

**TABLE 1. CORE CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHENTIC COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS**

Title and Source	Characteristics
WK Kellogg Foundation. (2001) Characteristics of Vibrant Partnerships Between Communities and Institutions of Higher Education. Available at <a href="http://www.wkkf.org">www.wkkf.org</a> . Accessed 6/20/2005.	Engaged higher education institutions and communities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See their present and future well-being as inextricably linked.</li> <li>2. Collaboratively plan and design mutually beneficial programs and outcomes.</li> <li>3. Engage in reciprocal learning.</li> <li>4. Respect the history, culture, knowledge, and wisdom of the other.</li> <li>5. Create structures that promote open communication and equity with one another.</li> <li>6. Have high expectations for their performance and involvement with each other;</li> <li>7. Value and promote diversity.</li> <li>8. Regularly conduct a joint assessment of their partnership and report results.</li> </ol>
Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (1998) Principles of Good Community-Campus Partnerships. Available at: <a href="http://www.ccpf.info">www.ccpf.info</a> . Accessed 5/22/2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Partners have agreed upon mission, values, goals and measurable outcomes for partnership.</li> <li>2. Relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness commitment.</li> <li>3. Partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, addresses areas needing improvement.</li> <li>4. Partnership balances power among partners and enables resources to be shared.</li> <li>5. Clear, open and accessible communication between partners, on-going priority to listen to each need, develop a common language, and validate/clarify the meaning of terms.</li> <li>6. Roles, norms, and processes are established with input &amp; agreement of all partners.</li> <li>7. There is feedback to, among and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and its outcomes.</li> <li>8. Partners share the credit for the partnership's accomplishments.</li> <li>9. Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time.</li> </ol>
Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships (1998). Findings of the Campus Compact Wingspread Conference on Campus/Community Partnerships. Available at <a href="http://www.compact.org/ccpartnerships/benchmarks-overview.html">http://www.compact.org/ccpartnerships/benchmarks-overview.html</a> . Accessed 5/22/2005	<p><i>Stage I: Designing Partnerships</i>                      Genuine democratic partnerships are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Founded on a shared vision and clearly articulated values</li> <li>▪ Beneficial to partnering institutions</li> </ul> <p><i>Stage II: Building Collaborative Relationships</i>                      Genuine democratic partnerships that build strong collaborative relationships are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect</li> <li>▪ Multi-dimensional- they involve the participation/collaboration of multiple/several sectors that act in service of a complex problem</li> <li>▪ Clearly organized and led with dynamism</li> </ul> <p><i>Stage III: Sustaining Your Partnership Over Time</i>                      Genuine democratic partnerships that will be sustained over time are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions</li> <li>▪ Sustained by a “partnership process” for communication, decision-making, and the initiation of change</li> <li>▪ Evaluated regularly with a focus on both methods and outcomes</li> </ul>

**TABLE 2. BENCHMARKS & INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL ENGAGEMENT**

Title and Source	Benchmarks & Indicators
<p>Committee on Institutional Cooperation (2005). <i>Resource Guide and Recommendations for Defining and Benchmarking Engagement</i>. Champaign, IL: CIC Committee on Engagement.</p>	<p>Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To enrich scholarship and creative activities,</li> <li>▪ To enhance curriculum, teaching &amp; learning,</li> <li>▪ To prepare educated, engaged citizens,</li> <li>▪ To strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility,</li> <li>▪ To address critical societal issues, and to contribute to the public good.</li> </ul> <p>Benchmarks for Engagement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of institutional commitment to engagement</li> <li>2. Evidence of institutional resource commitments to engagement</li> <li>3. Evidence that students are involved in engagement and outreach activities</li> <li>4. Evidence that faculty and staff are engaged with external constituents</li> <li>5. Evidence that institutions are engaged with their communities</li> <li>6. Evidence of assessing the impact and outcomes of engagement</li> <li>7. Evidence of revenue opportunities generated through engagement</li> </ol>
<p>NASULGC CECEPS Benchmarking Task Force, November 2003; Revised May 2004. <i>Qualities of Engagement</i>.</p>	<p>Qualities of Engagement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Engagement brings the University’s intellectual resources to bear on societal needs.</li> <li>2. Engagement is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service.</li> <li>3. Engagement implies reciprocity, whereby both the institutions and partners in the community both benefit and contribute.</li> <li>4. Engagement blends scientific knowledge from the university with experiential knowledge within the community to establish an environment of co-learning.</li> <li>5. Engagement involves shared decision making.</li> <li>6. Engagement is a practice that enables faculty to be better scholars; enhances the learning experience for students; and multiplies the institution’s impact on external constituencies.</li> <li>7. Engagement is actively listening to all stakeholders that reflect the diversity of our communities—especially including those stakeholders who have not been engaged before.</li> <li>8. A university is engaged when stakeholders see the institution as the “resource of choice” when dealing with an issue or problem.</li> <li>9. Engagement documents and evaluates its effectiveness through traditional measures of academic excellence.</li> <li>10. The quality of engagement is tied to public accountability and is measured by impact and outcomes on the communities and individuals it serves.</li> </ol>

Title and Source	Benchmarks & Indicators
<p>The Higher Learning Commission (2003). <i>Criterion Five: Engagement and Service</i>. In Chapter 3: The Criteria for Accreditation. The Handbook of Accreditation. Chicago, IL: The Higher Learning Commission.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.</li> <li>2. The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.</li> <li>3. The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.</li> <li>4. Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.</li> </ol>
<p>Campus Compact Available at: <a href="http://www.compact.org/ccpartnerships/knight/#ind">http://www.compact.org/ccpartnerships/knight/#ind</a>. Accessed 5/22/2005</p>	<p>Exemplary campus-community partnership are defined by the presence of the following indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Resource &amp; Budget Allocations are made available for community partners to create richer learning environments for students and for community-building efforts in local neighborhoods.</li> <li>2. Community Voice that deepens the role of community partners in contributing to community-based education and shaping outcomes that benefit the community.</li> <li>3. Enabling Mechanisms in the form of visible and easily accessible structures (i.e., centers) on campus to assist faculty with community-based teaching and to broker community partnerships.</li> <li>4. Teaching and Learning practices and policies that incorporate a community-based, public problem-solving approach to education.</li> </ol>
<p>Campus Compact Indicators of Engagement Project (IOEP) <a href="http://www.compact.org/indicators/IOEP_Booklet.pdf">http://www.compact.org/indicators/IOEP_Booklet.pdf</a> Accessed 5/22/2005</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mission and purpose.</li> <li>▪ Administrative and academic leadership.</li> <li>▪ External resource allocation.</li> <li>▪ Disciplines, departments, and interdisciplinary work.</li> <li>▪ Faculty roles and rewards.</li> <li>▪ Internal resource allocation.</li> <li>▪ Community voice.</li> <li>▪ Enabling mechanisms.</li> <li>▪ Faculty development.</li> <li>▪ Integrated and complementary community service activities.</li> <li>▪ Pedagogy and epistemology.</li> <li>▪ Forums for fostering public dialogue.</li> <li>▪ Student voice.</li> </ul>
<p>Brukardt MJ, Holland BA, Percy SL and Zimpher N. <i>Calling the Question: Is Higher Education Ready to Commit to Engagement? A Wingspread Statement</i>. Milwaukee, WI: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Fall 2004. Available at: <a href="http://www.uwm.edu/MilwaukeeIdea/elements/wingspread.pdf">http://www.uwm.edu/MilwaukeeIdea/elements/wingspread.pdf</a>. Accessed 5/22/2005</p>	<p>Promising Practices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Integrate engagement into mission.</li> <li>2. Forge partnerships as the overarching framework for engagement.</li> <li>3. Renew and redefine discovery and scholarship.</li> <li>4. Integrate engagement into teaching and learning.</li> <li>5. Recruit and support new champions.</li> <li>6. Create radical institutional change.</li> </ol>

<b>Title and Source</b>	<b>Benchmarks &amp; Indicators</b>
<p>Ramaley JA. A Matter of Mutual Benefit: <i>University-Campus Partnerships</i>. Presentation to the NASULGC Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service. June 18, 2004.</p>	<p>Engagement must be reciprocal (requiring the creation of a shared agenda) and must be mutually beneficial to all participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support community development.</li> <li>▪ Enrich the student experience.</li> <li>▪ Deepen scholarly interest of faculty and students in problems presented by community.</li> </ul> <p>Characteristics of Engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A common agenda and sharing of responsibility as well as risk and reward.</li> <li>▪ An ability to share power and resources equitably with the community.</li> <li>▪ The creation of a shared learning environment in which knowledge is created from both explicit and tacit resources of the campus and the community.</li> <li>▪ The inclusion of community concerns as a legitimate set of expectations about what the goals of and successful outcomes of a community-university partnership or engagement will be.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Levels of Commitment to Service, Characterized by Key Organizational Factors Evidencing Relevance to Institutional Mission</i>. In: Holland B. (1997). <i>Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors</i>. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 30-41.</p>	<p><i>Factors:</i>            Mission.            Promotion, tenure and hiring.            Organization structure.            Student involvement.            Faculty involvement.            Community involvement.            Campus publications.</p> <p><i>Levels of Commitment:</i>            Commitment is demonstrated across a continuum of 4 levels. For “promotion, tenure and hiring” for example:            Level 1: Low relevance – service to campus committees or to disciplines.            Level 2: Medium relevance – community service mentioned; may count in certain cases.            Level 3: High relevance – guidelines for documenting, rewarding service &amp; service-learning.            Level 4: Full integration – community-based research, teaching key criteria for rewards.</p>
<p><i>Self-Assessment Tool for Service-Learning Sustainability</i> (2001). Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. <a href="http://www.ccpsh.info">www.ccpsh.info</a>. Accessed 5/22/05.</p>	<p><i>Dimensions:</i>            Definition and application of service-learning.            Faculty support for and involvement in service-learning.            Student support for and involvement in service-learning.            Community support for and involvement in service-learning.            Institutional leadership and support for service-learning.</p> <p><i>Stages of sustainability:</i>            Stage 1: Critical mass building.            Stage 2: Quality building.            Stage 3: Sustained institutionalization.</p>