



# Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education

Chantal Jouannet  
Luis Arocha  
María Nieves Tapia  
Andrés Peregalli  
Andrew Furco  
Montserrat Alom Bartrolí  
Jay Brandenberger  
James Frabutt  
Bárbara Humphrey  
Donald R. McCrabb  
Amelia Blanton  
Pedro Pablo Rosso  
Sahaya G. Selvam  
Miguel Adasme

Alin Burgos  
Manuel Caire  
Rocío Fontana  
José Sepúlveda  
Maaïke Mottart  
Nicolas Standaert  
Almudena Eizaguirre  
Ariane Díaz-Iso  
Marian Aláez  
María García-Feijoo  
Marta Roldán  
Ulrike Brok  
Michael Winklmann  
Tom Kearney

Judith Pete  
Marietta Guanzon  
Lourdes Melegrito  
María Catalina Nosiglia  
Leticia López Villarreal  
Howard Rosing  
Irwin W. Steans  
Anna Escofet  
Laura Rubio  
Miquel Martínez  
Karen Venter  
Carol Ma Hok-ka  
Alfred Chan Cheung-ming  
Fanny Mak Mui-fong  
Alice Liu Cheng

Appendix: Rubrics for Assessment and Self-Assessment of Service-Learning Institutionalization processes

4.18

*Texts extracted from Volume 4 of the Uniservitate Collection:*  
***Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education***

Uniservitate Collection

Director: María Nieves Tapia

Coordination of Uniservitate Program: María Rosa Tapia

Editorial Coordination: Jorge A. Blanco

Coordinator of this volume: Chantal Jouannet Valderrama and Luis Arocha

Proofreading and editing of texts in Spanish: Licy Miranda

Translation and editing of texts in English: Alejandra Linares

Design of the collection and of this volume: Adrián Goldfrid

© CLAYSS

CLAYSS, Centro Latinoamericano de Aprendizaje y Servicio Solidario

[www.clayss.org](http://www.clayss.org) / [www.uniservitate.org](http://www.uniservitate.org)



*Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education / Chantal Jouannet...*

*[et al.] ; adaptado por Luis Arocha ; coordinación general de Chantal Jouannet ;*

*Luis Arocha. - 1a ed. - Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires : CLAYSS, 2023.*

*Libro digital, PDF - (Uniservitate ; 4)*

*Archivo Digital: descarga y online*

*Traducción de: M. Alejandra Linares.*

*ISBN 978-987-4487-46-9*

*1. Educación Superior. 2. Pedagogía. 3. Doctrina Social de la Iglesia. I. Jouannet, Chantal, coord. II. Arocha, Luis, adapt. III. Linares, M. Alejandra, trad.*

*CDD 378.002*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>18. Appendix: Rubrics for Assessment and Self-Assessment of Service-Learning Institutionalization processes</b> .....	363
--	-----

Compiler: Andrés Peregalli

CLAYSS-Uniservitate/Universidad Católica Argentina



## Andrés Nicolás Peregalli de Palleja

*Is a member of the coordinating team of the Uniservitate Global Program: promotion of Service-Learning in Higher Catholic Education (PORTICUS-CLAYSS). He holds a Doctoral Degree in Education from the University of San Andrés, Buenos Aires, Argentina; and a Master's Degree and a Specialist Diploma in Education, majoring in Education Management. He also holds a Bachelor's Degree in Education Science, majoring in Research and Teaching (Universidad de la República, School of Education Sciences and Humanities, Uruguay); and a degree in Philosophy from the Salesian University Institute, Montevideo, Uruguay. He was a Salesian clergyman between 1995 and 2001. Andrés is a tenured professor and researcher at the Universidad Católica Argentina (School of Social Sciences, Education Department—Inclusive and Effective Learning), and teaches a number of undergraduate and graduate degree courses at universities within and outside Argentina. He is an educator and a member of management teams for Civil Society Organizations in Uruguay and Argentina that work with children, adolescents and young people from underprivileged backgrounds. He is also a consultant and advisor for local and foreign government agencies and educational institutions. Andrés is a member of academic and research networks within and outside Argentina. His main areas of interest are: Service-Learning in Higher Education Institutions; inclusive education policies targeted at Children, Adolescents and Young People; State-Civil Society Relationships in educational inclusivity policies; Elementary Teachers' Training and Continuous Teachers' Training (innovation networks); and Institutional Self-Assessment. Andrés has authored books, chapters and papers. He is co-coordinator of the book: *La pedagogía del aprendizaje-servicio y las enseñanzas de la Iglesia Católica* (Service-Learning Pedagogy and the Teachings of the Catholic Church) (Colección Uniservitate); co-author of the chapter: "Uniservitate: las tecnologías digitales en el desarrollo internacional del aprendizaje-servicio" ("Uniservitate": Digital Technologies in the International Development of Service-Learning) (Narcea, 2022); and co-author of the chapter: "Aprendizaje-Servicio Solidario en Universidades Católicas Latinoamericanas: Educación Superior Integral para el Desarrollo Sostenible" ("Service-Learning in Latin-American Catholic Universities: Comprehensive Higher Education for Sustainable Development") (KHAF, 2021). He co-authored the paper *Aprender, servir y ser solidarios en tiempos de pandemias* (Learning, Serving and Solidarity during Pandemic Times) (RIDAS 2020); and authored the paper *Aprendizaje Servicio: Formar para (y desde) una cultura del encuentro* (Service-Learning: Educating for (and from) a Culture of Encounter) (CLAYSS-JIAS, 2019). ORCID: 0000-0002-0057-7665*

## 18. APPENDIX: RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT AND SELF-ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE-LEARNING INSTITUTIONALIZATION PROCESSES

Compiler: Andrés Peregalli

CLAYSS-Uniservitate/Catholic University of Argentina

*A number of assessment instruments involving a variety of approaches have been developed around the world aimed at measuring the level at which a service-learning practice is institutionalized.*

A number of assessment instruments involving a variety of approaches have been developed around the world aimed at measuring the level at which a service-learning practice is institutionalized.

In order to provide comprehensive and exhaustive tools that contribute towards a transition from projects to institutional policies, favoring the institutionalization of Service-Learning (AYSS, for its initials in Spanish) in Higher Education Institutions (IES, for its initials in Spanish), a number of rubrics are presented below, which specify how to walk through those processes and what aspects are worth taking into account.

This work has already offered Furco's rubric. Summarized below are other assessment matrices and rubrics that have been proved and validated in Higher Education Institutions around the world.

A few useful remarks regarding their choice and use are worth noting:

- ▶ **Regarding the choice of rubrics and instruments:** their choice is based on a thorough global review of programs, projects, resolutions, frameworks and research efforts carried out by Higher Education Institutions, networks and researchers focused on promoting the achievement of engaged Universities, and that have built assessment and self-assessment tools and resources over the years. In addition to the rubrics, this appendix introduces frameworks, grids, dimensions and indicators with a view to offering diverse and relevant resources for Higher Education Institutions in order to cater for the various geographic areas.
- ▶ **Regarding their creation:** The rubrics and instruments mentioned below should be viewed as *a part of a process and a context of stakeholders, institutions and organizations that designed them over the years, involving drafting, consolidation, review and revision stages, as well as the involvement of teachers, researchers,*

*The rubrics and instruments mentioned below should be viewed as a part of a process and a context of stakeholders, institutions and organizations that designed them over the years, involving drafting, consolidation, review and revision stages, as well as the involvement of teachers, researchers, students and, in some cases, community partners.*

students and, in some cases, community partners. In this regard, this appendix calls for a revision of the framework within which they were designed, and the processes through which they are used, so as to raise awareness of its complexity, avoiding a sort of decontextualized “applicationism” simplifying its conceptual and methodological

richness. It is also worth noting that, in order to avoid too long introductions to the rubrics and instruments, we decided to select and offer an overview of those tools in this section, with the caveat that—in many cases—it is merely a part of the assessment process. In this regard, we suggest visiting the websites of the institutions or organizations that created them.

- ▶ **Regarding their use:** the rubrics, or resources, address the processes of institutionalization of service-learning (or the like) in Higher Education Institutions, spanning a series of dimensions meant to capture their complexity. It should be noted, once again, that the assessment of institutionalization processes must take into account all, rather than some, dimensions, and that their use will depend of the institutions’ trajectories and specific characteristics. For example, using a rubric to assess the quality of a service-learning project or the institutionalization of course contents into the degree programs can be very useful for identifying and specifying institutionalization actions, but this should not be confused with, or have the effect of, overshadowing other relevant dimensions of the organization and the processes.

### **Assessment rubrics and instruments introduced:**

1. *Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors.* Holland, B. (1997).
2. *Inventory Tool for Higher Education Civic Engagement.* Watson, D. (2004).
3. *Defying University Public Engagement. Dimensions of University Public Engagement.* Hart, Northmore and Gerhart (2009).
4. *Inventory of Tools for Assessing University Capacity, Support for, and Outcomes of Community/Civic Engagement and Community-Engaged Scholarship.* Wenger, L. and MacInnis, A. (2011).

5. *Community Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices*. Barreno, Elliott, Madueke and Sarny (2013).
6. *Measuring Higher Education Civic and Community Engagement a Support Framework*. Campus Engage, Irish Universities Association (2018).
7. EDGE. *Instrumento de autoevaluación para apoyar y acrecentar la participación pública de las universidades, hacer un balance y planificar su trabajo*. [Self-Assessment Tool for Supporting and Enhancing Universities' Community Engagement, Evaluating and Planning their Work]. National Co-coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (2018).
8. *Guía para la institucionalización de aprendizaje servicio de una carrera y rúbrica de autoevaluación para la sustentabilidad de aprendizaje-servicio en una unidad académica*. [A Guide for Institutionalizing Service-Learning into a Degree Program and Self-Assessment Rubric for Measuring the Sustainability of Service-Learning in an Academic Unit]. Caire, Jouannet, Montalva and Ponce, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (2018).
9. *Rúbrica para autoevaluar proyectos de aprendizaje-servicio y su grado de institucionalización en IES*. [A Self-Assessment Rubric for Measuring Service-Learning and its Level of Institutionalization in Higher Education Institutions]. Campo Cano, L. (2014).
10. *Grilla para evaluar la calidad de los proyectos de AYSS en Educación Superior* [A Grid for Assessing the Quality of Service-Learning Projects in Higher Education]. (CLAYSS, 2016).
11. *EFCE: Towards a European Framework for Community Engagement in Higher Education*. Erasmus + Government of the Republic of Croatia (2018).
12. *Mapping and Critical Synthesis of Current State-of-the-Art on Community Engagement in Higher Education*. Paul, B.; Bojana, Ć; Thomas, F.; Frans, K.; Marco, S.; Ninoslav, Š.; Hans, V.; Institute for the Development of Education, Zagreb, Croatia: Paul Benneworth proof-reader (2018). ISBN 978-953-7901-30-1

## 1. Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors

Barbara Holland, 1997<sup>24</sup>

### ***A Proposed Matrix of Institutional Commitment to Service***

From case studies and the literature, especially Crosson (1983), the proposed matrix was developed to explain the interrelationship of levels of commitment to service with key or-

24 <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjcs/3239521.0004.104/1>

*The proposed matrix was developed to explain the interrelationship of levels of commitment to service with key organizational factors.*

organizational factors that illustrate and characterize each level. The matrix is shown in Figure 1. The four levels of institutional commitment to service represent different institutional expressions of seven organizational factors most often cited as definitive components that frame an institution's service-related activities. The organizational factors represent important aspects of organizational infrastructure, policy, communication, and participation that are typically affected by efforts to define and implement service as a reflection of campus mission. At any level of commitment to service, any institution should be able to match its organizational choices with these factors to test the linkage between goals and performance. The continuum of levels of commitment and the factors that define those levels arose naturally from data analysis that revealed the variety and nature of institutional choices and behaviors regarding involvement in and commitment to service and service-learning.

**Figure 1:** Levels of Commitment to Service, Characterized by Key Organizational Factors Evidencing Relevance to Institutional Mission

	<b>LEVEL ONE</b> Low Relevance	<b>LEVEL TWO</b> Medium Relevance	<b>LEVEL THREE</b> High Relevance	<b>LEVEL FOUR</b> Full Integration
<b>Mission</b>	No mention or undefined rhetorical reference.	Service is part of what we do as citizens.	Service is an element of our academic agenda.	Service is a central and defining characteristic.
<b>Promotion, Tenure, Hiring</b>	Service to campus committees or to discipline.	Community service mentioned; may count in certain cases.	Formal guidelines for documenting and rewarding community service/service-learning.	Community based research and teaching are key criteria for hiring and rewards.
<b>Organization Structure</b>	None that are focused on service or volunteerism.	Units may exist to foster volunteerism.	Centers and institutes are organized to provide service.	Flexible unit(s) support; widespread faculty and student participation.
<b>Student Involvement</b>	Part of extracurricular student activities.	Organized support for volunteer work.	Opportunity for extra credit, internships, practicum experiences.	Service-learning courses integrated in curriculum; student involvement in community based research.
<b>Faculty Involvement</b>	Campus duties; committees; disciplinary focus.	Pro bono consulting; community volunteerism.	Tenured/senior faculty pursue community-based research; some teach service-learning courses.	Community research and service-learning a high priority; interdisciplinary and collaborative work.



<b>Community Involvement</b>	Random or limited individual or group involvement.	Community representation on advisory boards for departments or schools.	Community influences campus through active partnership or part-time teaching.	Community involved in designing, conducting and evaluating research and service-learning.
<b>Campus Publications</b>	Not an emphasis.	Stories of student volunteerism or alumni as good citizens.	Emphasis on economic impact, links between community and campus centers/institutes.	Community connection as central element; fundraising has community service as a focus.

There is no intention in the matrix to judge “correctness” or “goodness” regarding an institution’s choice of level of commitment. Rather, the intent is solely to provide a framework that may be useful to an institution in comparing where it ideally seeks to be positioned on the matrix and its assessment of its current location, all in the service of coherent institutional planning and decision-making.

- ▶ *Level One: Low Relevance.* “We would provide service to the community, if we had additional time and resources, but it is not specifically encouraged or rewarded”. Service is not integral to institutions at this level; they most often place higher priority on specific and unique instructional environments or on research. Service for faculty and administration involves participation on campus committees or in disciplinary societies. Students experience service through self-selected extracurricular club-based activities not linked to other university goals.
- ▶ *Level Two: Medium Relevant.* “We encourage faculty, students, and staff to be volunteer’s in their local communities because to do so is good for society at large and is ‘consistent with the actions of an educated person.’” This philosophy is common among institutions who view community service as evidence of good institutional citizenship and an ingredient in good community and public relations. Such institutions may have organized units that promote and organize extracurricular community service activities for students, and sometimes for faculty and staff as well. Faculty pro bono work with community organizations may be acknowledged when there is a benefit to the institution, but most faculty service is campus or discipline-based. The campus invites community participation on advisory groups. Service-learning may occur in scattered courses based on the self-motivation of faculty.
- ▶ *Level Three: High Relevance.* “Our mission sees the community as a laboratory for research and teaching purposes. We have expertise that can help solve community issues, and we can help study community problems. Our students spend time in community-based learning experiences and, in some cases, required service projects.” This approach might be called an outreach, one-way, or expert model of community-university interactions and service activities. This level features the support of service and service-learning through highly traditional and familiar scholarly roles that are compatible with traditional evaluation mechanisms. Service activities are often organized in separate centers or institutes focused on public issues and advised by community partners and

community leaders. Student involvement is typically extra- or co-curricular, and often is career-oriented (internships and practica). Service-learning is generally offered as a distinct and separate course or requirement segregated from the rest of the academic experience. Service experiences for students and faculty do not often overlap.

- ▶ *Level Four: Full Integration.* “We ask the community to be our partner in setting and conducting our scholarly service agenda. We invest in service-learning within the curricular experience of students, and have support and reward structures for faculty and students who engage in community-university partnerships.” This level represents institutions that take an interactive and interdependent relationship with the community as a defining characteristic of the overall academic mission. Community service and service-learning are deliberately supported and promoted as relevant to some aspect of virtually every person’s academic experience. In most cases, service is integrated with many teaching and research activities for faculty and students. There is a specific strategy for recognizing and rewarding service-based scholarship of faculty and students, and a deliberate strategy for supporting service-learning as an integral component of the curriculum for most or all students. This level is especially distinguished by the influential role given to the community in guiding and evaluating community-university interactions that are meant to be mutually beneficial—a clear move away from the ‘expert’ model of outreach.

## 2. Inventory Tool for Higher Education Civic Engagement

David Watson, 2004<sup>25</sup>

The original version of this assessment tool appears in the book *Managing Civic and Community Engagement* by David Watson. It was originally designed for the Association of Commonwealth Universities in 2004.

The questionnaire aims to address the following five issues:

- a. clarifying the institution’s historical and mission-based commitments to its host society;
- b. identifying how engagement informs and influences the institution’s range of operations;
- c. describing how the institution is organized to meet the challenge of civic engagement and social responsibility;
- d. assessing the contribution of staff, students and external partners to the engagement agenda; and
- e. monitoring achievements, constraints and future opportunities for civic engagement and social responsibility.

25 <https://talloiresnetwork.tufts.edu/wp-content/uploads/InventoryToolHigherEdCivicEngagement.pdf>

It ends with an invitation to highlight the top two contributions your institution can make to a global inventory of successful practices.

## 1. Mission and history

The following questions ask you to describe how the origins and development of your institution incorporate commitments to the development of the region and locality.

1.1. What relevant objectives are set for the institution in its founding document (charter or equivalent)?

1.2. What relevant expectations are held by those who fund your work and support it (including politically)?

1.3. Which external groups are represented *ex officio* and *de facto* on the institution's governance or senior management bodies? How are the relevant individuals chosen and how do they see their roles?

1.4. To whom does the institution regard itself as accountable for its civic mission? For example, is there a "stakeholder group" such as a University Court, and if so, how does this work?

1.5. Are civic engagement and social responsibility objectives (as defined by answers to question 1.1. above) specified in the institution's strategic plan? If so, how, and with what indicators of success?

1.6. Have changes over time in the institution's composition or status (e.g. mergers, acquisitions, large scale contracts) affected the engagement agenda? If so, in what manner?

## 2. Balance of activities

The following questions investigate how your institution's pattern of activities reflects a civic engagement and social responsibility agenda.

2.1. Give a brief assessment of the chief economic and social needs of your region and/or locality. Include a description of the main sources of this information.

2.2. How does the institution's teaching profile (by subject and level, and including continuous professional development [CPD] and lifelong learning) reflect the needs of the local community and region? To what extent does the curriculum incorporate relevant features of the following:

- a) structured and assessed work experience and/or work-based learning;
- b) "service-learning"; and/or
- c) prior or concurrent informal work experience?

2.2.1. How can representatives of the local and regional economy and community influence curriculum and other choices?

2.3. What proportion of the institution's research activity is directed towards the needs of the local and regional economy and society?

2.3.1. How can representatives of the local and regional economy and community influence research priorities?

2.4. How would the institution describe its service objectives (i.e. its commitments to business and the community)?

2.4.1. How can representatives of the local and regional economy and community influence activities in this area?

2.5. Using as a proxy an estimate of staff time (academic and support), how far is engagement in each of the areas outlined in this section (teaching, research and service) directed towards:

- a) large business and industrial interest (including global and national organizations present in the region);
- b) small and medium-sized enterprises;
- c) other public services (e.g. education, health, social services);
- d) the voluntary sector, community groups and NGOs; and
- e) cultural and artistic organizations?

[A matrix, summing to 100% as the total staff effort involved in civic engagement, might be helpful].

2.6. Does the institution have any other policies (e.g. on environmental responsibility,

equality of opportunity, recruitment, procurement of goods and services) which can act positively or negatively on the region and the locality?

### 3. Organization

The following questions seek to understand how your institution organises itself and deploys its resources (including human resources) to meet civic objectives.

3.1. Does the institution have specialised services to meet civic and related objectives (e.g. web-based resources, business advisory services, help-desks, formal consultancy and related services)?

3.1.1. If so, do these operate at a central or a devolved level, and if both how do the levels relate?

3.2. Does the institution have either dedicated or shared services which are community-facing (such as libraries, performance or exhibition spaces, and sports facilities)?

3.3. On what terms and with what frequency and volume of uptake are the institution's campus or campuses accessible to the community?

3.4. What arrangements are made for the security of the members, guests, and property of the institution?

### 4. People

The following questions will help to describe how policies and practice involve members of the institution including staff at various levels, students and formal partners in achieving goals related to civic engagement and social responsibility.

4.1. Who takes primary responsibility for the institution's work in civic engagement and social responsibility as defined in response to question 1.5. (above)?

4.2. Does the institution's policy for student recruitment have a local or a regional dimension? If so, how is this determined and what impact does it have on the make-up of the institution community?

4.3. To what extent are civic engagement and social responsibility objectives built into contractual terms for:

a) senior managers; b) academic staff; and c) support staff (including the specialised staff referred to in question 3.1. above)?

4.3.1. Can achievement against such objectives positively influence decisions on promotion and re-grading?

4.4. Reflecting on the answer to question 2.2. (above), how far is the student body engaged in the economic and cultural life of the community through formal requirements?

4.5. What proportion of the student body (for example, postgraduate or post-experience students) is concurrently in full-time local or regionally-based employment?

4.6. What encouragement is there for members of staff to undertake aspects of community service (e.g. service on boards of other organisations, pro bono advice, elected political office)?

4.7. What is the extent of student volunteering in the community, and how is this organised? Does it attract: a) formal support (e.g. timetable concessions, payment of expenses); and/or b) academic credit?

## 5. Monitoring, evaluation and communication

The following questions seek to understand how your institution sets objectives and targets for civic engagement and social responsibility, monitors and evaluates achievement, and communicates both their intentions and related activities.

5.1. Has the institution undertaken any survey research to test internal and/or external interest in and proposals for the civic engagement and social responsibility agenda? If so, please summarise the results.

5.2. What steps does the institution take to consult upon and publicise its civic engagement and social responsibility agenda? (It may be helpful to review such publications as Annual Reports, newsletters and alumni communications).

5.3. What do you regard as the level of public confidence held at national, regional and

local level in the overall performance of your institution? What steps can be taken either to maintain or improve this level?

As a final step, please highlight your institution's top two contributions to the global inventory of higher education civic engagement and social responsibility. These highlights will in particular be shared with the membership of the Talloires Network in an effort to share experiences of successes and create a portfolio of best practices.

### 3. Dimensions of university public engagement<sup>26</sup>

Hart, Northmore and Gerhardt, 2009:4-5

DIMENSION OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT	EXAMPLES OF ENGAGEMENT	EVALUATION AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE/ OUTCOMES
<b>1. Public access to facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to university libraries.</li> <li>• Access to university buildings and physical facilities eg for conferences, meetings, events, accommodation, gardens etc.</li> <li>• Shared facilities eg. museums, art galleries.</li> <li>• Public access to sports facilities.</li> <li>• Summer sports schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased public support for the institution.</li> <li>• Better informed public.</li> <li>• Improved health and wellbeing.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Public access to knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to established university curricula.</li> <li>• Public engagement events eg. science fairs; science shops.</li> <li>• Publicly accessible database of university expertise.</li> <li>• Public involvement in research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased quality of life and wellbeing.-Increased social capital/social; cohesion/social. inclusion.-Enhanced public scholarship.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Student engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student volunteering.</li> <li>• Experiential learning eg. practice placements; collaborative research projects.</li> <li>• Curricular engagement.</li> <li>• Student-led activities eg. arts, environment, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased student sense of civic engagement.</li> <li>• Increased political participation.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Faculty engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research centres draw on community advisers for support/direction.</li> <li>• Volunteering outside working hours eg on trustee.</li> <li>• Boards of local charities.</li> <li>• Staff with social/community engagement as a specific part of their job.</li> <li>• Promotion policies that reward social engagement.</li> <li>• Research helpdesk/advisory boards.</li> <li>• Public lectures -Alumni services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social benefit to the community.</li> <li>• Increased staff sense of civic engagement.</li> <li>• Institutionalized faculty engagement.</li> <li>• More 'grounded' research.</li> </ul>

26 [https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/EvaluatingPublicEngagementSummary\\_1.pdf](https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/EvaluatingPublicEngagementSummary_1.pdf)

DIMENSION OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT	EXAMPLES OF ENGAGEMENT	EVALUATION AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE/ OUTCOMES
<b>5. Widening participation</b>  (equalities and diversity)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improving recruitment and success rate of students from non-traditional backgrounds through innovative initiatives eg. access courses, financial assistance, peer mentoring.</li> <li>A publicly available strategy for encouraging access by students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved recruitment and retention of undergraduates, especially from excluded communities.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Encouraging economic regeneration and enterprise in social engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research collaboration and technology transfer.</li> <li>Meeting regional skills needs and supporting SMEs.</li> <li>Initiatives to expand innovation and design eg. bringing together staff, students and community members to design, develop and test Assistive Technology for people with disabilities.</li> <li>Business advisory services offering support for community-university collaborations (eg. social enterprises).</li> <li>Prizes for entrepreneurial projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local/regional economic regeneration</li> <li>Social and economic benefit to the community.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Institutional relationship and partnership building</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University division or office for community engagement.</li> <li>Collaborative community-based research programmes.</li> <li>responsive to community-identified needs.</li> <li>Community-university networks for learning / dissemination/knowledge exchange.</li> <li>Community members on Board of Governance.</li> <li>Public ceremonies, awards, competitions and events.</li> <li>Website with community pages.</li> <li>Policies on equalities; recruitment; procurement of goods and services; environmental responsibility.-International links.</li> <li>Conferences with public access and public concerns.</li> <li>Helpdesk facility</li> <li>Corporate social responsibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More effective strategic investment of resources.</li> <li>Conservation of natural resources and reduced environmental footprint.</li> <li>Expanded and effective community partnerships.</li> <li>Social and economic benefit to the community.</li> </ul>

#### 4. Inventory of Tools for Assessing University Capacity, Support for, and Outcomes of Community/Civic Engagement and Community-Engaged Scholarship

Wenger and MacInnis, 2011<sup>27</sup>

This inventory is designed as a resource for those interested in assessing university capacity, support, and outcomes for community engagement and community-engaged scholarship (CE/CES). Developed through a search of primarily quantitative assessment

<sup>27</sup> [http://pumr.pascalobservatory.org/sites/default/files/assessment\\_tool\\_inventory.pdf](http://pumr.pascalobservatory.org/sites/default/files/assessment_tool_inventory.pdf)



tools identified within the grey literature and peer-reviewed articles, this inventory is presented to the CES Partnership work group charged with analyzing these instruments and developing a standardized assessment tool for the purposes of the partnership. As this is an evolving area of practice and scholarship, this inventory should be treated as a starting

*This inventory is designed as a resource for those interested in assessing university capacity, support, and outcomes for community engagement and community-engaged scholarship.*

point for discussion. In addition, it should be noted that this inventory is not focused on tools designed to assess specific CE programs, service-learning courses or community-campus partnerships.

SUMMARY OF KEY DOMAINS	CCPH (#12)	Furco (#7)	Holland (#11)	Beacon (#4)	CC (#1)	Carnegie (#8)	Minnesota (#19)	CIC (#15)	TTN (#16)
<b>MISSION / PURPOSE</b>									
<b>Clarity:</b> Clear and consistent definition of terms (used consistently and known by administration, faculty & students)	x	x				x			
<b>Commitment:</b> Identified in institutional mission docs/strategies; Promoted as an institutional priority, Updated as necessary	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
<b>Integration:</b> Integrated with other mission elements (student/faculty recruitment, teaching, partnerships); Connected to funding, activities	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
<b>SUPPORT FROM THE AUTHORITIES</b>									
<b>Appreciation:</b> Senior leaders understand importance and value of CE to institution's agenda	x	x	x	x	x	x			x
<b>Performance:</b> Visible support by seniors leader-word and act	x	x	x		x	x			
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>									
<b>Specific plan:</b> Clear plan for the strengthening CE (including short and long-term goals, success indicators)	x	x	x	x	x	x			x
<b>Supportive policy:</b> For rewarding/engaging faculty (reward, hiring, appoint); support commitment to local agencies / bussines, SR, Environ	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>Coordinating body:</b> Coordinating structure, committee focused on CE implementation, advancement, record-keeping	x	x	x	x	x	x			x
<b>Dedicated staff:</b> Dedicated, permanent staff with decision-making authority	x	x	x	x	x		x		x
<b>Sufficient resources:</b> Adequate & on-going physical and financial resources (departmental, institutional) internal and external Budget	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

SUMMARY OF KEY DOMAINS	CCPH (#12)	Furco (#7)	Holland (#11)	Beacon (#4)	CC (#1)	Carnegie (#8)	Minnesota (#19)	CIC (#15)	TTN (#16)
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>									
<b>Comprehensive Access:</b> CE opp. provided across programs/departments-not dependent on individual faculty		X	X		X	X	X		X
<b>Flexibility:</b> The institution enables students and faculty through flexible scheduling options, as necessitated by community based-work					X				
<b>FACULTY ENGAGEMENT</b>									
<b>Awareness:</b> Faculty are aware of CE priorities of institution (linked to communication)	X	X			X	X			
<b>Opportunities:</b> Faculty have opportunities for involvement as part of formal duties (not just volunteer)	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
<b>Encouragement:</b> Faculty are encouraged to participate/produce (high priority)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Participation:</b> Faculty actively participate in CE through teaching, service, research	X	X			X	X		X	X
<b>Development:</b> Faculty have access to development opportunities	X			X	X	X	X	X	
<b>Reward:</b> Faculty are rewarded to participation and knowledge distribution (e.g. T&P, grants, awards, sabbaticals, etc.)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Leadership:</b> Faculty act as leaders/advocates	X	X				X	X	X	
<b>STUDENT ENGAGEMENT</b>									
<b>Awareness:</b> Students are aware of CE opportunities (linked to communication)	X	X			X	X		X	
<b>Opportunities:</b> Students have options for co-curricular and curricular CE participation (including capstone courses)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Participation:</b> Students actively participate in opportunities	X					X		X	X
<b>Development:</b> Students develop skills related to CE work (more explicit than indications of relevant courses)	X			X	X	X	X	X	
<b>Reward:</b> Students are rewarded for participation (e.g. credits, certification, formal and informal recognition)	X	X			X	X	X		X
<b>Leadership:</b> Students serve in leadership roles and as ambassadors	X	X			X	X	X		
<b>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b>									
<b>Strong partnerships:</b> Trust; communication around needs, timelines, resources, capacities, goals, etc.; Relationship maintained & valued	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
<b>Access:</b> Community has clear access to university-based knowledge/resources/facilities/activities	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X

SUMMARY OF KEY DOMAINS	CCPH (#12)	Furco (#7)	Holland (#11)	Beacon (#4)	CC (#1)	Carnegie (#8)	Minnesota (#19)	CIC (#15)	TTN (#16)
<b>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b>									
<b>Voice:</b> Systematic process for soliciting community feedback and involvement and facilitating dialogue around public issues; Opportunities for community involvement in T & P processes and/or institutional committees	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>Rewards/Compensation:</b> Incentive & rewards offered to community for involvement; Financial compensation offered for participation	x				x				
<b>Impact:</b> Community experiences social and/or economic benefits for community (and institution) – not just value it, but measure it.					x			x	
<b>Diversity:</b> Commitment to engaging a diversity of communities.					x			x	
<b>Leadership:</b> Opportunities for community leadership; Integration of community expertise.	x	x	x		x		x		x
<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>									
<b>Internal:</b> Formal communication around CE activities within institution (curricular & co-curricular) – include attention to value/resources	x			x	x	x	x		x
<b>External:</b> Dissemination of information around research & partnerships beyond the institution (academic & broader community)	x	x	x			x	x		x
<b>EVALUATIONS MECHANISMS</b>									
<b>Development:</b> Community involved in developing assessment tools.			x					x	
<b>Collection:</b> Structure in place for on-going, systemic evaluation of CE activities-number, quality, impact on multiple stakeholders.	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
<b>Use:</b> Collected data are used, communicated within and outside institution.	x					x	x		

## 5. Community Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Assessment: A Review of Canadian Practices

Leonzo Barreno, Patricia W. Elliott, Ijeoma Madueke and Dominique Sarny.

Research Report prepared for the Faculty Assessment Workgroup Rewarding Community Engaged Scholarship: Transforming University Policies and Practices University of Regina, September 2013.<sup>28</sup>

### Characteristics of Community Engaged Scholarship (CES)

#### A Rubric for Evidencing CES

*This rubric is meant to be a guide for community-engaged scholars and those assessing their scholarship. This rubric may be completed by faculty, promotion and tenure committees, and/or community stakeholders.*

This rubric is meant to be a guide for community-engaged scholars and those assessing their scholarship. This rubric may be completed by faculty, promotion and tenure committees, and/or community stakeholders. Please refer to the associated Hand-

book for more information on CES. Given the sometimes unpredictable nature of CES, this rubric may be adapted to reflect long CES-term, multi-faceted projects, with different phases, by, for example, breaking down the CES initiative into phases, and completing a separate rubric for each phase. For example, part of a project may have extensive participant involvement, but another part may not, either by design or by the relative level of interest among community members. As well, most projects are multi-year. The “Characteristics” are meant as a guide and may have to be adapted based on the project, community and institutional contexts. The “Weight” section, left blank, allows for customization and prioritization of Characteristics.

**Table 3:** Characteristics of Community Engaged Scholarship (CES). A Rubric for Evidencing CES

28 [https://www.mtroyal.ca/AboutMountRoyal/TeachingLearning/CSLearning/\\_pdfs/adc\\_csl\\_pdf\\_res\\_revcanpract.pdf](https://www.mtroyal.ca/AboutMountRoyal/TeachingLearning/CSLearning/_pdfs/adc_csl_pdf_res_revcanpract.pdf)

WEIGHT	CHARACTERISTIC	LOWEST	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGHEST	TOTAL
	Problem identification by the community.	Conducting research on issues identified by the researcher.			Stakeholder partnership defines research.	
	Clear and important academic and community Change Goals - relevant research question.	Unidentifiable or unclear community outcomes.			Clear and measurable community outcomes.	
	Community involvement in research process.	Engaging with community stakeholders as subjects.			Includes all stakeholders and elicits under-represented perspectives.	
	Clear and measurable community outcomes / transformation.	Ambiguous and vague community outcomes.			Clear, measurable, and observable community outcomes.	
	Significant results: Builds community and institutional capacity.	Does not build capacity within the institution or community.			Builds significant institutional and community capacity.	
	Effective dissemination to academic and community audiences.	No dissemination of impact or lessons learned.			Collaborative scholarship and dissemination through a variety of community and peer-reviewed academic routes.	
	Reflective critique: Lessons learned to improve scholarship and community engagement.	Does not include self-reflexive, peer, community and stakeholder critique/evaluation.			Clear evidence of praxis for both community and academic stakeholders	
	Leadership and personal contribution.	Inflexible in adapting/anticipation changing contexts.			Demonstrates ability to adapt to changing contexts.	
	Consistently ethical behaviour: socially responsible conduct of research and teaching.	Does not demonstrate social responsibility.			Evidence of academic focus on equalizing power imbalances between stakeholders.	

## 6. Measuring higher education civic and community engagement a support framework, campus engage, Irish universities association (Campus Engage, 2018)<sup>29</sup>

*This Campus Engage Guide is offered as a support tool for all Irish Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to set about collecting information on existing strategic plans, policy, and infrastructure for engagement.*

This Campus Engage Guide is offered as a support tool for all Irish Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to set about collecting information on existing strategic plans, policy, and infrastructure for engagement. Its purpose is

<sup>29</sup> <https://www.iua.ie/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/MEASURING-HIGHER-EDUCATION-CIVIC-AND-COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT.pdf>

to assist HEIs to set new baseline figures, or key performance indicators, for engagement activity across research, teaching and learning, student volunteering and public engagement. The Guide aims to complement HEI's existing activity, and to prompt Institutions to consider new activities that advance clear outcomes and measures for success. In that sense, the Guide is more an aide-memoire than a prescriptive list.

## Dimensions and definitions

This document proposes five dimensions to consider when measuring and evaluating higher education civic and community engagement. These dimensions reflect the Campus Engage Charter, mirror the activities of the various Campus Engage Working Groups, and acknowledge the broader institutional initiatives which build and support a culture of engagement. It should be possible to provide data under each of the five dimensions to represent the range, volume and impact of engagement activity.

The five dimensions: 1) Engaged Research, 2) Teaching and Learning: Accredited Community Engaged Learning and Research, 3) Student Volunteering, 4) Public Engagement and Involvement, 5) Institutional, and 6) Infrastructure and Architecture.

## Evidence and impact

There are a number of indicators of qualitative and quantitative evidence of impact, some of which are provided below.

## Quantitative data

- ▶ Numeric data, figures, percentages, proportions
- ▶ Monetary amounts, funds, budgets
- ▶ Targets, projections, estimations
- ▶ Comparisons, benchmarks
- ▶ Data analytics
- ▶ Grants, awards
- ▶ Participant, audience, visitor involvement
- ▶ Test/exam results
- ▶ Workload/time allocation
- ▶ Attitudinal surveys

## Qualitative data

- ▶ Impact case studies
- ▶ Contextual information: what, where, why, who and how of engagement
- ▶ Institutional documentation: strategies, plans, policies, reports
- ▶ Partnership agreements/guidelines/compacts
- ▶ Resources/materials/toolkits/websites/templates
- ▶ Measures of Esteem/Feedback: Evaluations from students, staff, communities
- ▶ Interviews/focus groups
- ▶ Blogs, video, audio, podcasts
- ▶ Awards
- ▶ Narrative reports
- ▶ Participant stories and narratives
- ▶ Process details and charts
- ▶ Reflective writings

## Some existing qualitative and quantitative data sources that maybe used include:

- ▶ The Irish Survey of Student Engagement (ISSE): <https://studentsurvey.ie/>
- ▶ National student volunteer portal: <https://studentvolunteer.ie/>
- ▶ Bibliometrics (the quantitative analysis of publications).
- ▶ *Altmetrics* capture the attention a resource generates through blogs, reference management systems, scholarly social networks, and other platforms.
- ▶ Social media metrics: reach, likes, retweets, comments.
- ▶ Engaged Research Funding call criteria.
- ▶ Quality reviews and self-assessment.

The following page specifies dimensions/definitions and possible metrics to be used for evaluation.

DIMENSION/DEFINITION	POSSIBLE METRICS
<p><b>a. Engaged research:</b></p> <p>Engaged Research describes a wide range of rigorous research approaches and methodologies that share a common interest in collaborative engagement with the community. It aims to improve, understand, or investigate an issue of public interest or concern, including societal challenges. Engaged research is advanced with community partners rather than for them. 'Community' refers to a range of public research stakeholders, including public or professional service and product users, policy makers, civil and civic society organizations (CSOs) and actors (Engaged Research: Society and Higher Education Working Together to Address Societal Challenges, Campus Engage, 2017).</p>	<p><b>Provide data and examples (e.g. statistics, numbers, case studies, stories) on/of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and previous research projects and partners.</li> <li>• Research income generated from engaged research projects.</li> <li>• Number and reach of engaged research publications (alt/bibliometric).</li> <li>• Percentage of publications co-created with patients, members of the public, civic or civil society organizations, government agencies.</li> <li>• Grey literature, public information publications, infographics and other outputs.</li> <li>• New skills and competencies generated by engaged research and its findings.</li> <li>• New products, patents and intellectual property from engaged research.</li> <li>• New capacity building programmes developed / licensed / revised based on engaged research.</li> <li>• Modules, courses and training provided to build staff capacity in engaged research.</li> <li>• Examples of initiatives to promote Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI).</li> <li>• New or improved public services informed by engaged research evidence.</li> <li>• Media debates highlighting new research evidence and informing public debate.</li> <li>• New or revised public policy or plans informed by engaged research evidence.</li> <li>• Engaged research partnership agreements.</li> <li>• Engaged research projects that incorporate transdisciplinary approaches.</li> <li>• Events, including public lectures, showcasing engaged research activity.</li> <li>• Other activities which build upon and improve institutional and community capacity to develop projects and conduct engaged research.</li> <li>• Social media activity metrics (analysis of social media discussions and impressions).</li> <li>• Online and off-line media activities: podcasts, open source materials, MOOCs.</li> <li>• Open Access initiatives, including greater accessibility and usability of datasets.</li> <li>• Use of tools to measure attitudinal, capacity, competency changes.</li> <li>• Supervision of PhD and postdoctoral researchers advancing engaged research.</li> <li>• Honours and fellowships based on engaged research activities.</li> <li>• Committees, advisory boards and working groups that advance engaged research practices and crosssectoral collaborations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>b. Teaching and learning: accredited community engaged learning and research.</b></p> <p>Community-engaged learning and research are academic approaches that seeks to engage and accredit students, within the curriculum, for working in partnership with civic and civil society organisations (CSOs) to act on local societal challenges.</p>	<p><b>Provide data and examples (e.g. statistics/numbers/case studies/stories) on/of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accredited community-based engaged teaching, learning and/or research modules offered.</li> <li>• Accredited community-based engaged teaching, learning and/or research projects completed.</li> <li>• Percentage of students taking accredited community-engaged teaching, learning and/or research modules.</li> <li>• Percentage of programmes offering community-engaged teaching, learning and/or research modules.</li> <li>• Percentage of staff supervising community-engaged teaching, learning and/or research modules.</li> <li>• Number of organizations, charities, civil and civic society organisations, etc., collaborating to offer accredited community-engaged teaching, learning and research modules.</li> <li>• Number of staff who have completed capacity building programmes in accredited community engaged teaching, learning and/or engaged research.</li> <li>• Initiatives to empower and support communities and staff to develop/implement community engaged learning.</li> <li>• Number of hours community partners contribute in co-coordinating/engaging with students in community-engaged learning (monetary and economic value of these hours).</li> <li>• Community partner testimonials.</li> <li>• Percentage of students who report improved/enhanced graduate attributes through accredited community-based learning (e.g. communication, team work, IT, higher order thinking skills, analysis, understanding complex problems, career awareness skills, technical skills, etc.).</li> <li>• Percentage of students satisfied with accredited community-engaged teaching, learning and research opportunities.</li> <li>• Student ratings of personal and social outcomes (e.g. self-esteem, confidence empowerment, respect for others, civic responsibility, local/global citizenship, communication skills, teamwork due to accredited community-engaged teaching and learning).</li> <li>• Student rating of professional and/or subject/discipline outcomes (e.g. graduate attributes, higher order thinking skills, analysis, understanding complex problems, career awareness skills, technical skills, teamwork due to accredited community-engaged teaching and research).</li> <li>• Student rating of engaged learning experiences (e.g. course evaluations) and percentage of students satisfied with community-engaged learning opportunities.</li> <li>• Percentage of students reporting enhanced social networks due to accredited community-engaged teaching, learning and research.</li> <li>• Number and reach of publications on innovating and developing practice.</li> </ul>



<p><b>c. Student volunteering:</b></p> <p>Higher education student volunteering is the commitment of time and energy for the benefit of society and the community, the environment or individuals outside one's immediate family. It is undertaken freely and by choice, without concern for financial gain. <a href="https://www.studentvolunteer.ie/">https://www.studentvolunteer.ie/</a> is a one-stop-shop portal connecting higher education students with civil society organisation volunteering opp</p>	<p><b>Provide data and examples (e.g. statistics/numbers/case studies/stories) on/of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of students who volunteer.</li> <li>• Social media metrics related to student volunteering.</li> <li>• Number of organizations affiliated to student volunteering/ hosting student volunteers.</li> <li>• Total number of hours students volunteer.</li> <li>• Average number of hours students volunteer per week .</li> <li>• Monetary value of hours donated (use the Volunteer Investment and Value Audit tool) .</li> <li>• Percentage of student volunteers who receive institutional volunteering awards.</li> <li>• Percentage of students who report improved/enhanced graduate attributes through volunteering: communication, team work, IT, higher order thinking skills; analysis, understanding complex problems, career awareness skills, technical skills etc.</li> <li>• Percentage of students who report improved/enhanced personal attributes: wellbeing, self-esteem, empowerment, respect for others, civic responsibility, local/global citizenship etc.</li> <li>• Qualitative impact of volunteering on student learning outcomes: case studies/ stories of how volunteering enhanced student learning.</li> <li>• Number, and impact, of training programmes delivered to promote and advance student volunteering good practice; number of participants who attended.</li> <li>• Institutional budget/staff dedicated to support volunteering.</li> <li>• Protocols/procedures/guidelines on how students are selected, trained, and supported.</li> <li>• Percentage of students who would recommend volunteering or their volunteer experience.</li> <li>• Percentage of hosting organisations who report positive experience working with student volunteers, perception of work done by volunteers.</li> <li>• Percentage of students reporting enhanced social networks.</li> <li>• Statistics on retention of volunteers.</li> <li>• Charitable actions: number of institutional and partner fundraising events, number of attendees, amount raised.</li> </ul>
<p><b>d. Public engagement:</b></p> <p>Public engagement and involvement captures the broad range of initiatives, activities and events which combine to create a culture of societal engagement with higher education. Public engagement is about the institution facing outwards and connecting as widely as possible to communicate the value of learning and research and to leverage institutional knowledge and resources for social good.</p>	<p><b>Provide data and examples (e.g. statistics/numbers/case studies/stories) on/of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional resources provided as outreach to the community and utilized by members of the public and civil society organisations (e.g. campus facilities, sports amenities, library, archives, museums, IT services, lifelong learning programmes).</li> <li>• Connections to, and/or partnerships with, public agencies, cultural organizations, professional bodies, civic and civil society organisations, non-governmental organizations and charitable bodies which are mutually beneficial.</li> <li>• Educational programmes which foster, on a sustained basis, relationships with primary and secondary schools and their communities to widen participation.</li> <li>• Initiatives designed to support widening participation of students, their families and communities.</li> <li>• Number and impact of public intellectual activities (e.g. contribution of staff to public debate).</li> <li>• Number and impact of staff who serve on local, community and charitable organization committees.</li> <li>• Number of staff who act as consultants or advisors to community and voluntary bodies, public agencies and civil society organizations.</li> <li>• Number of staff who volunteer in community groups, organizations, civil society organizations, and NGOs.</li> <li>• Actions and activities which assist with community capacity building.</li> <li>• Involvement of community representatives in governance and advisory structures.</li> <li>• Initiatives to promote sustainability actions (e.g. green campus initiatives).</li> <li>• Number and impact of public events (e.g. learning festivals/events, Science Galleries, Festival of Social Science, Festival of the Mind, Science/Poetry Bus, Images of Research, Thesis in Three, SciComm, public talks and lecture series).</li> <li>• Number attending institutional public events and evaluations, if applicable.</li> <li>• Open access resources (e.g. free MOOCs, podcasts, web materials, blogs, video, archives, museum collections).</li> <li>• Number of school visits and talks / Number of campus tours.</li> <li>• Social media metrics (e.g. analysis of social media discussions and impression).</li> </ul>

<p><b>e. Institutional infrastructure and architecture:</b></p> <p>Institutional infrastructure and architecture relates to the strategies, policies, practices, and resources put in place to implement, sustain and embed civic and community engagement as a core institutional activity.</p>	<p><b>Provide data and examples (e.g. statistics/numbers/case studies/stories) on/of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional leadership / appointment for civic and community engagement.</li> <li>• A governance framework for civic and community engagement.</li> <li>• An institutional Civic and Community Engagement strategy, policy, and/or plan.</li> <li>• An institutional unit/structure for civic and community engagement.</li> <li>• A budget dedicated to civic and community engagement.</li> <li>• Staff employed specifically to drive and foster civic and community engagement activities.</li> <li>• A plan/programme to build institutional understanding of engagement with the wider community as a core higher education activity.</li> <li>• A policy on recruitment and promotion which weights civic and community engagement activity.</li> <li>• Programmes and training offered to build institutional and community capacity.</li> <li>• An institutional system/procedure to capture civic and community engagement data.</li> <li>• A civic and community engagement dimension to Quality Assurance mechanisms.</li> <li>• Institutional awards and honours (e.g. President's Awards, Teaching and Learning, Student Awards which recognise and celebrate civic and community engagement).</li> <li>• A workload allocation model which recognises and rewards time invested in community engagement.</li> <li>• A commitment to civic and community engagement through membership and involvement with. national and international community engagement networks (e.g. Campus Engage, Talloires Network etc).</li> </ul>
--	--

## 7. The EDGE tool-self-assessment matrix

(National Co-coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, 2018)<sup>30</sup>

The self-assessment matrix has nine focal points that allow evaluating the progress of the universities' public participation, describing the EDGE stages (EMBRYONIC, DEVELOPING, GRIPPING, EMBEDDING).

	FOCUS	EMBRYONIC	DEVELOPING	GRIPPING	EMBEDDING
PURPOSE	<p><b>Mission</b></p> <p>Have you created a shared understanding of the purpose, value and meaning of engagement and embedded this in your strategy and mission?</p>	There is little or no reference to public engagement in the organizational mission or in other institution-wide strategies.	Public engagement is referenced sporadically within the institutional mission documents and strategies, but is not considered a priority area.	Public engagement is clearly referenced within the institutional mission and strategies and the institution is developing an institution-wide strategic approach.	Public engagement is prioritized in the institution's official mission and in other key strategies, with success indicators identified. It is a key consideration in strategic developments in the institution.
	<p><b>Leadership</b></p> <p>Do you support champions across the organization who embrace engagement?</p>	Few (if any) of the most influential leaders in the institution serve as champions for public engagement.	Some of the institution's senior team act as informal champions for public engagement.	Some of the institution's senior team act as formal champions for public engagement.	The Vice Chancellor acts as a champion for public engagement and a senior leader takes formal responsibility. All senior leaders have an understanding of the importance and value of public engagement to the institution's agenda.

<sup>30</sup> [https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/nccpe\\_edge\\_tool.pdf](https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/nccpe_edge_tool.pdf)

	FOCUS	EMBRYONIC	DEVELOPING	GRIPPING	EMBEDDING
PURPOSE	<p><b>Communication</b></p> <p>Do you communicate consistent, clear messages to validate, support and celebrate it, and ensure open and two-way communication with internal and external stakeholders?</p>	The institution's commitment to public engagement is rarely, if ever, featured in internal or external communications.	Public engagement occasionally features in internal and external communications.	Public engagement frequently features in internal communications, but rarely as a high-profile item or with an emphasis on its strategic importance.	Public engagement appears prominently in the institution's internal communications; its strategic importance is highlighted, and resources and strategic support have been allocated to sustain this.
PROCESS	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>How do you coordinate your support to maximise efficiency, target support, improve quality, foster innovation, join up thinking and monitor effectiveness?</p>	There is no attempt to coordinate public engagement activity or to network learning and expertise across the institution.	There are some informal attempts being made to coordinate public engagement activities, but there is no strategic plan for this work. Some self-forming networks exist, not supported by the institution.	Oversight and coordination of public engagement has been formally allocated (e.g. to a working group or committee) but there is minimal support and resource to invest in activity.	The institution has a strategic plan to focus its coordination, a body/ies with formal responsibility for oversight of this plan, and resources available to assist the embedding of public engagement. There are a number of recognised and supported networks.
	<p><b>Learning</b></p> <p>What opportunities do you provide for learning and reflection and what support do you provide for CPD?</p>	There is little or no opportunity for staff or students to access professional development to develop their skills and knowledge of public engagement.	There are some opportunities for staff or students to access professional development and training in public engagement, but no formal or systematic support.	There are some formal opportunities for staff or students to access professional development and training in public engagement.	Staff and students are encouraged and supported in accessing professional development, training and informal learning to develop their skills and knowledge of engagement.
	<p><b>Recognition</b></p> <p>How do you recognise and reward staff involvement within recruitment, promotion, workload plans and performance reviews, and how do you celebrate success?</p>	Staff are not formally rewarded or recognised for their public engagement activities.	Some departments recognise and reward public engagement activity on an ad hoc basis.	The university is working towards an institution-wide policy for recognising and rewarding public engagement activity.	The university has reviewed its processes, and developed a policy to ensure public engagement is rewarded and recognised in formal and informal ways.
PEOPLE	<p><b>Staff</b></p> <p>Do you ensure that all staff—in academic and support roles—have opportunities to get involved in informal and formal ways?</p>	Few if any opportunities exist for staff to get involved in public engagement, either informally, or as part of their formal duties.	There are opportunities for staff in a handful of faculties or departments to get involved in public engagement, either informally or as part of their formal duties.	There are structured opportunities for many staff members to get involved in public engagement; but not in all faculties or departments. There is a drive to expand opportunities to all.	All staff have the opportunity to get involved in public engagement, either informally or as part of their formal duties, and are encouraged and supported to do so.

FOCUS	EMBRYONIC	DEVELOPING	GRIPPING	EMBEDDING	
P E O P L E	<b>Students</b> How are students involved and what opportunities do they have to contribute their expertise and energy?	Few opportunities exist for students to get involved in public engagement, either informally, through volunteering programmes, or as part of the formal curriculum.	There are opportunities for students to get involved, but there is no coordinated approach to promoting and supporting these opportunities across the institution.	Many (but not all) students have the opportunity to get involved in public engagement and are encouraged and supported to do so. There is a drive to expand opportunities to all.	All students have the opportunity to get involved in public engagement, and are encouraged and supported to do so. The institution offers both formal and informal ways to recognize and reward their involvement.
	<b>Public</b> Do you proactively involve stakeholders / users / publics in shaping the mission and in the delivery of the strategy, and maximise opportunities for their involvement?	Little or no attempt has been made to assess community need, or to support “non-traditional” groups in engaging with the institution.	Some attempt has been made to analyse community need and interest; and to begin to tackle access issues to open up the institution and its activities to the public.	The institution has committed resources to assessing community need and interests, and to using this insight and feedback to inform its strategy and plans.	The institution has assessed need and committed resources to supporting a wide range of groups to access its facilities and activities, and to systematically seek their feedback and involvement.

## 8. A guide for institutionalizing service-learning into a degree program

(Caire, Jouannet, Montalva and Ponce, 2018)

The “Guide for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning into a Degree Program” (Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, CU) offers specific resources: (a) a diagram for the process of institutionalization of service-learning (SL)<sup>31</sup> into a degree program (estimated two-year development), (b) self-assessment rubric for SL sustainability in an academic unit.

**Table 4:** SL Institutionalization Diagram (Caire, Jouannet, Montalva and Ponce, 2018:12)

<b>STAGE I:</b> <b>Beginning of institutionalization</b>	Formation of SL committee. Application of Self-Assessment Rubric.
<b>STAGE II:</b> <b>Diagnosis</b>	Consistency among official CU and SL documents. Compilation of foreign SL case stories. Compilation of institution's case stories/SWOT analysis.
<b>STAGE III:</b> <b>Implementation design and proposal</b>	Definition of cross-cutting skills. Identification of pilot courses. Definition of profile of community partners. Internal management of degree program / teachers' training.
<b>STAGE IV:</b> <b>Implementation and assessment</b>	Implementation of pilot courses. Process assessment. Final decisions for continuity.

31 The Pontifical Catholic University of Chile uses the acronym A+S, which stands for Aprendizaje Servicio (Service-learning) in its documents.

## Self-Assessment Rubric for Sustainability of SL in an Academic Unit (CU)<sup>32</sup>

(Caire, Jouannet, Montalva and Ponce, 2018: 44-51)

**Table 5:** Self-Assessment Rubric for Sustainability of SL in an Academic Unit (CU)

DIMENSION	SUB-DIMENSION	LEVELS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION		
		BEGINNING (1)	IN PROCESS (2)	CONSOLIDATION (3)
<b>1. Incorporation of SL from a curricular approach</b>	1.1.- In corporation of SL in line with institutional mission, impression and graduate profile	The presence of SL in the degree program(s) is aligned with the Catholic University's institutional mission and profile.	The presence of SL in the degree program(s) is aligned only with the CU's institutional mission and profile, as the graduate profile does not reflect the elements or skills associated with the methodology. However, there is an explicit intention to carry out the required adjustments, as the academic unit intends to train its students in the skills associated with SL.	The presence of SL in the degree program(s) is in line with the academic unit's stated graduate profile, and is consistent with the institutional mission and educational project.
	1.2.- Definition of courses that will implement SL in the curriculum	SL courses potentially included in the curriculum are identified, which will be piloted in a subsequent stage. Courses may include prior SL implementation experiences.	The methodology is implemented as a pilot in a variety of courses to identify the relevance and scope of the methodology in specific course contexts.	The implementation in the identified courses is consolidated after more than one implementation. New courses can be added into the consolidated curriculum at this stage.
	1.3.- Incorporation of cross-cutting skills associated with the SL methodology in those courses that will implement SL	SL courses developed at the Academic Unit have addressed skills associated with SL. However, efforts towards institutionalizing this learning goal have not been made in all of them, nor has the level of achievement of the skill been identified or determined.	The skills to be addressed in each course as part of the pilot have been determined, but have not necessarily been declared in all course syllabi or their specific level has not been determined. The manner of monitoring the skill in the students has been planned for or carried out in the pilots.	SL courses have cross-cutting skills defined and declared in their syllabi, which specify the specific level of the skill addressed. The achievement of the skills is monitored on a permanent basis. The skill of community engagement is addressed at all levels within the curriculum, which is targeted at a twofold transformation: that of society and that of the student, and is based on the CU's mission and principles.
	1.4.- Opportunity for students to learn with the SL model	SL courses developed in the unit are isolated experiences (1 or 2) but are sustained over time (more than 2 years), or several courses implemented the SL methodology, but they extend less than 2 years.	Students can take 3 subjects with the SL approach throughout their course of studies if they wish, since courses identified as "SL" are not necessarily part of the minimum required courses or taught on a permanent basis, thereby not ensuring at least 3 SL experiences throughout a student's course of studies.	Students take at least 3 courses with the SL approach throughout their course of studies, thinking that it is necessary to give continuity to service-learning and to the development of any associated skill.

32 <https://cld.bz/skUYaPu/44/>

DIMENSION	SUB-DIMENSION	LEVELS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION		
		BEGINNING (1)	IN PROCESS (2)	CONSOLIDATION (3)
<b>1. Incorporation of SL from a curricular approach</b>	1.5.-Implementation of quality in the core elements of the SL methodology into courses.	Most courses face quality issues, so implementation should be improved. Quality implies that at least the core elements of the methodology, service aligned with goals, reflection and quality service should be achieved.	A few courses face quality issues in their methodological implementation, taking into account that at least the core elements of the methodology, service aligned to goals, reflection and quality service are achieved.	Most courses reach an implementation of the methodology with a good quality level, taking into account that at least the core elements of the methodology, service aligned to goals, reflection and quality service are achieved.
<b>2. SL Faculty</b>	2.1.- Involvement of faculty from the academic unit and critical mass	Some faculty members know SL at a surface level. A few faculty members are familiar with or have a good command of SL.	A group within the Academic Unit has a deep understanding of SL and can disseminate and share their knowledge or experience with others. The other faculty members have only heard about it or don't know about it at all.	Most of the Academic Unit's faculty knows SL and the reason for including it in the curriculum. A group exists within the faculty that is more closely affiliated and familiar with SL.
	2.2.- Faculty trained in SL	A small group of faculty members is trained in SL.	Those faculty members who incorporate SL in any of their courses are trained in the implementation, including all faculty members who participate in the implementation of pilots.	A substantial number of faculty members and the main academic leaders are trained in SL and are highly familiar with it.
	2.3.- Recognition mechanisms for faculty members who implement the methodology	Faculty members who implement SL only obtain recognition for actions carried out by themselves, mainly involving the sharing of the experiences or outcomes of their courses, which contributes to receiving social recognition by the community.	Faculty members who implement SL are recognized mainly for sharing the experience or outcomes from their courses, which contributes to receiving social recognition by the community. Generally, this is a deliberate action taken by the AU's authority or the SL program leader. Additional formal and symbolic recognition may be given by the authorities.	SL is mentioned in the supplementary university regulations, so it is recognized at the time of assessing the faculty's teaching. Courses taken are registered in the faculty's academic files. Both actions are aimed at giving formal, institutional recognition that may positively impact other aspects of the faculty's work.
<b>3. Work with community partners</b>	3.1.- Definition of the community partners' profiles	Partners were recruited according to the needs arising from the courses, so a functional relationship has been established but not sustained over time.	Types of partners have been identified with which joint work can be done in the courses, enabling relationships with institutions targeted for long-term, mutually beneficial work.	The profile of community partners with which the Academic Unit works has been established. The Academic Unit has work and formal cooperation agreements with partners, which can span beyond SL-related actions.

DIMENSION	SUB-DIMENSION	LEVELS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION		
		BEGINNING (1)	IN PROCESS (2)	CONSOLIDATION (3)
<b>3. Work with community partners</b>	3.2.- Two-sided, lasting relationship between partners and academic unit	The institution has worked with partners only sporadically, which has prevented a two-sided relationship to arise.	Partners have built a relationship with the Academic Unit, but are still working on or building the relationship. Therefore, work is generally not two-sided. However, mechanisms and/or trust are/ is being built so that the relationship can be two-sided.	The relationship between partners and the Academic Unit is two-sided; they feed each other with information and expertise. Partners actively participate in the definition of services, attend courses and closures and are actively and permanently involved with the Academic Unit.
	3.3.- Training and raising awareness in the community partner as to its teaching role	Partners are only slightly familiar with the methodology, which can enhance or jeopardize implementation, depending on the case.	Partners are trained in SL, and understand the core elements of SL and the role they play in SL.	Partners are trained in SL, acquire training tasks in relation to students, with an active role in the training process.
<b>4. Student involvement</b>	4.1.- Students' awareness and knowledge of SL	Students act out SL, but are not formally aware during the course that SL is being incorporated. In that context, they will learn what SL is and why it is being incorporated well into the course, if at all.	Students know, when they find themselves in a SL course, that their course of studies incorporates SL and what courses implement SL. In that context, they will learn what SL is and why it is being incorporated into the course and/or degree program.	Students know that their course of studies incorporates SL. It is possible to identify SL courses in the course curriculum to make it easier for students to choose and register for courses, or at least so they can know the characteristics of their future courses. The methodology is always introduced at the beginning of the course, explaining the rationale behind the presence of SL in the course of studies and in individual courses.
	4.2.- Student leadership and involvement in instances addressing SL	Students only participate in those instances in which they are allowed to participate, which are set out in the SL courses.	Students may participate in SL-linked spaces other than their courses, such as the SL institutionalization committee of their academic department.	Student leaders can participate in formal curricular activities where SL is discussed, and students are given opportunities to participate in activities other than their courses, such as attending congresses, applying for grants, etc.
<b>5. SL implementation support and management in the Academic Unit</b>	5.1.- Formation of the team that advances SL and installation of its main actions in the Academic Unit	A committee is formed to advance and guide the implementation of SL in the Academic Unit. This committee has temporary functions exclusively associated with the implementation of SL.	The committee remains active during the implementation and assessment of the pilot courses, projecting future actions aimed at installing its functionality in the Academic Unit's formal structures.	In a state of consolidation of implementation, the SL committee's tasks have already been transferred to the offices or entities dealing with curriculum and faculty in the Academic Unit.

DIMENSION	SUB-DIMENSION	LEVELS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION		
		BEGINNING (1)	IN PROCESS (2)	CONSOLIDATION (3)
<b>5. SL implementation support and management in the Academic Unit</b>	5.2.- SL Leader in the academic unit	The Academic Unit does not have a person responsible for SL or SL leaders, so the implementation tasks and the challenge of advancing institutionalization falls only to the SL committee, which is composed of a group of persons who were assigned that task.	The Academic Unit has no person in charge of SL. The Academic Unit has scholars leading SL, who naturally assume a leading role, driving the advance and/or participating in the SL committee.	The Academic Unit has a person who is highly trained in SL, tasked with supporting the implementation of SL in the Academic Unit. This task is part of his/her job description.
	5.3.- Incorporation of SL in the academic unit's management mechanisms	SL incorporation goals exist within the unit, but these are only set by the SL committee and not by the governance structures; or the authorities have set concrete goals, but these are not in line with those set by the SL committee.	The Academic Unit has set concrete goals in the context of the institutionalization process, which stem from the SL committee and are shared and approved by the unit's governance structures (i.e., dean, management, academic committee).	In order to have a mid- and long-term horizon, the Academic Unit has incorporated into its strategic plan concrete goals dealing with SL implementation, which gives implementation a more permanent character.
	5.4.- Funding used for SL implementation	The Academic Unit has no funding to incorporate the SL methodology; therefore, it can only carry out those actions that professionals and scholars can carry out from their current positions and/or actions that require no direct funding.	Owing to its interest in incorporating SL, the Academic Unit funds actions in the short term (every semester or year) through direct funding (one-time expenditures) or grant funds it can obtain. For example, materials are paid for, funds are used for hiring assistants, support is provided to the faculty, etc.	The Academic Unit's permanent or continuous budget makes provision for funding associated to SL implementation actions, making its implementation sustainable over time, as supports can be funded on a permanent basis.
	5.5.- Assessment and follow-up mechanisms	A self-assessment is carried out to determine the initial status of SL implementation in the Academic Unit. A SWOT analysis is carried out and SL-related experiences in SL are collected at the institution, national and international level.	Assessment mechanisms are designed or set out with which pilot courses will be assessed, based on the fact that the SL assessment tools offered by the program (students and partners), in addition to the early assessment of the course, among others. The implementation of SL mechanisms helps project improvements.	The permanent mechanisms for collecting evidence have been defined, which are applied regularly and feed stakeholders with information for permanent improvement.
	5.6.- Dissemination of SL experiences	Dissemination of experiences, academic publications and congress presentations have not occurred, or have occurred only once.	Experiences, implementation outcomes and narratives from faculty, partners and students involved are disseminated, or academic contributions are made through research journals or presenting outcomes in congresses on the field. These actions have occurred sporadically (2 or 3 times a year).	Experiences, implementation outcomes and narratives from faculty, partners and students involved are disseminated. Academic contributions are also made through research journals or presenting outcomes in congresses on the field. All of this is carried out regularly (3 or more times a year).



## 9. Self-Assessment Rubric for Service-Learning Project Quality in Higher Education

**Table 6:** Self-Assessment Rubric for Service-Learning Project Quality (Campo Cano, Laura. 2014:178 ).

NOTE: The original rubric contains a column entitled “Remarks” in addition to each of the four levels.

	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
<b>1. Learning Approach</b>	The project promotes a learning approach based on rote learning and the achievement of a number of institutional requirements without focusing on attitudinal changes.	The project develops learning goals aimed at making students change their worldview, create their own reality and also foster meta-cognition.	The project develops learning goals aimed at making students change their worldview and create their own reality. Additionally, there is a specific reflection instance about the project.	The project further proposes learning strategies based on the student's engagement with the subject, using those strategies to maximize their understanding to satisfy their curiosity. There are specific instances for this.
<b>2. Participation level</b>	Students do not participate in the preparation of, or in decisions on, the content or the development of the project. Students' participation is simple.	Students can give their views and opinions on the project. They are encouraged to give their opinion or rate the project and there is a specific opportunity for that. Student's participation is consultative.	Students participate in the definition of the project and in the determination of its meaning and its goals. They also participate in its design, its planning, its execution and evaluation. Projective participation.	Students ask for, require or generate new opportunities or mechanisms for participation in the project. Equal to a maximal participation level: meta-participation.
<b>3. Skills</b>	The project promotes learning of cross-cutting skills associated with collaborative work, communication and empathy.	The project influences the student's existing cross-cutting skills and autonomy, creativity, critical thinking, personal initiative and sensitivity.	The project fosters the acquisition of professional skills inherent in the students' studies.	The project influences the curricular skills inherent in the course where the project is developed. Skills associated with inquiry and research are developed.
<b>4. Academic follow-up in the entity</b>	No academic follow-up of students is carried out in the entity where the service is developed.	Students are specifically followed up on in the entity where the service is developed.	There is academic follow-up of students in the entity, in coordination with the training institution.	Intense academic follow-up of students is carried out in the entity, in coordination with the training institution.
<b>5. Cross-disciplinary</b>	No opportunity is provided for students from different areas to work together.	Students from different areas but from the same field of study work on the same challenges, but need not supplement each other.	Students from different areas but from the same field of study work on the same challenges, and need to supplement each other.	Students from different areas and fields of study work on the same challenges and need to supplement each other.

	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
<b>6. Social impact and projection</b>	The project addresses real, concrete needs.	The project addresses real and concrete needs and influences the beneficiary's context.	The project offers tools to the community when the project finishes (it empowers the community).	The project influences the transformation of the administration, encouraging students to address the needs beyond the scope of the execution of the project.
<b>7. Networking</b>	An educational institution and a social institution create partnership bonds to build a common project.	An educational institution and a social institution create partnership bonds to build a common project with support from institutionalized liaisons.	An educational institution and one or more social institutions create partnership bonds to build a common project. Additionally, the project is linked to a network of similar projects.	An educational institution and one or more social institutions create partnership bonds to build a common project. Additionally, the project is hooked to an institutionalized network of similar projects to share views and improvements through frequent meetings.
<b>8. Professional field</b>	The project does not alter the conventional view of the professional field.	The project helps open up to a view of the professional field that involves greater social implication.	The project helps open up to new professional views from similar organizational situations to those of professional ones with greater community engagement.	The project helps open up to new professional fields with greater community engagement and is aimed at similar organizational situations to those of professional ones which imply working with professionals from different lines of work.
<b>9. Academic institutionalization</b>	The institution does not promote awareness of service-learning.	The institution proposes a few actions to raise awareness of service-learning but not systematically.	The dissemination of service-learning among members of the academic community is facilitated.	The expansion and replication of service-learning projects are facilitated.
<b>9.1. Dissemination</b>				
<b>9.2. Academic recognition</b>	The institution does not explicitly exhibit its support for service-learning.	The institution exhibits interest in some aspects of service-learning projects but not systematically.	Projects are situated in some structure of the institution (subjects, practices or programs).	Explicit documents and actions exist in which the institution shows its support for, and recognition of, service-learning.
<b>9.3. Availability of resources</b>	No resources are provided by the institution to carry out service-learning projects.	The institution supports the organization of projects with flexible groups and timetables if necessary.	The institution supports the organization of projects with flexible groups and timetables if necessary. Authorizations and agreements are also supported.	The institution provides resources, contacts to build project networks, and offers a variety of available services. The institution provides instruments for the evaluation of projects. There is a coordination office or somewhere to address queries. The academic time employed by the faculty is rewarded.

	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
<b>9.4. Relevance and visibility</b>	No opportunity exists for recognition of the project by the educational community.	Some recognition is given but is not institutionalized or systematized.	An opportunity exists for institutional recognition and reward.	The institution favors social recognition through awards and supports.
<b>10. Assessment</b>	Learning is assessed by the teachers in the same way as the other curricular contents.	Learning is assessed by all project participants (leaders, entity, faculty and students).	The service offered to the community is assessed as well as the learning.	Learning, community service and the project are globally assessed in order to make improvements in future editions. The assessment is carried out by all participants.

## 10. Assessment Grid for Evaluating the Quality of SL Projects in Higher Education (Ierullo, 2016:30)

VARIABLE	DIMENSIONS	INDICATORS
<b>Quality of the LS experience</b>	Trajectory	Number of years the experience has been in place.
		Awards/recognition obtained.
	Institutional integration of the experience	Degree of mandatoriness.
		Type of institutional integration.
		Extent of the Project in relation to the academic cycle.
		Set weekly time employed in the project.
		Approximate number of weekly hours.
	Participants in the experience	Number and proportion of teachers involved in relation to the total number of faculty members.
		Number and proportion of students in relation to the total student roll.
		Participation of alumni in the project.
		Disciplines teachers and students belong to.
		Development of opportunities for cross-disciplinary dialogue.
		Number of community links/relationships and type of liaison.
	Profile of the project	Profile of the service actions carried out.
		Project's contribution to the students' education.
	Assessment and reflection	Existence of opportunities for assessment and reflection about the experience. Aspects assessed.
		Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the project's outcomes.
	Communication of the experience	Communication of the experience in academic events.
		Impact on local media.

## 11. TEFCE (Towards a European Framework for Community Engagement in Higher Education)

(Erasmus+, Government of the Republic of Croatia)<sup>33</sup>

### 1. Introduction to TEFCE toolbox

The TEFCE Toolbox for Community Engagement in Higher Education was developed as part of the project Towards a European Framework for Community Engagement in Higher Education (TEFCE), funded through the Erasmus+ programme of the European Commission.

**Policy background:** The role of higher education in responding to societal challenges is re-emerging as a policy priority in many countries. This priority is featured in the EU's Renewed Agenda for Higher Education<sup>34</sup> and in the Horizon 2020 programme. It is also reflected in the expectation that universities should contribute to the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Community engagement in higher education is central to this debate, and is thus an increasingly relevant topic for policymakers, universities and their communities.

**Purpose of the TEFCE Toolbox:** The TEFCE Toolbox guides universities and their external communities through a process to examine their community engagement in a robust and comprehensive way. The TEFCE Toolbox serves as a reference tool for universities, communities and policymakers to better understand the dimensions of community engagement and as a practical tool for universities to determine how well they perform according to each dimension, as well as where they can improve.

*Toolbox The TEFCE Toolbox is the result of a co-creation process involving over 170 participants from 8 countries over 18 months. A prototype of the TEFCE Toolbox was piloted and refined during workshops at four higher education institutions (University of Rijeka, Croatia; University of Twente, the Netherlands; TU Dresden, Germany; and TU Dublin, Ireland), involving discussions between university and community representatives*

**Development of the TEFCE:** Toolbox The TEFCE Toolbox is the result of a co-creation process involving over 170 participants from 8 countries over 18 months. A prototype of the TEFCE Toolbox was piloted and refined during workshops at four higher education institutions (University of Rijeka, Croatia; University of Twente, the Netherlands; TU Dresden,

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.eoslhe.eu/tefce-toolbox-an-institutional-self-reflection-framework-for-community-engagement-in-higher-education/>

<sup>34</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/Es/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52017DC0247>

Germany; and TU Dublin, Ireland), involving discussions between university and community representatives<sup>35</sup>.

**European potential of TEFCE Toolbox:** The TEFCE Toolbox can be implemented in different institutional and local contexts. It thus has the potential to become a robust tool that will support European universities in institutionalizing their cooperation with the wider community. Due to its flexibility and openness, it could be applied at a European scale and could be promoted by the different European-level organisations and initiatives. The TEFCE Toolbox therefore has the potential to become a European framework for community engagement in higher education.

## 2. Key definitions and principles

### Defining ‘community’, ‘engagement’ and ‘societal needs’

Community engagement is about how universities address societal needs in partnership with their external communities. More precisely, the TEFCE project proposes the following definitions of ‘engagement’, ‘community’ and ‘societal needs’.

- ▶ **Community:** refers to ‘communities of place, identity or interest’, thus including organisations from government, business, civil society organisations and citizens, whether at the local, regional, national or global level.
- ▶ **Engagement:** refers to a process whereby universities undertake joint activities with external communities in a way that is mutually beneficial, even if each side benefits in a different way.
- ▶ **Societal needs:** refer to political, economic, cultural, social, technological and environmental factors that can influence quality of life in society.

The TEFCE project adopts “community engagement” with a broad definition that can provide an overarching term for other terms that are sometimes used such as “civic”, “public”, “regional”, and “societal” engagement.

---

35 GUNI Network: <http://www.guninetwork.org>;  
 Declaration of Bologna: <http://ees.umh.es/contenidos/Documentos/DeclaracionBolonia.pdf>;  
 European University Association: <https://eua.eu>;  
 European University Association (EUA): <https://www.eurashe.eu>;  
 Higher Education Authority in Ireland: <https://hea.ie>;  
 International Association of Universities: <https://www.iau-aiu.net>;  
 National Coordination Centre for Public Engagement: <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk>

## Approach: guiding principles of TEFCE Toolbox

The four principles guiding the TEFCE Toolbox, and differentiating it from previous tools for community engagement, as well as from metric-driven and competitive approaches to performance assessment, are the following:

- 1. Authenticity of engagement:** The TEFCE Toolbox's interpretative framework valorises authentic community engagement that provides the community with a meaningful role and tangible benefits from partnerships.
- 2. Empowerment of individuals:** The TEFCE Toolbox aims to recognise and award value for different kinds of individual efforts and results in community engagement, thus encouraging universities to develop empowering environments for individuals at the university.
- 3. Participative approach combining bottom-up and top-down steering:** The TEFCE Toolbox is based on mapping diverse community engagement practices through narratives collected from university staff and community partners, rather than on 'best practices' selected by senior management.
- 4. Learning journey rather than benchmarking:** The TEFCE Toolbox results in a qualitative discovery of good practices and a critical reflection on strengths and areas to improve, both achieved through a collaborative learning process.

### 3. TEFCE toolbox: overview of the tools

**Tool 1: Dimensions of engagement:** The first tool provides a classification of the community engagement activities. Its purpose is to help users understand the scope of what is meant by a community-engaged university and to help them identify engagement practices at their institution.

<b>I. Teaching and learning</b>	Extent to which study programmes reflect societal needs, include community-based learning and involve external communities in teaching and learning.
<b>II. Research</b>	Extent to which research is carried out about and with external communities.
<b>III. Service and knowledge exchange</b>	Extent to which academic staff is involved in joint initiatives that/to support external communities' development and empowerment.
<b>IV. Students</b>	Extent to which students lead their own projects and initiatives with external communities (outside the framework of their study programmes).
<b>V. Management (partnerships and openness)</b>	Extent to which the university establishes mutually beneficially partnerships with external communities and provides them with access to facilities and resources.
<b>VI. Management (policies and support structures)</b>	Extent to which the university management reflects its commitment to community engagement in policies and institutional support structures.
<b>VII. Supportive peers</b>	Extent to which the academic and administrative/professional staff actively support community engagement.

**Tool 2: Levels of engagement:** The second tool provides a rubric defining different levels of engagement for each of the 20 sub-dimensions of community engagement. Its purpose is to allow users to critically analyse their engagement practices and to determine the level of authenticity of engagement.

**Tool 3: Institutional community-engagement heatmap:** The third tool provides a color-coded matrix to synthesize the findings for each dimension of engagement and to further determine the extent to which community engagement is multifaceted and embedded at the university.

COLOUR 1	COLOUR 2	COLOUR 3	COLOUR 4	COLOUR 5
LOWER LEVELS			HIGHER LEVELS	
Superficial engagement, no evidence yet of mutual benefit.		1. Authenticity of engagement	Authentic engagement, with tangible benefits for communities.	
Needs of labour market and industry.		2. Societal needs addressed	Global 'grand challenges' (e.g. climate change) or local social needs.	
Well-resourced institutions (business, government).		3. Communities engaged with	Low-resource partners (schools, NGOs, social enterprises, citizens).	
Engagement practices only present at one or two university departments.		4. Institutional spread	Engagement practices that take place across the entire institution.	
Engagement through short-term projects.		5. Institutional sustainability	Engagement that has been institutionalised, with adequate funding.	

**Tool 4: 'SLIPDOT' analysis:** The fourth and final tool provides a customised SWOT analysis developed by the TEFCE project team to facilitate self-reflection discussions between all stakeholders about the results of the entire TEFCE Toolbox process. Its purpose is to validate the conclusions, acknowledge achievements and define areas for improvements.

<p><b>Areas of Strength:</b> Areas where the university is doing particularly well in terms of community engagement.</p>	<p><b>Areas of Lower Intensity:</b> Areas of community engagement that are not highly developed at the university (due to it not yet being a priority, due to limited capacity or other reasons).</p>	<p><b>Areas with Potential for Development:</b> Areas of community engagement that the university could realistically improve in the future.</p>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b> <i>Internal:</i> e.g. Level of support among leadership and academic staff. <i>External:</i> e.g. Level of community support; in line with national policy; availability of funds and programmes.</p>	<p><b>Threats</b> <i>Internal:</i> e.g. Lack of support among leadership and academic staff. <i>External:</i> e.g. Lack of community support; not in line with national policy; lack of funds and programmes.</p>	

## 12. Mapping and Critical Synthesis of Current State-of-the-Art on Community Engagement in Higher Education

Paul, B.; Bojana, Ć; Thomas F.; Frans K.; Marco, S.; Ninoslav, Š.; Hans, V. Institute for the Development of Education, Zagreb, Croatia: Paul Benneworth proof-reader (2018).

ISBN 978-953-7901-30-1: <https://www.tefce.eu/publications/mapping>.

*This publication (available in English) defines the concept of Community Engagement in Higher Education, comprehensively outlines existing frameworks for measuring community engagement and identifies the needs, gaps and opportunities of this approach.*

This publication (available in English) defines the concept of Community Engagement in Higher Education, comprehensively outlines existing frameworks for measuring community engagement and identifies the needs, gaps and opportunities of this approach.





In support of the Global Compact on Education

*Uniservitate* is a global programme for the promotion of service-learning in Catholic Higher Education. Its objective is to generate a systemic change in Catholic Higher Education Institutions (CHEIs) through the institutionalisation of service-learning (SL) as a tool to achieve its mission of offering an integral education and training of agents of change committed to their community.

***“We will not change the world, if we do not change education”***

*Pope Francis*

## **4** Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education

This work aims to discover and highlight all the wealth within the perspectives of the different actors participating in the institutionalization processes of service-learning in Higher Education. Through the description of various global cases of service-learning institutionalization, the book presents reflections, actions and experiences that outline conceptual elements and key features, seeking to contribute to the great global debate on how and to which purpose processes allowing for the integration of service-learning into the identity and culture of Higher Education institutions are launched and developed.

We introduce this fourth volume of the Uniservitate collection with the firm intention of allowing readers to experience, through its pages, a journey across the different continents and cultures, exploring stories as diverse as the contexts and actors behind them, and to take on the challenges and dreams that we believe the book suggests, with a forward-looking approach, for those interested in a Higher Education that is more engaged with the world in which it unfolds its actions.

UNISERVITATE COLLECTION

*Uniservitate is an initiative led by Porticus, with the general coordination of the Latin American Center for Service-learning (CLAYSS)*

<https://www.uniservitate.org>



CLAYSS



PORTICUS

ISBN 978-987-4487-46-9



9 789874 448746

Published in April 2023  
ISBN 978-987-4487-46-9