



Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

ACE American
Council on
Education



The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Elective Classification for Community Engagement for Australia 2026 First Time Documentation Guide to the Application

About the Classification

The Classification seeks to recognise higher education institutions that demonstrate commitment and excellence in community engagement. As such, it requires a large body of evidence of meaningful and sustained institutional investment of policies, systems and structures that support individuals, groups and communities to work with each other for mutual benefit in a context of respectful partnership characterised by reciprocity, accountability and a strengths-based asset orientation. Institutions will successfully achieve classification when they demonstrate that community engagement is enacted and supported by the **institution**, not just through the activity and commitment of individual academics, professional staff and students. Through a self-study process, institutions are encouraged to demonstrate the arc of rigorous and high-quality community engagement across institutional structures and areas of responsibility.

Community engagement: Carnegie Foundation definition

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

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

It is acknowledged that all Australian higher education institutions aspire to the advancement and self-determination of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, in addition to the reconciliation between Indigenous peoples and the wider Australian community. Consideration of this commitment is foundational to Community Engagement in the Australian context, and it must be appropriately and substantially demonstrated in

this application. Evidence may refer to the full range of university work: teaching, learning, research, targeted programs and institutional policies and practices.

Deep, pervasive and integrated

Not all institutions that have community engagement activities occurring on their campuses or practiced among their members will be recognised for institutional classification. In many ways, institutions are not typically set up to support mutually beneficial, reciprocal and accountable community engagement partnerships, particularly in the core work of teaching and learning, research and service. For example, community needs and activities might not follow academic calendars. Institutional rewards and recognitions policies and practices may not include diverse forms of scholarship beyond traditional or conventional artefacts.

To be recognised for this classification, the higher education institution must demonstrate that it plans for, enacts, supports and maintains community engagement in a way that is deep, pervasive and integrated. This often *requires shifts in core features, functions and assumptions of the institution*. Institutions that achieve community engagement classification demonstrate success in **institutional transformation** such that high quality community engagement is supported and enacted across the institution via **institutional structures, systems, practices, policies and cultures**.

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

Key terms used in this guide

Higher education institutions interact with their communities in many ways in support of the shared goal of addressing society's most pressing and complex challenges. Many forms of public impact scholarship (broadly defined) produce important outputs and outcomes. However, community engagement is differentiated from these other approaches by its emphasis on key principles and practices.

- **Mutual benefit** is the understanding, established at the outset, that the collaboration will identify and work towards outputs and/or outcomes that serve each partner's objectives and goals.
- **Outcomes and impacts:** Community engagement is described by **purpose** (i.e., the expected contributions to populations or stakeholders) and **values** (i.e., the principled intentions that drive partners to collaborate). The realisation of these purposes and values results in both **short to medium term outcomes** and **continuing impacts**. Outcomes are understood as changes that occur in learners, participants, issues and situations etc that are clearly linked to engagement efforts and objectives. Impacts are the continuing consequences of community engagement, representing broader changes within the institution, community, organisation, society or environment that result from the engagement.
- **Outputs:** Community engagement produces diverse and varied forms of **activities and artefacts** that may range from books and peer-reviewed journal articles to exhibitions, reports, presentations, data sets, podcasts, programs and curricular, to name a few. Knowledge and practices co-produced are shared and communicated in ways that are accessible, relevant and useful to both community and academic audiences.
- **Partnerships** are designed to serve a public purpose, building the capacity of individuals, groups and organisations involved to understand and collaboratively address issues of shared concern. Community engagement requires academics, professional staff and students to partner outside of the academy with individuals, groups and organisations who are with and for the community in which the work is occurring. Both community and university-based members act as equal partners, sharing expertise and accountability.
- **Process and principles:** Community engagement is distinguished by its emphasis on **relationship** (i.e., the ways in which partners work together through collaboration, reciprocity, shared decision making, equitable resource use) and **epistemology** (i.e., through a transdisciplinary and asset-based leveraging of community members' strengths and knowledge in the co-construction and sharing of new knowledge). The process of engagement – and the principles that underpin it – between partners shapes the knowledge project. For this reason, process and principles are the most essential and distinctive characteristic of community engagement. Community engagement champions democratic and accountable processes that are designed to build the capacity of individuals, groups and organisations to collaboratively define, investigate, analyse and address issues of shared concern. The institution works with the communities directly involved in or affected by the topics and issues addressed

in relationships that are reciprocal, accountable and mutually beneficial. In short, engagement is being and doing *with* communities not *for* or *to* them.

- **Reciprocity** is an epistemic stance. It involves the recognition, respect and valuing of the knowledge, perspectives and resources of academics, professional staff, students and community partners. Diverse ways of knowing – such as lived experiences, practical skills, collective wisdom, disciplinary-based expertise – are equally recognised as valuable, credible and legitimate assets which partners bring to a collaboration. Thus, notions of reciprocity are grounded in a **strengths-based** framing of what is considered an asset, who gets to participate and how, and equitable resource-sharing. Accordingly, reciprocity and **accountability** go hand-in-hand: accountability draws attention to these social relations underpinning engaged research and practice.
- **Scholarship** Following Ernest Boyer's (1990) influential call for a more 'capacious' understanding of scholarship, we use the term broadly to include the full range of *what academics do as scholars* that can be demonstrated via teaching, research, creative activity and service, and the multiple artefacts of those activities. The term **community-engaged scholarship** (sometimes also referred to as the scholarship of engagement) thus 'refers to research/creative activities, teaching, service undertaken by faculty members in collaboration with community members (and often students) that embody the characteristics of both *community engagement* [and] *scholarship*' (Janke et al. 2023, p. 56). Characteristics of traditional scholarship include the following: applying the literature and discipline-based theoretical frameworks; posing questions; conducting consistently ethical and systematic inquiry that is made public; and providing data and results that can be reviewed by the appropriate knowledge community and can be built upon by others to advance the field. Additional characteristics of community-engaged scholarship include participatory practices, reciprocity, co-construction, democratic practices, shared authority and shared resources (Blanchard and Furco 2021, p. 35).

A note on 'community'

It is crucial to explain your institution's understanding of and scope for 'community'. Clear terminology will tremendously help the reviewers to put your application claims into context. For example, government entities and industry partners may be included as community partners, or they may be classified as and referred to with other terms. Some institutions differentiate between community organisations/service providers and individual community members acting on their own, while others categorise them under the same term. Business/industry partners may or may not be referred to using the same term as non-profit organisations. When considering the appropriateness of any individual, organisation or group to be labelled 'community partner', please give regard to the complexity and heterogeneity of community in your context (McQueen et al. 2011). Who is excluded, who is included?

Please note that applications that do not provide evidence of community engagement aligned with the above will undermine a reviewer's confidence in the institution's claims to be committed at the level necessary to be endorsed by the Carnegie Foundation.

How to Use This Guide

The First-Time Classification Documentation Framework is intended to help you gather information about your institution's current community engagement definition, commitments and activities. This guide provides additional context to help clarify what types of information reviewers are looking for overall and for each question.

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

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

Data provided: The data provided in the application should draw from recent academic years, up to the previous five years. Historical data may be referred to for comparison or background purposes. For the 2026 cycle, institutions may use data from AY 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, plus the autumn session of 2025. Institutions may use the data from any of those years that provides the best representation of their community engagement for that particular question. For each question and/or example, indicate the year that the data represents. For example: "(AY 2021)" or "In 2022, the Centre for Community Engagement..."

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

References used in this guide:

Blanchard, L and Furco, A 2021, *Faculty engaged scholarship: Setting standards and building conceptual clarity*, The Academy of Community Engagement Scholarship.

<https://doi.org/10.17615/0xj1-c495>

Boyer, E 2016 [1990], *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate* (expanded ed.), by D. Moser, T.C. Ream, J.M. Braxton and Associates, Jossey-Bass.

Janke, EM, Jenkins, I, Quan, M and Saltmarsh, J 2023 'We're talking about process: The primacy of relationship and epistemology in defining community-engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure policy', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 29, no. 1. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcs1.2734>

MacQueen, KM, McLellan, E, Metzger, DS, Kegeles, S, Strauss, RP, Scotti, R, Blanchard, L and Trotter, II, RT 2001, 'What is community? An evidence-based definition for participatory

public health', *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 91, pp. 1929_1938.
<https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.91.12.1929>

Strum, S, Eatman, T, Saltmarsh, J and Bush, A 2011, 'Full participation: Building the architecture for diversity and community engagement in higher education, *Imagining America*, vol. 17. <https://surface.syr.edu/ia/17>

Section 1: Applicant's Contact Information

See application website for information requested.

Section 2: Institution, Community and Community Engagement Context

The institutional context for embracing community engagement as an institutional priority is different for every institution. In this section, institutions are asked to provide an overview of the characteristics that influence and shape its community engagement. Institutions need to explain – broadly and succinctly – how characteristics such as institutional type, location, curricular programs and historical community experiences and priorities have shaped particular legacies, strategies, trajectories and achievements for community engagement. This section also asks institutions to reflect on how support for community engagement has changed due to evolving circumstances and priorities.

Be sure to describe intentional institutional efforts to support all members of the institution (academics, professional staff and students) to fully participate in community engagement activities, engage reciprocally and give and receive benefit from intended and achieved outcomes. Additional explanation and guidance for evidence required to demonstrate commitment to full participation is provided below in Section 2, Question 3.

1. Describe your institution in a way that will help provide a context to understanding how community engagement is envisioned and enacted. Include descriptions of the institution and community. If your institution has multiple campuses, please describe each campus for which you are seeking endorsement. **(Maximum 1,000 words per response)**
 - a. Describe the region; founding and history; current institutional mission; institutional culture; types of degree programs; and demographics of student, academics and professional staff populations.
 - b. Describe the leadership priorities, vision and strategic plan; initiatives and other features that shape and distinguish the institution, particularly as they relate to community engagement.
 - c. Describe the communities to which the institution is accountable, including community characteristics, community priorities and the relationship of the community to the institution, including how it may have evolved over time.

The community context for community engagement is different for every institution. For this question, describe the unique characteristics of the community/ies that your institution engages with. This includes – but is not limited to – descriptors of special type (regional, urban, etc.), size (population), economic health, region, unique history, demographics and other distinguishing features. This question is a place to reflect on community context at the macro level as well as provide some details on the specific communities and partner organisations with whom students, professional staff and academics engage. You may wish to refer to widening participation strategies; National Centre for Equity in Higher Education Research (NCEHE) data on student equity; Engagement and Impact Assessment Data;

SAGE/Athena SWAN data; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education and employment data as example sources.

How is community engagement structured at your institution? For example: Where does the community engagement unit report to? Is it this way because of how community engagement evolved at the institution? Often, on large campuses, structures are decentralised, so the community engagement work may also be decentralised. Or it may be that community engagement is driven by executive leadership on the institution with certain priorities. This question asks you to share information on what fundamentally shapes the structures of community engagement at your institution.

This question further explores how institutions hold themselves accountable, in particular by outlining the ways in which they consistently work alongside their local communities in mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnerships. Explain how your institution recognises community priorities, strengths and needs, the potential for growth and development in relationship building between the institution, community and industry stakeholders, and their alignment with initiatives that directly address community-identified needs.

2. Describe your university's definition of community engagement and related terms. **(Maximum word count of 500 words per response)**

When institutionalising community engagement, it is important that there is a clear and shared definition across the institution so that every unit is working toward the same goals. This does not mean that the same terminology has to be used by every unit: community engagement may go by different terminology depending on the academic/disciplinary and community context. What is important is that the definition and application of key terms are demonstrative of the core standards, values and practices of engagement. Be sure to review the Community Engagement Definition and key terms at the beginning of this guide.

- a. Does your institution have an institution-wide definition and key terms for community engagement at your institution?

If YES,

- List the institutional definition and related key terms here.
- Upload the document or list the website link where the institution-wide definition of community engagement appears.

If NO,

- Are there definitions and key terms within work units or divisions that are used to define community engagement? If so, list these definitions and key terms.
- Is an institution-wide definition and key terms a goal? If yes, how will that be achieved? If not, why not?

The above question asks you to describe how community engagement is understood at your institution through its definition and terminology.

Some institutions do not have an institution-wide definition but have different terminology and policies to arrive at a shared understanding of community engagement. Community

engagement may go by different terminology depending on the academic and community context.

- b. Definitions and key terms lay the foundations for establishing institutional standards for high-quality community engagement. Provide the context for the creation of the definition/s and terms at your institution, including how they were determined and approved, how they are used, and any evidence of their effectiveness in guiding high-quality community engagement, and proof that demonstrates an institutionally sanctioned definition.

This question asks about the process that led to either an approved institution-wide definition or the process that is underway to arrive at a shared definition. It is also interested in how your institution determines what high-quality community engagement is and how those quality standards are put into practice.

- c. How do your definitions, terms and standards of community engagement demonstrate the core standards, values and practices of the engagement?
3. Describe how your institution ensures that students, academics, professional staff and community partners have equitable access and opportunity to participate in community engagement activities and partnerships. Equitable access and opportunity require focused efforts to address systems and structures that create barriers to participation. **(Maximum 500 words per response)**

Responses should provide a concise but comprehensive overview of the relevant contexts that shape the institution's understanding of and approach to equitable access and opportunity. The concept of 'equitable access and opportunity' is informed by the concept of full participation:

Full participation is an affirmative value focused on creating institutions that enable people, whatever their identity, background, or institutional position, to thrive, realise their capabilities, engage meaningfully in institutional life, and contribute to the flourishing of others (Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh & Bush, 2008, p.3).

Full participation directs attention to assessing who is included and who is excluded in definitions and practices of community engagement at your institution. This question is based on the premise that institutions are both *in* and *of* multiple communities, necessitating diverse, intentional efforts to work towards the goal of full participation. Provide specific descriptions of plans, infrastructure, activities and assessed outcomes related to equitable access and opportunity for community engagement.

- a. Describe the relevant contexts – both internal to your institution and external (local, regional, national) – that shape how equitable access and opportunity in community engagement is defined, discussed, planned, enacted and held accountable at your institution.
- b. Describe institutional systems and structures that address equitable access and opportunity in community engagement for students, academics, professional staff and

community partners. Examples may include infrastructure, programs/initiatives, policies, procedures and practices, staffing and hiring/recruitment, offices and finance, network or coalition of centres, institutional climate surveys, etc.

- c. Describe how the institution ensures that community partners have significant voice and input into institutional or departmental planning and collective goals.
- d. Describe the resources made available to community partners that support community engagement (e.g., professional development, compensation, materials, space, acknowledgement, awards).
- e. In what ways does the institution collect information from partners to ensure accountability to the community, particularly on reciprocity, mutual benefit and accountability? Is the data shared back with the community?

4. Describe the infrastructure to support and advance community engagement.
(Maximum 500 words per response)

Much evidence shows that an enabling mechanism of some kind is needed to ensure the institutionalisation of community engagement. Here, this mechanism is referred to as a 'coordinating infrastructure', suggestive of an office, centre or multiple offices dedicated to advancing community engagement activity and tasked with coordinating and facilitating community engaged activity across the institution. When describing this coordinating infrastructure, be sure to describe the mission, staffing, resources and location (its reporting line) of the centre. If there are multiple centres, please describe and explain how the various centres are coordinated and work together.

Regardless of the number of coordinating centres/offices, think beyond this specific infrastructure to show how community engagement is infused throughout various aspects of the institution's structure. There may be other specialised areas, programs or centres that engage students, academics, professional staff and the community through community engagement initiatives (e.g., Career Centre, Honours Program, Workforce Development, Youth in Care, Multicultural Centre, Alliances, Veteran Support Services, staff and student unions, Clubs, etc.).

- a. Provide the title of the institution-wide coordinating infrastructure(s) that supports and advances community engagement. This may be a centre, office, network or coalition of centres, etc. Describe its purpose, goals, staffing and reporting structure. If the institution has more than one centre coordinating community engagement, describe each centre, and indicate how the multiple centres interact with one another to advance institutional community engagement.
- b. Describe internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with the community.
 - Include details on whether the sources of these funds are permanent or temporary. Is community engagement funded through operational funds (ongoing budget line items), through grant funding (temporary) or some combination of both, and if both, what is the mix?
 - For any funds listed as temporary, explain if any plans are being made to have them become permanent.

- Describe how budget shortfalls may have impacted funding for community engagement. If budget shortfalls have occurred, how is this being addressed so that the community engagement work can continue?

Planned and dedicated resources demonstrate an institution's commitment to institutionalising and sustaining community engagement. This question is asking about institutional budgets dedicated to community engagement (as opposed to activities merely based in the community). Refer to the primary coordinating centre but also other work units and activities that support community engagement. This question provides the opportunity to discuss how community engagement is funded, the various challenges that funding has faced, including during the global COVID-19 pandemic, and responses.

- c. List any strategic fundraising efforts or external funding sought (including but not limited to grants) specifically connected to supporting community engagement. Identify any specific endowments earmarked for community engagement.

This question is different from question 'b' above: it is not asking about budgets and finances but, rather, about fundraising and external grants. For example, you can provide evidence of community engagement being an explicit part of an institutional capital campaign; individual donors who have contributed for the specific purpose of supporting community engagement either with one-time funds or through the creation of an endowment specifically for community engagement; or where the institution was successful in obtaining a grant specifically for community engagement activity.

You may also refer to government funding, local, state or federal, if specifically connected with and used to address community issues and/or initiatives (e.g., food insecurity, housing, education access).

5. Describe how community engagement efforts have been impacted and shaped by recent local, national and/or global events such as the COVID-19 pandemic, crises of community wellbeing and cohesion, decreasing trust in democracy and institutions and natural disasters. **(Maximum 500 words)**

It is expected that global problems, such as COVID-19, mental health, social and historical injustices, economic crises and global warming, to name a few, will have impacted the communities that your institution engages with, as well as your institutional practices and culture. Further, the impact of these events on institutions and communities may have been uneven. This question asks how external events have impacted the community engagement work of your institution and how your institution has responded.

6. Describe how your institution tracks and assesses engagement with communities. Be sure to describe: **(Maximum 500 words per response.)**
 - a. How does your institution maintain systematic institution-wide tracking of community engagement? Consider:
 - What systems are used to track the data?
 - What data are collected and how often?

- Who has responsibility for the collection and management of the data (which individual/s or office)?
- How are the data used (what is the purpose of these tracking activities)?

The question first asks about the tools (often software) that allow for the tracking of activity (by students, professional staff and/or academics who are engaged with the community). The remainder of the question is about the tracking and documentation processes and purposes.

- Describe any institution-wide evaluations or self-studies of community engagement (not including this application) that have taken place in the last five years, explaining the purpose for the evaluation or self-study, what data were collected, who was responsible for conducting the evaluation or self-study and how the evaluation or self-studies were used.

Often, due to the length of time between classification cycles or because of other institutional evaluations (such as accreditation), institutions use various tools or task outside consultants to help them assess their community engagement activity. This question asks whether your institution has undertaken any kind of evaluation of community engagement within the last five years, what the institution learned from the evaluation and any changes that have occurred as a result. Examples may include strategic planning processes, re-accreditation processes, self-study and external review of a centre for community engagement, Excellence in Research for Australia, Engagement and Impact Assessment, Voice Survey, Reptrak Survey and SAGE/Athena SWAN data, etc.

SECTION 3: Institutional Identity and Culture

Although not the only determining factor, leadership is essential to ensure the success of any significant initiative on campus. The questions in this section ask for evidence regarding the executive leadership in several key areas. These include leadership's role in publicly shaping the way community engagement is understood, enacted and sustained at the institution; making engagement visible and communicating its importance to the institution and community; reinforcing the centrality of community engagement to the institution's identity; and validating the community engagement activity that is being enacted at the institution.

- Describe how executive leadership of the institution (Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor/President, Provost, etc.) explicitly promotes community engagement as a priority. **(Maximum 500 words)**
- Provide a letter from the Chancellor/Vice-Chancellor/President/Provost that includes the following: **(Maximum 500 words)**
 - Their perception of where community engagement fits into their leadership of the institution.
 - A description of community engagement's relationship to the institution's core academic identity, strategic direction and practices.
 - Details on how community engagement has been sustainably institutionalised.

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

3. Describe how community engagement is emphasised as part of the institution's brand message identity or framework. **(Maximum 500 words)**

All institutions present themselves publicly in a way that creates an identity: what they want to be known for, and how that distinguishes them from other institutions. This question asks about the construction of that identity and where community engagement fits in that intentional messaging. Brand messaging around identity provides 'talking points' for institutional events, physical and online presence, annual reports, accreditation reports, grant reports and planning documents (e.g., strategic plan or educational master plan). It also provides information for local press releases and overall media coverage. This kind of brand messaging usually takes place in a wide array of outlets – for example, in public marketing materials, websites, community reports, news articles, etc.

When gathering evidence for this question, consider reviewing various publications, websites, etc. where information is disseminated, including Board of Trustees meetings, President's reports, institution updates/announcements, presentations, speeches, graduation addresses, etc.

SECTION 4: Quality of Community Engagement Relationships and Academic Partnerships

The previous sections focused on the institution and community context. This section now focuses on evidence of engagement, and it is intentionally focused on *academic* community partnerships. The quality of partner relationships is foundational to this application. All of the questions in this section focus on: 1) how the standards and values of community engagement explicitly stated in the Carnegie Foundation's definition of community engagement are enacted; and 2) how institutions are accountable to quality community engagement. For additional explanation of how quality may be assessed, refer to the Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Definition and related discussion at the beginning of this document.

1. Describe specific systematic actions, strategies and evaluations that are used to ensure the institution, academic units (colleges, faculties, schools, departments) and academic and professional staff are building partnerships that centre mutual benefit, reciprocity, accountability and an asset-based framing. **(Maximum 500 words per response)**
 - a. What activities and strategies are used to include community partners reciprocally for mutual benefit?

One indicator of mutuality and reciprocity is deep collaboration between the institution and community partners. This question is interested in formal and informal conversations and activities that are conducted to generate greater response to an issue or specific community

need. Such opportunities for information sharing are critical and serve to assist with initiatives, programs, grant applications, public information campaigns and fundraising efforts.

- b. How do these activities and practices encourage mutually beneficial, accountable and reciprocal collaboration with community partners?

When an institution collaborates with the community, there are strengths and challenges related to building multi-directional community partnerships. Consider where the institution is excelling and where it might be lacking in creating solid partnerships.

- c. What kinds of partnerships exist? Are these partnerships with non-profits, elected officials, or business and industry groups? Do your institutional demographics impact the type of partnerships you have?
- d. In what ways does your institution collect feedback and evaluation data on academic community partnerships? How does your institution share the data, and with whom? How have the data been used to deepen, understand and improve community engagement?

This question asks for evidence of how community engagement evaluation data are shared with community partners and the extent to which community partners have input into shaping community engagement goals and practices, particularly those practices that will support mutuality, reciprocity and accountability. Consider the role of community partners as members of institutional advisory, steering and governance committees and planning groups for this purpose. Additional roles may include membership on business and industry board(s), etc.

Community engagement evaluation data maybe internal (i.e., data from institution-wide surveys, program reviews, or curricular changes) or external (e.g., as part of nationwide surveys). These data may have been presented at major events both on and off campus.

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

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

Questions for each partnership:

- Project/collaboration title
- Name of community organisation/group
- Community partner key person's name
- Community partner key person's contact details

- Institution partner (person, program, department, centre, etc.)
- Purpose of the partnership
- Longevity of the partnership
- Number of academics involved (annually and/or over the life of the partnership)
- Number of professional staff involved (annually and/or over the life of the partnership)
- Number of students involved (annually and/or over the life of the partnership)
- Titles of subjects/units/courses linked to the partnership
- Research projects linked to the partnership, if relevant
- Grant funding, if relevant
- Provide one example that shows how reciprocity and mutual benefit are enacted through the partnership
- Provide one example of positive outcome and/or impact for the community
- Provide one example of positive outcome and/or impact for the institution

This question is intended to get a sense of who your community partners are, what community issues shape the partnership and the significance and quality of the partnership. Institutions often have many partners with different levels of engagement across different parts of the institution. There are a few things to keep in mind here. First, choose five to eight partnerships that best represent a wide range of partnership activity. Second, the way that this question is structured around ‘academic community–institution partnerships’ signals the importance that the Carnegie Foundation places on partnerships that are connected to the academic core of the institution: teaching and learning and research. Third, ‘best represent’ is not synonymous with longstanding. Long-term commitments are important and can be included here, but short-term or newly created partnerships can also ‘best represent’ an important engaged response to emergent community issues.

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

SECTION 5: Academics and Professional Staff

Institutional commitments to community engagement includes the provision of support for employees to establish and maintain mutually beneficial, reciprocal and accountable partnerships as part of their work responsibilities and activities. This section asks for descriptive information about the nature and structure of academics and professional staff work and support for community engagement.

It is also interested in how community-engaged scholarship (sometimes also referred to as the scholarship of engagement) is understood at your institution. Please refer to the ‘key terms’ at the beginning of this guide for further detail.

1. Check all of the community-engaged **resources and support services** available for academics and/or professional staff in any employment status (casual/fixed term/ongoing, honorary/adjunct/conjoint, and part/full time) who seek to develop or deepen community engaged approaches and methods. Only select those resources and

support services that directly relate to community engagement. Topics may include but are not limited to:

- Community partner research training (including research ethics)
- Community advisory boards, committees, councils
- Community-academic partnership identification and development
- Academics/professional staff fellowship and/or mentorship
- Funding support for professional development, conference or travel
- Support for peer-reviewed publishing
- Support for seeking external funding (e.g., grants, philanthropic donations, endowments)
- Provision of internal grants for curriculum development and/or scholarship
- Engaged learning website, library and/or guidebook
- Online learning modules that can be embedded into courses and/or programs
- Student transportation assistance
- Other: Please describe

Describe three of the topics that have been checked off above in the text box underneath the selected topic. Include the purpose, participants, activities and results. Include which work unit/s assume responsibility for these services, how often programs are offered and how many academics and professional staff participated (specifying whether numbers refer to one-off, average per event, total per annum, etc.) **(Maximum 500 words per topic)**

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- How do students participate in expanding services, collaboration and capacity-building opportunities within community-engaged initiatives?
- Where do community-engaged councils and committees exist within the university? Think about community engagement in institutional planning including for strategic plans. Consider community engagement in institution governance, teaching and learning, and research teams/committees.
- How are internal institution funds used to provide seed money for community engaged projects, compensate community partners, support equipment costs or fund release time for academics and professional staff? Consider internal grant programs that support community-engaged teaching, research, creative activity and/or service.
- For external funds, consider what programs, personnel and other resources are dedicated to supporting academics and professional staff to identify, apply and engage in externally funded community engagement through teaching, research, creative activity and/or service?
- What kind of community engagement support exists in negotiated contracts for academics and staff?
- How are relationships fostered and developed between individual academics and/or professional staff and community partners?
- How is travel for community engagement purposes supported in the institution/department's annual budgets? Include support for sabbatical work if relevant.

- How is the transportation of students to and from sites for community-engaged learning and development supported? Consider policies, procedures, funds and resources that might apply.
 - What kind of support is provided to academics and professional staff to help them identify, develop and publish their community-engaged scholarship for dissemination?
2. Check all of the community-engaged **professional development programs** for academics and professional staff that are provided, supported or facilitated by your institution. As above, only select those programs that directly relate to community engagement. Topics may include but are not limited to:
- Community-engaged syllabus planning, development and implementation
 - Partnership planning, initiation, development, management and evaluation
 - Remote/online community engagement (curricular and/or co-curricular, research, service)
 - Inclusion of community engagement in assessment criteria of student learning outcomes
 - Participation in learning communities, writing retreats and engaged research institutes related to community engagement
 - Understanding ethical engagement practices that ensure equitable access and opportunity in community engagement
 - Documentation and assessment of community engagement in academic promotion (programs for academics and/or academic promotion panel members)
 - Global and/or intercultural community engagement
 - Sustainable development goals connected to community engagement
 - Social innovation, entrepreneurship and economic engagement
 - Engaged learning webinars and/or workshops
 - Other: Please describe

Describe three of the topics that have been checked off above in the text box underneath the selected topic. Include the purpose, participants, activities and results. Include which work unit/s assume responsibility for these professional development programs, how often programs are offered and how many academics and professional staff participate (as above, specifying whether numbers refer to one-off, average per event, total per annum, etc.).

(Maximum 500 words per topic)

Institutions are asked to identify professional development opportunities for building academic and professional staff capability to implement high quality community engagement. When considering this question, think far and wide and take into consideration various aspects of each employee's position in their work unit.

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- What kinds of community engaged-relevant professional development programs are available internally through the institution's professional development centre or community engagement office? Examples include leadership training, project management, mentorship programs, etc.

- What types of professional development offerings are provided to institution stakeholders and community partners? Are community partners and other stakeholders provided with fee waiver or discount to participate?
 - What professional development programs are there to support engagement between academics/professional staff and local businesses/industries?
 - What programs and opportunities exist to understand and improve diversity, equity and inclusion related to community engagement?
 - What external professional development opportunities for academics and professional staff are available and promoted, supported and facilitated (e.g., with funding and/or workload recognition) by your institution? Examples may include opportunities/events/conferences by the higher education sector, community groups/organisations, government agencies, etc.
3. Describe the formal recognitions provided by your institution through institution-wide awards and/or celebrations for academics/professional staff that partake in academic community engagement. **(Maximum 500 words)**

Academic community engagement initiatives that are valued by an institution are publicly recognised and celebrated by awards and ceremonies, making them visible as a valued activity that others might emulate. In answering this question, describe who is being recognised (academics and/or professional staff), the outcomes or successes for which they are being recognised and how this recognition connects to teaching/student development, research, creative activity and/or service. Please note, do not confuse this question with later questions about academic rewards. This application distinguishes between *awards* and *rewards* by positing that awards are relatively easy to enact but may not indicate a change in institutional culture, whereas rewards are part of the incentive system for academics and professional staff advancement and reflect core values of the institution's academic culture.

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- Do awards include academic and professional staff teams with students and community partners?
 - Are community engagement awards formally recognised or celebrated by the Chancellor/Vice-Chancellor/President/Provost?
 - How are awards and celebrations recognised by local organisations that engage in community engagement work, including businesses, non-profits and elected officials?
 - Does your institution support any formal awards by the local community, business or local elected officials for academics/professional staff/students?
4. Provide examples of outputs of community-engaged scholarship for each of the following three categories listed below. Refer to the description of community-engaged scholarship provided at the beginning of this guide, if need be. **(Maximum 1,000 words for each category: professional staff, academics, students. Web links may be provided as part of the description.)**
- Five to ten examples of outputs by professional staff
 - Five to ten examples of outputs by academics
 - Five to ten examples of outputs by students.

When listing examples, please note that a title (for example, of a published article) may not convey much about community engagement. If so, provide a short description of how the output is related to community engagement.

Community engagement scholarship outputs may include, but are not limited to, the following types of activities and artefacts:

- Writing or editing and/or publishing of a book, book chapter, white paper, report, program evaluation, technical paper, policy brief, curriculum, dataset, article or manuscript (broadly defined) or other forms of publication
- Zine, comic book, film, video, performance, composition, artwork, installation, exhibit or other creative practices
- Public event, lecture, conference, webinar, forum, summit, workshop, program, deliberative dialogues or town halls
- Newsletters, blogs, vlogs, websites or social media campaigns

For **professional staff**, report how professional staff (especially but not limited to those whose position is focused on advancing community engagement) contribute to developing community-engaged scholarship.

For **academics**, provide a broad summary of the ways in which academics are producing and disseminating their community-engaged scholarship. The question seeks a variety of examples that reveal the pervasiveness of scholarship by academics from across the institution. Please include a brief description about what makes the examples community engaged.

For **students**, provide a variety of examples of the ways in which students at all levels (undergraduate, postgraduate coursework, higher degree research) are producing community-engaged scholarship. Please include a brief description of what makes the examples community engaged.

5. Describe how your institution regularly measures and evaluates academics' community engagement, particularly as it relates to outputs and outcomes relative to teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service. **(Maximum 500 words)**
 - Who are the findings shared with?
 - How are the evaluation data used to improve programs and outcomes?
 - Please describe at least one thing that has been learned about the activities and impacts of community-engaged scholarship for academics as a result of evaluation.

This question asks about specific examples of a systematic, institution-wide evaluation mechanism that provides information about the activities, outcomes and impacts for academics who participate in community engagement. Here, systematic means ongoing and regular processes for gathering data and making sense of the data to inform practice and drive improvement.

Consider the following tools and information, focusing on their relevance for community engagement:

- Review of self-evaluations
 - Review of course learning outcomes during the curriculum process as well as during course evaluation by peers
 - Review of professional development evaluations
 - Review of community partner interviews/evaluations
 - Review of accreditation results from certain professional programs (such as nursing or paralegal programs)
6. Describe policies and practices that support academics' community engagement at your institution such as recruitment, annual review, reappointment and reward. Do NOT include promotion in this response (this is covered in Questions 8 and 9, in this section). Specify if these policies are different for academics of different employment statuses (casual/fixed term/ongoing, honorary/adjunct/conjoint and part/full time.) **(Maximum 500 words)**
- Institutions are asked to provide the specific text explicitly rewarding community engagement from any level of the institution, be it as a part of academic teaching, research, creative activity or service.
 - Describe how widespread these policies and practices rewarding academics for community engagement are. Do they apply to all academics at the institution, to academics in a particular faculty/school/department/institute, or to academics who have different types of appointments? Are teaching assistants and staff in dual academic/professional roles considered in this practice?
 - How does the institution signal the importance of community engagement through its public recruitment and hiring processes?
 - When gathering information for this question, consider the following:
 - For institutions guided by collective bargaining agreements, review HR guidelines and collective bargaining agreements.
 - Review job descriptions since different levels of community engagement may be required for certain positions. While specific items are dependent on collective bargaining, overall, community engagement is something that could be encouraged.
 - Check with individual departments and see how they address the need for community engagement for all types of academic appointment.
7. Describe the policies for academic promotion from all levels of the institution that specifically reward academics' community-engaged scholarship. Describe the pervasiveness of the policies: Are they practiced across the institution? By most departments? By a few? **(Maximum 500 words)**

The presence of policies and guidelines explicitly rewarding community engagement is a strong indicator of its institutionalisation into academic culture. This question builds on the one above and asks for a description of the academic promotion policies explicitly rewarding community engagement. The second part of the question asks about the pervasiveness of community engaged criteria and guidelines for academic promotion. Do they exist in departmental guidelines and criteria, at the faculty or school level within a university, or at the institutional level, or perhaps some combination of the three?

If applicable, review policies approved by human resources and examine collective bargaining agreements.

Please note that more details of academic promotion policies are requested in the next question; structure your responses to avoid duplications.

8. If your institution rewards community engagement in academic promotion, please address the following, where applicable: **(Maximum 500 words per response)**
- a. Describe how policies reward academics for community-engaged, research, creative activity and service. Provide examples of policy descriptions that support community engagement in each of the academic roles below:
- Community-engaged teaching and learning
 - Community-engaged research and creative activity
 - Community engagement as a form of service

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

- b. Describe the involvement of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor/President, Provost, Deans, Chairs, academics leaders, Chief People Officer, Human Resources, Community Engagement Centre Director, or other key institutional leaders in supporting policies that specifically reward academics for community engagement. **(Maximum 500 words)**

Policies in place that specifically reward academics for community engagement are very likely to have been supported by your institution's executive leadership. This question asks you to describe in as much detail as possible who was involved in helping implement these academic reward policies and how that implementation process occurred.

When gathering evidence, consider the following:

- Public information archives, speeches, websites and major planning documents
 - Public minutes to meetings, including any related discussions engaged in by the Board of Trustees
 - Any pertinent or related items discussed during contract negotiations, institution-wide planning committees, the academic senate, curriculum committee, the Executive cabinet, Deans' council, Chairs' committee or similarly relevant bodies.
- c. Cite **three examples** of faculty/school/department-level policies with text taken directly from policy documents that specifically reward academics for community engagement across teaching, research, creative activity and service. Describe the pervasiveness of policies outlined. **(Maximum 500 words)**

Another strong indicator of the institutionalisation of community engagement into academic culture is the existence of policies and practices explicitly valuing community engagement in the immediate work unit of each academic. This question asks for evidence of such institutionalisation.

When answering this question, consider:

- Policies approved by HR as well as collective bargaining agreements
- Recent accreditation/self-study
- Institutional strategic plan, policies and/or administrative procedures
- Academics' work plans and work review processes and documents
- Academics' self-evaluations
- Multiple academic job descriptions across the institution to see if a shared language regarding community engagement rewards exists

- d. If your institution has revised its policies specifically to incorporate community engagement, describe when the revisions occurred and the process that resulted in the revisions. **(If policies have not been revised, skip 'd' and 'e' here and go straight to Question 9.) (Maximum 500 words)**

Specific academic reward policies for community engagement are often put in place through a deliberate process of policy revision. This question asks you to describe in detail how that revision process occurred.

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

When gathering evidence, consider the following:

- Major planning documents, board decisions and administrative policies
- Changes in HR procedures related to recruitment and hiring as well as specific language provided in job descriptions. Also relate the same process to collective bargaining outcomes (if applicable)
- Any changes related to employee training and professional development opportunities
- Any changes in response to the accreditation standards and/or process and related language
- Any internal or external changes impacted by state- and/or nationwide mandates or initiatives
- Any partnership agreements that reflect community engagement

9. If there is work in progress to revise promotion policies and guidelines to reward academics' community-engaged scholarly work, describe the current work in progress, including a description of the process and who is involved. This may include the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor/President, Provost, Deans, Chairs, academic leaders, Chief People Officer, Human Resources, Community Engagement Centre Director or other key institutional leaders. Also describe any products resulting from the process (i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc.). Specify if these policies are different for academics of

different employment statuses (casual/fixed term/ongoing, honorary/adjunct/conjoint, part/full time, etc.). **(Maximum 500 words)**

Academic reward policies are artefacts of academic culture and culture change is inherently a slow process. This question asks about where your institution is in that culture change process. While it is not expected that community-engaged institutions will have completed the process of revising their academic reward policies to specifically reward community engagement, there is the expectation that there will have been some institutional activity addressing the need for revision and the beginnings of a process for achieving those revisions.

When gathering evidence, consider the following:

- Major planning documents, board decisions and administrative policies
- Changes in HR procedures related to recruitment and hiring as well as specific language provided in job descriptions. Also relate the same process to collective bargaining outcomes (if applicable)
- Any changes related to employee training and professional development opportunities
- Any changes in response to the accreditation standards and/or process and related language
- Any internal or external changes impacted by state- and/or nationwide mandates or initiatives
- Any partnership agreements that reflect community engagement

SECTION 6: Curricular Engagement

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

The term 'community engaged subjects/units/courses' is used in the application to denote the application and integration of community engagement principles and processes, as outlined at the beginning of this document, into teaching and learning. A range of terms are used by institutions, including service-learning, community-based or community-engaged learning, community placement, work-integrated learning, industry internship, etc. Regardless of the terminology used, what is key here is the presentation of clear evidence of how community-engaged principles and processes are a constitutive part of these teaching and learning programs.

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

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

<i>Number of for-credit community engaged designated subjects/units/courses (UG/G)</i>
<i>Percentage of community-engaged designated subjects/units/courses as proportion of all for-credit subjects/units/courses (UG/G)</i>
<i>Number of academics teaching for-credit community-engaged designated subjects/units/courses</i>
<i>Percentage of academics teaching for-credit community-engaged designated subjects/units/courses as proportion of all academics</i>
<i>Of the academics teaching for-credit community-engaged designated subjects/units/courses, what percentage are part time?</i>
<i>Of the academics teaching for-credit community-engaged designated courses, what percentage are full time?</i>
<i>Number of academic departments offering for-credit community-engaged designated subjects/units/courses</i>
<i>Percentage of academic departments offering for-credit community-engaged designated subjects/units/courses as proportion of all departments</i>
<i>Number of students enrolled in for-credit community-engaged designated subjects/units/courses (UG/G)</i>
<i>Percentage of students enrolled in for-credit community engaged designated subjects/units/courses as proportion of all students (UG/G)</i>

The above set of questions asks you to share your data about community-engaged subjects/units/courses, the number of academics (full and part time) who teach these subjects/units/courses, and the number of students who are enrolled. It also asks for data about departments that offer community-engaged subjects/units/courses. These questions also allow you to distinguish between undergraduate and graduate courses.

The following set of questions seeks to draw out the various stories, considerations and rationales behind the above numbers. They offer a chance to provide qualitative and contextual depth.

2. Describe the institution-wide definition and standards used for community-engaged subjects/units/courses. Be sure to provide examples of: **(Maximum 500 words per response)**
 - a. Institutional, departmental and/or program definitions, learning outcomes, standards and/or required components

This question is foundational to understanding the degree to which community engagement is part of the instructional culture of credit-bearing subjects/units/courses across the institution and the extent to which it pervades teaching, learning and academics' work in curriculum and pedagogy, as well as in student learning. The question asks how community-engaged curricula is defined. Please note, there are many ways in which the community might be involved in teaching and learning, but not all examples would be considered

engaged. What are the parameters that defines community-engaged curricula at your institution?

This question also focuses on learning outcomes that are expected from community-engaged subjects/units/courses (NOT co-curricular engagement, which is addressed in the next section). These learning outcomes may be specified at the institutional level (e.g., as part of the graduate outcomes or general education curriculum); a department or major; a program that involves students from across majors; or a combination of these. The question presumes that if learning outcomes are being named, then there are standards of practice to support these subjects/units/courses which are also measured consistently, producing valid evaluation data for assessing community engagement in the curriculum (see question 'b' and 'c' below).

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

This question asks for detail on how the data for understanding curricular engagement is gathered. It also asks you to reflect on your data and what they tell you about the extent (depth and pervasiveness) to which community engagement is embedded in teaching and learning across the institution. Additionally, it asks how the definition in your answer to 1a above is connected to a subject/unit/course designation. In other words, how is it decided that a subject/unit/course is community-engaged? Is it through some process of designation, or is it up to an academic to denote it as such? Knowing how community-engaged subjects/units/courses are both defined and designated is essential for appraising the validity of any quantification of these subjects/units/courses. This question also asks you to reflect on your processes to uphold community engagement standards of practice in teaching and learning, especially as regards to sustaining community-engaged learning, subject/unit/course design and course designation and curriculum review.

- c. How student learning outcomes are assessed. Explain any changes to coursework that occurred as a result of evaluation activities.

Based on the data gathering and evaluation processes vis-à-vis the standards of practice described in the answers above, what has been the outcome of that evaluation? Consider: 1) what was learned during the evaluation process about the extent to which students were achieving the desired community-engaged learning outcomes?; and 2), how did those findings impact teaching and learning practices?

3. Describe how community engagement is integrated into traditional curricular structures. These may include core subjects/units/courses, capstone/senior-level projects, first-year subjects/units/courses/sequences, general education, majors/departments, minors, graduate subjects/units/courses and clinical/professional education, training or residencies. Provide at least two but not more than four examples. **(Maximum 500 words)**

Institutions can demonstrate the pervasiveness of community engagement by sharing where in the curriculum community-engaged subjects/units/courses are situated. A comprehensive inventory is not required: rather, choose two to four examples across all of the curricular structures. When answering this question, consider the role of institutional leaders and academics in supporting the multiple ways teaching and learning align with the university's community engagement commitment.

When exploring this question, consider:

- Traditional service-learning and project-based learning subjects/units/courses and activities
- Curriculum committee and/or accreditation body requirements or recommendations
- Community partner organisations' requirements for specific subjects/units/courses and programs
- Connection to degree transfers (including recognition of prior learning if relevant) and/or entry pathways
- Faculties/school/departments
- Learning communities
- Honours programs
- Internships
- Team teaching/multi-disciplinary teaching

4. Describe how community engagement is integrated into the following academic activities offered for credit and/or required by a curricular program. These may include but are not limited to: student research, student leadership, internships, co-operatives, career and employment, study abroad, alternative break tied to a course or an institutional scholarship program. Provide one to two examples. **(Maximum 500 words)**

In addition to the curricular structures listed in Question 2, many institutions also attach curriculum credits to other learning programs, such as those listed above, that have community engagement components. The question asks for evidence of for-credit activities. For example, a leadership program might have a required community engagement component, but there is not a course or credit involved; in that case, it is not appropriate evidence for this question. Again, this question is not asking for a comprehensive inventory of activities; provide only one to two examples in total that best represent how community engagement is integrated into diverse activities.

When gathering evidence for this question, consider the following:

- How are community sources of knowledge valued, incorporated and acknowledged in for-credit activities across the institution?
- Consult with specific departments (e.g., honours, study abroad, career centre, internship office, international students/international education), clinical/professional degree programs (e.g., medicine, nursing, allied health, pharmacy, psychology, law, social work) and additional career education areas
- Credit recognition for training of student government officers
- Credit requirements for specific community engagement scholarships

5. Describe how your institution tracks and evaluates curricular engagement and how students gain access to, participate in and get recognised for community-engaged courses. **(Maximum 750 words)**

a. How are the data for community-engaged subjects/units/courses gathered, by whom, with what frequency and for what purpose? How are they shared/reported, particularly in student transcripts?

This question is grounded in the assumption that there is a definition and standards of practice of community-engaged subjects/units/courses that are tied to producing valid data for evaluating community engagement in the curriculum. Based on that assumption, this question seeks detailed answers on how the data for understanding curricular engagement are gathered and how community-engaged subjects/units/courses feature as academic work on student transcripts.

When answering this question, consider the following:

- How is information regarding community-engaged subjects/units/courses disseminated through various sources, including the institutional catalogue, online enrolment portal and application consultations?
- Is program information shared during new student orientation or first-time consultation meetings?
- How are evaluation data for curricular engagement collected by or reported to the curriculum committee and other relevant bodies?
- Is there a specific centre or office that collects community-engaged teaching and learning evaluation data? Consider, too, if this centre or office also provides other support such as helping to enrol students.
- How are designations of community-engaged subjects/units/courses listed, if at all, on transcripts? If a designation is not included in an official transcript, is a separate certificate of activity transcript provided to students?

b. Describe the process and/or experiences at your institution in designing new curricular programs and initiatives or redesigning existing ones to increase students' access to and participation in community engaged activities. Have these efforts resulted in an increase in the proportion and/or diversity of students having the opportunity to develop the cultural competencies, asset-based approaches and values of reciprocity for engaging with communities?

This question asks to what extent students at your institution are provided scaffolded community engagement opportunities as they progress through their studies.

When answering this question, consider the following:

- Are there specific subjects/units/courses with community engagement stated in the title or course description?
- Are there subjects/units/courses that include community engagement components or specialised course assignments or projects?
- How did these subjects/units/courses get approved through the curriculum process?
- Do these subjects/units/courses articulate with credit transfer mechanisms?

- Are opportunities to take part in community engagement represented more in certain disciplines and programs than others?
6. Reflect on what all of the data provided in this section tells you about the extent to which community engagement is embedded in teaching and learning at your institution. Consider both the levels of pervasiveness (across faculties/schools/departments) and depth (within a faculty/school/department) of community engagement in curricular structures. **(Maximum 500 words)**

SECTION 7: Co-Curricular Engagement

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

1. Describe how community engagement is integrated into institutional co-curricular practices by providing two to four examples from the following categories: **(Maximum 1,000 words)**
- Social innovation/entrepreneurship
 - Community dialogues
 - Community service projects – outside of the institution
 - Community service projects – within the institution
 - Student leadership
 - Student internships/co-operatives/career and employment
 - Student volunteering – domestic
 - Student volunteering – international
 - Study abroad
 - Student research (not-for-credit)
 - Work-study placements
 - Opportunities to meet with employers who demonstrate Corporate Social Responsibility
 - On-campus accommodation/residence activities
 - Institution scholarships program
 - Sports
 - Other: Please describe

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

Consider the following when gathering evidence:

- How do student groups participate in the community-engaged innovation/entrepreneurship space? Are there economic development opportunities for students?

- What kind of community engagement projects are occurring in the community, and where are they taking place (e.g., for-profit, non-profit, faith/ethnic/cultural/sector-based organisations)?
 - What kind of community engagement opportunities are provided by not-for-credit study abroad programs?
 - What kind of community engagement activities are performed by student government, peer advisors, mentors and tutors as well as students participating in action teams and alliances?
 - What kind of not-for-credit community internships are available to students, and through which departments? Are they restricted, or available to students from all disciplines?
 - How is student not-for-credit community-engaged research connected to an internship, independent study or honours project?
 - Consult with various departments and offices specifically interested in this topic.
 - How are sports activities embedding community engagement opportunities?
 - Which scholarships specifically focus on community engagement?
2. Describe the process and/or experiences at your institution in designing new co-curricular programs and initiatives or redesigning existing ones to increase students' access to and participation in community engagement activities. Have these efforts resulted in a relatively larger proportion of students having the opportunity to develop the cultural competencies, asset-based approaches and values of reciprocity for engaging with communities? **(Maximum 500 words)**

This question asks to what extent students at your institution are provided with scaffolded co-curricular community engagement opportunities as they progress through their studies.

3. Describe any co-curricular engagement tracking system used by your institution. Does your institution produce a co-curricular transcript or record of community engagement? **(Maximum 500 words)**
4. Provide an example of a systematic, institution-wide mechanism for assessing student learning and development outcomes as they relate to co-curricular community engagement. Describe one key finding. **(Maximum 500 words)**

Just as there can be community engagement learning outcomes tied to subjects/units/courses, there can also be community engagement learning outcomes for co-curricular experiences. This question presumes that if learning outcomes are being named, then they are also being assessed. In addition, the question asks what has been learned – one key finding – from the evaluation of community engagement learning outcomes from co-curricular activities.

SECTION 8: Community Engagement and Other Institutional Initiatives

1. Indicate if community engagement is intentionally and explicitly aligned with, directly contributes to or is informed by any of the following institutional priorities. Check all that apply in the Table below.
 - a. Anchor institution mission or initiative(s)
 - b. Diversity, equity and inclusion
 - c. Sustainable Development Goals
 - d. Student retention and success
 - e. Social innovation or social entrepreneurship
 - f. Human Research Ethics Committee specific guidance for community-engaged research
 - g. Service activities
 - h. Community and economic development
 - i. Lifelong learning (non-credit)
 - j. Food security programs (internal and external)
 - k. Respect.Now.Always.
 - l. Other: (please specify)

Community engagement is often one among several institutional priorities. This question asks about how community engagement as a priority is intentionally connected with other pervasive institutional priorities. The phrase 'intentionally connected' signifies that community engagement is purposely used as a way to achieve the success of another priority; and, vice versa, that other priorities are purposefully used to achieve the success of community engagement. The key here is **intentionality**. Therefore, please do NOT include examples where, with hindsight, community engagement just happens to be associated with a particular priority.

2. Describe at least two examples from Question 1, above, including how the priority is intentionally and explicitly aligned with community engagement; how it is communicated internally and externally; and lessons learned and improvements made during the reporting period. **(Maximum 1,000 words in total)**

SECTION 10: Reflection and Additional Information

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

5. Request for Permission to use Application for Research and Training:

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

Please respond with 'a', 'b' or 'c' below:

- a. I consent to having the information provided in the application used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, the identity of my institution will not be disclosed.
- b. I consent to having the information provided in the application used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, I also agree that the identity of my institution may be revealed.
- c. I do not consent to having the information provided in the application used for research purposes.

6. Before you submit your final application, please provide a list of community partners that should receive the partnership survey. Include the partners described in Section 4, Question 2, but you may include additional partners up to a total of 15 (see guide for partnership survey information). For each community partner, provide the following:

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

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

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

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

Dear {community organisation partnering with an institution},

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

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

We would like to ask you to assist with this classification process by providing confidential responses to a very brief online survey. While your participation in the survey is entirely voluntary, your input and perspective on the activity are valuable in evaluating institution community engagement. Beyond the evaluation of institution community engagement, the responses provided by community partners contribute to a national understanding of how communities and institutions are collaborating for the purpose of deepening the quality and impact of such partnerships.

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

Many thanks for your response.

Sincerely,

The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Team

Survey questions

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

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

1. As a partner, I feel that my organisation and I are recognised by the institution.
2. I am asked about my perceptions of the institution's engagement with and impact on the community.
3. My experience, knowledge and opinions are valued in this partnership.
4. I am involved in important institution conversations that impact my community.

5. The academics and/or professional staff in our community partnership try to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.
6. The institution collects and shares feedback and evaluation findings regarding partnerships, reciprocity and mutual benefit, both from community partners to the institution and from the institution to the community.
7. Our partnership with the institution is having a positive impact on my community.

Please provide any additional information that you think will be important for understanding how the institution partnering with you has enacted reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority and co-creation of goals and outcomes.

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

Please respond with 'a' or 'b':

- a. I consent to having the information provided in the survey used for the purposes of research. In providing this consent, the identity of my organisation will not be disclosed.
 - b. I do not consent to having the information provided in the survey used for research purposes.
-