

## Perceptions and Visions of Community Engagement: A Pilot Study for Assessment Across the Institution

*Sandra Sgoutas-Emch<sup>1</sup>, Kevin Guerrieri<sup>1</sup>, and Colton C. Strawser<sup>1,2</sup>,*

*<sup>1</sup>University of San Diego*

*<sup>2</sup>University of Texas – Arlington*

### ABSTRACT

Universities seek tools that provide a clear vision and expectations for community engagement at the institutional level. This study focused on the development of the Community Engagement Institutional Assessment (CEIA) rubric to evaluate four key criteria and its application in a pilot study of course-based community engagement. The results revealed a significant divergence between faculty perceptions and the vision projected in the rubric, which suggests the need for building a more collective understanding of and development opportunities in community engagement.

*Keywords:* CEIA rubric; course-based; democratic partnerships; social justice; critical reflection; societal issues

There have been recent calls for institutions of higher education to reaffirm their commitment to their public purposes and the common good, as evident, for example, in Campus Compact's (2016) 30th Anniversary Action Statement. However, in parallel with such renewed commitments, there are also increasingly more demands on institutions to provide clear evidence of their positive impact on communities and their contributions to society in general. This has led to greater efforts to identify and document, more systematically, community engagement activities at the institutional level as well as to evaluate their effectiveness. An initial step in this process necessarily involves clarifying the terminology, given that a wide range of activities at a given college or university may be understood as being aligned with the public purposes of the institution, especially at larger universities that house multiple professional schools.

In their approach to collecting comprehensive institution-wide data from faculty and staff, Janke and Medlin (2015) marked a distinction between two broad

categories: community engagement and public service. Whereas the latter is used to describe "activities that were relatively more unilateral and unidirectional in the sense that the university provides services to the public," the former is based on the Carnegie Foundation definition and emphasizes the "reciprocal exchange of knowledge enacted through partnership" (Janke & Medlin, 2015, p. 129). While this is a useful distinction, the notion of community engagement still remains a broad category that can potentially encompass many different activities. Holton, Jettner, Early, and Shaw (2015), for example, identified five different types of "community-engaged activities": service-learning, student volunteer service, 12-month employee volunteer service, community-engaged research, and community-university partnerships. Faced with a similar plethora of perspectives as well as the frustration of some participants—university leaders, administrators, faculty, and staff—whose activities were not considered community engagement, Starke, Shenouda, and Smith-Howell (2017) proposed the use of an inclusive spectrum between "community

service” at one extreme and “community engagement” at the other, with a matrix of dimensions (context, knowledge, outcome, and operation) that would emerge from within each institution.

These approaches reflect some of the challenges of conceptualizing and tracking community engagement at the institutional level. In light of these and other studies, the present project focused on the design and implementation of a community engagement rubric that would address a series of key questions and needs. First, a clear definition of community engagement needs to be identified through the criteria in the rubric. Second, the rubric needs to be able to evaluate activities across a wide range of modalities, and yet, at the same time, foster a common set of values and practices among different units and entities on campus. Third, this assessment tool must be general enough to make it versatile at the institutional level, but also reflect an adequate degree of specificity in order to help nurture a shared understanding and culture of engagement across campus. And, finally, the rubric must be informed by a critical and social justice lens and also emphasize the role of equitable, democratic, and mutually beneficial community partnerships. This article describes the creation of such a tool, the Community Engagement Institutional Assessment (CEIA) rubric ([Appendix A](#)), and a pilot study in which it was implemented with a sample of course-based community engagement activities from multiple academic units.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Over the last couple of decades, dozens of assessment tools have been designed by researchers to evaluate different aspects of community engagement at the institutional level, and these instruments come with a wide range of components and in many different forms including checklists, dimensions, indicators, benchmarks, rubrics, matrices, and systems, among others (Furco & Miller, 2009; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). At the heart of designing a tool, initially, is reaching both a

shared understanding of the terminology used and a clearly defined purpose for the assessment, especially given that many of the existing instruments and models have been developed with the intent of being adapted to each institutional identity and circumstances. As Holland (1997) indicated in her proposal of a matrix for analyzing institutional commitment to service, the key is “to achieve a creative tension between vision and reality regarding the implementation of each institution’s vision of the role of service” (p. 33). In this sense, an assessment tool for community engagement must acknowledge that a diversity of approaches to the work will be proposed across campus and, simultaneously, provide an aspirational level of outcomes.

The University of San Diego (USD) is a private, independent university located in California on the border with Tijuana, Mexico. The university has approximately 9,000 students enrolled in undergraduate and graduate programs across the academic units, which include 20 different departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and six different professional schools. Over the last 30 years USD has developed an extensive and robust infrastructure of community engagement, which is overseen by the Mulvaney Center for Community, Awareness, and Social Action (i.e., Office of Community Engagement), and the institution has received the community engagement classification from the Carnegie Foundation. In addition, USD is an Ashoka U Changemaker campus, and the anchor institution mission is one of six pathways for the current strategic plan of the university. All these circumstances contribute to the institution’s overall commitment to its public purposes, positive social change, and the common good; however, they also translate into many different understandings of what community engagement means and how it is operationalized.

As a nationally recognized baseline definition, the research team initiated the development of the rubric using the description and purpose of community

engagement from the Carnegie Classification (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.). It is important to emphasize here that our primary purpose was to develop a rubric that could be used to assess community engagement in different modalities across campus: curricular; research, scholarship, and creative activity; co-curricular; and extra-curricular. However, the purpose was not to evaluate the actual effectiveness of any specific activity that had been implemented given that evaluation of that type must involve the full participation and co-creation of community partners and those affected by the work being done at all stages, from inception to acting on results, in order to be truly democratically engaged assessment (Bandy et al., 2018). Rather, our intent was to create a rubric for internal use only that would help participants—university faculty, students, and staff—to critically reflect on their perception and understanding of their own activities being carried out off campus. Similarly, as the rubric was implemented more widely for different modalities across campus, it would contribute to a more collective shared understanding of community engagement.

Drawing from the Carnegie definition; the institution's mission, vision, and strategic plan; and the current research in the field, the research team determined four primary areas as criteria for the CEIA rubric: (a) democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships; (b) societal issues and the common good; (c) critical reflection; and (d) civic learning, citizenship, and democratic values. The corresponding descriptions for the four criteria would become the exemplars for the rubric (see [Appendix A](#)). Staff of our community engagement office as well as some community partners then vetted the rubric. Subsequently, in order to test the rubric within a single modality and make any necessary adjustments prior to conducting a wider and more in-depth study, the research team developed a pilot study focused on course-based community engagement. We selected this group of participants given that faculty

play an essential role in the institutionalization of community engagement in higher education in general (Furco, 2007, 2016; O'Meara et al., 2011; Saltmarsh et al., 2011). After receiving IRB approval (#2019-201) from the university for research involving human subjects, the pilot study was initiated.

## METHODOLOGY

### Participants

Participants for the pilot study were limited to faculty who incorporated community engagement projects in their courses. In order to identify such faculty, the researchers reached out to the Mulvaney Center for assistance. A list of 20 faculty was collected and emails were sent to invite them to participate in the pilot project. Thirteen faculty members responded that they would be willing to participate, and 12 of those faculty completed the online survey. Furthermore, one survey respondent did not include the required materials for review; therefore, a total of 11 complete responses were analyzed.

### Survey

The online survey, conducted using Google Forms, consisted of eight questions and a request to upload any pertinent materials for review. The purpose of the survey was to gather faculty perceptions of their courses and how they would rate the community engagement work along the four criteria covered in the rubric used for the analysis described below. Question 1 (open-ended) asked participants to define community engagement. Questions 2 and 3 asked how many years they had participated in course-based and non-course-based community engagement, respectively. Questions 4–8 were on a Likert scale using the following points: 1 = Not Successful, 2 = Slightly Successful, 3 = Mostly Successful, 4 = Very Successful, and a response for Do Not Know (no numerical designation). Question 4 asked to evaluate the overall success of the community engagement component. Finally, questions 5–8 focused on

rating the success for each criterion on the rubric. (See [Appendix B](#) for complete survey.)

### Methods

All faculty who agreed to participate were sent a link to a Google form that included the survey as well as informed consent. Faculty were also asked to upload any course materials that were related to the community engagement experience in their courses. These materials were used to analyze the quality and existence of the criteria of the rubric. All surveys and materials were anonymized and given code numbers by a graduate research assistant before scoring. Any survey that was not completed or did not include any supporting materials was excluded from scoring and analysis.

### Scoring with the CEIA Rubric

As mentioned earlier, the CEIA rubric developed by the researchers has four criteria: (a) democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships; (b) societal issues and the common good; (c) critical reflection; and (d) civic learning, citizenship, and democratic values. Each criterion contains four levels of complexity or achievement including exemplar (aspirational level), emerging (developmental level), basic (minimal expectation level), and below basic (needs improvement level). The four criteria were scored using the course materials submitted by each faculty member. All three researchers participated in a norming session with course materials from three faculty participants. During this session, discrepancies across scores—more than 1-point difference in scores—were discussed using the rubric descriptors for each criterion. Following the norming session, researchers assessed each of the remaining participant's materials separately. Scores were entered and examined for discrepancies. As in the norming session, any score that was more than one point different was reviewed until a consensus was reached.

### Analysis

Mixed methods were implemented in the analysis to address both qualitative and quantitative data collected from the surveys. Descriptive statistics including frequency data were calculated to provide summary information on the experience and background of participants with community engagement. Median scores, instead of the means, were calculated for the Likert questions on the surveys and the rubric scores due to the rating scale and small sample size. Additionally, correlations were calculated examining the relationship between the variables in the surveys to measure how these concepts were related to one another. To examine any differences between scorers' ratings and participants' perceptions, Mann-Whitney U comparisons were also done. Finally, the community engagement definitions provided by the participants were analyzed qualitatively utilizing protocol coding (Saldaña, 2015) to identify with which category within the CEIA rubric—community partnerships, societal issues, critical reflection, or civic learning—the definition most closely aligned.

## RESULTS

### Survey

Almost all the faculty (90.1%) provided their syllabi as evidence of community engagement within the course, with slightly over half (54.5%) of the respondents providing only a syllabus. Some of the respondents also submitted project guidelines (2), reflection guidelines (2), and other documents (5). The experience of faculty members teaching courses with community-engaged elements ranged from two years to 15 years, with a mean of six years. Survey respondents included faculty from the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and professional schools (business, engineering, and law).

Each respondent was asked to provide their definition of what community

engagement means for them. The analysis revealed that all participant responses were most closely aligned with the criterion focused on community partnerships. The descriptions of community partnerships ranged from very basic, such as simply “working with a community partner or organization” to more complex articulations:

Community engagement is the co-construction of new ideas, learning, spaces, and opportunities between a variety of stakeholders. I think community engagement seeks to achieve long-term goals with the community with respect to discourse, decision making, relationships, processes, etc. Community engagement also presents an opportunity for communities to be informed, consulted, and empowered. It relates to mutual respect and acknowledgement of different ways of knowing, doing, and being while working toward specific goals that create—what Paulo Freire would call “liberation.”

One faculty member mentioned societal issues more specifically in their definition:

Community engagement, in the context of course work, offers the opportunity for students to learn from engaging in the lives of our community members. Most times, this includes a preference for reaching out to underserved members of the community, practicing a “preferential option for the poor and marginalized.” The hope is that students will have a “constructive encounter with otherness,” thereby expanding their circle of concern wider than before the engagement. Similarly, only one faculty member included a reference to reflection in their definition: “[community

engagement consists of] matching academic learning goals with community needs and also including reflection (this is for course-based).”

Finally, almost half of the faculty mentioned civic engagement, directly or indirectly, in their definitions. For example, one faculty member referred to “collaborating with people outside of [the university] on a project whose goal is to benefit both partners. On our end the benefit is student learning in subject matter, life skills and awareness of local/global issues.” None of the definitions submitted included references to all four criteria in the CEIA rubric. The themes presented suggest that faculty in the current study emphasize partnerships in their conceptualization of what course-based community engagement should entail over other essential criteria that appear on the rubric.

With regard to the participants’ assessment of the four criteria in the survey, the median ratings were 3s for all criteria (partnerships, societal issues, critical reflection, and civic learning). However, the ratings had a wider range for societal issues (1–4) than for the other three criteria (2–4). Overall, these ratings mean that faculty considered the community-based component in their courses to be successful at achieving all of these criteria even though they themselves did not include most of the criteria in their definitions of community engagement.

### **Comparisons Between CEIA Rubric Scores and Survey Ratings**

The scores of the researchers that assessed the criteria on the rubric using the course materials provided did not always align with faculty perceptions. For example, in two cases, faculty members rated their partnership at a level 4; however, after review of their materials, the research team scored them at the below basic level (score of 1). In one case, the partner was not even identified, and, therefore, the team was not able to assess the partnership. In another case, the partner was identified, but

it was clear that the collaboration was not co-constructed and that there was little or no input from the partner with regard to the creation of the project.

However, there were some cases of alignment between the participants' and the research team's assessment. One instructor rated their course at a level 3 on partnerships, and the research team concurred. The instructions given to students in the following paragraph from the syllabus provide insights into how the course was co-constructed with a local community partner:

You will put the concepts learned in section 1 of the course into practice by working along with the BCC [Blind Community Center] students to define and solve a design challenge related to the development/modification of toys and/or games for independent and inclusive participation by vision impaired children and adults. During the 8-week period, the BCC students will join us on campus for class on Tuesdays, and on Thursdays, the class sessions will be held at the BCC.

Societal issues was the only criterion of the rubric in which the research team and faculty members coincided in terms of the median rating/score (*Mdn* = 3 each). However, in some cases there was extreme variation due to faculty respondents believing they were strongly covering societal issues at the highest level, but the materials they submitted were scored at the lowest level. In one case, for example, a faculty member stated that their course covered societal issues at the highest level (4), yet no readings were assigned around a particular issue, and the community engagement component was left to the students to decide (e.g., pick an organization and contribute 10 hours). Accordingly, the research team gave a score of 1 on the rubric.

Critical reflection was the criterion that had the largest variation between the faculty

members' ratings (*Mdn* = 3) and the CEIA rubric scores (*Mdn* = 1) from the research team. In order to earn the highest score in critical reflection, instructors had to create opportunities for students to reflect more than once throughout the course, use more than one method of reflection, and have guidance for students to reflect on aspects of the partnership, societal issues, their civic learning, and connections to social justice. Many of the faculty members either did not include reflective components within their courses, only used one type of reflection, or had a reflection paper at the end of the course with little or no guidance on the content.

Civic learning was the most challenging category for the research team to evaluate as this area was focused on how students interacted with individuals who experienced life differently than themselves and provided students with the opportunity to describe how these experiences were influencing their own civic identity and commitment to public action. A majority (64%) of the faculty members received a 1 on the rubric, as it was unclear whether or not civic learning was embedded within the course.

Because of the small sample size, only limited statistical analysis could be performed. Mann-Whitney U comparisons were done between rubric scores and survey scores with no significant differences reported. Spearman correlations were calculated to examine how the various criteria of the rubric were intercorrelated as well as how the researcher scores correlated with the participants' responses. No significant relationships were found between the researchers' scores on the rubric and the participants' responses on the survey, which suggests a lack of alignment between how the researchers assessed the community engagement and how each faculty member perceived their course. These data indicate a significant gap between faculty members' perception of their success in implementing community engagement and the aspirational level established in the CEIA rubric, a gap with crucial implications as to

how the community engagement is conceptualized, put into practice, and evaluated at the institutional level.

There were significant correlations across survey ratings. Overall, course ratings were negatively correlated with partnerships ( $r_s(11) = -0.61, p < 0.05$ ) but positively related to reflection ( $r_s(11) = .77, p < 0.005$ ) and marginally related to civic learning ( $r_s(11) = 0.59, p < 0.06$ ). No significant relationship was found between overall course ratings and societal issues. Partnership ratings were negatively related to reflection and civic learning ratings ( $r_s(11) = -0.68, p < 0.02$  and  $r_s(11) = -0.74, p < 0.009$ ). In addition, reflection was positively related with civic learning scores ( $r_s(11) = 0.62, p < 0.02$ ). Therefore, faculty who reported having success in their partnerships were less likely to perceive their courses as successful at civic learning and reflection. Given that partnerships was the main criterion that all faculty included in their definitions of community engagement, it follows that the inverse relationship with the other variables may impact overall success of the courses to fulfill the criteria of the CEIA rubric.

## DISCUSSION

When asked to provide evidence of effective community engagement within their courses, a majority of faculty respondents only provided their syllabi. This finding illustrates that even when faculty are firmly committed to integrating community engagement within their courses, the extent to which the elements of a comprehensive community engagement experience are adequately integrated within the course—with high ratings in all criteria, democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships; societal issues and the common good; critical reflection; civic learning, citizenship, and democratic values—cannot be verified without further data collection.

When coding the personal definitions of community engagement from the faculty respondents, all responses predominantly

discussed elements of community partnerships. The median response for partnerships from respondents was a 3 out of 4; however, utilizing the CEIA rubric the median was a 1 out of 4. This demonstrates the importance that community partnerships constitute in these faculty members' conceptualization of community engagement while simultaneously suggesting that the mutually beneficial and reciprocal nature of the partnerships may potentially be lacking or is not made explicit in the materials. Most respondents received a lower score due to community partners either not being identified (e.g., a requirement to carry out service at any community-based organization of the student's choice); not being fully integrated into the course (e.g., more than one site visit); or not having any level of co-creation of the project (e.g., students create a presentation and then deliver it at a local school).

Societal issues within most courses were adequately explored, and those with higher scores included explicit examinations of systems and structures that produce and perpetuate inequality and inequity, and raised questions of power, privilege, oppression, and intersectionality. Most courses actively examined a societal issue, but based on the provided documentation it was unclear in some instances how much attention was paid to the various power differentials surrounding these societal issues. As mentioned previously, societal issues was the criterion for which the participants' responses most closely aligned with the research team's scores on the rubric.

Critical reflection was one of the lowest scored items within the assessment with the CEIA rubric, but the highest rated criterion on the faculty surveys. The reflection component constitutes an essential element of community engagement learning given that it provides students with the necessary opportunities and space to draw connections among the course material, the classroom setting, and the actual experience in the community. Critical reflection should be ongoing throughout a course and not limited to



a short written assignment at the end of the term, but, in this pilot study, many instructors only provided a single opportunity for reflection for a course-long engagement. Similarly, the reflection must not simply be an account of the experience, but one that focuses on the partnership(s), societal issues, and the civic learning experience throughout the engagement process. Courses that received higher scores on critical reflection were those courses that addressed these aspects, integrated reflection at multiple points during the process, and utilized different methods (written, oral, and artistic, among others).

Civic learning was also scored relatively low with the CEIA rubric. Many of the respondents failed to provide evidence on how students would have opportunities to interact with individuals who experience life differently as a result of their identities. In order for respondents to receive a higher score, there needs to be a direct connection to how students would engage in opportunities to examine the contexts and structures within a community through inquiry and listening that acknowledges mutuality. In addition, further opportunities need to be provided to students at multiple points of the engagement to describe what they have learned about themselves in relation to their own civic identity and commitment to public action.

Thus far, this discussion has focused primarily on the interpretation of the disparities between the faculty participants' perceptions of their community engagement courses and the researchers' assessment of those courses with the rubric. However, the value of the CEIA rubric itself became evident quite early in the very process of its creation. The research team engaged in multiple discussions over a period of many weeks in order to identify the four criteria—including the distinctions and areas of overlap among them—as well as the nuances both within and among the different levels of achievement. Another key question that emerged was whether the rubric should be designed with the intent of actually measuring the impact of different activities. However, as mentioned

previously, the outcomes, assessment tools, and measures of success for each community engagement activity must be co-created with community partners; accordingly, our focus shifted precisely to how this work is envisioned across campus at an institutional level and what is the overall culture that sustains it. Similarly, the different modalities of community engagement were discussed extensively. After creating and sharing the rubric with others, a growing number of faculty, students, and staff are engaging in conversations around how the four criteria are defined and what they look like when implemented in courses and other activities. The scope and depth of such conversations as an ongoing practice have key implications for enabling a broader cultural shift around the understanding of community engagement at the institutional level.

### **Limitations**

This project was considered a pilot study for a larger assessment initiative; therefore, there are some inherent limitations. While the rubric was designed to be applied at the institutional level, the pilot study focused on a small sample of those implementing community engagement practices through course-based experiences. The scoring was also limited by the documents provided by faculty members, which consisted primarily of course syllabi. It is possible that more data on the courses could have been obtained through follow-up interviews; however, there were no limitations on the number of documents that could be provided—faculty members were simply asked to provide materials which illustrated how they integrated community engagement within their courses. In addition, faculty respondents did not have access to the rubric in advance of the study in an effort to minimize bias, yet this could have also skewed the data since faculty respondents were simply using a rating scale with general descriptors. Upon seeing the rubric, faculty members may have rated the success of their own course-based community engagement lower. It is important to acknowledge that the participants



and the researchers were using two separate lenses to examine the courses. Nonetheless, the examination of the discrepancies between multiple perceptions and understandings of community engagement and aspirational visions of the work is precisely a key objective of this study.

## CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

Creating tools to help institutions clarify and define their mission and vision around community engagement work is essential to meeting the goals aligned with the public purposes of the university. There are few instruments designed specifically for internal use with the purpose of helping the campus to coalesce around a shared understanding of community engagement, and the aim of the current study was precisely to develop a rubric with that purpose and to examine its implementation in a pilot study of course-based community engagement. The results indicated some clear areas of divergence between the faculty participants' perceptions of their community engagement work and the vision projected by the exemplars for the four criteria in the rubric. The findings within this pilot study provide insights into the areas—strengthening partnerships in the community as well as incorporating more comprehensive critical reflection and civic learning in courses—that could be addressed with more intentionality through, for example, faculty development workshops and other mechanisms.

The next steps for this research project involve three primary areas. The first consists of using the CEIA rubric and the results of this pilot study to initiate or resume further conversations with faculty, both the study participants and others, on the vision of community engagement reflected in the four criteria. These conversations, in combination

with development opportunities, will potentially contribute to shifting the overall campus culture towards an approach informed by a critical and social justice lens and centered on equitable, democratic, and mutually beneficial community partnerships. The second consists of implementing the rubric in other community engagement modalities and activities across campus, such as curricular and co-curricular activities as well as the faculty's community-based research and creative work, for example. Finally, the third involves continuing to refine the rubric with input from a greater number of both members of the university campus and community partners in order to enhance its implementation. Ultimately, the CEIA rubric constitutes a useful instrument for helping institutions to delve into crucial conversations about the nature of their community-based work, for developing a shared understanding on how to evaluate their impact, and for bridging the gap between their aspirations and visions of community engagement and the diverse approaches that enact it in and with community.

## REFERENCES

- Bandy, J., Price, M. F., Clayton, P. H., Metzker, J., Nigro, G., Stanlick, S., Woodson, S., Bartel, A., & Gale, S. (2018). *Democratically engaged assessment: Reimagining the purposes and practices of assessment in community engagement*. Davis, CA: Imagining America.
- Campus Compact. (2016). *Thirtieth anniversary action statement of presidents and chancellors*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (n.d.). Defining community engagement. <https://compact.org/actionstatement/>

- Furco, A. (2016). Creating an institutional agenda for community-engaged scholarship faculty development. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 8*(3), 1–5.
- Furco, A. (2007). Institutionalising service-learning in higher education. In L. McIlrath & I. MacLabhrainn (Eds.), *Higher education and civic engagement: International perspectives* (pp. 65–82). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.
- Furco, A., & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education, 147*, 47–54.
- Furco, A., Weerts, D., Burton, L., & Kent, K. (2009). Assessment rubric for institutionalizing community engagement in higher education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 4*, 30–41.
- Holton, V. L., Jettner, J. F., Early, J. L., & Shaw, K. K. (2015). Leveraging internal partnerships and existing data infrastructure to track and assess community engagement across the university. *Metropolitan Universities, 26*(2), 75–98.
- Hutson, N., York, T., Kim, D., Fiester, H., & Workman, J. L. (2019). Institutionalizing community engagement: A quantitative approach to identifying patterns of engagement based on institutional characteristics. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 11*(2), 3–15.
- Janke, E. M., & Medlin, K. D. (2015). A centralized strategy to collect comprehensive institution-wide data from faculty and staff about community engagement and public service. *Metropolitan Universities, 26*(2), 125–146.
- O’Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 36*(2), 83–96.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Saltmarsh, J., Zlotkowski, E., & Hollander, E. (2011). Indicators of engagement. In J. Saltmarsh & E. Zlotkowski (Eds.), *Higher education and democracy* (pp. 285–302). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Starke, A., Shenouda, K., & Smith-Howell, D. (2017). Conceptualizing community engagement: Starting a campus-wide dialogue. *Metropolitan Universities 28*(2), 72–89.

**Appendix A**

[\[Return to Page 1\]](#)

[\[Return to page 3\]](#)

*Community Engagement Institutional Assessment (CEIA) Rubric*

	<b>Below Basic</b>	<b>Basic</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Exemplar</b>
<b>Democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships</b>	Little or no planning with community partners occurs. No collaboration is present. Expectations are not discussed. No outcomes are agreed upon.	Includes community partners in some of the planning but without an active leadership role. Expectations for partners are discussed but may still be vague. Outcomes may be one-sided.	Includes community partners in some of the planning. Community partners play a limited leadership role. Expectations of partnership are defined and recorded. Develop outcomes together for mutual understanding and benefit.	Partnership includes co-creation of the experience. Community partners have an active leadership role. Expectations of partnership are defined and recorded. Outcomes are developed together for clear understanding, mutual benefit, and sustainability.
<b>Societal issues and the common good</b>	Completely lacks or inadequately includes societal issues. Has little or no focus on contributing to the common good. Lacks a social justice lens.	Addresses some critical societal issues and includes a contribution to the common good. Uses a social justice lens that is attentive to at least one of the following areas: the root causes of different issues; the systems and structures that produce and perpetuate inequality and inequity; and questions of power, privilege, oppression, and intersectionality.	Actively addresses critical societal issues and is focused on contributing to the common good. Uses a social justice lens that is attentive to at least two of the following areas: the root causes of different issues; the systems and structures that produce and perpetuate inequality and inequity; and questions of power, privilege, oppression, and intersectionality.	Explicitly addresses critical societal issues and is focused on contributing to the common good through positive social change and transformation. Uses a social justice lens that is attentive to the root causes of different issues, to the systems and structures that produce and perpetuate inequality and inequity, and to questions of power, privilege, oppression, and intersectionality.
<b>Critical Reflection</b>	There is no evidence of reflection occurring or, if evident, it is lacking in multiple aspects.	Reflection occurs at least once during the engagement, utilizes at least one method (written, oral, artistic, etc.), and includes some albeit incomplete integration of skills, knowledge, and theory from both the community and the university. No signs are evident of the examination of the power dynamics that frame and shape learning and knowledge production. Reflection fails to focus sufficiently on any of the following areas: the partnership(s), societal issues, and civic learning.	Reflection occurs at multiple points during the engagement, utilizes different methods (written, oral, artistic, etc.), and includes the articulation of integrated skills, knowledge, and theory from both the community and the university. Reflection may include signs of examination of the power dynamics that frame and shape learning and knowledge production. Reflection focuses on one or two of the following, but not all: the partnership(s), societal issues, and civic learning.	Reflection occurs at multiple points during the engagement, utilizes different methods (written, oral, artistic, etc.), and includes the articulation of integrated skills, knowledge, and theory from both the community and the university. Reflection includes examination of the power dynamics that frame and shape learning and knowledge production. Reflection focuses on the partnership(s), societal issues, and civic learning.
<b>Civic learning, citizenship, and democratic values</b>	Does not provide participants with sufficient opportunities to interact with individuals who experience life differently as a result of their identities. The context and structures within a community are not introduced. Experience provides no opportunities for participants to describe what they have learned about themselves in relation to their own sense of civic identity and commitment to public action.	Provides participants with opportunities to interact with individuals who experience life differently as a result of their identities. The context and structures within a community are introduced but not thoroughly discussed. Experience provides at least one opportunity for participants to describe what they have learned about themselves in relation to their own sense of civic identity and commitment to public action.	Provides participants with opportunities to interact with individuals who experience life differently as a result of their identities. Participants learn about the various components of the context and structures within a community through inquiry and listening that acknowledges mutuality. Experience provides limited opportunities for participants to describe what they have learned about themselves in relation to their own civic identity and their commitment to public action.	Provides participants with opportunities to interact with individuals who experience life differently as a result of their identities. Participants learn about the various components of the context and structures within a community through inquiry and listening that acknowledges mutuality. Opportunities are provided at multiple points of the engagement for participants to describe what they have learned about themselves in relation to their own civic identity commitment to public action.

**Appendix B**  
[\[Return to text\]](#)

*Community Engagement Course Survey*

When responding to these questions, please select one course in which community engagement is applied.

1. How would you define community engagement?
2. How many years have you been engaged in course-based community engagement?
3. How many years have you been engaged in non-course-based community engagement?

For the next questions, please answer using a scale of 1-4.

1 – Not successful    2 – Somewhat successful    3 – Successful    4 – Very Successful

4. How would you rate the community engagement component in your course overall?
5. How would you rate your course in relation to the development of reciprocal and equitable community partnerships?
6. How would you rate the effectiveness of the community engagement component in addressing societal issues and the common good?
7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the community engagement component in your course in assisting critical reflection?
8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the community engagement component in your course in providing opportunities for students to describe what they have learned about themselves in relation to their own civic identities and commitment to public action?

Please upload your syllabus and other materials you feel will help describe the community engagement component of your course.

Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, Professor of Psychological Sciences, and Kevin Guerrieri, Associate Professor of Languages and Literatures, are faculty liaisons with the Mulvaney Center for Community, Awareness, and Social Action. Colton C. Strawser is an Assistant Professor of Philanthropy at the University of Texas at Arlington and a Visiting Research Fellow with the Mulvaney Center at the University of San Diego.

**AUTHOR NOTE**

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, University of San Diego, Department of Psychological Sciences, 5998 Alcala Park, San Diego, CA 92110. Email: [emch@san Diego.edu](mailto:emch@san Diego.edu)