

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Imagining America

Scholarship in Action

9-23-2010

Assessing the Public and Academic Outcomes of Public Scholarship: Implications for the Engaged Campus

John Saltmarsh
NERCHE

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/ia>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Saltmarsh, John, "Assessing the Public and Academic Outcomes of Public Scholarship: Implications for the Engaged Campus" (2010). *Imagining America*. 8.
<https://surface.syr.edu/ia/8>

This Conference Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarship in Action at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Imagining America by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

**Assessing the Public and Academic
Outcomes of Public Scholarship:
Implications for the Engaged
Campus**

Imagining America

September 23, 2010

Integrated Assessment

- “Responsible assessment of public scholarship is *integrated assessment*: it aims to understand how public scholarship impacts all stakeholders -- community partners, faculty, students, and administrators -- in relation to defined civic, social, and academic goals.”

Integrated Assessment

- “At the same time, integrated assessment invites evaluation of the institution’s own practices, position, contributions, and benefits in relation to the goals of civic engagement, knowledge building, and effective campus-community partnership.”

Integrated assessment of public scholarship is guided by the following principles (draft):

- **COLLABORATION**—Integrated assessment engages stakeholders in defining what are meaningful outcomes and indicators of success, long before the assessment itself begins. Integrated assessment is grounded in a shared understanding of interrelated goals.
- **GENERATIVE PROCESS**—Integrated assessment feeds the project, program, or course at hand; it is part of an ongoing and dynamic process of programmatic, institutional, community, and/or regional development.
- **ITERATIVE PROCESS**—Integrated assessment looks beyond the semester or project unit and invites stakeholders to evaluate the overall, long-term relationships at the heart of community-based education and public scholarship.
- **CREDIBLE PRACTICES**—Integrated assessment utilizes sound evaluation methodologies and practices.
- **PRACTICABLE MEASUREMENTS**—Integrated assessment activities are proportionate to the project and resources available.
- **SHARED PROCESS**—Integrated assessment goes back to the stakeholders involved; it invites reflection, feedback, and critique.

Emergent Issues

- What if all our assorted efforts don't make a difference in the communities - does our intervention perpetuate the problem – is there a larger scale assessment that can get at a larger transformation that needs to happen?
- How do people at a university take the larger picture into account in their planning and practices?
- Challenge is a lack of resources (human and financial and capacity) to undertake community impact evaluation.
- Tools that we have for assessing student learning may not help us assess community impact.
- Defining outcomes for community engagement that will make it valuable for other units on campus (economic, education, political benefit to others on campus).
- Summative or formative assessment – what are we trying to accomplish with the assessment process?

Emergent Challenges

What is the relationship between assessing the impacts of public scholarship and assessing the impacts institutional public engagement?

What is the relationship between the Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship and Integrated Assessment?

What kinds of impacts – how broad? A continuum of outcomes and impacts?

- Public access to knowledge
- Student engagement
- Faculty engagement
- Widening Participation (Access through success for underserved students)
- Building community partner capacity
- Benefits external to the University-Community partnerships: There are benefits outside those accruing to partners, including building social trust, enhanced sustainability, and community wellbeing, and building a wider public culture of democracy.

Elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

- Introduced by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 2005
- First Elective Classification as a complement to the established Basic Classification
- First offered in 2006; second cycle in 2008, a third in 2010 – will then fall into the same 5-year cycle of the Basic Classification (next in 2015)

Classified Campuses 2006 + 2008

196 institutions are classified

112 public/84 private institutions

- 74 doctoral granting universities
- 63 master's colleges and universities
- 31 baccalaureate colleges
- 14 community colleges
- 4 specialized focus (arts, medicine, technology)

Elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

A benchmarking tool:

- mainly descriptive
- self-reported data/information
- institutions evaluate various aspects of their processes in relationship to standards of best practice (Documentation Framework)
- not a ranking tool – no hierarchy or levels of classification

Inputs	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
All the resources put into the project to enable the delivery of outputs	All the activities undertaken and products and services delivered	The changes, benefits, learning or other effects that result from the outputs	The effect of a project at a higher or broader level, in the longer term, after a range of outcomes have been achieved

Institutional Motivation

- **Institutional self-assessment and self-study**: A way to bring the disparate parts of the campus together in way that advances a unified agenda. At the same time it allows for the identification of promising practices that can be shared across the institution.
- **Legitimacy**: Seeking a new level of legitimacy and public recognition and visibility for your work.
- **Accountability**: A way to demonstrate that the institution is fulfilling its mission to serve the public good.
- **Catalyst for Change**: A tool for fostering institutional alignment for community-based teaching, learning and scholarship.
- **Institutional Identity** : The classification is a way to clarify institutional identity and mission that distinguishes the institution from peers.

Creating a Counterbalance

The first elective category to be developed was, significantly, community outreach and engagement. If the effect of Carnegie's efforts (and those of Dupont Circle and AAUP) in the first three quarters of the 20th century was to inscribe in academic structures and in the consciousness of faculty a national [and cosmopolitan] orientation, those organizations are increasingly emphasizing the value of the local. (p.12)

Rhoades, G. (2009) Carnegie, Dupont Circle and the AAUP: (Re)Shaping a cosmopolitan, locally engaged professoriate, *Change*, January-February, p. 8-13.

Elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

Community Engagement describes the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and **reciprocity**.

Reciprocity

As a core principle – there is a flow of knowledge, information and benefits in both directions between the University and community partners.

Reciprocity is what defines and distinguishes engagement: reciprocity = engagement

Community Engagement Classification

Documentation Framework

Community Engagement Classification Application

- **Foundational Indicators**
 - Institutional Commitment
 - Institutional Identity and Culture
- **Curricular Engagement**
- **Outreach and Partnerships**

Foundational Indicators

- Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?
- Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?
- Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?
- Does the institution have search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise and commitment to community engagement?
- **Do the institutional policies and for promotion and tenure reward the scholarship of community engagement?**

Questions on Faculty Roles and Rewards

- Question: “Do the institutional policies for promotion and tenure reward the scholarship of community engagement?”
- Sub-Question A: “If yes, how does the institution categorize the community engagement scholarship? (Service, Scholarship of Application, other)”
- Sub-Question B: “If no, is there work in progress to revise the promotion and tenure guidelines to reward the scholarship of community engagement?”

Curricular Engagement

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

1. a. Does the institution have a definition and a process for identifying service learning (community-based learning) courses?
 - b. How many formal, for credit courses (Service Learning, Community Based Learning, etc.) were offered in the most recent academic year?
What percentage of total courses?
 - c. How many departments are represented by those courses?
What percentage of total departments?
 - d. How many faculty taught Service Learning or Community Based Learning courses in the most recent academic year?
What percentage of total faculty?
 - e. How many students participated in Service Learning or Community Based Learning courses in the most recent academic year?
What percent of total number of students?

Curricular structures and pathways

- community engagement in general education.
- community engagement in Freshman Seminars.
- community engagement in Senior Year or Capstone courses.
- community engagement as a focus of the major – departmental strategies
- community engagement at the core of interdisciplinary majors and minors.
- community engagement integrated into internships and study abroad.
- community engagement in graduate studies

Outreach and Partnerships

Outreach and Partnership describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. The first focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use benefiting both campus and community. The latter focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, discovery, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (e.g.. research, economic development, capacity building, etc.) and related scholarship.

Assessing Community “Impact”

I. Foundational Indicators

A. Institutional Identity and Culture

3.a. Does the institution have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution’s engagement with community?

Assessing Community “Impact” (cont.)

B. Institutional Commitment

- 3.a. Does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community?

- 3.c. Are there systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms to measure the impact of institutional engagement?
 - d. If yes, indicate the focus of those mechanisms:
 - Impact on students
 - Impact on faculty
 - Impact on community
 - Impact on Institution

6. Does the community have a “voice” or role for input into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?

Assessing Community “Impact” (cont.)

II. Categories of Community Engagement

B. Outreach and Partnerships

- 4.a. Does the institution or do the departments work to promote the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnerships?

- b. Are there mechanisms to systematically provide feedback and assessment to community partners and to the institution?

Areas of Challenge (2006+2008)

- Assessing the community's perspective on engagement
- Assessing impact of institutional engagement on faculty, community, and institution
- Developing substantive roles for the community in creating the institution's plans for engagement
- Demonstrating how institutions had achieved genuine reciprocity
- Specifying student learning outcomes resulting from community engagement
- Lack of significant support for faculty
- Changes in the recognition and reward system for promotion and tenure
- Counting engagement as service (not teaching or scholarship)

The TTI raised the issue of the reconsideration of the peer in peer review to include evaluation by non-credentialed, non-academics in the community who are affected by the research and can recognize the data and findings as their own, value them in their own terms, and use as they see fit

Integrated Assessment raises the issue of collaborative assessment of community impacts.

It also raises the issue of not only assessing outcomes collaboratively, but determining outcomes collaboratively.

If outcomes are determined collaboratively – what would this mean for institutional practice:

- Would the community be part of shaping the mission of the campus?
- Would the community be part of the strategic planning process?
- Of accreditation?
- Of faculty development?
- Of determining learning outcomes?
- Of shaping the curriculum?

What would shift in the kinds of questions that the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification would ask if there were a shift to integrated assessment?

Small Group Discussion

(please record your key ideas – we will collect it after the session and it will help to inform this initiative)

1. How does integrated assessment resonate for you in the context of your work and institution? What would it mean for you if you were to approach assessment in a more integrated way?
2. What role could IA play in facilitating your use of integrated assessment.