



The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Elective Classification for Community Engagement

2026 Reclassification Documentation Framework

About the Classification

The Classification seeks to recognize institutions that demonstrate commitment and excellence in community engagement. As such, it requires a large body of evidence of meaningful and sustained institutional investment of systems and structures that support individuals, groups, and communities to work with each other for mutual benefit and in a context of reciprocal partnership. Institutions will be successful in achieving classification to the extent that they demonstrate that community engagement is enacted and supported by the **institution** specifically, including but also beyond, the activity and commitment of individual faculty, staff, and students.

Institutional commitment and excellence are demonstrated through systems and structures that are deep, pervasive, and integrated.

- **Deep** engagement demonstrates systems, structures, behaviors, and outcomes that appropriately position all partners—students, faculty, staff, and community members—as *co-educators, co-learners, and co-generators of knowledge*; and it involves professional development that *builds the capacity of all partners* to undertake it in high quality, contextualized, and continuously improving ways. How has an institutional commitment to community engagement helped transition its partnerships beyond transactional exchanges to generate new, transformative possibilities among partners through reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships?
- **Pervasiveness** is demonstrated by the extent to which community engagement is *part of the plans, activities, and outcomes across the academic institution*, such as within academic units, student services, communications, business affairs, and other relevant areas. Is community engagement a far reaching activity such that it is practiced, valued, and supported across many or all units and divisions with the potential to transform institution-wide cultures and systems?
- **Integration** is demonstrated by the extent to which community engagement is *embedded into the core, strategic, and academic purposes and structures of the institution*. How do commitments to the principles and practices of community engagement align with, inform, and influence institutional priorities and initiatives such as student success, faculty and staff scholarship (broadly defined), and public and community service and how they are selected, enacted, and assessed?

Institutions of higher education may take many different approaches to supporting social impact for the purpose of addressing society's most pressing and complex challenges. These may include public impact research, public scholarship, translational science, and applied scholarship, to name a few. Many forms of public impact scholarship (broadly defined) address outputs and outcomes.

However, *community engagement is differentiated by the processes taken by academic and community partners with regards to reciprocity and epistemic inclusion.*

- **Outputs:** Community engagement produces diverse and varied forms of **activities and artifacts** (i.e., forms of outputs) that range from books and peer-reviewed journal articles to exhibitions, reports, presentations, data sets, podcasts, programs, and curricular, to name a few.
- **Outcomes:** Community engagement is described by the **purpose**, the expected or achieved contributions to populations or stakeholders, or the **values**, the principled intentions that drive partners to collaborate. Community engagement mutually benefits both academic communities, such as serving the teaching and learning, research and creative activity, or public and outreach missions of the institution, as well as the community. It is mutually beneficial.
- **Processes:** Community engagement is described by the **relationship**, the ways in which partners work together (e.g., collaboration, reciprocity, mutual benefit), or **epistemology**, the primacy of community members in the co-construction of and sharing of knowledge. Process is the most essential and distinct differentiation of community engagement. It describes scholars' work *with* members of the communities that are directly involved in or affected by the topics and issues addressed, and the relationship is described as reciprocal. Reciprocity is the recognition, respect, and valuing of the knowledge, perspectives, and resources of community partners and that are designed to serve a public purpose, building the capacity of individuals, groups, and organizations involved to understand and collaboratively address issues of public concern. In short, community engagement requires academics to partner outside of the academy *with* partners who are in and of the community in which the work is occurring and/or focused on and requires that community and academic members are thought-partners and co-laborers who share expertise and accountability.

Not all institutions that have community engagement activities occurring on their campuses or practiced among their members will be recognized for institutional classification. In order for institutions to plan for, enact, support, and maintain community engagement in a way that is deep, pervasive, and integrated, often *requires shifts in core features, functions, and assumptions of the college or university.* In many ways institutions are not typically set up in ways that support mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnerships, particularly in the realms of teaching and learning, and research and creative activity. For example, partnership activities and requirements do not follow academic calendars and student and faculty schedules. Faculty rewards and recognitions policies and practices may not formally or culturally include modern and diverse forms of scholarship that extend beyond traditional or customary artifacts. Institutions that achieve community engagement classification demonstrate success in institutional transformation such that high quality community engagement is supported and enacted across the campus via institutional structures, systems, practices, and cultures.

How to Use This Guide

The Reclassification Documentation Framework is intended to help you gather information about your campus's current community engagement commitments and activities as well as changes that have taken place since your campus last received the classification. The Reclassification Documentation Framework is designed for an evidence-based reflective process focusing on what has changed since receiving the classification. The narrative responses are designed to address (1) what currently exists, (2) changes since the last classification, and (3) relevant supporting evidence.

This guide provides additional context to help clarify what types of information reviewers are looking for overall and for each question.

Word limit: For reclassification, each response is limited to 500 words unless noted otherwise. It is recommended that applicants review the application website directly for exact word limits as well as response structure for each question.

Web links: Reclassification applicants should provide web links to relevant campus resources where requested in the application. Reviewers may want to examine websites for additional clarification of the responses in the application. However, it is important to note that in questions in which web links are *not* specifically requested, reviewers are not required to review the links.

Data provided: Typically, the data provided in the application should reflect the most recent academic year. However, we understand that COVID-19 has likely impacted data from 2021–2022.

For the 2026 cycle, campuses may use data from AY 2021–2022, 2022–2023, and 2023–2024 (including fall 2024) within the application. Campuses may use the data that provides the best representation of their community engagement. Data provided for one question or set of questions can be from one academic year, and data provided for another question or set of questions can be from a different academic year.

For each question and/or example, indicate the year that the data represents. For example: “(AY 2021–2022)” or “In 2022–2023, the Center for Community Engagement...”

Use of data: The information you provide will be used to determine your institution’s community engagement classification. Only those institutions approved for classification will be identified. At the end of the application, you will have an opportunity to authorize or prohibit the use of this information for other research purposes.

Community Engagement Definition

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defines community engagement as the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial creation and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership (of knowledge and resources) between colleges and universities and the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

As noted in the introductory “About the Classification” section, community engagement describes activities that are undertaken with community members using particular processes of reciprocity in relationships and epistemic inclusion. In reciprocal and epistemically inclusive partnerships, there are collaborative community–campus definitions of problems, solutions, and measures of success. Community engagement requires processes in which academics recognize, respect, and value the knowledge, perspectives, and resources of community partners and that are designed to serve a public purpose, building the capacity of individuals, groups, and organizations involved to understand and collaboratively address issues of public concern.

Community engagement is shaped by relationships between those in the institution and those outside the institution that are grounded in the qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes. Such relationships are by their very nature transdisciplinary (knowledge transcending the disciplines and the college or university) and asset based (where the strengths, skills, and knowledge of those in the community are validated and

legitimized). Community engagement assists campuses in fulfilling their civic purpose through socially useful knowledge creation and dissemination and through the cultivation of democratic values, skills, and habits. The difference between community engagement that happens at institutions and institutional commitment to community engagement is evidenced through policies, infrastructure, reciprocal partnerships, and deep and pervasive processes as well as outputs and outcomes. Through this self-study process, institutions are encouraged to demonstrate the arc of community engaged success and pervasiveness across institutional structures and areas of responsibility.

SECTION 1: Applicant's Contact Information

See application website for information requested.

SECTION 2: Campus, Community, and Community Engagement Context

The campus context for embracing community engagement as an institutional priority is different for every campus. This section provides campuses with the opportunity to provide a broad overview of the different characteristics that influence and shape community engagement. For example, reviewers want to understand—broadly and succinctly—how characteristics such as—but not limited to—institutional type, location, curricular programs, and community experiences and priorities have shaped particular legacies, trajectories, and achievements for community engagement. This section also asks institutions to provide a sense of how support for community engagement has changed due to circumstances and priorities.

Be sure to describe intentional institutional efforts to support the full participation of scholars (inclusively defined) so that they are able to participate in community engagement activities, engage reciprocally, and have the opportunity to benefit from intended and achieved outcomes. Additional explanation and guidance for evidence required to demonstrate commitment to full participation is provided below in Section 2, question 3.

1. Describe your institution in a way that will help provide a context to understand how community engagement is envisioned and enacted. Include descriptions of the institution and community. If your institution has multiple campuses, please describe each campus for which you are seeking an endorsement. **(Maximum word count of 1,000 words per response)**
 - a. Region; founding and history; current institutional mission; institutional culture; types of degree programs; and demographics of student, faculty, and staff populations
 - i. Community context for community engagement is different for every campus. Describe the unique characteristics of the community(ies) that your campus engages with. This includes but is not limited to descriptors of special type (regional, urban, etc.), size (population), economic health, region, unique history, demographics of community population served/employed, and other features that distinguish the institution and community(ies). This question reflects on communities at the macro level with space to describe the communities in which students and faculty are engaging with through partner organizations.
 - b. Leadership priorities, vision, and strategic plan and initiatives and other features that shape and distinguish the institution, particularly as they relate to community engagement

- i. How is community engagement structured on your campus? Where does the community engagement unit report to, and is it the way it is because of the way community engagement evolved on the campus? Often, large campuses understand the structures on the campus as being decentralized, so the community engagement work is also decentralized. Or it may be that community engagement is driven by executive leadership on the campus with certain priorities. Or it may be a case of the campus working to improve local community relations and address past isolation from community issues. Whatever it is that fundamentally shapes the structures of community engagement on campus, here is where you can share that information.
 - c. Describe the communities to which the institution is accountable to, including community characteristics, community priorities, and the relationship of the community to the institution.
 - i. Who makes up the external community, including the priorities and needs? The question further explores how institutions hold themselves accountable in not only acknowledging the community but outlining ways in which they consistently work alongside their local communities in a mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnership. This includes recognizing potential for growth and development in relationship building between the institution, community, and industry stakeholders as well as alignment with initiatives that directly address community-identified needs.

- 2. Describe the institutionally sanctioned definition of community engagement and related terms. **(Maximum word count of 500 words per response)**

When institutionalizing community engagement, it is important that there is a clear and shared definition across the campus so that every unit is working towards the same goals. This does not mean that the same terminology has to be used by every unit; community engagement may go by different terminology depending on the academic/disciplinary and community context.

Be sure to review the Community Engagement Definition on page 3 for how community engagement is distinctive from other forms of public impact. A report from the Academy of Community Engagement Scholarship emphasizes that “while engaged scholarship continues to be termed differently,” there remain core “standards and values” that define community engagement: participatory practices, reciprocity, co-construction, democratic practices, shared authority, and shared resources (Blanchard & Furco, 2022). Evidence for a complete and comprehensive definition includes references to the types of: (1) outputs (i.e., articles and activities, such as publications, reports, policy briefs, educational materials, art installations, or community programs developed through engagement with community partners); (2) outcomes (i.e., purpose and values, such as changes in policies, improvements in community well-being, shifts in power dynamics, increased community capacity, and sustainable positive impacts that result from the collaborative engagement and scholarship conducted); and (3) processes used (i.e., relationships and epistemic inclusion, such as relationship-building, knowledge co-creation, and mutual learning that occurs during the research or scholarship process) (Janke, Jenkins, Quan, and Saltmarsh, 2023). Regardless of what terminology for community engagement is used on your campus, is it defined by the core standards and values of engagement?

- a. List the terms and definitions here that provide the institutional standards for community engagement. Provide context for the creation of the definition and standards of high quality community engagement, including how it was determined and approved, how it is used, and any evidence of its effectiveness in guiding community engagement on campus in relation to

your last classification. If the definition of community engagement has been refined/revised since the last classification, describe the rationale, process of change, and the extent to which the revision has had an impact. Additionally, upload the document or list the website link where the institution-wide definition of community engagement appears. **You may skip "b" below if you answer "a" here. Proceed to "b" if unable to answer "a".**

- i. Describe how community engagement is understood on your campus (definition and terminology). It is also asking about the process that led to either an approved, institution-wide definition or the process that is underway to arrive at a shared definition.
 - ii. This question asks about how your campus determines what high quality community engagement is and how those quality standards are put into practice.
- b. If your campus does not have an institutional definition of community engagement, are there definitions and standards provided within a unit or division that are used to define community engagement? If so, list the terms and definitions for high quality community engagement. **If you answered "a", skip**
 - i. Some campuses do not have an institution-wide definition but have different terminology and policies to arrive at a shared understanding of community engagement. Community engagement may go by different terminology depending on the academic and community context.
3. Describe how the institution ensures that students, faculty, staff, and community partners have equitable access and opportunity to community engagement activities and partnerships. Equitable access and opportunity requires focused efforts to address systems and structures that create barriers to participation. **(Maximum word count of 500 words per response)**

Responses should provide a concise and comprehensive overview of the relevant contexts that shape the institution's understanding of and approach to equitable access and opportunity as well as more specific descriptions of plans, infrastructure, activities, and assessed outcomes related to equitable access and opportunity for community engagement. The concept of "equitable access and opportunity" is informed by the concept of full participation.

"Full participation is an affirmative value focused on creating institutions that enable people, whatever their identity, background, or institutional position, to thrive, realize their capabilities, engage meaningfully in institutional life, and contribute to the flourishing of others (Sturm 2006, 2010) (Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh and Bush, 2008)." Full participation asks questions about and assesses who is and who is not included in prevailing definitions and practices of community engagement and articulates plans and processes to reciprocally and mutually beneficially partner with stakeholders, including those who live, work, and matriculate within higher education and those who physically or practically occupy physical or project spaces connected to higher education institutions.

- a. Describe the relevant contexts—both within the institution as well as beyond (local, regional, national)—that shape how equitable access and opportunity in community engagement is defined, discussed, planned, enacted, and held accountable on your campus.
- b. Describe institutional systems and structures that address equitable access and opportunity in community engagement for students, faculty, staff, and community partners. This may

- include, infrastructure; program/initiative; policies, procedures and practices; staffing; office; finance; network or coalition of centers; campus climate survey; hiring/recruitment; etc.).
- c. Describe how the campus ensures that community partners have “significant voice” and input into institutional or departmental planning and collective goals
 - d. Describe the resources made available to community partners that support community engagement (e.g., professional development, compensation, materials, space, acknowledgement, awards).
 - e. In what ways does the campus collect information from partners to ensure accountability to the community—in particular reciprocity, mutual benefit, and respect?

4. As evidence for your earlier classification, you provided a description of the campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, network or coalition of centers, etc.) to support and advance community engagement and you reported how it is staffed, how it is funded, and its reporting line. **(Maximum word count of 500 words per response)**

- a. For reclassification, describe what has changed, if anything, with this infrastructure, its mission, staffing, funding, and reporting since the last classification. If the campus has more than one center coordinating community engagement, describe each center, staffing, and purpose and indicate how the multiple centers interact with one another to advance institutional community engagement. Provide any relevant links that support the narrative.

In understanding the institutionalization of community engagement, it has long been demonstrated that some kind of enabling mechanism is needed to assure that it is embedded in the core academic work of the campus. The application refers to this mechanism as a “coordinating infrastructure.” The framing of “coordinating infrastructure” suggests that it is an office, center, or multiple offices dedicated to advancing community engagement activity and that it serves as a unit that coordinates and facilitates community activity across the campus, particularly in academic work or in faculty teaching and research. On some engaged campuses, there may be more than one center or office facilitating community engagement. If this is the case, then be sure that in describing the “coordinating infrastructure” to address how the work of the various centers is coordinated and how that coordination happens. In answering this question, be sure to describe the mission and purpose of the center(s), how it is staffed and resourced, and where the center(s) is located (its reporting line).

Even if there is one coordinating center, think beyond community engagement work as designated to one specific “center” but how it is infused throughout various aspects of the institution’s structure. There are specialized areas, programs, or centers that engage students, faculty, staff, and the community through community engagement initiatives (e.g., Career Center, Honors Program, Workforce Development, Incarcerated Students, Foster Youth, DACA, Intercultural Center, Alliances, Veterans Center, Student Government, Clubs, etc.).

- b. Describe the most recent internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with the community and what has changed, if anything, with the budgetary allocations since the last classification. Describe whether the sources of these funds are permanent or temporary. Describe how budget shortfalls may have impacted funding for community engagement.

Resources demonstrate an institution’s commitment to institutionalizing and sustaining community engagement. This question asks about campus budgets dedicated to community engagement—not

for any activity external to the campus (community-based) but for community engagement activity. It asks not only about the center but also other units and activities that support community engagement. Is community engagement funded through operational funds (ongoing budget line items), through grant funding (temporary) or some combination of both—and if both, what is the mix? Both public and private campuses have been impacted by financial challenges from the global COVID-19 pandemic in addition to the structural challenges of higher education funding generally. And as with the recent economic downturn, the impact has not typically been linear; perhaps cuts occurred and now finances are being restored or possibly not. If the funds are listed as temporary, explain if any plans are being made to have them become permanent. If budget shortfalls have been impacted, how is this being addressed so that the community engagement work can continue? For example, a college experiencing a budget impact can seek ways to have other departments support community engagement work. This question provides the opportunity to discuss how community engagement is funded and the challenges that funding has faced. Additionally, for some institutions, funding structures are connected to statewide funding. For the institutions that are affected by this, think about how state mandates or statewide funding affect the budget. Is engagement dependent on the financial support of the statewide chancellor's office, state legislature, endowments, grants, bond measures, or donations? How does that impact community engagement initiatives within the institution?

c. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described strategic fundraising efforts and/or external funding (grants) specifically undertaken to support community engagement. For reclassification, describe the most recent strategic fundraising efforts and/or external funding (grants) specifically undertaken to support community engagement and identify any specific endowments earmarked for community engagement.

This question is different from question “b” above. It is not asking about budgets and finances but rather about fundraising and grants. This is where you can provide evidence of community engagement being an explicit part of a campus capital campaign; where individual donors have contributed for the specific purpose of supporting community engagement either with one-time funds or through the creation of an endowment specifically for community engagement; or where the campus was successful in obtaining a grant specifically for community engagement activity. For institutions impacted by state funding, think about funding received by the state chancellor's office or state legislature to address a community engagement issue directly connected with the local community and/or initiatives (e.g., food insecurity, housing, education access).

5. Describe how community engagement efforts have been impacted and shaped by recent local, national, and/or global events such as the COVID-19 pandemic, greater attention to racial and social justice, the crisis of decreasing trust in democracy and institutions, and natural disasters. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

A lot has happened between the classification cycles that impacts not only the overall state of higher education but the state of community engagement—its processes and its central purpose of revitalizing a diverse democracy committed to equity. It is expected that global problems, such as COVID-19, mental health, racial injustices, economic crises, and global warming, to name a few, have impacted the communities that your campus engages with as well as your campus practices and culture. It is also expected that these events have impacted campuses and communities unevenly. This question offers an opportunity for you to share how external events have impacted the community engagement work of the campus and how your campus has responded.

6. Describe how the institution tracks and assesses engagement with communities. Be sure to describe: **(Maximum word count of 500 words per response)**

a. How the institution maintains systematic campus-wide tracking of engagement with the community, including the purpose for tracking, what data is collected, what systems are used to track data, who is responsible for collected data, how often data is collected, and how data is used.

Part one asks about the tools (often software) that allow for the tracking of activity (by students, staff, and/or faculty who are engaged with the community). The second part of the question is about the tracking or documentation process—how the data is gathered (which individual or office is responsible) and how often the data is gathered, how the data is managed (how is it compiled, how is it shared and with whom), and how the data is used (the purpose of tracking these activities).

b. Any campus-wide assessments or self-studies of community engagement (not including this application) that have taken place in the last five years, including the purpose for the assessment or self-study, what data were collected, who was responsible for conducting the assessment or self-study, and how the assessments or self-studies were used.

Often, either because of the length of time between classification cycles, or because of other institutional assessments (such as accreditation), campuses look for tools to help them assess their community engagement activity or may bring outside consultants to help with assessment. This question asks whether your institution has undertaken any kind of assessment of community engagement within the last five years, what the campus learned from the assessment, and how practice has been reinforced or changed. Campuses that did a Campus Compact Civic Action Plan (CAP) can use that as a tool.

SECTION 3: Institutional Identity and Culture

For the success of any significant initiative on campus, leadership matters. It's not the only thing that makes a difference, but it is essential. The questions in this section ask for evidence that the executive leadership of the campus is publicly shaping the way community engagement is understood and enacted and ensured on campus; is making it visible and communicating its importance to the campus and community; is reinforcing the centrality of community engagement to the campus identity; and/or is validating the community engagement activity that is being enacted on campus.

1. Specify changes in executive leadership since your last classification and the implications of those changes for community engagement. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

2. Provide a letter from the president/chancellor or provost (vice president for Academic Affairs) that includes the following: **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

- Their perception of where community engagement fits into their leadership of the institution
- Community engagement's relationship to the institution's core academic identity, strategic direction, and practices
- How community engagement is institutionalized for sustainability in the institution

Please either copy and paste the text of the letter in the following textbox or upload a PDF copy of the letter below.

3. In addition to the letter, provide evidence of recent statements of affirmation of community

engagement. In the grid below, provide two excerpts from the relevant documents and up to two web links to the full document if it exists.

As evidence that supports the narrative provided in the letter above, here is where you can identify specific examples of how the campus leadership is communicating the importance of community engagement for achieving the goals of the campus and the community.

Document Excerpt	Web Link (if available)
3.1 Annual addresses/speeches (maximum word count of 500 words):	
3.2 Published editorials (maximum word count of 500 words):	
3.3 Campus publications (maximum word count of 500 words):	
3.4 Other (maximum word count of 500 words):	

4. Describe how community engagement is emphasized as part of the institution’s brand message identity or framework. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

All campuses present themselves publicly in a way that creates an identity for the campus—what they want to be known for in a way that distinguishes them from other campuses. This question asks about the construction of that identity and where community engagement fits in that intentional messaging. Brand messaging provides “talking points” for campus events and data that may be posted on the campus website. Branding information serves to demonstrate (or not demonstrate) community engagement work that is discussed in annual reports, accreditation reports, grant reports, catalog, planning documents (e.g., strategic plan or educational master plan). Furthermore, it provides information for local press releases and overall media coverage. This kind of brand messaging usually takes place in a wide array of outlets—for example, in public marketing materials, websites, community reports, news articles, etc.

When gathering evidence for this question, consider reviewing various publications, websites, etc. where information is disseminated, including board of trustees meetings, foundation board meetings, president’s reports, campus updates/announcements, presentations, speeches, graduation addresses, convocation, etc.

SECTION 4. Quality of Community Engagement Relationships and Academic Partnerships

Once the campus and community context has been shared, this section focuses on evidence of engagement, and it is intentional that the section is about *academic* community partnerships. The quality of partner relationships is foundational to the application. All of the questions in this section

focus on how 1) the standards and values of community engagement explicitly stated in the definition of community engagement from the Carnegie Foundation are enacted, and 2) how campuses are accountable to quality community engagement. For additional explanation of how quality may be assessed, refer to the About the Guidebook section and the Carnegie Community Engagement Definition near the beginning of this document.

In brief, high-quality community engagement partnerships are mutually beneficial, reciprocal, and asset based. Mutual benefit is the assurance that all parties involved achieve outputs and/or outcomes that serve their interests. Reciprocity includes all partners, especially community partners and students, as thought-partners and collaborators who help decide and inform the direction, activity, assessment, and dissemination of the partnerships' efforts. Asset based means recognizing and valuing the knowledge, capacities, resources, and resilience of all partners, especially community and student partners.

1. Describe at least five but no more than eight representative examples of academic-community partnerships (i.e., institutional, centers, departmental, and faculty/staff) that are connected to the academic core of the campus—which includes teaching, learning, and research, and illustrate both the breadth and depth of community engagement during the most recent academic year.

Please keep in mind that you will be requested to offer a list of community partners who will receive a partnership survey after submission of the application. Partners from this section should be included in the partner survey specified in section 10.

Campus questions for each partnership:

1. Project/Collaboration Title
2. Community Partner Name
3. Community Partner Contact
4. Name of community organization/group
5. Campus Partner (person, program, department, center, etc.)
6. Purpose of the Community-Campus Partnership
7. Provide one example as to how reciprocity and mutual benefit are enacted through the partnership
8. Length of Partnership
9. Number of faculty involved
10. Number of staff involved
11. Number of students involved annually
12. Titles of Courses Linked to Partnership
13. Grant funding, if relevant
14. Research projects linked to partnership, if relevant
15. Impact on the community
16. Impact on the campus

This question is intended to get a sense of who your community partners are and what community issues shape the partnership. Campuses often have many partners with different levels of engagement with different parts of the campus. There are a few things to keep in mind here. First, choose five to eight partnerships that best represent a wide range of partnership activity. Second, the way that this question is structured around “academic community–campus partnerships” signals the importance that the Carnegie Foundation places on partnerships that are connected to the academic core of the campus—connected with teaching, learning, and research. Third, “representative” is not

synonymous with longevity. Long-term commitments are important and can be revealed here, but short-term partnerships may indicate responsiveness to community issues.

This question is also linked to question 6 in Section 10. Highlighted campus partnerships in this section should be listed as partners who will receive the partnership survey for a full holistic view of academic community partnerships.

2. In comparing the partnership responses from your previous classification with the responses above, please reflect on what has changed in the quality, quantity, and impact of your academic community partnership activity. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Here, you are asked to provide a narrative about your community partnership activity since your last classification. What, if anything, has changed? What have you learned about partnership relations?

3. Describe specific systematic actions, strategies and assessments that are used to ensure the institution, academic units (colleges, departments), and faculty and staff are building partnerships that center mutual benefit, reciprocity, and asset-based partnerships. Be sure to describe: **(Maximum word count 500)**
 - a. Activities and strategies used to include community partners reciprocally for mutual benefit and collective action
 - b. How these activities and practices encourage authentic collaboration and reciprocity with community partners
 - c. How the institution collects and shares feedback and assessment of academic community partnerships and shared goals to deepen, understand, and improve reciprocity, mutual benefit, and asset-based engagement
- a. One indicator of mutuality and reciprocity is deep collaboration between the campus and the community partner. This question encourages formal and informal conversations and opportunities to discuss ways to generate greater assistance in addressing an issue or focusing on a specific community need. Such information is critical and serves to assist with initiatives, programs, grant applications, public information campaigns, and fundraising efforts.
- b. When a campus collaborates with the community, there are strengths and weaknesses related to building multi-directional community partnerships. Consider where the institution is lacking in creating solid partnerships or where it is excelling with partnerships—and what kinds of partnerships exist. Are these partnerships with nonprofits, elected officials, or business and industry groups? Does your institutional demographics impact the type of partnerships you have?
- c. To improve and receive feedback, this question asks for evidence of how community engagement assessment data is shared with community partners, the extent to which community partners have input into shaping community engagement goals and practices, and how shared data is used to deepen mutuality and reciprocity.
 - Consider the role of community partners as members of campus advisory committees, planning groups, and steering committees. Additional roles may include membership on the foundation board and business and industry board(s), bond measure oversight committees, etc.

- Connect with the community regarding business and industry needs, including public safety and health-related concerns. Review presentations made at major fundraising events, including on-campus and off-campus events. Explore any external data collected for your institutions as part of nationwide surveys (e.g., NSLVE, NSSE, CCSSE, etc.). Consider reviewing internal data collected by campus-wide surveys and program review as well as curricular changes or state mandates.

4. What actions have you taken since the last classification to deepen and improve partnership practices and relationships—in initiating, sustaining, and assessing partnerships? How did these practices encourage authentic collaboration and reciprocity with community partners? **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Adding more specificity to the reflection above, this question asks about specific actions taken by the campus to improve partnership activity and to better understand the outcomes and impacts of the partnerships.

SECTION 5: Faculty and Staff

Institutional commitments to community engagement provide support for employees to establish and maintain mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnerships as part of their work responsibility and activity. This section asks for descriptive information about the nature and structure of faculty and staff work and support, as each institution is unique.

Scholarly work that uses “community engaged approaches and methods” refers to community engagement as part of teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service.

Characteristics of community engagement include collaborative, reciprocal, mutually beneficial, innovative, partnerships, and public purposes.

Characteristics of scholarship within research and creative activities include the following: applying the literature and theoretical frameworks in a discipline or disciplines; posing questions; conducting systematic inquiry that is made public; and providing data and results that can be reviewed by the appropriate knowledge community and can be built upon by others to advance the field.

Campuses often use the term community-engaged scholarship (sometimes also referred to as the scholarship of engagement) to refer to inquiry into community-engaged teaching and learning or forms of participatory action research with community partners that embodies both the characteristics of community engagement and scholarship.

1. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described the ways the institution offers resources and support services for faculty in any employment status (tenured/tenure track, adjunct/clinical/non-tenure track, and part/full time) and/or staff who seek to develop or deepen community engaged approaches and methods.

For reclassification, describe what currently is in place and what has changed, if anything, with resources and support services for community engagement. Include which offices and/or unit(s) assume responsibility for these services, how often programs are offered, and how many faculty and staff participate. How have the content, program, approaches, or audience for professional development changed since the last classification? What have been the results? **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Campuses are asked to identify which of the community-engaged resources and support services are provided for building faculty and/or staff capacity to implement high quality community engagement. Provide evidence of three examples.

This question also asks how the resources that are offered now are different from what was offered at the time of your last classification.

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- How do students assist in expanding outreach, engagement, and capacity-building opportunities within engaged initiatives?
 - Consider where participation on community engaged councils and committees exist. Think about engaged work with campus planning and research teams/committees, especially those working directly with the strategic plan and college planning.
 - How are innovation funds from within the college or office of Academic Affairs used to provide seed money for projects, compensate community partners, support equipment costs, or fund release time?
 - What kind of community engagement support exists in negotiated contracts for faculty and staff?
 - How are relationships fostered and developed with individual faculty and community partners?
 - What programs, personnel, and other resources are dedicated to supporting faculty and staff to identify, apply, and engage in externally funded community engagement through teaching, research, creative activity, and/or service?
 - Consider internal grant programs offered across the institution that support community engagement teaching, research, creative activity, and/or service.
 - How is travel support facilitated in the institution's or department's annual budgets and recognized as significant by the office of academic affairs, teaching and learning center, and foundation office? Consider sabbatical work if it is relevant.
 - What kind of support is provided to faculty and staff to help them identify, draft, and publish their scholarship (broadly defined) for dissemination?
 - Consider policies, procedures, funds, and resources that support the transportation of students to/from sites for community-engaged learning and development.
2. Check all of the community engaged professional development programs faculty and staff are provided. These programs provide educational training to improve community engagement across faculty and staff roles.
- Syllabus development and implementation planning
 - Partnership initiation, development, management, assessment planning
 - Remote/online community engagement (curricular or co-curricular)

- Inclusion of community engagement in evaluation criteria of student learning outcomes
- Participation on learning communities, writing retreats, engaged learning institutes related to community engagement
- Training to understand ethical engagement practices that ensure equitable access and opportunity related to community engagement
- Documenting and evaluating promotion, tenure, and/or reappointment dossiers for faculty candidates and reviewers
- Global and intercultural community engagement
- Climate and Sustainability Development Goals connected to community engagement
- Social innovation, entrepreneurship, and economic engagement
- Engaged learning webinars and workshops
- Other: (please describe)

Describe three of the topics that have been checked off above in the text box underneath the selected topic and include the purpose, audience, activities, and results. Include which offices and/or unit(s) assume responsibility for these services, how often programs are offered and how many faculty and staff participate. **(Maximum word count of 750 words per topic)**

Campuses are asked to identify professional development opportunities for building faculty and staff capacity to implement high quality community engagement on campus.

When considering this question, think far and wide and take into consideration various aspects of each employee's position, department, or unit.

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- What kind of faculty training is available through the campus's teaching and learning center or community engagement office?
- What kind of training, workshops, and presentations are provided by the institution's professional development program or office? This can include leadership training, project management, mentorship programs, emergency preparedness training (in conjunction with the local municipality), health and wellness events, etc.
- What types of professional development offerings and credit (e.g., hours or dollars) are provided to campus stakeholders? Are programs also available to community partners or other educators (e.g., K-12 employees).
- What kind of faculty and classified support is encouraged or facilitated by the academic senate and classified senate, respectively.
- How are faculty in particular encouraged to participate in writing and facilitating grant opportunities?
- How do campus stakeholders work directly to foster community engagement activities with local business and industry partners?
- Training to understand inclusion and equity related to community engagement
- Consider internal and external professional development opportunities. What kind of training is made available by campus offices—Teaching and Learning, Professional Development, Civic/Community Engagement, Inter or Multicultural Center, Student Development, Classified Senate, and/or Academic Senate. Also review external training opportunities made available

by higher education associations. Finally, consider campus and statewide initiatives advanced by the state chancellor's office and campus human resources office, if applicable.

3. Describe the formal recognitions provided by your institution through campus-wide awards and/or celebrations for faculty/staff that partake in academic community engagement.

Academic community engagement initiatives that are valued on a campus are publicly celebrated, made visible as a valued activity that others might emulate, and recognized by awards and ceremonies that create opportunities for celebration and visibility. In the response to this question, describe who is being recognized (faculty and/or staff); the outcomes or successes for what they are being recognized; and how this connects to teaching/student development, research, creative activity, and/or service. Also, do not confuse this question with later questions about faculty rewards. The application distinguishes between *awards* and *rewards* in positing that awards are relatively easy to enact but may not indicate a change in campus culture, whereas faculty rewards are part of the incentive system for faculty advancement and reflect core values of the academic culture on the campus.

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- Think beyond formal awards from a civic/community engagement center— awards can include recognition by the local community, business, or local elected officials that are also supported by your institution.
- Do awards include faculty and staff teams with students and community partners? How are awards and celebrations recognized by local organizations that engage in community engagement work, including businesses, nonprofits, and elected officials.
- Are community engagement awards formally recognized or celebrated by the chancellor, president, or administration?

4. Provide five to 10 examples of staff scholarship (conference presentation, publication, consulting, awards, etc.) that have taken place since your last classification. A title may not convey how the example is about community engagement, so please provide a short description of how the activity is related to community engagement. **(Maximum word count of 1,000 words. Web links may be provided as part of the description.)**

Professional staff on campus whose position is focused on advancing community engagement, often referred to as community engagement professionals, contribute to developing scholarship in the field of community engagement. This question is specifically about the intellectual and scholarly contributions of community engagement staff.

We use the term “scholarship” broadly to include various forms of scholarly community engagement activity that can be demonstrated via teaching, research, creative activity, inquiry, and service. Indicators of scholarly work include: clear goals, preparation and mastery of existing knowledge, appropriate use of methods, meaningful or significant results, effective dissemination and communication, and consistently ethical conduct (Glassic, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997).

Contributions address academic and nonacademic audiences and may include but are not limited to the following types of activities and artifacts:

- Book, book chapter, white paper, report, program evaluation, technical paper, policy brief, curriculum, dataset, article, or manuscript (broadly defined)

- Zine, comic book, film, video, performance, composition, artwork, installation, exhibit, or other creative practice
- Public event, lecture, conference, webinar, forum, summit, workshop, program, curriculum deliberative dialogues or town halls
- Newsletters, blogs, vlogs, websites, or social media campaigns

5. Provide five to 10 examples of faculty scholarship from as many different disciplines as possible that have taken place since your last classification. A title may not convey how the example is about community engagement, so please provide a short description of how the activity is related to community engagement. **(Maximum word count of 1,000 words. Web links may be provided as part of the description.)**

Provide a broad summary of the ways in which faculty are producing community-engaged scholarship. The question asks about a variety of examples that indicate the pervasiveness of scholarship by faculty from across the campus. It also asks that for whatever evidence is provided that there is a brief description about what makes it community engaged.

We use the term “scholarship” broadly to include various forms of scholarly community engagement activity that can be demonstrated via teaching, research, creative activity, inquiry, and service. Indicators of scholarly work include: clear goals, preparation and mastery of existing knowledge, appropriate use of methods, meaningful or significant results, effective dissemination and communication, and consistently ethical conduct (Glassic, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997).

Contributions address academic and nonacademic audiences and might include but are not limited to the following types of activities and artifacts:

- Writing or editing and/or publishing of a book, book chapter, white paper, report, program evaluation, technical paper, policy brief, curriculum, dataset, article, manuscript (broadly defined), or other forms of publication
- Film, video, performance, composition, artwork, installation, exhibit, zine, comic book, or other creative practice
- Public event, lecture, conference, webinar, forum, summit, workshop, program, dialogue, town hall, curriculum, display, art installation, exhibit, or other activities
- e-Newsletters, blogs, vlogs, websites, or social media campaigns

6. Provide five to 10 examples of student scholarship from as many different disciplines as possible. A title may not convey how the example is about community engagement, so please provide a short description of how the activity is related to community engagement. **(Maximum word count of 1,000 words. Web links may be provided as part of the description.)**

Provide a variety of examples of the ways in which students are producing community engaged scholarship. It also asks that for whatever evidence is provided that there is a brief description about what makes it community engaged. This question is specifically about the intellectual and scholarly contributions produced by either undergraduate or graduate student(s).

We use the term “scholarship” broadly to include various forms of scholarly community engagement activity that can be demonstrated via teaching, research, creative activity, inquiry, and service. Indicators of scholarly work include: clear goals, preparation and mastery of existing knowledge,

appropriate use of methods, meaningful or significant results, effective dissemination and communication, and consistently ethical conduct (Glassic, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997).

Contributions address academic and nonacademic audiences and might include but are not limited to the following types of activities and artifacts:

- Writing or editing and/or publishing of a book, book chapter, white paper, report, program evaluation, technical paper, policy brief, curriculum, dataset, article, manuscript (broadly defined), or other forms of publication
- Film, video, performance, composition, artwork, installation, exhibit, zine, comic book, or other creative practice
- Public event, lecture, conference, webinar, forum, summit, workshop, program, dialogue, town hall, curriculum, display, art installation, exhibit, or other activities
- e-Newsletters, blogs, vlogs, websites, or social media campaigns

7. Describe how the institution regularly measures and assesses faculty community engagement, particularly as it relates to outputs and outcomes relative to teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service. How is data used to improve programs and outcomes? How have the results changed since your last classification? Provide relevant links. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

This question asks about what you know about the activities of and impacts for faculty who participate in community engagement. It asks for a specific example of a systematic (ongoing, permanent processes for gathering data, and ongoing, regular processes for making sense of the data to inform practice and drive improvement), campus-wide assessment mechanism that provides information about the activities and impacts for faculty and at least one thing that has been learned about the activities and impacts for faculty as a result of campus support for community engagement since your last classification. How are the findings used, who are the findings shared with, and how are the findings used to improve practice?

Consider the following tools and information:

- Review of self-evaluations
- Review of course student learning outcomes during the curriculum process as well as during course evaluation by peers
- If applicable, community engagement is a strong part of the faculty member's course during the tenure process. The instructor can discuss during evaluation meetings and highlight in course assignments, projects, and rubrics
- Review of professional development evaluations
- Review of community partner interviews/evaluations
- Review of board certifications from certain programs such as nursing or paralegal programs

8. Indicate the campus approach to faculty tenure and/or promotion: (Check all that apply)

- My campus has a contract or tenure track structure rather than a tenure and promotions structure.
- My campus has a tenure and promotion structure defined at the department level.
- My campus has a tenure and promotion structure defined at the school level.
- My campus has a tenure and promotion structure defined at the institutional level.

Campuses differ greatly in the way faculty positions and reward systems are structured. Some campuses have a contract structure in which all faculty have set terms that are established by contract. Other systems have a tenure system for some faculty. Check “My campus has a contract or tenure track structure rather than a tenure and promotions structure” if your campus does not offer tenure to any faculty at all. If tenure is offered to some faculty, check each of the levels (i.e., department, school/unit, institution) at which tenure is defined and reviewed.

9. Describe policies and practices that support faculty community engagement for faculty at your institution such as search and recruitment, annual review, reappointment, promotion, bonuses, and/or merit pay. Do NOT include promotion and/or tenure policies in this response. Specify if these policies are different for faculty of different employment statuses (tenured/tenure track, adjunct/clinical/full time non-tenure track, and part/full time). **(Maximum word count of 500 words)** Campuses are asked to provide the specific text rewarding community engagement from any level of the campus that makes it explicit whether community engagement is rewarded as a part of faculty teaching, research, creative activity, or service. Describe how widespread these policies and practices rewarding faculty for community engagement are. Do they apply to all faculty at the campus, to faculty in a particular school or college, to faculty in a department or set of departments, or to faculty who have different types of appointments? Are teaching assistants and staff in dual administration/teaching roles considered in this practice? How does the campus signal the importance of community engagement through its public, highly visible search and hire processes?

For institutions guided by collective bargaining agreements, review HR guidelines and collective bargaining agreements since these policies are determined by the full-time and/or adjunct union(s).

When gathering information for this question consider the following:

- Review job descriptions since different levels of community engagement may be required for certain positions, especially administrative. All job descriptions are approved by HR, and while specific items are dependent on collective bargaining, overall, community engagement is something that could be encouraged.
- Check with individual departments and see how they address the need for community engagement. (This also includes classified and non-teaching positions.)
- Check with classified and non-teaching areas, including economic development.

10. Describe the policies for faculty promotion (at tenure-granting campuses) from all levels of the institution (campus, college or school, department) that specifically reward faculty community-engaged scholarship. If there are separate policies for tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, part time, research, and/or clinical faculty, please describe those as well. Describe the pervasiveness of the policies outlined in question. For example, are they practiced across the institution? By most departments? By a few? **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

A strong indicator of institutionalization of community engagement into faculty culture is that there are policies and guidelines explicitly rewarding community engagement. This question builds on the one above and asks for a description of the faculty reward policies explicitly rewarding community engagement from any level at the institution. The second part of the question asks about where the criteria and guidelines for tenure and promotion (including promotion for non-tenure track faculty) is defined. Is it in departmental guidelines and criteria, at the school or college level within a university, or at the institutional level (or perhaps some combination of the three)?

If applicable, review policies approved by human resources and examine collective bargaining agreements. Reach out to respective unions and the district to identify specific language.

Certain institutions do not require or encourage outside scholarly work. However, this work certainly provides the institution with external recognition and reputation.

11. In the period since your last classification, if you made revisions to faculty community engagement reward policies to promotion and tenure (at tenure granting campuses), please address the following where applicable. **(Maximum word count of 500 words per response)**

A. Describe how community engagement is rewarded to faculty for community engaged teaching and learning, research, creative activity, and service. Provide examples of policy descriptions that support community engagement in each of the faculty roles below:

- i. Community engaged teaching and learning
- ii. Community engaged research and creative activity
- iii. Community engagement as a form of service

Community-engaged scholarship may occur within each of the three traditional faculty roles of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. While these roles are often integrated, policies often differentiate among these roles. Therefore, this question asks that you provide the specific text rewarding community engagement from each of the three faculty roles to demonstrate the scope and breadth of the policies as they pertain to reviewing and rewarding community-engaged scholarship.

B. Cite three examples of college/school and/or department-level policies with text taken directly from policy documents that specifically reward faculty for community engagement across teaching, research, creative activity, and service. Describe the pervasiveness of policies outlined. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

A strong indicator of institutionalization of community engagement into faculty culture is that there are policies and practices explicitly valuing community engagement closest to the disciplinary and professional academic units of the faculty member. This question asks for evidence of faculty rewards for community engagement within the academic home of the faculty member.

When exploring this question, consider:

- Policies approved by HR as well as collective bargaining agreements (if applicable) reached by respective unions and the district to identify specific language
- Recent accreditation/self-study
- Recent strategic plan
- Work plans and work reviews
- Board policies and/or administrative procedures
- Evaluation processes for faculty, staff, and administrators
- Questions from administrative self-evaluations as well as faculty evaluation documents
- Multiple job descriptions across campus sectors to see if language regarding community engagement exists

C. If your campus has revised its policies specifically to incorporate community engagement, describe when the revisions occurred and the process that resulted in the revisions. **(If policies have not been revised, skip to “d”). (Maximum word count of 500 words)**

If there are faculty reward policies in place that specifically reward faculty for community engagement, it is very likely that those policies are there because there was a deliberate process of policy revision to include them. This question asks you to describe in as much detail as possible how that revision process occurred.

D. Describe the involvement of the president/chancellor, provost, deans, chairs, faculty leaders, chief diversity officer, human resources, community engagement center director, or other key leaders. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

If there are faculty reward policies in place that specifically reward faculty for community engagement, it is very likely that those policies are there because of support from institution administration. This question asks you to describe in as much detail as possible who was involved in helping implement faculty reward policies and/or how that revision process occurred.

When gathering evidence, consider the following:

- Public information archives, speeches, and websites as well as information presented in major planning documents
- Public minutes to meetings, including any related discussions engaged in by the board of trustees
- Any pertinent or related items discussed during contract negotiations
- Any pertinent or related items discussed during campus-wide planning committees
- Any pertinent or related items discussed by the academic senate, classified senate, or curriculum committee
- Any pertinent or related items discussed by the executive cabinet, deans' council or chairs' committee

E. Describe any products resulting from the revision process (i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc.) **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

When gathering evidence, consider the following:

- Major planning documents, board decisions, and administrative policies
- Changes in HR procedures related to hiring and tenure as well as specific language provided in job descriptions. Also relate the same process to collective bargaining outcomes (if applicable)
- Any changes related to employee training and professional development opportunities
- Any changes to the accreditation process or language related to the standards
- Any internal or external changes impacted by statewide mandates or initiatives
- Any partnership agreements that reflect community engagement (e.g., designating the campus as an official county vote center, etc.)

12. If revisions have not taken place but there is work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines (at tenure granting institutions) to reward faculty scholarly work that uses community engaged approaches and methods, describe the current work in progress, including a description of the process and who is involved. Describe how the president/chancellor, vice presidents/chancellors, provost, vice provosts, deans, chairs, faculty leaders, chief diversity officer, community engagement center director, or other key leaders are involved. Also describe any products resulting from the process (i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc.). Specify if these policies are different for faculty of different employment statuses (adjunct, full-time contract, tenure track, tenured, etc.). **(Maximum word count of 300 words)**

Because faculty reward policies are artifacts of faculty culture and culture change is inherently a slow process, this question asks about where your campus is in that culture change process. While there is not an expectation that all community-engaged campuses have completed the process of revising their faculty reward policies to specifically reward community engagement, there is the expectation that there has been some activity on campus that addresses the need for revision and begins to formulate a process for achieving those revisions.

When gathering evidence, consider the following:

- Major planning documents, board decisions, and administrative policies
- Changes in HR procedures related to hiring and tenure as well as specific language provided in job descriptions. Also relate the same process to collective bargaining outcomes (if applicable)
- Any changes related to employee training and professional development opportunities
- Any changes to the accreditation process or language related to the standards
- Any internal or external changes impacted by statewide mandates or initiatives
- Any partnership agreements that reflect community engagement (e.g., designating the campus as an official county vote center, etc.)

SECTION 6: Curricular Engagement

Curricular Engagement describes the teaching, learning, and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

The term "community engaged courses" is used in the application to denote academically based community engaged courses. Other terms may be used by campuses, including service-learning, community based learning, public service courses, etc.

1. Provide a summary narrative describing overall changes and trends that have taken place related to curricular engagement on campus since the last classification. In your narrative, address the trajectory of curricular engagement on your campus. Where have you been? Where are you now? Where are you strategically planning on going? **Web links can be provided as part of the description. (Maximum word count of 500 words)**
2. As evidence provided for your earlier classification, you described an institution-wide definition of community engaged courses used on campus. For reclassification,

describe the institution-wide definition and standards used for community engaged courses and provide examples of: **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

- a. Institutional, departmental, and/or programmatic definitions, learning outcomes, standards, and/or required components

This question is foundational to understanding the degree to which community engagement is part of the instructional culture of credit-bearing courses across the campus—the extent to which it pervades teaching and learning and, thus, faculty work in curriculum and pedagogy as well as student learning. The question asks how community engagement is defined. In other words, without some parameters, any kind of teaching and learning that in any way involves the community could be considered.

This question also focuses on learning outcomes. While there may be co-curricular learning outcomes on your campus, this question is specifically about learning outcomes that are expected from community engagement courses. These community engagement learning outcomes may be specified at the institutional level (for example, as part of the general education curriculum); they may be community engagement learning outcomes in a department or major; they may be tied to a community engagement program (for example, a leadership or engaged courses program that involves students from across majors); or a combination of these. The question is structured in a way that presumes (see question b. and c. below) that if learning outcomes are being named, then there is a standard of practice to support engaged courses and that they are also being measured consistently, producing valid data for assessing community engagement in the curriculum.

- b. Processes for ensuring that the standards for community engagement are part of the course design (e.g., course designation, curriculum review)

This question asks about the details for how the data for understanding curricular engagement is gathered. It also asks you to reflect on your data and what it tells you about the extent to which community engagement is embedded in faculty teaching and student learning across the campus. Additionally, it asks how that definition is connected to a course designation. In other words, how is it decided that a course is community engaged? Is it through some process of designation, or is it up to a faculty or staff member to claim that a course is community engaged? Without knowing both how community engaged courses are defined and designated, it is not possible to know the validity of any quantification of community engaged courses. It asks you to reflect on your processes to uphold community engagement standards of practice through teaching and learning and specifically key pieces to sustaining engaged learning, course design, course designation, and curriculum review.

- c. How student learning outcomes are assessed. Explain any changes to coursework that occurred as a result of assessment activities since your last classification

Campuses can share the pervasiveness of community engagement by sharing where in the curriculum community engaged courses are situated. You do not need to provide a comprehensive inventory here. The question asks for at least two examples across all of the curricular structures. When answering this question, consider what role campus leaders and faculty play in supporting the multiple ways teaching and learning align with the college's community engagement commitment.

When exploring this question, consider:

- Traditional service-learning and project-based learning courses and activities
- Curriculum committee requirements or recommendations
- SLO requirements for specific courses and programs

- Connection to transfer degrees or Guided Pathways model
- Academic departments (e.g., paralegal, nursing, early childhood education)
- Learning communities
- Honors college/program(s)
- Internships
- Engaged courses encouraged by academic affairs
- Team teaching/multi-disciplinary teaching

3. Describe how community engagement is integrated into traditional curricular structures. These may include core courses, capstone/senior-level projects, first-year course/sequence, general education, majors/departments, minors, and graduate courses or medical education, training, or residencies. Provide at least two but not more than three examples. **(Maximum word count of 500 words per example)**

Campuses can share the pervasiveness of community engagement by sharing where in the curriculum community engaged courses are situated. You do not need to provide a comprehensive inventory here. The question asks for at least two examples across all of the curricular structures. When answering this question, consider what role campus leaders and faculty play in supporting the multiple ways teaching and learning align with the college's community engagement commitment.

When exploring this question, consider:

- Traditional service-learning and project-based learning courses and activities
- Curriculum committee requirements or recommendations
- SLO requirements for specific courses and programs
- Connection to transfer degrees or Guided Pathways model
- Academic departments (e.g., paralegal, nursing, early childhood education)
- Learning communities
- Honors college/program(s)
- Internships
- Engaged courses encouraged by academic affairs
- Team teaching/multi-disciplinary teaching

4. Describe how community engagement is integrated into the following academic activities offered for credit and/or required by a curricular program.

These may include but are not limited to: **Student Research, Student Leadership, Internships, Co-Ops, Career exploration, Study Abroad/Study Away, Alternative Break tied to a course, or a Campus Scholarship Program.** Provide one but not more than two examples. **(Maximum word count of 500 words per example)**

In addition to the curricular structures listed in question 3, there are many campuses that also attach credit bearing curriculum to programs that have community engagement components. The question asks for evidence of for-credit activities—for example, a leadership program might have a required community engagement component, but there is not a course or credit involved. In that case, it is not

appropriate evidence for this question. Again, this question is not asking for a comprehensive inventory of activities; provide one to two examples total across all of the activities listed.

When gathering evidence for this question, consider the following:

- Work with specific campus departments or programs like honors, study abroad, career center, internship office, international students/international education, counseling, nursing, public safety, paralegal, and additional career education areas
- Credit support for training among student government officers
- Credit requirements for specific community engagement scholarships
- How are community sources of knowledge valued, incorporated, and acknowledged at the institution?

5. Describe how your campus tracks and assesses curricular engagement and how students gain access to and participate in courses. **(Maximum word count of 750 words)**

- a. How is community engaged course data gathered, by whom, with what frequency, and for what purpose? How is it shared/reported, particularly in student transcripts?

This question is grounded in the assumption that there is a definition of community engaged courses that is tied to producing valid data for assessing community engagement in the curriculum. Based on that assumption, this question asks about the details for how the data for understanding curricular engagement is gathered and how community engaged courses show up as academic work on student transcripts.

When answering this question, consider the following:

- How information is disseminated through various sources, including the college catalog, online enrollment portal, and counseling appointments
- How information is collected by the curriculum committee, institutional research, community engagement, honors, etc.
- Is there a specific center, program, or office that works to collect data as well as to help enroll students?
- Check with admissions and records to learn how designations are provided, if at all, on transcripts. If a designation is not available for an official transcript, is a separate certificate of activity transcript provided to students?
- Is program information shared during new student orientation or first-time counseling meetings?

- b. Since your last application, describe how your campus has designed new curricular programs and initiatives or re-designed existing ones to both increase students' access to and participation in community engaged activities (particularly students who are not currently engaged) so that a relatively larger portion of students have the opportunity for developing the cultural competencies, asset-based approaches, and values of reciprocity for engaging with communities.

This question is asking to what extent students on your campus are provided scaffolded community engagement opportunities as they progress through their undergraduate

experience since your last classification. If you are a medical or professional program, how are your students provided scaffolded community engagement experiences in their training?

When answering this question, consider the following:

- Are there specific classes with community engagement stated in the title or course description?
- Are there classes that include community engagement components or specialized course assignments or projects?
- How did these courses get approved through the curriculum process, and do they articulate with a four-year transfer institution?
- Are opportunities to take part in community engagement represented more in certain disciplines and programs (e.g., honors or academic divisions)?

- c. Reflect on how the data indicates the levels of pervasiveness and depth infused in the curriculum and traditional curricular structures.

This question asks you to reflect on your data and what it tells you about the extent to which community engagement is embedded in faculty teaching and student learning across the campus.

6. Complete the table below. Data should be drawn from undergraduate and graduate for-credit courses and be indicated accordingly. Please also indicate what academic year the data represents:

What academic year does this data represent? (Select One)
 [Dropdown Menu:, 2021–2022, 2022–2023, 2023–2024]

<i>Number of for-credit community engaged courses UG/G</i>	<i>Change in number of for-credit courses since last Application UG/G</i>	<i>Percentage of total courses UG/G</i>	<i>Percent change in courses since last Application UG/G</i>

<i>Number of departments represented by community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of departments since last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total departments</i>	<i>Percent change in departments since last application</i>

<i>Number of faculty who taught for-credit community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of tenured and tenure-track faculty who taught for-credit community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of tenured and tenure-track faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of tenured and tenure-track faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who taught for-credit community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of part-time faculty who taught for-credit community engaged courses</i>	<i>Change in number of part-time faculty since the last application</i>	<i>Percentage of total faculty</i>	<i>Percent change in number of part-time faculty since last application</i>

<i>Number of students participating in for-credit community</i>	<i>Change in number of students since last application UG/G</i>	<i>Percentage of total students UG/G</i>	<i>Percent change since last application UG/G</i>
---	---	--	---

<i>engaged courses UG/G</i>			

This question is grounded in the assumption that there is a definition of community engaged courses that is tied to a course designation process, producing valid data for assessing community engagement in the curriculum. Based on that assumption, this question asks about the details for how the data for understanding curricular engagement is gathered. It also asks you to reflect on your data and what it tells you about the extent to which community engagement is embedded in faculty teaching and student learning across the campus.

SECTION 7: Co-Curricular Engagement

Co-curricular engagement describes structured learning that happens outside the formal for-credit academic curriculum through training, workshops, and experiential learning opportunities. Co-curricular engagement requires structured reflection and connection to academic knowledge in the context of reciprocal, asset-based community partnerships.

1. Describe how community engagement is integrated into institutional co-curricular practices by providing at least two but not more than four examples from the following categories. For each example, describe what has changed since the last classification. **(Maximum word count of 1,000 words)**
 - Social innovation/entrepreneurship
 - Civic engagement/ electoral engagement
 - Dialogues
 - Community service projects - outside of the campus
 - Community service projects - within the campus
 - Alternative break - domestic
 - Alternative break - international
 - Study abroad/away
 - Student leadership
 - Student internships/co-ops/career exploration
 - Student research
 - Work-study placements
 - Opportunities to meet with employers who demonstrate Corporate Social Responsibility
 - Living-learning communities/residence hall/floor
 - Student teaching assistants (provided the TAs are not receiving credit)
 - Campus scholarship program

- Athletics
- Greek life
- Other: (please describe)

Community engagement is often part of programming outside of academic courses. This question asks about the co-curricular activities on campus that have community engagement integrated into them. The question asks for at least two to four examples across all of the activities listed.

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- How do student groups participate in the innovation/entrepreneurship space? Are there economic development opportunities for students on campus?
- What kind of community/civic engagement projects are occurring in the community, and where are they taking place (for-profit, nonprofit, or faith-based organizations)?
- What types of domestic/international alternative break opportunities do study abroad or community engagement offices provide?
- What kind of opportunities for studying abroad do study abroad or student international services provide?
- What kind of activities are performed by student government, peer advisors, mentors, and tutors as well as students participating in action teams and alliances?
- What kind of internships are available to students and through which departments? Are they restricted to career education because of Perkins funding, or are internships available to students from all disciplines?
- How is student research connected to an internship, independent study, or honors project?
- Consult with various departments specifically interested in this topic—business or sustainability—and discuss opportunities with offices focused on economic development.
- How are the athletics or Greek life departments implementing community engagement opportunities?
- Which scholarships specifically focus on community engagement?

2. Describe any co-curricular engagement tracking system used by your institution that can provide a co-curricular transcript or record of community engagement. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

For the co-curricular activities that include a community engagement component, this question asks how those activities are tracked and whether documenting students' co-curricular community engagement is compiled into a co-curricular transcript.

3. Provide an example of a systematic, campus-wide mechanism for assessing student achievement of community engagement learning outcomes for students who participate in co-curricular experiences that are community engaged and describe one key finding. What has changed in the results of student achievement of co-curricular community engagement outcomes since your last classification? Describe how the institution uses and disseminates data from the mechanisms described. **Web links can be provided as part of the description. (Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Just as there can be community engagement learning outcomes tied to courses, there can also be community engagement learning outcomes for co-curricular experiences. This question is structured in a way that presumes that if learning outcomes are being named, then they are also being

measured. And the question asks what has been learned from the assessment of community engagement learning outcomes.

SECTION 8: Civic Learning and Life

1. According to the Carnegie definition of community engagement, one of the purposes of community engagement is to prepare educated, engaged citizens and strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility. Describe at least **two examples of practical experiences in the table** below, of how your campus prepares students, faculty, staff, and community to understand and engage in ways that address critical community issues and contribute to community/public good by providing practical experience with community. Be sure to share how these activities are community engaged. **(Maximum word count of 750 words)**

Examples of practical experience may include activities such as the following but not limited to:

- Electoral education and participation (such as voter information, education, registration, polling site(s); meetings with elected officials; Constitution Day)
- Meetings with community members, elders, and community leaders to learn about community issues; land-based learning
- Issue awareness and advocacy training (such as Advocacy Days)
- Civic focused student organizations (voter engagement, Model UN, Model OAS, Peace Corps Prep, or similar programs)
- Civic fellows/scholars
- Debate team
- Civic awards to students, faculty and staff, or the community

Campus Questions for each practical experience above:

1. Civic engagement experience overview and purpose
2. Campus partner(s) that provide support for mentioned experience (person, program, department, center, etc.)
2. Provide one example as to how reciprocity and mutual benefit are enacted through the practical experience
3. Number of faculty involved
4. Number of staff involved
5. Number of students involved
6. Community partners involved, if relevant
7. Grant funding, if relevant
8. Research projects linked to partnership, if relevant **(New)**
9. Impact on the campus
10. Impact on the community

Campuses may do this work in a variety of different ways. It may include curricular and co-curricular examples that both engage the awareness of democracy and civic skills as well as create opportunities for students to have practical experiences with the community that show democracy in action. Include representative examples of the activities that offer practical experiences to participate in civic life. Examples shared can include activities that student clubs and organizations are offering/organizing, advocacy campaigns, internships with elected officials, or public service internships. They can also be local, national, and/or global.

2. Are civic skills incorporated into curricular and/or co-curricular community-engaged activities? If so, describe how civic skills are integrated and how student learning outcomes are applied and assessed. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Examples of civic skills may include the following but are not limited to:

- Critical thinking and evidence-based reasoning
- Development of digital data and media literacy
- Conveys ideas across difference - orally and in writing
- Seek out and engage with multiple perspectives
- Listen attentively and with patience
- Reflexive thinking
- Understanding of intersectionality, privilege, and bias
- Development of cultural humility, empathy, compassion, and courage to act in service of the greater good
- Opportunity to collaborate and participate with multiple forms of culturally based leadership models prevalent in communities of color

Share how your campus is connecting civic skills to student learning outcomes and how they are engaging in this skill building. Is this integrated into the core curriculum, in certain courses, or co-curricular programming, and if so, how is it assessed? If your campus is part of a system and the system has adopted civic learning skills, what does it look like, and how is it being aligned at your campus?

3. Civic identity involves the formation and negotiation of personal and group identities as they relate to presence, role, and participation in public life. Civic identity is particularly important and a factor in civic engagement and participation.

What are the pathways and opportunities available to students at your institution to develop their civic identity? How are community partnerships incorporated into these pathways? What kind of institutional support is in place to encourage civic identity development? **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Examples of civic identity formation may include the following but are not limited to:

- Understanding the variety of ways to make change within a community (community organizing, going to the media, activism, etc.)
- Coalition building to engage in relationships where trust is formed while recognizing barriers
- Examining one's positionality in relation to self and society
- Articulating a vision of a just and equitable society
- Leveraging passion for social change into actions that benefit the community
- Understanding the power of voice to make change and what limits voice for many
- Creating a sense of belonging to community and responsibility for the greater good

Civic identity development can also be aligned to institutional mission and values. Students can also come in with much of their civic identity formation having developed from previous life experience, especially non-traditional students. Share what opportunities exist for students to develop or further develop their civic identity and how students are supported in this formation and evolution.

4. Indicate where civic knowledge development for a diverse democracy is part of the community engaged student learning outcomes inside and outside of the curriculum. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Examples of civic knowledge may include the following but are not limited to:

- Community-based participatory research on democracy and civic engagement
- Collaborative problem solving
- Knowledge of systems (governance and community networks)
- Ethical reasoning and critical inquiry
- Information literacy and empathy
- How to use policy for social change
- Compassion and communicating across differences

Civic knowledge also entails understanding of how American democracy is structured and how the government system works such as how bills become laws, the form and function of the branches of government, and knowledge for a pluralistic society. Share institutional and/or programmatic learning outcomes that demonstrate how this civic knowledge development exists in curricular and/or co-curricular offerings. Share the learning outcome(s) and representative examples. What courses exist that are aligned or incorporate civic knowledge?

5. How is free speech showing up on your campus? What is your institutional policy on free speech and free expression? What kind of programming, partnerships, and policies for staff, faculty, students and/or community do you offer or participate in that foster critical thinking, space to engage in deliberative dialogue, civil discourse and communication across differences, and exchange of ideas around contentious issues? Is there training offered to faculty, staff, and/or the community to incorporate these skills into courses and programming? **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

The first part of this question asks you to share the story around free speech/free expression/and academic freedom on your campus. Share the policy, when the policy was adopted/revised and how it has been interpreted. How has your campus balanced free expression with the right to learn free from harassment? Share how these policies promote free expression and civility. The second part of this question asks campuses to identify programming that promotes civic skills and/or deliberative dialogue. What curriculum, training, or opportunities that support the exchange of ideas across differences does your campus participate or offer? This can be curricular or co-curricular offerings. Share if your campus is involved with or participates with organizations that prepare students for civic life by providing programming/training around dialogue across differences. Please include training and development programs that faculty and staff might participate in. Share who offers this programming, who is involved, and the types of outcomes and results connected to this kind of academic or co-curricular programming. These can be related to political diversity, religious diversity, or difficult dialogue, etc.

6. Describe how your campus tracks and assesses civic engagement. Explain how your campus uses the data to inform programming and enhance student learning. **(Maximum word count of 500 words)**

Share the assessment tools your institution uses to collect, track, and inform programming related to civic learning, political engagement, or voter participation. This can include internal as well as external tools such as National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), National Study on Student Learning and Voter Engagement (NSLVE), etc. Share information on if your campus participates in ALL In Campus Democracy Challenges or other such programs that encourage student and community participation in elections or has developed civic action plans or other planning tools to enhance tracking and assessment of civic engagement to inform and support student learning.

SECTION 9: Community Engagement and Other Institutional Initiatives

1. Indicate if community engagement is intentionally and explicitly aligned with or directly contributes to any of the following additional institutional priorities: (In Table- Check all that apply and describe two of the checked examples in the table, in the text box below in question 2). **Maximum word count of 1,000 words)**
 - Anchor institution mission or initiative(s)
 - Campus diversity, inclusion, and equity goals (for students and faculty)
 - Efforts aimed at student retention and success
 - Encouraging and measuring student voter registration and voting
 - Development of skills and competencies to engage in dialogue about controversial social, political, or ethical issues across the curriculum and in co-curricular programming
 - Social innovation or social entrepreneurship that reflects the principles and practices of community engagement
 - The campus institutional review board (IRB) provides specific guidance for researchers regarding human subject protections for community engaged research
 - Efforts that support federally funded grants for Broader Impacts of Research activities of faculty and students
 - Outreach activities
 - Community and economic development
 - Lifelong learning (non-credit)
 - Campus food security programs (internal and external)

For community engaged campuses, it is typical that community engagement is one among a number of campus priorities. This question asks about how community engagement as a priority is intentionally connected with other pervasive institutional priorities. What is meant by “intentionally connected” is that community engagement is purposely used as a way to achieve the success of a priority (conversely, it does not mean that, in hindsight, community engagement happens to be associated with a particular practice).

2. Describe at least two examples from question 1, including (how the priority is aligned with community engagement; where you have been; where you are now, where you are strategically planning on going; and lessons learned over the past two years.) **(Maximum word count of 1,000 words)**

For the institutional priorities above that are intentionally connected to community engagement, provide at least two examples. What does that intentional connection look like in practice?

SECTION 10: Reflection and Additional Information

1. (Optional) Use this space to elaborate on any question(s) for which you need more space. Please specify the corresponding section and item number(s).
2. (Optional) Is there any information that was not requested that you consider significant evidence of your institution's community engagement? If so, please provide the information in this space.
3. (Optional) Reflect on who was around the table, who was missing, representation of the community members, and how these voices might have improved this report.
4. (Optional) What is a question you would like us to ask that was not included in the application?
5. Request for Permission to use Application for Research:

In order to better understand the institutionalization of community engagement in higher education, we would like to make the responses in the applications available for research purposes for the Carnegie Foundation, its administrative partners, and other higher education researchers. Only applications from campuses that agree to the use of their application data will be made available for research purposes. No identifiable application information related to campuses that are unsuccessful in the application process will be released. We encourage you to indicate your consent below to advance research on community engagement.

Please respond with A, B, or C below:

A. I consent to having the information provided in the application used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, the identity of my campus will not be disclosed.

B. I consent to having the information provided in the application used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, I also agree that the identity of my campus may be revealed.

C. I do not consent to having the information provided in the application used for research purposes.

6. Before you submit your final application, please provide a list of community partners that should receive the partnership survey. Include the partners described in Section 4 question 1, but you may include additional partners up to a total of 15 (see guide for partnership survey information).

- a. Partner Organization Name
- b. Partner Organization Contact Full Name
- c. Partner Organization Contact Email Address

This question is linked to a survey of community partners. This is an opportunity for the classification to bring community voices into the process. In order to do this in a way that attempts to get authentic, candid feedback from community partners, the community partners are assured of confidentiality in their responses. Survey responses will not be shared with the campus. **At the time you submit your application formally (not when you enter the information in the form)**, your community partners will be contacted. We suggest that partnerships shared in **section 4** receive the partnership survey.

In the 2020 cycle, a pilot was initiated to collect information from community partners. This information was enlightening. Although partnership survey responses were not used in an evaluative manner in this pilot, reviewers found that the partner responses generally validated the broader assessment of a campus, indicating a strong relationship between the variety of other indicators in the application framework and the likelihood of strong partnership. For the 2026 cycle, partnership survey responses will be used in an evaluative manner as part of the holistic review process.

The community partners that you identify will be sent a short survey with the following questions:

Dear {community organization partnering with a college or university},

{Name of Campus} is in the process of applying for the 2026 Elective Community Engagement Classification from the Carnegie Foundation. The classification is offered to campuses that can demonstrate evidence of collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial creation and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. Partnerships that meet the standards of community engagement are grounded in the qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.

We were provided your email address by the campus applying for the Community Engagement Classification. The Community Engagement Classification is offered by the Carnegie Foundation and is available to all colleges and universities in the United States. For more information about the classification, please go to <https://carnegieelectiveclassifications.org>.

We would like to ask you to assist with this classification process by providing confidential responses to a very brief online survey (LINK provided). While your participation in the survey is entirely voluntary, your input and perspective on the activity are valuable in evaluating campus community engagement. Beyond the evaluation of campus community engagement, the responses provided by

community partners contribute to a national understanding of how communities and campuses are collaborating for the purpose of deepening the quality and impact of such partnerships.

In order to be able to assess and improve partnership activities, it is important to provide candid responses to the questions. The responses you provide are confidential and will not be shared with your partner campus.

Many thanks for your response.

Sincerely,

The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Team

Survey Questions

The survey will include the definition of community engagement from the Carnegie Foundation. Exact language of the survey follows:

As a community partner, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your collaboration with this institution? (1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree)

- 1. As a partner, I feel that my organization and I recognized by the campus.*
- 2. I am asked about my perceptions of the institution's engagement with and impact on the community.*
- 3. My experience, knowledge, and opinions are valued in this partnership*
- 4. I am involved in important campus conversations that impact my community.*
- 5. The faculty and/or staff in our community partnership try to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.*
- 6. The campus collects and shares feedback and assessment findings regarding partnerships, reciprocity, and mutual benefit, both from community partners to the institution and from the institution to the community.*
- 7. Our partnership with the campus is having a positive impact on my community.*
- 8. Please provide any additional information that you think will be important for understanding how the campus partnering with you has enacted reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.*

Please indicate whether you consent to having your responses used for research purposes by the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. For research purposes, all responses will be aggregated, and no individual partner or campus information will be identified. If you have any questions, please contact us via email at carnegieelectives@acenet.edu.

Please respond with A or B:

A. I consent to having the information provided in the survey used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, the identity of my organization will not be disclosed.

B. I do not consent to having the information provided in the survey used for research purposes.