleges in England. In partnership with HEFCE, the Wellcome Trust and Research Councils UK contributed funding to support the initiative, keen to learn how public engagement could be embedded into the culture of PSIs. This

work was also informed by the UK Charter for Science and Society (Gov. of United Kingdom), which was the result of government-sponsored consultations on the relationship between research and the public. The Charter was intended to guide the development of a national strategy on public engagement in research and outlined three principles in the following areas: strategic commitment; implementation and practice; and evaluation and impact.

The Beacons project responded to the Charter by funding six 'Beacons' – university-based collaborative centres that support, recognize, reward and build capacity for public engagement work – and creating the NCCPE-UK to act as a national coordinating body to its twenty-three member universities. The NCCPE-UK defines public engagement as "the myriad of ways in which the activity and benefits of higher education and research can be shared with the public. Engagement is by definition a two-way process, involving interaction and listening, with the goal of generating mutual benefit" (NCCPE-UK, What is public engagement?, 2016). The project has flourished since 2008, inspiring several shifts in how research capacity is generated, how research impact is measured and funded, and how post-secondary institutions embed an ethic of public engagement.

One of the most valuable contributions of the Beacons project has been the development of a self-assessment tool to assist PSIs in evaluating their current level and areas for improvement related to public engagement. The EDGE tool (Appendix B) anchors the key aspects of embedded public engagement in higher education across nine key dimensions ranging from communication and leadership to learning and recognition. The nine dimensions are organized into three categories to motivate discussion and encourage reflection: *Purpose* includes embedding goals for public engagement into the mission and vision of the university, and championing it through all communications. *Process* involves investing in systems to facilitate involvement, maximize impact, and ensure quality. Finally, *People* recognizes the importance of having staff, students, and the public involved at all stages, utilizing their knowledge and expertise to inform the public engagement strategy. Online support tools have also been developed to assist insitutions in applying the EDGE Tool to their specific context and can be found on the NCCPE-UK's website at https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/support-it/self-assess-with-edge-tool (NCCPE-UK, 2016).

Irish Community Engagement

Over 2014-2015, Campus Engage Ireland convened post-secondary leaders to sign on to a Charter for community engagement as well as a statement of 'Indicative Actions' that engaged institutions should manifest (Campus Engage, 2015). The purpose was to 'present a broad interpretation of civic engagement, from activities through to policy and strategies that assist in embedding a culture of engagement' (2015, p. 2). The partners are clearly civil society groups and governments, although economic and entrepreneurial actors are also envisaged as partners for research. The document is both descriptive of existing work and aspirational, detailing actions across research, teaching and engagement. These indicative actions are clearly designed to elaborate upon the statement of shared principles among Ireland's post-secondary PSI's as captured in the 'Charter for Civic and Community Engagement' (Campus Engage, 2014) document.

Most recently, Campus Engage Ireland's 'Metrics Framework' (currently in draft form, shared with AICI) has forwarded measures for community engagement that are intended to be useful for institutions *and* for government funders. They are written to assist member institutions respond to the Irish

Government's 'Higher Education Systems Performance Framework 2018-2020', and the metrics specifically address the second objective, 'Creating rich opportunities for national and international engagement which enhances the learning environment and delivers a strong bridge to enterprise and the wider community' (HEA, 2018).

This larger performance framework for Irish universities is noteworthy in that it distinguishes 'community engagement' activities and measures from 'spin-out companies, incubation & use of facilities,' and so preserves space for community engagement without the expectation of revenue generation. In part, this distinction is accomplished via a further distinction between 'engaged research,' which is more aligned to commercialization measures (e.g. numbers of patents), and 'socially engaged research.'

Campus Engage Ireland notes that their ‘Metrics Framework’ was developed after some post-secondary institutions piloted the Carnegie classification and that this product is hence the result of learning undertaken by the Campus Engage Ireland's `community of practice’. The metrics are collated under five dimensions: engaged research, teaching and learning, student volunteering, public engagement and involvement, and institutional infrastructure and architecture (p. 5). After defining each of these dimensions, the document lists the ‘possible metrics’ for PSI’s to consider In total, 78 metrics are suggested, nearly all of which are simply number counts of the existence of the phenomenon in question (e.g. number of engaged research projects, number of community-engaged learning modules, percentage of students who volunteer, number of public intellectual engagement activities, and the existence of an institutional /unit or structure for civic and community engagement).

These Campus Engage Ireland metrics crystallize some of the difficulties in defining community engagement. Articulated to the system performance indicators, the metrics measure only the volume of activity, and not the value or of the activities or their independent review. There is perhaps an unwarranted assumption that higher volumes of activity (or inputs) are good for the post-secondary institution and the communities to which they are engaged. The Irish solution, at least in its draft form, highlights the problem with classification and systems assessment of community-engaged activity: heterogeneous activities gathered under the banner of community engagement are not entirely commensurable across institutions, and subsequently produce a focus upon the activities rather than outcomes and impacts of campus-community engagement (see also OECD, 2017). Without clear input into these measures, it becomes difficult to see how communities can have a direct and on-going influence on the scope and shape of the activities or provide advice on how they could be improved.

As the CFICE project continues, and as a new Community Campus Engagement Canada network emerges, the classification and design of metrics and evaluation of community engagement impacts will remain an ongoing piece of work. At the time of writing, the Ontario Council of Universities was engaged in the difficult task of designing appropriate measures for its members. When the primary policy and funding responsibilities for the post-secondary sector lie with sub-national political entities, as they do with the Canadian provinces, there will inevitably be a wide diversity of approaches undertaken. It remains imperative for a ‘community first’ approach that the community be involved in any attempt to articulate and independently review the volume and value of community engagement practices.

Works Cited

Beere, C. A., Votruba, J. C., & Wells, G. W. (2011). *Becoming an engaged campus: A practical guide for institutionalizing public engagement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benneworth, P. (2013). *University engagement with socially excluded communities*. Dordrecht: Springer Verlag

Benneworth P., Charles D. (2013). University–community engagement in the wider policy environment. In Benneworth P. (Ed.) *University engagement with socially excluded communities* (pp. 223-241). Springer, Dordrecht.

Bortolin, K. (2011). Serving ourselves: How the discourse on community engagement privileges the university over the community. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 49-58.

Campus Engage Ireland (2014). *Charter for civic and community engagement*. http://www.campusengage.ie/groups/campus-engage-charter-higher-education-civic-and-community-engagement Accessed May 7, 2018.

Campus Engage Ireland (2015). *Community and Civic Engagement Charter Indicative Actions for Engagement.* http://www.campusengage.ie/groups/preview-community-and-civic-engagement-charter-indicative-actions-engagement Accessed May 7, 2018.

Government of Canada (2013, 09 06). *Community-University Research Alliances*. Retrieved from Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council: http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx Accessed May 7, 2018.

Government of Canada. (2016, 06 28). *Connections Program*. Retrieved from Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council: http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/umbrella_programs-programme_cadre/connection-connexion-eng.aspx Accessed May 7, 2018.

CBRC. (2016, 01 21). *Introduction and Profile of CBR and CUE Movement in Canada with Katherine Graham and Budd Hall.* Accessed from CBRC Resources: https://communityresearchcanada.net/cat/154/view, May 7, 2018.

CFICE. (2016). *About*. Retrieved from Community First : http://carleton.ca/communityfirst/about/ Accessed May 7, 2018.

CFICE. (2016). *CFICE's Cross-Sector Work*. Retrieved from Community First : http://carleton.ca/communityfirst/cross-sector-work/ Accessed May 7, 2018.

Driscoll, A. (2009). Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirming higher education's role in community. *New Directions for Higher Education*(147), 5-12.

Driscoll, A. (2014). Analysis of the Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement: Patterns and Impact on Institutions. *New Directions for Institutional Research*(162), 3-15.

Dugan, J. (2015). Governing academic civic engagement: Lessons and challenges from four engaged campuses. *Partnerhips: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement, 6*(3), 73-86.

Furco, A. (2010). The engaged campus: Toward a comprehensive approach to public engagement. *Society for Educational Studies, 58*(4), 375-390.

Furco, A., & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement. *New Directions in Higher Education* (147), 47-54.

Government of Canada. (2012). *Jobs, Growth and Long-Term Prosperity: Economic Action Plan 2012.* Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Greenwood, D. J. (2007). Teaching/learning action research requires fundamental reforms in public higher education. *Action Research, 5*(3), 249-264.

Higher Education Authority (2018). Higher education system performance framework 2018-2020. Accessed from http://hea.ie/search/search?s=Systems+performance&post_type=publications&resource_year=2018, May 3, 2018.

Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Fall*, 30-41.

Holland, B. A. (2009). Will it last? Evidence of institutionalization at Carnegie classified community engagement institutions. *New Directions for Higher Education*(147), 85-98.

Inman, P. (2010). Institutionalizing university engagement. In P. Inman, & H. G. Schuetze, *The Community Engagement and Service Mission of Universities* (pp. 103-118). Leicester: NIACE.

Johnston, D. (2012, 05 28). *A true democracy of knowledge: speech*. Retrieved from The Record.com: http://www.therecord.com/opinion-story/2604918-a-true-democracy-of-knowledge-speech/ Accessed May 7, 2018.

Jongbloed B., Benneworth P. (2013). Learning from History. In Benneworth P. (Ed.) *University engagement with socially excluded communities* (pp. 263-283). Springer, Dordrecht.

Khanenko-Friesen, N. (2015). Exchanges: Conversation with Randy Stoecker, University of Wisconsin-Madison. *Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching and Learning, 1*(1), 193-198.

Kimball, M. J., & Thomas, F. D. (2012). Place-building theory: A framework for assessing and advancing community engagement in higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community-Service Learning*, 19-28.

UK Government (n.d.). *Blog: Science and Society.* Retrieved from GOV.UK: https://scienceandsociety.blog.gov.uk/uk-charter-for-society/ Accessed May 7, 2018.

Kliewer, B. W. (2013). Why the civic engagement movement cannot achieve democratic and justice aims. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Spring*, 72-79.

NCCPE-UK. (2016). *Self assess with the EDGE Tool.* Retrieved from National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement: https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/support-it/self-assess-with-edge-tool

NCCPE-UK. (2016). *What is public engagement?* Retrieved from National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement: https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/explore-it/what-public-engagement

OECD (2017). Benchmarking higher education system performance: Conceptual framework and data, Enhancing Higher Education System Performance, OECD Paris. Accessed from http://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/Benchmarking%20Report.pdf May 3, 2018.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, Jr., D. E., O'Meara, K., Sanmann, L., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Community Engagement and Institutional Culture in Higher Education. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, B. A. Holland, & (Eds.), *Creating Our Identities in Service-Learning and Community Engagement* (pp. 3-29). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Sandmann, L. R. (2009). *Articles.* Retrieved from Campus Compact: http://compact.org/resource-posts/placing-scholarly-engagement-on-the-desk/ Accessed May 7, 2018.

Shrader, E., Saunders, M. A., Marullo, S., Benatti, S., & Weigert, K. M. (2008). Institutionalizing community-based learning and research: The case for external networks. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Spring*, 27-40.

Spilker, R., Nagel, R., Robinson, J., Brown, L., & Tremblay, C. (2016). *Creating Citizen Communities? Innovation and Impacts in Community-University Engagement Networks.* Victoria: Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community University Engagement, University of Victoria.

Stoecker, R. (2009). Are we talking the walk of community-based research? *Action Research, 7*(4), 385-404.

Stoecker, R., & Tryon, E. A. (2009). Community Organizations and Service Learning. In R. Stoecker, E. A. Tryon, & A. (. Hilgendorf, *The Unheard Voices: Community Organizations and Service Learning* (pp. 1-18). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Van Deventer Iverson, S., & Hauver James, J. (2014). *Feminist Community Engagement: Achieving Praxis.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weerts, D. J., & Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities. *The Review of Higher Education, 32*(1), 73-106.

APPENDIX A: Levels of Commitment to Engagement (The Holland Matrix)

	Level One Low Relevance	Level Two Medium Relevance	Level Three High Relevance	Level Four Full Integration
Mission	No mention or undefined rhetorical reference	Service is a part of what we do as citizens	Service is an element of our academic agenda	Service is a central and defining characteristic
Promotion, Tenure, Hiring	Service to campus committees or to discipline	Community service mentioned; may count in certain cases	Formal guidelines for documenting and rewarding community service/service-learning	Community based research and teaching are key criteria for hiring and rewards
Organization Structure	Non that are focused on service or volunteerism	Unites may exist to foster volunteerism	Centers and institutes are organized to provide service	Flexible unit(s) support; widespread faculty and student participation
Student Involvement	Part of extracurricular student activities	Organized support for volunteer work	Opportunity for extra credit, internships, practicum experiences	Service-learning courses integrated in curriculum; student involvement in community based research
Faculty Involvement	Campus duties; committees; disciplinary focus	Pro bono consulting; community volunteerism	Tenured/senior faculty pursue community-based research; some teach service-learning courses	Community research and service-learning a high priority; interdisciplinary and collaborative work
Community Involvement	Random or limited individual or group involvement	Community representation on advisory boards for departments or schools	Community influences campus through active partnership or part-time teaching	Community involved in designing, conducting and evaluating research and service-learning
Campus Publications	Not an emphasis	Stories of student volunteerism or alumni as good citizens	Emphasis on economic impact, links between community and campus centers/institutes	Community connection as central element; fundraising has community service as a focus

(Holland B. , 1997)

APPENDIX B: The EDGE Tool

The EDGE tool

	Focus	Embryonic	Developing	Gripping	Embedding
PURPOSE	Mission	There is little or no reference to public engagement in the organisational mission or in other institution-wide strategies	PE is referenced sporadically within the institutional mission documents and strategies, but is not considered a priority area	PE is clearly referenced within the institutional mission and strategies and the institution is developing an institution-wide strategic approach	PE is prioritised in the institution's official mission and in other key strategies, with success indicators identified. It is a key consideration in strategic developments in the institution
	Leadership	Few (if any) of the most influential leaders in the institution serve as champions for public engagement	Some of the institution's senior team act as informal champions for public engagement	Some of the institution's senior team act as formal champions for public engagement	The VC acts as a champion for PE and a senior leader takes formal responsibility. All senior leaders have an understanding of the importance and value of public engagement to the institution's agenda
	Commun-ication	The institution's commitment to public engagement is rarely if ever featured in internal or external communications	Public engagement occasionally features in internal and external communications	Public engagement frequently features in internal communications, but rarely as a high profile item or with an emphasis on its strategic importance	PE appears prominently in the institution's internal communications; its strategic importance is highlighted, and resources and strategic support have been allocated to sustain this
PROCESS	Support	There is no attempt to co-ordinate public engagement activity or to network learning and expertise across the institution	There are some informal attempts being made to co-ordinate PE activities, but there is no strategic plan for this work. Some self-forming networks exist, not supported by the institution	Oversight and co-ordination of PE has been formally allocated (e.g. to a working group or committee) but there is minimal support and resource to invest in activity	The institution has a strategic plan to focus its co-ordination, a body/ies with formal responsibility for oversight of this plan, and resources available to assist the embedding of PE. There are a number of recognised and supported networks
	Learning	There is little or no opportunity for staff or students to access professional development to develop their skills & knowledge of PE	There are some opportunities for staff or students to access professional development and training in PE, but no formal or systematic support	There are some formal opportunities for staff or students to access professional development and training in PE.	Staff and students are encouraged and supported in accessing professional development, training and informal learning to develop their skills and knowledge of engagement
	Recognition	Staff are not formally rewarded or recognised for their PE activities	Some departments recognise and reward PE activity on an ad hoc basis.	The university is working towards an institution-wide policy for recognising and rewarding PE activity	The university has reviewed its processes, and developed a policy to ensure PE is rewarded & recognised in formal and informal ways
PEOPLE	Staff	Few if any opportunities exist for staff to get involved in public engagement, either informally or as part of their formal duties	There are opportunities for staff in a handful of faculties or departments to get involved in PE, either informally or as part of their formal duties	There are structured opportunities for many staff members to get involved in PE; but not in all faculties or departments. There is a drive to expand opportunities to all	All staff have the opportunity to get involved in public engagement, either informally or as part of their formal duties, and are encouraged and supported to do so
	Students	Few opportunities exist for students to get involved in PE, either informally, through volunteering programmes, or as part of the formal curriculum	There are opportunities for students to get involved, but there is no coordinated approach to promoting and supporting these opportunities across the institution	Many (but not all) students have the opportunity to get involved in PE and are encouraged and supported to do so. There is a drive to expand opportunities to all	All students have the opportunity to get involved in PE, and are encouraged and supported to do so. The institution offers both formal and informal ways to recognize and reward their involvement
	Public	Little or no attempt has been made to assess community need, or to support 'non traditional' groups in engaging with the institution	Some attempt has been made to analyse community need and interest; and to begin to tackle access issues to open up the institution and its activities to the public	The institution has committed resources to assessing community need and interests, and to using this insight and feedback to inform its strategy and plans	The institution has assessed need & committed resources to supporting a wide range of groups to access its facilities and activities, and to systematically seek their feedback and involvement.

National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement The EDGE tool www.publicengagement.ac.uk