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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Source</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. See their present and future well-being as inextricably linked.  
2. Collaboratively plan and design mutually beneficial programs and outcomes.  
3. Engage in reciprocal learning.  
4. Respect the history, culture, knowledge, and wisdom of the other.  
5. Create structures that promote open communication and equity with one another.  
6. Have high expectations for their performance and involvement with each other;  
7. Value and promote diversity.  
8. Regularly conduct a joint assessment of their partnership and report results. |
2. Relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness commitment.  
3. Partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, addresses areas needing improvement.  
4. Partnership balances power among partners and enables resources to be shared.  
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.  
6. Roles, norms, and processes are established with input & agreement of all partners.  
7. There is feedback to, among and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and its outcomes.  
8. Partners share the credit for the partnership’s accomplishments.  
9. Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time. |
Genuine democratic partnerships are:  
- Founded on a shared vision and clearly articulated values  
- Beneficial to partnering institutions  
**Stage II: Building Collaborative Relationships**  
Genuine democratic partnerships that build strong collaborative relationships are:  
- Composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect  
- Multi-dimensional- they involve the participation/collaboration of multiple/several sectors that act in service of a complex problem  
- Clearly organized and led with dynamism  
**Stage III: Sustaining Your Partnership Over Time**  
Genuine democratic partnerships that will be sustained over time are:  
- Integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions  
- Sustained by a “partnership process” for communication, decision-making, and the initiation of change  
- Evaluated regularly with a focus on both methods and outcomes |
TABLE 2. BENCHMARKS & INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Source</th>
<th>Benchmarks &amp; Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Committee on Institutional Cooperation (2005). Resource Guide and Recommendations for Defining and Benchmarking Engagement. Champaign, IL: CIC Committee on Engagement. | Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors:  
  ▪ To enrich scholarship and creative activities,  
  ▪ To enhance curriculum, teaching & learning,  
  ▪ To prepare educated, engaged citizens,  
  ▪ To strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility,  
  ▪ To address critical societal issues, and to contribute to the public good.  
  
  Benchmarks for Engagement:  
  1. Evidence of institutional commitment to engagement  
  2. Evidence of institutional resource commitments to engagement  
  3. Evidence that students are involved in engagement and outreach activities  
  4. Evidence that faculty and staff are engaged with external constituents  
  5. Evidence that institutions are engaged with their communities  
  6. Evidence of assessing the impact and outcomes of engagement  
  7. Evidence of revenue opportunities generated through engagement |
| NASULGC CECEPS Benchmarking Task Force, November 2003; Revised May 2004. Qualities of Engagement. | Qualities of Engagement:  
  1. Engagement brings the University’s intellectual resources to bear on societal needs.  
  2. Engagement is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service.  
  3. Engagement implies reciprocity, whereby both the institutions and partners in the community both benefit and contribute.  
  4. Engagement blends scientific knowledge from the university with experiential knowledge within the community to establish an environment of co-learning.  
  5. Engagement involves shared decision making.  
  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.  
  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.  
  8. A university is engaged when stakeholders see the institution as the “resource of choice” when dealing with an issue or problem.  
  9. Engagement documents and evaluates its effectiveness through traditional measures of academic excellence.  
  10. The quality of engagement is tied to public accountability and is measured by impact and outcomes on the communities and individuals it serves. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Source</th>
<th>Benchmarks &amp; Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Higher Learning Commission (2003). <em>Criterion Five: Engagement and Service.</em></td>
<td>1. The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Chapter 3: The Criteria for Accreditation. The Handbook of Accreditation. Chicago, IL: The Higher Learning Commission.</td>
<td>2. The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Compact</td>
<td>Exemplary campus-community partnership are defined by the presence of the following indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available at: <a href="http://www.compact.org/ccpartnerships/knight/#ind">http://www.compact.org/ccpartnerships/knight/#ind</a></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessed 5/22/2005</td>
<td>2. Community Voice that deepens the role of community partners in contributing to community-based education and shaping outcomes that benefit the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Teaching and Learning practices and policies that incorporate a community-based, public problem-solving approach to education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Compact Indicators of Engagement Project (IOEP)</td>
<td>Mission and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplines, departments, and interdisciplinary work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty roles and rewards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal resource allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated and complementary community service activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy and epistemology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forums for fostering public dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Forge partnerships as the overarching framework for engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Renew and redefine discovery and scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Integrate engagement into teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Recruit and support new champions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Create radical institutional change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and Source</td>
<td>Benchmarks &amp; Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ramaley JA. A Matter of Mutual Benefit: *University-Campus Partnerships*. Presentation to the NASULGC Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service. June 18, 2004. | Engagement must be reciprocal (requiring the creation of a shared agenda) and must be mutually beneficial to all participants.  
- Support community development.  
- Enrich the student experience.  
- Deepen scholarly interest of faculty and students in problems presented by community.  

Characteristics of Engagement:  
- A common agenda and sharing of responsibility as well as risk and reward.  
- An ability to share power and resources equitably with the community.  
- The creation of a shared learning environment in which knowledge is created from both explicit and tacit resources of the campus and the community.  
- 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. |

- Mission.  
- Promotion, tenure and hiring.  
- Organization structure.  
- Student involvement.  
- Faculty involvement.  
- Community involvement.  
- Campus publications.  

Levels of Commitment:  
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 4: Full integration – community-based research, teaching key criteria for rewards. |

- 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.  

Stages of sustainability:  
Stage 1: Critical mass building.  
Stage 2: Quality building.  
Stage 3: Sustained institutionalization. |