

Detailed Evaluation Rubric for Engaged Research Micro-Credential

	Absent/ Insufficient 0	Emerging 1	Good 2	Exemplary 3
(1) Understanding of concepts & frameworks of community engagement and community-engaged research, including familiarity with the histories and basic literatures of community engaged scholarship (CES), broadly, and community-based (participatory) research, specifically	Little or no expressed understanding of frameworks for community engagement and CBR; no demonstrated familiarity with broader histories and literatures of CES and CB(P)R	Demonstrates understanding of concepts and frameworks of CES and CBR, but little expressed familiarity with the histories and basic literatures of CES broad and CB(P)R specifically (or vice-versa)	Demonstrates understanding of concepts & frameworks of community engagement and community-engaged research, including familiarity with the histories and basic literatures of community engaged scholarship (CES), broadly, and community-based (participatory) research, specifically	Demonstrates very strong understanding of concepts & frameworks of community engagement and community-engaged research, including extensive familiarity with the histories and basic literatures of community engaged scholarship (CES), broadly, and community-based (participatory) research, specifically
(2) Knowledge of guiding principles of community-based research and ability to apply these guiding principles to models and practices of project planning, implementation, and evaluation	Little or no articulation of specific, guiding principles of CBR or how these principles are applied in practice to their project planning, implementation and evaluation	Articulates guiding principles of CBR but does not adequately demonstrate how these principles are applied in practice across domains of project planning, implementation, and evaluation	Articulates guiding principles of community-based research and demonstrates how principles are applied in practice across domains of project planning, implementation, and evaluation	Articulates guiding principles of community-based research and demonstrates, in a nuanced and reflective way, how those principles are applied in an integrated way across domains of project planning, implementation, and evaluation
(3) Ability to design and frame research in ways that acknowledge various contributors to community issues (e.g., social, economic, behavioral, political, environmental, historical relations, et al.) and the interplay between these factors	Little or no attempt to contextualize research project in relation to various contributors to community issues or health, or to address the potential interplay(s) between these factors	Frames research in ways that acknowledge one or more contributors to community issues or health, but does not adequately address or theorize the interplay between factors or how they shape the research approach	Designs and frames research in ways that acknowledge various contributors to community issues (e.g., social, economic, behavioral, political, environmental, historical relations, et al.) and addresses the interplay(s) between these factors and how they shape the research approach	Designs and frames research in ways that acknowledge a variety of contributors to community issues and health (e.g., social, economic, behavioral, political, environmental, historical relations, et al.) and extensively describes and addresses the interplay(s) between these factors and how they shape the research approach and impact research subjects

Campus Compact Community Engagement Professional Credentialing Program – May 2020

<p>(4) Knowledge of the institutional review board (IRB) processes</p>	<p>Little or no mention of the purposes or importance of IRB processes or the need for human subject review</p>	<p>Demonstrates basic understanding of importance of human subject and ethical research concerns, but provides scant evidence of engaging with IRB processes</p>	<p>Demonstrates understanding of the importance of human subject and ethical research concerns, and describes own participation in IRB processes</p>	<p>Demonstrates nuanced understanding of importance of human subject and ethical research concerns, <i>including both concerns and challenges that are unique to CB(P)R</i>, and describes own participation in IRB processes</p>
<p>(5) Knowledge of the history, strengths, and assets of the community as well as the agendas, desires, and goals of the particular community constituents with whom one partners</p>	<p>Little or no effort to seek comprehensive knowledge of the history, strengths, and assets of the community in which research will be conducted; little or no articulation of the agenda, desire, and goals of community partners</p>	<p>Demonstrates effort to understand the history of the community but demonstrates little effort to assess its strengths and assets; articulate a less-than-comprehensive understanding of the agenda, desire, and goals of community constituents with whom they partner</p>	<p>Demonstrates effort to understand the history of the community in which research is being conducting as well as the community’s strength and assets; demonstrates processes through which the agenda, desire, and goals of community partners were sought and understood</p>	<p>Articulates comprehensive steps taken to understand the history of the community as well as its strength and assets, and is able to articulate the processes through which the agenda, desire, and goals of community partners were sought, understood, and integrated into the project</p>
<p>(6) Ability to design research through an asset-based lens, where the strengths, skills, and situated knowledges of those in the community are validated and legitimized, even as community challenges are acknowledged</p>	<p>Little or no use of asset-identification or mapping strategies as part of research design</p>	<p>Demonstrates understanding of asset-based approach but does not articulate processes through which community assets were identified or mapped, or ways in which community members’ skill, strengths, or situated knowledges were validated and integrated into the project design</p>	<p>Demonstrates steps and process through which community assets were identified or mapped, and the ways in which the skills, strengths, and situated knowledge of those in the community were validated/ legitimized and integrated into the research project design</p>	<p>Demonstrates multiple manners through which community assets were mapped and community members’ strengths, skill, and situated knowledges were validated and integrated into the research project design</p>
<p>(7) <u>Knowledge of self:</u> Ability to acknowledge and articulate one’s positionality as an engaged researcher and how it shapes</p>	<p>Little or no expressed attention to how own personal and professional identities, affiliations, and status may shape</p>	<p>Acknowledges that own personal and professional identities, affiliations, and status are likely to impact the research in various ways, but</p>	<p>Acknowledges and analyzes own personal and professional identities, affiliations, and status and the nuanced ways these complex positionings</p>	<p>Acknowledges and analyzes own personal and professional identities, affiliations, and status and the nuanced ways that these complex positionings may impact the research</p>

Campus Compact Community Engagement Professional Credentialing Program – May 2020

<p>dynamics of collaboration in consequential ways.</p> <p><i>This includes attention to:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>The power relations and inequalities inherent in higher education-community partnerships</i></p> <p>(b) <i>The relative privilege of trained researchers in community contexts and how this may impact the project design and implementation processes, including ways in which similarities and differences (in position, experience, formal schooling, race or ethnic status, gender, sexuality, SES, [dis]ability, institutional affiliation, or identity) may shape dynamics of collaboration in consequential ways</i></p>	<p>or impact the research in consequential ways that deserve analysis and acknowledgement</p>	<p>offers scant attention to any particular scenarios or dynamics that are likely to be at play in the specific community setting; does not adequately assess how such dynamics might be acknowledged or managed in the research process</p>	<p>may impact the research process in specific community setting; demonstrates ability to assess how such dynamics might be productively acknowledged or managed in the research process</p>	<p><i>process, from design to implementation to dissemination;</i> demonstrates ability to assess how such dynamics might be productively acknowledged or managed in the research process</p>
<p>(8) Ability to articulate a collaborative research design process that is grounded in qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation. <u>This includes:</u></p>	<p>Do not score</p>	<p>Do not score</p>	<p>Do not score</p>	<p>Do not score</p>
<p>(a) Ability to actively engage community</p>	<p>Little or no attention to</p>	<p>Actively engages partner-participants</p>	<p>Actively engages community partner-</p>	<p>Actively engages community partner-</p>

Campus Compact Community Engagement Professional Credentialing Program – May 2020

<p>partner-participants in all phases of the research design and decision-making (inclusive of goal setting, development/selection of methodology, data collection/project implementation, analysis, and dissemination);</p>	<p>engaging partner-participants beyond a status of research subjects or “clients”</p>	<p>in initial process of issue/problem identification, but does not create/outline processes or means through which partner-participants might continue to actively contribute in all phases of the design and decision-making</p>	<p>participants in multiple phases of the research design and decision making, allowing means for them to actively contribute and participate on an ongoing basis</p>	<p>participants as co-researchers in all phases of research design and decision making</p>
<p>(b) Ability to involve partnership members in ongoing reflection on, and assessment of, the research process before, during, and after the partnership to ensure accountability to their desire, priorities, and outcomes (<i>Note: this includes strategies for monitoring & facilitating communication and shared work among differently-positioned partners to ensure the quality of relationships and validate the contributions and authority of each partner</i>)</p>	<p>Creates little/no space or ongoing opportunities for community partner-participants to reflection on and share their assessments of the research process to ensure accountability to their desires, priorities, and outcomes</p>	<p>Episodically seeks feedback from “main” community partner during the project, but does not incorporate into the research design ongoing opportunities for community partner-participants to reflection on and share their assessments of the research to ensure accountability to community desires, priorities, and outcomes</p>	<p>Demonstrates a research design plan which offers ongoing opportunities for community partner-participants to reflection on and share their assessments of the research—before during, and after the partnership-- to ensure accountability to community desires, priorities, and outcomes</p>	<p>Engages community partner-participants as co-researchers who continually reflect on, analyze, and share their assessments of research data and partnership relations—before during, and after the partnership-- to ensure accountability to community desires, priorities, and outcomes</p>
<p>(c) Ability to recognize, mediate, mitigate, or hold in creative tension conflicts as they arise and to develop strategies</p>	<p>Little or no recognition of conflicts or disagreement that arise; no articulation of specific strategies</p>	<p>Provides an example of conflict but does not reflect on strategies that were or could be used to reaffirm or model inclusive and</p>	<p>Provides an example(s) of conflict and reflects on strategies that were used, or could be used in the future, to reaffirm or model</p>	<p>Provides an example(s) of conflict and reflects on strategies utilized to mediate conflict and model/reaffirm inclusive and collaborative participation; describes</p>

Campus Compact Community Engagement Professional Credentialing Program – May 2020

<p>that reaffirm or model inclusive and collaborative participation</p>	<p>to mediate that could reaffirm or model inclusive and collaborative participation</p>	<p>collaborative participation</p>	<p>inclusive and collaborative participation</p>	<p>creation of intentional spaces and opportunities for conflicts to be safely articulated and addressed</p>
<p>(9) Ability to demonstrate how the research (in terms of both process and products) contributes to the skill- and capacity-building of all research partners, including those in the community most affected by the problem</p>	<p>Research design, process, or products offer little in term of direct skill- or capacity-building for community partners</p>	<p>Research yields important “product” for community partner but offers relatively little in terms of contributing to the skill- and capacity-building of community partners, including those most affected by the problem</p>	<p>Research design, process, or products contribute meaningfully to the skill- and capacity-building of all research partners, including those in the community</p>	<p>Research is intentionally and elaborately designed to contribute to the skill- and capacity-building of all research partners, including those in the community most affected by the problem</p>
<p>(10) Ability to work with community partners to develop strategies and practices of public dissemination that address multiple audiences through multiple products (E.g, policy papers, peer-reviewed publications, educational programs, community-led interventions, etc.), and include community partners as (co-) producers/ presenters whenever possible</p>	<p>Little evidence of working with community partners to develop and co-participate in dissemination strategies beyond a final report, presentation, brochure, or publication</p>	<p>Works with community partner to develop an important “product” but makes few plans to disseminate project findings through a variety of venues targeting multiple audiences</p>	<p>Works with community partner to develop a variety of dissemination strategies to address multiple audiences</p>	<p>Work with community partner to co-develop and co-disseminate a variety of products addressed to multiple audiences; community partners play a central role as communicators in the dissemination process.</p>
<p>(11) Ability to provide tangible goods to the community constituents with whom one partners in ways that suit their goals/desires and</p>	<p>No tangible product of direct and measurable benefit is offered to the community partner to inform their ongoing work</p>	<p>Research culminates in a final report, plan, or presentation but product offers no or only minor direct, tangible or measurable benefit to the community</p>	<p>Research produces an outcome or product that is of direct, tangible, and measurable benefit to the community partner</p>	<p>Research produces a variety of outcomes or products that are of direct, tangible, and measurable benefit to the community partner</p>

Campus Compact Community Engagement Professional Credentialing Program – May 2020

inform their ongoing work		partner in their ongoing work		
---------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--