

## Iowa Campus Compact Member Capacity Self-Assessment Rubric

### Foundational Indicators

| Capacity Area and Scale   | 1 = No Capacity  | 2 = Very Little Capacity  | 3 = Moderate Capacity  | 4 = Strong Capacity  | 5 = Exceptional Capacity  |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| <p><b>1. Institutional Identity</b></p> <p>Degree to which community engagement is represented in the institutional identity as presented to external audiences (ie, mission, vision, marketing, promotions, public speeches, etc.)</p> | Community engagement activities exist, but have yet to be included in external expressions of campus identity. | Community engagement is included in the mission and/or vision statement, but other categories are just beginning or do not yet occur. | Community engagement is evident in most, but not all of the areas outlined.                        | Community engagement is evident in all of the areas described, but could be stronger.  | Community engagement has a prominent and permanent place in the unique campus identity is presented to external audiences.  |
| <p><b>2. Institutional Commitment</b></p> <p>Degree to which community engagement is supported through infrastructure and resources (ie, budgetary allocations, fundraising, and staffing).</p>   | Community engagement exists, but does not have a coordinating infrastructure or dedicated resources.           | Community engagement has some budgetary support, but no coordinating infrastructure.  | Community engagement has at least one person providing coordination and some resource allocations. | Community engagement has a clear, centralized support structure with moderate internal and external budgetary allocations; there is coordination with fundraising efforts, and some community investments. | Community engagement has strong infrastructure with ongoing internal and external budgetary allocations, fundraising to support these efforts, and ongoing community investments. |

| Capacity Area and Scale   | 1 = No Capacity   | 2 = Very Little Capacity   | 3 = Moderate Capacity  | 4 = Strong Capacity  | 5 = Exceptional Capacity   |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>3. Internal Culture</b></p> <p>Degree to which community engagement is part of the <b>internal campus culture</b> and is well-defined, celebrated, and recognized and aligned and integrated with other institutional strategic plans, goals, and priorities (recruitment, retention, sustainability, etc.)</p> | <p>Community engagement is just beginning to emerge and does not impact campus culture.</p> | <p>Community engagement is evident in only some aspects of campus culture, with no clear definition, and no celebration and recognition of activities.</p> | <p>Community engagement has some influence on campus culture and efforts are underway to increase common understandings and recognition of activities.</p> | <p>Community engagement is generally evident, if not prominent, in campus culture. The campus has general expectations and understandings for community engagement and some activity related to recognition of activities.</p> | <p>Community engagement is prominent and widespread in campus culture and aligned and integrated with other plans, goals and, priorities. The campus has institution-wide definitions, understandings, expectations and traditions including celebrations and recognition.</p> |
| <p><b>4. Professional Development</b></p> <p>Degree to which professional development support is provided to faculty and staff who engage with community (i.e. workshops, conference funds, training, fellowships, etc).</p>  | <p>There is no professional development offered specific to community engagement.</p>       | <p>Community engagement is included in a few, isolated professional development activities, but is not widely used.</p>                                    | <p>Community engagement is included in professional development in some areas but is not strategically aligned or offered at different levels.</p>         | <p>Community engagement is integrated into faculty and staff development activities and widely available throughout careers, beginning with faculty and staff orientation.</p>   | <p>Community engagement professional development is integrated, systematic, wide spread, and well-resourced at all levels and throughout careers and there is evidence of its impact.</p>  |

| Capacity Area and Scale   | 1 = No Capacity  | 2 = Very Little Capacity  | 3 = Moderate Capacity  | 4 = Strong Capacity   | 5 = Exceptional Capacity   |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p><b>5. Personnel Decisions</b></p> <p>Degree to which community engagement is part of personnel decisions (i.e. recruitment and hiring and staff goal-setting) and the degree to which those responsible for hiring receive professional development on how to evaluate community-engaged work.</p> | Community engagement is not included in review and personnel decisions.                                | Community engagement is recognized as a factor in some reviews and personnel decisions based on the position, but not others.                 | Community engagement is generally recognized as a positive factor in review and personnel decisions in some departments, but not across the institution.                               | Community engagement is encouraged, recognized and rewarded as a positive factor at all levels of hiring and personnel decisions in most areas across the institution.  | The value of community engagement is communicated throughout hiring and review processes across the institution; and those responsible for review and hiring receive professional development on how to evaluate community-engaged work.               |
| <p><b>6. Internal Assessment and Impact</b></p> <p>Degree to which the community engagement efforts are systematically tracked, documented, and assessed including the impact on students, faculty, and the institution and the degree to which that information is shared and used.</p>              | Community engagement is not tracked, and documented, or assessed in any consistent or coordinated way. | Community engagement is tracked and documented in at least some programs and courses, but information is not systematically assessed or used. | Community engagement is tracked and documented across the institution, but there is no central mechanism for assessing internal impact and the information is not systematically used. | Community engagement is systemically tracked and documented and there are widely used methods for assessing impact in at least some of the areas outlined. This information is used in at least one way to make improvements. | Community engagement is systematically tracked and documented, and the institution has means of assessing impact on students, faculty, and institution. There is a clear process for using data collected to understand, improve, and promote efforts. |

| Capacity Area and Scale   | 1 = No Capacity  | 2 = Very Little Capacity   | 3 = Moderate Capacity  | 4 = Strong Capacity  | 5 = Exceptional Capacity   |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>7. External Assessment and Impact</b></p> <p>Degree to which the community engagement partnerships are assessed including community perceptions, quality of partnerships and community impact, and the degree to which that information is shared and used.</p> | <p>Community partnerships, perceptions, and impact are not assessed.</p> | <p>Community partnerships, perceptions and/or impact are assessed in at least some programs and courses, but the data is not systematically assessed, collected or used.</p> | <p>Community perceptions are assessed and partners are asked for their feedback in a systematic way, but impact is not measured and the data is not shared and used regularly.</p> | <p>Community perceptions, partnerships, and impact are assessed on a regular basis. This information is used in at least one way to make improvements.</p> | <p>Community perceptions, partnerships and impact are systematically assessed and there is a clear process for sharing and using data collected to understand, improve, and promote efforts.</p> |

## Categories of Engagement

| Capacity Area and Scale   | 1 = No Capacity  | 2 = Very Little Capacity   | 3 = Moderate Capacity  | 4 = Strong Capacity  | 5 = Exceptional Capacity  |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p><b>1. Curricular Engagement</b></p> <p>Degree to which community engagement is integrated into teaching and learning, through courses and other curricula, with linkages and pathways and clear definitions, course designations, and institutional learning outcomes.</p>                       | Community engagement is not represented in courses or curricula.             | Community engagement can be found in some courses and curriculum and has some faculty support, but no course designations, definitions, or outcomes. | Community engagement is well-established in some departments and programs and has some learning outcomes, but it not defined and courses are not designated at an institutional level. | Community engagement is integrated in a broad range of colleges, departments and/or programs and has at least one of these elements: definition, course designation, or learning outcomes. | Community engagement is integrated across the curriculum with intentional linkages and pathways. It has an institution-wide, agreed-upon definitions and learning outcomes and courses are clearly and systematically designated.     |
| <p><b>2. Co- and Extra-Curricular Engagement</b></p> <p>Degree to which community engagement is integrated into student life through extra-curricular and/or co-curricular programs and other venues (residence halls, social activities, etc.) with institutional goals and learning outcomes.</p> | Community engagement is not present in student life and student programming. | Community engagement exists in some areas of student life and programming, but is isolated and/or sporadic and does not influence efforts.           | Community engagement is integrated and has some influence on student life and programming and there is some coordination of efforts.   | Community engagement is well established, integrated, and coordinated in a variety of programs, but there are not yet institutional goals and outcomes.                                    | Community engagement is an enduring part of student life and programming with established and measured institutional goals and learning outcomes and includes a continuum of opportunities for students that offer depth and breadth. |

| Capacity Area and Scale  | 1 = No Capacity   | 2 = Very Little Capacity  | 3 = Moderate Capacity   | 4 = Strong Capacity  | 5 = Exceptional Capacity   |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>3. Scholarship and Engaged Research</b></p> <p>Degree to which community 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 for promotion and tenure.</p> | <p>Community engagement is not present in the institution's faculty scholarship..</p> | <p>Some faculty have begun to integrate community engagement as scholarship, but it is not recognized, encouraged, or rewarded.</p> | <p>Community engagement is encouraged, supported and recognized as scholarly work through teaching, research, or service (not all three) in some areas, but not at the institutional level.</p> | <p>Community engagement is recognized and supported as scholarly work through teaching, research, or service in many colleges or departments, but there is no institution-wide policy (or it is a work in progress).</p> | <p>There is intentional linkage and connectivity that demonstrates community engagement is encouraged, supported and recognized as scholarly work through teaching, research, and service at all levels.</p> |

## Voice and Leadership

| Capacity Area and Scale  | 1 = No Capacity   | 2 = Very Little Capacity   | 3 = Moderate Capacity  | 4 = Strong Capacity   | 5 = Exceptional Capacity   |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p><b>1. Faculty Voice and Leadership</b></p> <p>Degree to which faculty are formally involved as mentors and leaders for community engagement and whether they receive training and development for community engagement leadership.</p>                                    | Faculty have yet to take an active role in community engagement.                  | A few faculty members play supporting roles community engagement activities, primarily because of their own initiatives, not because of intentional decisions or programs on campus.                     | A few faculty members play major roles in supporting community engagement activities, but they do not receive training and development and it is not widespread.                     | Community engagement programs formally include faculty voice in planning and offer leadership opportunities, training and development.                  | Many faculty members from different disciplines and backgrounds play an active, prominent and effective leadership role in community engagement programs and overall strategy and receive effective leadership development and training.   |
| <p><b>2. Staff and Administration Voice and Leadership</b></p> <p>Degree to which staff and administrations are formally involved as mentors and leaders for community engagement and whether they receive training and development for community engagement leadership.</p> | Staff and administrative have yet to take an active role in community engagement. | A few members of staff and administration play supporting roles community engagement activities, primarily because of their own initiatives, not because of intentional decisions or programs on campus. | A few members of staff and administration play major roles in supporting community engagement activities, but they do not receive training and development and it is not widespread. | Community engagement programs formally include staff and administration voice in planning and offer leadership opportunities, training and development. | Staff and administration across campus and at a variety of levels play an active, prominent and effective leadership role in community engagement programs and overall strategy and receive effective leadership development and training. |

| Capacity Area and Scale   | 1 = No Capacity  | 2 = Very Little Capacity  | 3 = Moderate Capacity  | 4 = Strong Capacity   | 5 = Exceptional Capacity   |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p><b>3. Student Voice and Leadership</b></p> <p>Degree to which students are involved as assistants, mentors, and leaders, for community engagement and whether they receive training and development for community engagement leadership.</p> | <p>Students have yet to take an active role in community engagement.</p>                     | <p>A few students play supporting roles in community engagement activities, primarily because of their own initiatives, not because of intentional decisions or programs on campus.</p> | <p>A few students play major roles in supporting community engagement activities, but they do not receive training and development and it is not widespread.</p> | <p>Community engagement programs include the student voice in planning and offer leadership opportunities, training and development.</p>                          | <p>Many students from different disciplines and backgrounds play an active, prominent and effective leadership role in community engagement programs and overall strategy and receive effective leadership development and training.</p> |
| <p><b>4. Community Voice and Leadership</b></p> <p>Degree to which community members and organizations are have a voice or role for input and leadership of community engagement planning and assessment.</p>                                   | <p>The community has no voice or role in planning for or assessing community engagement.</p> | <p>A few community members have a role in institutional planning that is not directly tied to community engagement efforts.</p>   | <p>Some programs or courses allow for community voice or a role in planning and assessing their activities.</p>  | <p>Community members and organizations have a clear path to provide input into the planning and assessment of most community engagement courses and programs.</p> | <p>There is an institutional framework for including community voice and leadership across community engagement activities, programs, and courses in the planning and assessing stages.</p>  |

## Outreach and Partnerships

| Capacity Area and Scale  | 1 = No Capacity  | 2 = Very Little Capacity  | 3 = Moderate Capacity   | 4 = Strong Capacity  | 5 = Exceptional Capacity  |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p><b>1. Community Outreach</b></p> <p>Degree to which the institution provides programs and institutional resources to meet community-identified needs (i.e. tutoring, non-credit courses, training programs, student service and/or work study placements, cultural and athletic offerings, library services, faculty consultation, economic development, etc.).</p> | <p>The institution has yet to undertake any specific community outreach programs or share resources.</p> | <p>There are a few instances of resource-sharing and programming, but they are not well-known or used.</p>  | <p>Some resources are shared with the community and at least one strong outreach program exists.</p>  | <p>Several institutional resources are shared with the community and there are strong outreach programs that are well-known and used.</p>  | <p>There are many outreach initiatives that involve and are developed by community members and multiple departments with clear policies and goals that are well-known and used by many in the community.</p>            |
| <p><b>2. Community Partnerships</b></p> <p>Degree to which there are institution and department partnerships with community that demonstrate reciprocity and mutual benefit and have systematic mechanisms for collecting and assessing feedback.</p>  | <p>There is no evidence of reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships across the institution.</p>   | <p>Many partnerships for community engagement are short term and have only sporadic communications with partners covering mainly logistical arrangements.</p> | <p>There are some examples of strong partnerships in isolated courses or programs, but it is not widespread and no feedback is collected or assessed.</p> | <p>Strong, reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships underlie many, but not all community engagement courses and programs and some feedback is collected and assessed.</p> | <p>The institution maintains strong, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships with the community that cross programs and courses and there are clear and systematic mechanisms for feedback and assessment.</p> |