

## PROMOTING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT THROUGH COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE: Enhancing Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification Documentation Framework

*"In my roles as a university professor, a state budget director, chief of staff to a governor, and chancellor in two of the largest states in the country, I am encouraged by the increased use of collaboration at all levels of government, and the participation by those in the private and non-profit sectors... As university leaders, we need to find new ways to fulfill the university mission of serving the public and improving the lives of our citizens. The university can serve as a forum for the discussion and critical examination of ideas and issues. We can have a positive effect in important areas of public concern that overlap with our public service mission." - Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, California State University System*

*"In observing the many kinds of conflicts in need of resolution, I am particularly interested in the role university based programs can play as a neutral venue for assisting in the use of collaborative problem solving to address complex public issues. It is often valuable for the collaborative decision-making group to operate under the auspices of a non-governmental, neutral organization like a university." -William D. Ruckelshaus, founding chair of the University of Washington/Washington State University Ruckelshaus Center*

Universities have traditionally been called on by communities for their substantive knowledge. Increasingly they are being asked by community leaders for help in addressing some of the challenges faced by communities and regions<sup>1</sup> by providing impartial forums and process expertise so that public, private and civic sector leaders and citizens can jointly work together to reach agreement on and implement solutions.

In response, universities are setting up centers with the expertise and capacity to assess, plan and carry out collaborative multi-sector partnerships and solutions processes on public issues. These college and university centers and institutes engage in the scholarship of application<sup>2</sup> and service to enable citizens and their leaders engage in dialogue, discussion, problem solving and consensus building around complex societal issues. In recognition of this development, the University Network for Collaborative Governance (UNCG) was formed in 2008 by over 30 university centers to enhance centers' capacity and improve practice and applied scholarship.<sup>3</sup>

The Carnegie Foundation's classification of higher education institutions of community engagement seeks to honor achievements in engagement while promoting ongoing improvement. Universities seeking the classification must demonstrate the quality and depth of mutually beneficial reciprocal partnerships between institutions of higher education and their larger communities. The kinds of centers and institutes that make up UNCG and specialize in studying, teaching, and applying collaboration should be considered an important component of a university's community-engagement strategy. Centers and institutes can contribute their expertise to produce greater alignment of mission, collaborative leadership and strategic planning outcomes. Through their knowledge and skills, centers can significantly enhance the effectiveness of reciprocal collaborative partnerships, especially those demonstrating multi-sector collaborative governance.

The Carnegie classification assessment can help direct Universities as part of and a result of their self-assessment to tap the creativity that these centers can bring to the table in deepening the institutional commitment to excellence in collaborative community engagement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gilderbloom and Mullins in *Promise and Betrayal: Universities and the Battle for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods (2005)* suggest that universities often play three primary roles within the community: as a facilitator it can serve as an "honest broker" to guide efforts for the greater good of the community; as an equity partner it can utilize their capital and human resources to help shape the community; and as a technical resource it can provide research knowledge, education, training, facilitation and consultation services.

<sup>2</sup> Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered (1990)* maintains that the "scholarship of application" is one of the four separate but overlapping scholarship functions that include discovery, integration and teaching. He suggests it is the most practical in that it seeks out ways in which knowledge can solve problems and serve both the community and the campus. As opposed to merely "citizenship," Boyer argues that "to be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity." These scholars ask "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to problems? How can it be helpful to people and institutions?"

<sup>3</sup> See, <http://www.policyconsensus.org/uncg/index.html>

**Elective Classification: Community Engagement  
2008 Documentation Framework.**

*Underlined text are proposed additions for the 2010 round*

**II. Foundational Indicators**

**A. Institutional Identity and Culture (Required Documentation 1-5)**

1. Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?
2. Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through campus-wide awards and celebrations?
3. Does the institution have mechanisms for systemic assessment of community perceptions of the institution's engagement with the community? b. Does the institution aggregate and use the assessment data?
4. Is community engagement emphasized in the marketing materials (website, brochures, etc.) of the institution?
5. Does the executive leadership of the institution (President, Provost, Chancellor, Trustees, etc.) explicitly promote community engagement as a priority?
6. Does the institution recognize and promote its role in convening their larger communities and facilitate efforts to engage on societal and community challenges?

**B. Institutional Commitment (Required Documentation 1-6)**

1. Does the institution have a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc) to support and advance community engagement?
2. a. Are there internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community? b. Is there external funding dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community? c. Is there fundraising directed to community engagement?
3. a. Does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement in community? b. If yes, does the institution use the data from those mechanisms? c. Are there systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms to measure the impact of institutional engagement? d. If yes indicate the focus of the mechanisms (impact on students; impact on faculty; impact on community; impact on institution); e. Does the institution use the data from the assessment mechanisms?
4. Does the institution coordinate and build upon the community engagement and collaboration efforts of its centers and institutes?
5. Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?
6. Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?
7. Does community have a "voice" or role in institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?

**Supplemental, Documentation (1-5)**

1. Search/recruitment policies encouraging the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment

to community engagement

2. a Institutional policies for promotion and tenure rewarding scholarship of community engagement? b. If yes, how does the institution classify community engaged scholarship? (service, scholarship of application, other). If no, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward the scholarship of community engagement?
3. Do students have a leadership role in community engagement? What kind of decisions do they influence (planning, implementation, assessment or other)?
4. Is community engagement noted on student transcripts?
5. Is there a faculty governance committee with responsibilities for community engagement?

### III. Categories of Community Engagement

#### A. Curricular Engagement (1-4)

#### B. Outreach and Partnerships

1. Indicate which outreach programs are developed for community: (learning centers; tutoring; extension programs; non-credit courses; evaluation support; training programs; professional development centers; collaboration centers and institutes.
2. Which institutional resources are provided as outreach to the community? (co-curricular student service; work/study student placements; cultural offerings; athletic offerings; library services; technology; faculty consultation; and center consultation and facilitation assistance.
3. Using the following grid, describe representative partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year. (Partnership name; Community Partner; Institutional Partner; Purpose; Length of Partnership; # of faculty; # of centers; # of students; Grant funding; Institution Impact; Community Impact).
4. a. Does the institution, or do the departments and/or centers work to promote the mutuality and reciprocity and collaborative nature of the partnerships. (Describe the strategies) b. Are there mechanisms to systematically provide feedback and assessment to community partners? (Describe the mechanisms)
5. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their outreach and partnerships activities (technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy reports, publications, etc.)? (*minimum of 5 examples from varied disciplines.*)