

SUMMARY ADVICE OF CAMPUS COMPACT ADVANCE INSTITUTE ON
INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION FOR SERVICE AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
IN HIGHER EDUCATION, MARCH 22-23, 2001

Prepared by Judith Ramaley

The assumptions that the group built upon were that the goals of this work are to (a) deepen and advance campus practices of engagement and (b) create avenues to promote the legitimacy of engagement, both within the Academy and with external stakeholders.

CC is advised to approach this work in an **incremental and developmental way** and in **collaboration** with both higher education associations and organizations representing community interests. Barbara Holland's perspectives on the qualities of a good model were thought to be an excellent guide to test the value of the results at each stage.

The advice to you is as follows:

1. Study current practice as a source of indicators and benchmarks to record and document, assess and communicate the work of engagement and its outcomes in all of its many forms. In doing so, take the following things into account:
 - a. Include institutions at several stages of implementation of engagement strategies from early to advanced.
 - b. Decide at the onset whether to include institutions of all types or to work first with a smaller cohort of institutions with similar missions.
 - c. Be sure to include both internal and external perspectives as you begin to assemble cases and examples of good practice. This can either be done separately with the intention of bringing the two outlooks together or as a composite from the beginning.
 - d. Create a family of indicators that will be useful to institutions that are at different stages of development, at different levels within an organization and valid from different perspectives inside and outside the institution.

2. The group felt that the introduction of engagement should progress on all three fronts simultaneously, although the short-term gains would be greater for some of these efforts than for others. Employ the results obtained in step 1 to introduce material on engagement into
 - a. the creation of a recognition program (see notes from group 2 on how to build a recognition program).
 - b. topologies and classification models
 - c. a methodology for the conduct of focused self-studies for institutional as well as specialized accreditation. There was considerable interest in working with professional associations since the framework of a particular discipline and practice may facilitate the shaping of measures for engagement.

3. Regarding the specific role of CC, the group considered different levels of involvement

a. **Direct:** The direct work of CC should be based on the core competency of the organization which is the student experience and the campus as a learning community (The idea of promoting "university as citizen" or campus-community partnerships was seen as too broad and too much of a stretch for CC except insofar as the campus itself becomes a laboratory for learning the skills of citizenship.)

b. **In cooperation with others:** CC is advised to approach this work **in collaboration** with both higher education associations and organizations representing community interests. The community voice needs to be in the mix from the beginning!

c. **Advocacy** for the actions of others: CC is encouraged to urge appropriate groups or institutions to conduct research on engagement, develop new assessment tools and new forms of documentation. CC can then create vehicles for summarizing this work in progress, posting promising practices on its website and creating a clearinghouse of best practices and good research outcomes. The group urges CC to legitimate and cultivate multiple perspectives and models as this work progresses.

Additional comments from participants:

Brian Murphy, San Francisco State: At the end of the meeting there was an important proposal to develop two working groups to: 1. Develop a metric to seriously account for student engagement outcomes; 2. Develop assessment or outcomes measures to account for the impact on communities when universities engage as institutions.

Jane Wellman, IHEP: While this meeting was focused on internal measures, Campus Compact may be well positioned to develop a conversation about how to develop "outside-in" measures of community expectations for higher education.