



## ***Embedding Service Engagement in Higher Education: A Rubric for Institutional Planning***

### **Overview:**

Indiana Campus Compact is inviting your campus to participate in an opportunity to reflect upon where your campus is in institutionalizing service engagement and to start planning where you would like to be in two years and in five years. Through this process we hope to:

1. Help campuses with self-assessment and potential strategic planning in the area of service engagement. This process offers campuses:
  - A chance for reflection for where campuses are and where they want to go in this area;
  - An opportunity to develop a vision for this realm of work;
  - An occasion to begin to document work in service engagement to help prepare for award and other applications; AND
  - Information to assist Presidents and Chancellors with a framework for the potential of service engagement opportunities and advancements.
2. Guide Campus Compact in its work with individual campuses and collective membership base. The information garnered through this assessment will be used to:
  - Guide campus visits and related programming; AND
  - Direct programming and technical assistance offerings.

This process is **NOT** intended to compare any campus to another. It is a planning tool for your campus and for Campus Compact. Information from the participating campuses may be compiled to find themes, common ground and other trends, but it will not be used to rank, classify or compare campuses. Information from individual campuses will only be shared with members of the campus steering committee team and the campus's senior administration. Any information shared with a larger audience will be shared in the aggregate and will not identify specific campuses.

### **Directions:**

Each campus should pull together a team of five to seven members to serve as the overall campus steering committee. The team should represent those who are involved in service engagement activities, and decision-making processes, on your campus and in your community, and may include:

- Chief Academic Affairs Officer
- Chief Student Affairs Officer
- Campus Community Service Director/Professional Staff Member
- Student (student government president or other key student leader/s)
- Faculty Member
- Community Representative (from a key partner agency)
- Other suggestions for team members could include: government relations, elected officials, university communications, alumni relations, community outreach, admissions, and/or marketing, among others.

Once the team is assembled, the team should decide how it will prepare for moving forward. Preparation for completion of the rubric may include conducting a campus-wide survey, hosting focus groups, and/or working as campus steering committee to develop mean scores based off of your individual perspectives. The Indiana Campus Compact staff is more than happy to talk with you about options for data collection and/or facilitate a consensus-building workshop. Campus steering committee teams

*This rubric is adapted from Bringle and Hatcher (2000) by Stevens and Jamison (2009). Revised by Stevens and Jamison (2014).*

will need to complete the past (2 years ago) and current (where the campus is today) parts of the rubric prior to participating in workshop.

### **Tips for Completing Rubric**

- Items should be rated on a scale of 1 through 5 where 1 represents that there is little evidence of the item and 5 indicates that there is high evidence of the item on your campus.
- You may rate the items in whole numbers or decimals if you feel your campus is between two descriptors.
- Campuses should not feel that they have to “strive for a 5” in all areas. Each campus should prioritize areas of service engagement and determine where they want to move based on these priorities.
- In each of the five focus areas (campus, faculty, staff, student, and community partners) there is a *wild card* item. This is an opportunity for each campus to record and rate any other indicators that come to mind when thinking about service engagement and the named focus area. This is an optional piece to help personalize the assessment tool for each campus.

**Indiana Campus Compact uses the term *service engagement* throughout this rubric. For your reference, the operational definition of *service engagement* is listed below.**

*Service Engagement* is any endeavor that addresses social concerns and brings the community into the campus and the campus into the community, for the public good. It includes a wide array of activities including service-learning, co-curricular community service, volunteerism, some internships and field experiences, and community based research and other forms of engaged scholarship. Ultimately, the sum of these activities leads to a campus that is fully engaged with the community in an equal co-educational process.

*(Jamison & McCracken, 2006; Revised Jamison and Stevens, 2013).*

*Please note that this is a term that Indiana Campus Compact and several member campuses have adopted. Your campus may want to use another word or phrase that resonates with your campus throughout this rubric.*



## **Institutionalization of Service Engagement – The Campus**

### **1. Identity**

Degree to which service engagement is part of the **external campus identity** as represented in campus mission, strategic planning, and external publicity (i.e. catalogues, websites, admissions brochures, institutional descriptions, presidential statements), as well as public statements by key individuals (i.e. presidents/chancellors, senior administrators, and board of trustees members).

5=Service engagement has a prominent and permanent place in the campus structure, culture, and mission statement and in the manner in which the campus identity is presented to external audiences and public statements by key individuals.

4=Service engagement appears as one element among many others in the campus mission statement and in the manner in which the campus identity is presented to external audiences and in public statements by key individuals.

3=Service engagement is evident in some, but not all of the following areas: campus mission statement, the manner in which campus identity is presented to external audiences and in public statements by key individuals.

2=The integration of service engagement into the campus is just beginning to occur and service engagement is referred to only occasionally in the manner in which the campus identity is presented to external audiences and public statements by key individuals.

1=Service engagement activities exist on campus, but have yet to influence the campus identity.

0=Service engagement activities do not exist on campus.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 2. Fiscal Operations

Degree to which service engagement is connected to the **fiscal operations** of various units on campus (i.e. student affairs, academic programs, financial aid, advising, long term planning, assessment, and development and budget offices).

5=Service engagement is prominent and widespread in the development and implementation of administrative budgets and operations of the campus and supported with at least 90% internal, recurring funding.

4=Service engagement is evident even if not prominent in the administrative operations of the campus and supported with 60-90% internal, recurring funding.

3=Service engagement is evident in only some of the administrative operations of the campus and supported with 40-60% internal, recurring funding.

2=Service engagement is just beginning on campus and its impact on the administrative operations is very limited and supported with 20-40% internal, recurring funding.

1= Service engagement is just beginning on campus and its impact on the administrative operations is very limited and supported with less than 20% internal, recurring funding

0=Service engagement has yet to influence campus operations or budgets.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



### 3. Structure and Operations

Degree to which the campus has developed **plans and policies** for service engagement, as well as effective administrative structures.

5=The campus has a widely embraced definition of service engagement and a statement of goals, principles, and procedures for service engagement with a permanent, centralized office(s) led by a senior level administrator designated to facilitate, assess and develop service engagement opportunities and programs, and there is a cross institutional governance committee that guides the work of the centralized office(s).

4= The campus has a widely embraced definition of service engagement and a statement of goals, principles, and procedures for service engagement with either a permanent, centralized office(s) designated to facilitate, assess and develop service engagement opportunities and programs or a cross institutional governance committee that guides the work of the centralized office(s).

3= Several offices and/or departments oversee independent service engagement programs and have begun the process of defining service engagement at an institutional level and the impact it will have on opportunities and programs, but there is no overall statement of goals, principles and procedures in place.

2=Several offices and/or departments oversee independent service engagement programs, but have no regular contact or coordination with each other.

1=Service engagement opportunities are done entirely through individual faculty or staff initiatives and interests. There is no one person or one office to oversee and coordinate service engagement work.

0=There is no service engagement on campus.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



**4. Integration of service engagement across student and academic affairs.**

Degree to which the expertise of both student and academic affairs **work together** in developing service engagement programs.

5=Both units work together seamlessly through the collaboration of senior level administrators in each unit to develop programs that reflect their respected areas of expertise as well as the emerging research and literature on service engagement.

4= Both units work together without the direct interaction and /or support of senior level administrators from each unit to develop programs that reflect their respected areas of expertise as well as the emerging research and literature on service engagement.

3=These two units each actively support service engagement, but there is little coordination or collaboration between them.

2=Only one of these units is involved in developing and implementing service engagement.

1=Service engagement programs occur without the assistance of either unit.

0=Service engagement does not yet exist on campus.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 5. Campus Culture and Vision

Degree to which service engagement is part of the **internal campus culture and future vision for the campus** (i.e. faculty, staff and students talk about service engagement as a part of the culture and it is present in campus norms, pervasive understandings, knowledge and traditions).

5=Service engagement is prominent and widespread in campus culture. The campus has well established, institution-wide understandings, expectations and traditions for service engagement including celebrations for and recognition of service engagement activities.

4=Service engagement is generally evident, even if not prominent in campus culture. The campus has general expectations and understandings for service engagement and may have school, department, or program level celebrations for and recognition of service engagement activities

3=Service engagement has not been prominent in campus culture; however, through recent strategic decisions, the campus is (or will be) developing common understandings and expectations for service engagement.

2=Service engagement is evident in only some aspects of campus culture and there is no celebration for and recognition of service engagement activities.

1=Service engagement is just beginning to emerge and have an impact on campus culture and its impact is sporadic.

0=Service engagement has yet to influence campus culture.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 6. Outcomes and Assessment

Degree to which the **outcomes** (i.e. student learning, community growth, and sustained partnerships) of service engagement have been defined and are being regularly and systematically assessed.

5=There is an ongoing, prominent campus conversation, led by a centralized unit, which includes faculty, staff, students and community partner voices, about the outcomes of service engagement as well as agreed upon and widely used methods for assessing the quality, impact and effectiveness of existing courses and programs.

4=There is an ongoing, prominent campus conversation, which includes faculty, staff, students and community partner voices, about the outcomes of service engagement as well as agreed upon and widely used methods for assessing the quality, impact and effectiveness of existing courses and programs, but not led by one centralized unit.

3=Particular courses and/or programs have developed their own understanding of these issues without coordination of these desired outcomes with other courses, programs, or community partners.

2=Standard college/university course and program evaluation instruments are used to assess service engagement courses and programs with little to no accommodation to the distinctive character of these courses/programs or campus expectations.

1=Few faculty or staff have used evaluation instruments for service engagement courses and/or programs that they direct.

0=Service engagement courses or programs are rarely, if ever, evaluated.





## 7. Wild Card (the Campus)

Describe other examples of specific activities other than those that are identified above that are significant indicators of service engagement across your institution\*:

### **\*Rate Wild Card according to the following rating scale:**

5= Evidence of high maturity

- Development and implementation of programs over a long period of time that effectively target program goals
- Clear results of stable accomplishments that are reflected in campus culture
- Programs that are exemplary in planning, implementation, innovation, and results that demonstrate congruence between what is considered ideal and practical
- Programs that other campuses have found to be informative
- Campus accomplishments that are in the top 15% of campuses in America

4= Evidence of maturity

- Development and implementation of stable programs over a significant period of time that target program goals
- Clear results that are influencing campus culture
- Programs that reflect good planning, implementation, innovation, and results that are close to what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses could find the program to be informative and a few have
- The campus accomplishments are in the top 33% of campuses in America

3= Average maturity

- Development and implementation of programs that target program goals
- Some results with favorable prospects for continuation
- Programs that reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses might find the work to be informative
- The campus accomplishments are what is typical of campuses in America

2= Developing maturity

- Has begun development and implementation of programs targeting the characteristic
- A few results with prospects of continuation
- Programs reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- The work at this time has been disseminated only internally
- The campus accomplishments are probably exceeded by 2/3 of campuses in America

1= Little evidence of maturity

- No or very little development and implementation of programs that target the characteristic
- No or only scattered results
- What has been done, if anything, reflects limited planning and implementation, and there has not been much progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- There is not much others can learn from the campus's experience
- The campus accomplishments are inferior to most campuses in America



## **Institutionalization of Service Engagement—Faculty**

### **1. Courses**

Degree to which faculty include service engagement (i.e. service-learning, internships, community based research, etc.) in the **courses and curriculum** they develop and teach.

5= The integration of service engagement into courses and curriculum is an enduring part of faculty culture across the campus, not dependent on only a few individual faculty members or a few departments, with intentional links from one course to another and could take place through interdisciplinary education and/or capstone experiences.

4=The integration of service engagement into courses and curriculum is an enduring part of faculty culture across a broad range of colleges, departments and programs and is not dependent on only a few individual faculty members or a few departments.

3=The integration of service engagement into courses and curriculum is well established only in some programs/departments.

2=The integration of service engagement into courses and curriculum depends on the initiative of a small number of faculty scattered across the campus.

1=The integration of service engagement into courses and curriculum is beginning to find some support in the faculty culture, but is mostly accomplished by non-faculty staff.

0=Service engagement has yet to influence curriculum and how faculty develop and teach.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 2. Scholarship and Engaged Research

Degree to which service engagement is recognized as **scholarly work** (i.e. action research studies, professional service to a non-profit and/or charity, conference presentations, teaching, pedagogy workshops, publications, etc.) and supported through campus review processes (at department, college/school and campus levels).

5= There is intentional linkage and connectivity that demonstrates service engagement is encouraged, supported and recognized as scholarly work through teaching, research, and service at all levels of the faculty review and reappointment process which is evidenced through tenured engaged faculty across campus.

4= Service engagement is recognized and supported as scholarly work through teaching, research, or service at some levels and/or in some colleges or departments.

3=Service engagement is encouraged, supported and recognized as scholarly work through teaching, research, and service at all levels across campus, but there is no visible, intentional linkage between or across these activities.

2=Some faculty have begun to integrate service engagement as scholarship, but it is still unknown how well supported or recognized this will be on campus..

1=The integration of service engagement into faculty scholarship is only now beginning to occur with only limited and isolated support.

0=Service engagement has yet to be included or seen as scholarship.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



### 3. Faculty Development

Degree to which service engagement is part of **professional development activities** for faculty (i.e. workshops, faculty conversations, faculty development programs and committee work).

5=The intentional integration of service engagement into faculty development activities is systematic, wide spread, and effective for faculty members of all levels (adjunct, pre-tenure, tenured) and on-going with evidence of impact, across various points of their career starting with faculty orientation.

4=The integration of service engagement into faculty development activities is wide spread and effective for faculty members of all levels (adjunct, pre-tenure, tenured) and across various points of their career starting with faculty orientation.

3=Faculty development activities focusing on service engagement are available in some colleges, departments, programs or units, but not others.

2=Service engagement is included in a number of faculty development activities, but few faculty participate.

1=There are only a few, isolated activities for faculty development with respect to service engagement.

0=Service engagement has yet to be included in faculty development activities.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



#### 4. Personnel Decisions

Degree to which service engagement is part of **faculty personnel decisions** (i.e. recruitment and hiring, annual review and promotion and tenure) and supported through campus review processes (i.e. at department, college/school and campus levels).

5=The value of service engagement is communicated throughout faculty hiring processes, and an interest in engaging in service engagement through teaching, research and service is sought in recruitment and hiring activities across campus. Once hired, faculty members are encouraged, recognized, and rewarded as a positive factor at all levels of faculty review and personnel decisions across campus.

4=Service engagement is not part of the hiring process, but is encouraged, recognized and rewarded as a positive factor at all levels of faculty review and personnel decisions across the campus.

3=Service engagement is generally recognized as a positive factor in faculty review and personnel decisions in some departments, but not across the campus.

2=Service engagement is recognized as a factor in some faculty reviews and personnel decisions based on the position, but not others.

1=The integration of service engagement into faculty review and personnel decisions is beginning to occur with limited and isolated support.

0=Service engagement has yet to be included as a positive factor in faculty review and personnel decisions.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 5. Wild Card (the Faculty)

Describe other examples of specific activities other than those that are identified above that are significant indicators of service engagement among faculty at your institution\*:

### \*Rate Wild Card according to the following rating scale:

5= Evidence of high maturity

- Development and implementation of programs over a long period of time that effectively target program goals
- Clear results of stable accomplishments that are reflected in campus culture
- Programs that are exemplary in planning, implementation, innovation, and results that demonstrate congruence between what is considered ideal and practical
- Programs that other campuses have found to be informative
- Campus accomplishments that are in the top 15% of campuses in America

4= Evidence of maturity

- Development and implementation of stable programs over a significant period of time that target program goals
- Clear results that are influencing campus culture
- Programs that reflect good planning, implementation, innovation, and results that are close to what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses could find the program to be informative and a few have
- The campus accomplishments are in the top 33% of campuses in America

3= Average maturity

- Development and implementation of programs that target program goals
- Some results with favorable prospects for continuation
- Programs that reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses might find the work to be informative
- The campus accomplishments are what is typical of campuses in America

2= Developing maturity

- Has begun development and implementation of programs targeting the characteristic
- A few results with prospects of continuation
- Programs reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- The work at this time has been disseminated only internally
- The campus accomplishments are probably exceeded by 2/3 of campuses in America

1= Little evidence of maturity

- No or very little development and implementation of programs that target the characteristic
- No or only scattered results
- What has been done, if anything, reflects limited planning and implementation, and there has not been much progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- There is not much others can learn from the campus's experience
- The campus accomplishments are inferior to most campuses in America



## **Institutionalization of Service Engagement—Professional Staff**

### **1. Programs and Activities**

Degree to which staff include service engagement (i.e. community service, internships, leadership development programs, etc.) in the **co-curricular programs and activities** they develop and implement.

5=The integration of service engagement into co-curricular programs and activities is an enduring part of campus culture seen across a broad range of programs and not dependent on a few individual staff members or a few departments.

4=The integration of service engagement into co-curricular programs and activities is well established only in some programs.

3=The integration of service engagement into co-curricular programs and activities relies on the initiative of a small number of programs scattered across the campus.

2=The integration of service engagement into co-curricular programs and activities is only now beginning to find some support in the campus culture, but is mostly accomplished by only a few individuals.

1=Service engagement has yet to influence how co-curricular programs and activities are developed.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 2. Staff Development

Degree to which service engagement is part of **professional development activities** for staff (i.e. workshops, campus conversations, staff development programs and committee work).

5=The integration of service engagement into staff development activities is systematic, wide spread, and effective.

4=Staff development activities focusing on service engagement are available in some units and programs, but not others.

3=Service engagement is covered in a number of staff development activities, but few staff participate.

2=There are only a few, isolated activities for staff development with respect to service engagement.

1=Service engagement has yet to be included in staff development activities.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				





### 3. Personnel Decisions

Degree to which service engagement is part of **non-faculty personnel decisions** (i.e. hiring, annual review and promotions) and supported through campus review processes (i.e. at department, division and campus levels).

5=Service engagement is encouraged, recognized and rewarded as a positive factor at all levels of staff review and personnel decisions across the campus.

4=Service engagement is generally recognized as a positive factor in staff review and personnel decisions in some departments, but not across the campus.

3=Service engagement is recognized as a factor in some staff reviews and personnel decisions based on the position, but not others.

2=The integration of service engagement into staff review and personnel decisions is only now beginning to occur with only limited and isolated support.

1=Service engagement has yet to be included as a positive factor in staff review and personnel decisions.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



#### 4. Wild Card (the Professional Staff)

Describe other examples of specific activities other than those that are identified above that are significant indicators of service engagement among professional staff at your institution\*:

**\*Rate Wild Card according to the following rating scale:**

5= Evidence of high maturity

- Development and implementation of programs over a long period of time that effectively target program goals
- Clear results of stable accomplishments that are reflected in campus culture
- Programs that are exemplary in planning, implementation, innovation, and results that demonstrate congruence between what is considered ideal and practical
- Programs that other campuses have found to be informative
- Campus accomplishments that are in the top 15% of campuses in America

4= Evidence of maturity

- Development and implementation of stable programs over a significant period of time that target program goals
- Clear results that are influencing campus culture
- Programs that reflect good planning, implementation, innovation, and results that are close to what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses could find the program to be informative and a few have
- The campus accomplishments are in the top 33% of campuses in America

3= Average maturity

- Development and implementation of programs that target program goals
- Some results with favorable prospects for continuation
- Programs that reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses might find the work to be informative
- The campus accomplishments are what is typical of campuses in America

2= Developing maturity

- Has begun development and implementation of programs targeting the characteristic
- A few results with prospects of continuation
- Programs reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- The work at this time has been disseminated only internally
- The campus accomplishments are probably exceeded by 2/3 of campuses in America

1= Little evidence of maturity

- No or very little development and implementation of programs that target the characteristic
- No or only scattered results
- What has been done, if anything, reflects limited planning and implementation, and there has not been much progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- There is not much others can learn from the campus's experience
- The campus accomplishments are inferior to most campuses in America



## **Institutionalization of Service Engagement—Students**

### **1. Curricular Opportunities**

Degree to which service engagement has been **integrated across the curriculum** (i.e. general education courses, interdisciplinary courses, majors, minors, graduate and undergraduate courses, as well as student research, leadership, internships/co-ops, and study abroad).

5=Many degree programs, as well as the general education curriculum, systematically incorporate service engagement with significant numbers of students enrolling for and successfully completing these courses, and the courses are included on academic transcripts as service engagement courses.

4=Service engagement curricular opportunities are widely available, but are not systematically built into degree programs or the general education curriculum; however, the courses are included on academic transcripts as service-engagement courses.

3=Service engagement opportunities are built into some degree programs, but not others and are not systematically documented across the campus.

2=Service engagement courses and curricula are only just now being developed.

1=Service engagement opportunities do not exist currently in the curriculum.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 2. Student Life and Culture

The degree to which **student life** (i.e. co-curricular service, social activities, and residential life) and **student culture** (i.e. expectations and assumptions) include service engagement.

5=Students recognize and talk about service engagement as prominent, widespread and valued in student life and culture.

4=Service engagement is generally present and recognized by some students, but not prominent, in student life and culture.

3=Service engagement plays a role in some aspects of student life and culture, but not others.

2=Service engagement plays only an episodic/minimal role in student life and culture, largely through isolated, short-term activities.

1=Service engagement is not yet present in student life and culture.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



### 3. Student Involvement

The degree to which students are involved as **assistants, mentors, leaders, and recruiters** for service engagement activities and/or attend conferences on service engagement.

5=Many students from different disciplines and backgrounds across the campus play an active, prominent and effective leadership role in service engagement activities on campus.

4=Service engagement programs include the student voice in planning, but not in a regular, intentional leadership role.

3=A few students play major roles in supporting service engagement activities, primarily because of their own initiatives, not because of intentional decisions or programs on campus.

2=A few students play supporting roles service engagement activities, primarily because of their own initiatives, not because of intentional decisions or programs on campus.

1=Students have yet to take an active role in service engagement.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



#### 4. Student Continuum of Engagement

The degree to which students are actively **developed and encouraged** over time to broaden their views on, understanding of, and involvement in service engagement (i.e. moving students from volunteers to researching on the impact of volunteerism on communities; workforce and economic development; writing legislation; and understanding the underlying societal issues).

5=Many students move along a continuum with the support of a campus-based advisor or faculty member, and continue to seek the next step with intentional guidance from the campus.

4=Some students have been actively involved in service engagement and have moved along the continuum, but with varied levels of support from the campus (i.e. an individual campus-based advisor/faculty member, but not as part of the overall campus plan for student development).

3=Few students have moved along a service engagement continuum, but with little support from the campus.

2=Students who are involved in service engagement may move up the continuum, but it is not tracked or encouraged on the campus.

1=Students are involved purely in volunteerism with no reflection or intentional activities to help the students advance along the continuum of engagement.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 5. Student Outcomes

The degree to which identified **student outcomes** (i.e. satisfaction, learning and other educational objectives, retention, and civic skills) of service engagement are assessed in a regular and effective manner.

5=Student outcomes in service engagement courses are always identified and assessed in effective and meaningful ways that are consistent across the campus.

4=Student outcomes in service engagement courses are often assessed in effective and meaningful ways, but the means for assessment are not consistent across the campus.

3=Some data is collected on student outcomes in some service engagement courses, primarily by the instructor for his/her own use.

2=A means for collecting data on student outcomes in service engagement courses is being developed.

1=As yet, there are no means for collecting data from students in service engagement courses.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 6. Wild Card (the Students)

Describe other examples of specific activities other than those that are identified above that are significant indicators of service engagement among students at your institution\*:

### **\*Rate Wild Card according to the following rating scale:**

5= Evidence of high maturity

- Development and implementation of programs over a long period of time that effectively target program goals
- Clear results of stable accomplishments that are reflected in campus culture
- Programs that are exemplary in planning, implementation, innovation, and results that demonstrate congruence between what is considered ideal and practical
- Programs that other campuses have found to be informative
- Campus accomplishments that are in the top 15% of campuses in America

4= Evidence of maturity

- Development and implementation of stable programs over a significant period of time that target program goals
- Clear results that are influencing campus culture
- Programs that reflect good planning, implementation, innovation, and results that are close to what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses could find the program to be informative and a few have
- The campus accomplishments are in the top 33% of campuses in America

3= Average maturity

- Development and implementation of programs that target program goals
- Some results with favorable prospects for continuation
- Programs that reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses might find the work to be informative
- The campus accomplishments are what is typical of campuses in America

2= Developing maturity

- Has begun development and implementation of programs targeting the characteristic
- A few results with prospects of continuation
- Programs reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- The work at this time has been disseminated only internally
- The campus accomplishments are probably exceeded by 2/3 of campuses in America

1= Little evidence of maturity

- No or very little development and implementation of programs that target the characteristic
- No or only scattered results
- What has been done, if anything, reflects limited planning and implementation, and there has not been much progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- There is not much others can learn from the campus's experience
- The campus accomplishments are inferior to most campuses in America





## **Institutionalization of Service Engagement—Community Partners**

### **1. Campus/Community Outreach**

Degree to which campus and community members share in the **development of programs and institutional resources** for the community (i.e. tutoring, non-credit courses, training programs, student service and/or work study placements, cultural and athletic offerings, library services, faculty consultation, etc.).

5=There are many campus/community outreach initiatives that involve and are developed by community members and multiple departments from across the campus (including representation from both student affairs and academic affairs).

4=There are some campus/community outreach initiatives, but do not include multi-departmental representation.

3=Outreach of this nature is currently being developed.

2=This type of outreach is sporadic, short term and episodic.

1=This type of collaboration does not currently exist.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 2. Mutual Benefit from Partnership

Degree to which university and community members share in the **development and mutual use of physical space** (i.e. use of each other's facilities/parking at little to no cost) and mutual resources (i.e. joint programs, submission and administration of joint grant applications, *give and get equally*).

5=There are many campus community partnerships present which include multiple departments from across the campus including representation from both student affairs and academic affairs.

4=There are some campus community partnerships present, but do not include multi-departmental representation.

3=Partnerships of this nature are currently being developed.

2=This type of partnership is sporadic, short-term and episodic.

1=This type of collaboration does not currently exist.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



### 3. Reciprocal Partnerships in Curricular Development

The degree to which community partners (i.e. nonprofit community organizations, government agencies, and/or educational institutions) have been integrally involved in the **development and improvement of service engagement courses and curricular design** (i.e. service-learning courses, internships, community based research, etc).

5=Strong reciprocal and sustainable partnerships underlie most service engagement courses and curricula with regular communication to design, implement, assess and evaluate these courses and programs so that they successfully meet the learning and service objectives identified by each constituency and become a prototype from which others can learn.

4=Strong reciprocal and sustainable partnerships underlie some, but not other service engagement courses and curricula.

3=Goals of reciprocity and sustainability are only now being developed and implemented.

2=Many partnerships for service engagement courses and curricula are short term, disappear when the semester ends or initiating faculty member retires and have only sporadic communications with partners covering mainly logistical arrangements.

1=This type of collaborative partnership has not yet begun.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



#### 4. Reciprocal Partnerships in Program Development

The degree to which community partners (i.e. nonprofit community organizations, government agencies, and/or educational institutions) have been integrally involved in the **development and improvement of co-curricular service engagement programs** (i.e. community service projects, days of service, fundraisers for community agencies).

5=Strong reciprocal and sustainable partnerships underlie most service engagement programs with regular communication to design, implement, assess and evaluate these programs so that they successfully meet the learning and service objectives identified by each constituency and become a prototype from which others can learn.

4=Strong reciprocal and sustainable partnerships underlie some, but not other service engagement programs.

3=Goals of reciprocity and sustainability are only now being developed and implemented.

2=Many service engagement programs are short term, disappear when the initiating faculty or staff member retires/leaves the institution and have only sporadic communications with partners covering mainly logistical arrangements.

1=This type of collaborative partnership has not yet begun.

	<b>My Rank</b>	<b>Average Rank</b>	<b>Consensus Rank</b>	<b>Artifacts/ Evidence/Action Steps</b>
<b>2 years ago</b>				
<b>Current</b>				
<b>2 years from now</b>				
<b>5 years from now</b>				



## 5. Wild Card (Community Partners)

Describe other examples of specific activities other than those that are identified above that are significant indicators of service engagement among community partners at your institution\*:

### \*Rate Wild Card according to the following rating scale:

5= Evidence of high maturity

- Development and implementation of programs over a long period of time that effectively target program goals
- Clear results of stable accomplishments that are reflected in campus culture
- Programs that are exemplary in planning, implementation, innovation, and results that demonstrate congruence between what is considered ideal and practical
- Programs that other campuses have found to be informative
- Campus accomplishments that are in the top 15% of campuses in America

4= Evidence of maturity

- Development and implementation of stable programs over a significant period of time that target program goals
- Clear results that are influencing campus culture
- Programs that reflect good planning, implementation, innovation, and results that are close to what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses could find the program to be informative and a few have
- The campus accomplishments are in the top 33% of campuses in America

3= Average maturity

- Development and implementation of programs that target program goals
- Some results with favorable prospects for continuation
- Programs that reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- Other campuses might find the work to be informative
- The campus accomplishments are what is typical of campuses in America

2= Developing maturity

- Has begun development and implementation of programs targeting the characteristic
- A few results with prospects of continuation
- Programs reflect some degree of planning and implementation, and results are showing progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- The work at this time has been disseminated only internally
- The campus accomplishments are probably exceeded by 2/3 of campuses in America

1= Little evidence of maturity

- No or very little development and implementation of programs that target the characteristic
- No or only scattered results
- What has been done, if anything, reflects limited planning and implementation, and there has not been much progress toward reducing the discrepancy between actual and what is considered ideal and practical
- There is not much others can learn from the campus's experience
- The campus accomplishments are inferior to most campuses in America

