



Carnegie Classification Initiative

Beth Claassen Thrush, Director of Strategic Initiatives and Special Projects

Richard Edwards, Executive Director for the XCITE Center for Teaching & Learning

Department Chairs - APO
Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Overview of Carnegie Classification Initiative



Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Application Timeline



Defining Community Engagement

Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Emphasis added

From <https://carnegieelectiveclassifications.org/the-2024-elective-classification-for-community-engagement/>

Looking for examples of and policy supporting:

- **Community engaged teaching and learning** (i.e. utilizing community engaged pedagogy in a course)
- **Community engaged research and creative activity** (i.e. community-engaged or public-facing scholarship)
- **Community engagement as a form of service** (i.e. individual contributions such as judging science fairs, serving on community boards, etc.)

Examples of Resources and Guidelines from Other Campuses



From [UCLA's Promotion & Tenure Report](#) (including examples from Berkeley and Minnesota) and [Purdue's Guide](#) for documenting, evaluating, and recognizing engaged scholarship)

Our framing: the problem

Impediments and disincentives to community-engaged research and teaching, **despite their being core to the UCLA's mission** as a public university and central to the academic/intellectual identity of increasing numbers of faculty

At UCLA, faculty report that the **academic review process discourages community-engaged scholarship** by not recognizing the distinctive process and products of such work

The question of how to treat community-engaged scholarship as **scholarly activity** and **not as service** in tenure and promotion has been the focus of discussion among faculty at UCLA for years

Our framing: why engaged scholarship matters for the future

- Expectation from the public and funders to conduct research for broader societal impact
- Current students are looking to connect their studies to critical societal issues
- Greater interest among new and future faculty:
 - Will UCLA retain the junior faculty committed to community-engaged scholarship if our tenure review processes discourage or don't recognize work that is central to their intellectual, professional, and personal identities?

From UC Berkeley:

Tips for Strengthening and Contextualizing Cases Involving Community-Based Research and Other Public Interest-Focused Research

“It is essential that the quality and impact of the work be articulated and not just described. You help your own case when you provide context and explain why the award or paper is important.”

– Emily Ozer

Tips for Strengthening and Contextualizing Cases Involving
Community-Based Research and Other Public Interest-Focused Research
Emily J. Ozer, UC-Berkeley Professor of Public Health July 2021

What should Berkeley faculty know when preparing self-statements and reviewing ad hoc committee and decanal case evaluations, especially related to your community-engaged and policy-focused scholarship? Our [APM evaluation criteria](#) are flexible: They discuss discipline-specific standards and value diverse forms of scholarship. As noted, it is essential that the quality and impact of the work be articulated, not just described. You help your own case when you provide context and explain why the award or paper is important.

The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations [aka Budget Committee (BC)] recently provided a memo, prompted by an institutional change grant led by Professors Ozer (Public Health) and Stone (Social Welfare), to further articulate how the quality and impact of community-engaged scholarship could be more strongly emphasized in cases. Now on the BMAP site as [guidelines for assessing community-based research](#) (see appendix if you do not have access) they clarify what can get credited as creative work as opposed to service. For example, many faculty spend intensive time and energy on impactful policy- or practice-related briefs (peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed) that may not get sufficiently credited as creative work. The BC is encouraging us to contextualize and concretize the impact of such work. Also, as relevant, you are encouraged to highlight how your creative work and other parts of your portfolio support **equity and diversity priorities** within and outside the university. A 2015 change in APM-210 below makes this explicit:

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

From Purdue University:

Characteristics of Scholarship of Engagement

- Reciprocal relationship with communities (organizations, governmental agencies, schools, business/industry)
- High level of disciplinary expertise
- Innovative
- Capable of being replicated and elaborated
- Documented results
- Professionally and/or peer-reviewed
- Impactful

Examples of Scholarship of Engagement

- Laws/public policy
- Video archives, documentaries, films
- Delivery of products/services (e.g., training materials, courses, workshops)
- Professionally and/or peer-reviewed publications

DEFINITIONS FOR SCHOLARSHIP, ENGAGEMENT AND SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

Results from the 2017 survey suggested the need for greater clarity concerning the definitions of scholarship, engagement and the Scholarship of Engagement. To address the definitional anarchy (Sandmann, 2008) associated with the Scholarship of Engagement, we have conducted a thorough review of the peer-reviewed literature to define scholarship, engagement and ultimately how they, collectively, determine important characteristics of the Scholarship of Engagement.

Scholarship is innovative with a high level of disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, produces documented results that are impactful and is professionally or peer-reviewed (Diamond and Adam, 1993).

Engagement is the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (Carnegie Foundation, 2008).

The characteristics of the **Scholarship of Engagement** include: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/or peer-reviewed and has evidence of impact. Building on this, Purdue Deans and Department Heads have agreed on the following list of characteristics of the Scholarship of Engagement (Table 2) and examples of the Scholarship of Engagement (Table 3).

Table 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

- Reciprocal relationship with communities (organizations, governmental agencies, schools, business/industry)
- High level of disciplinary expertise
- Innovative
- Capable of being replicated and elaborated
- Documented results
- Professionally and/or peer-reviewed
- Impactful

Table 3

EXAMPLES OF THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

- Laws/public policy
- Video archives, documentaries, films
- Delivery of products/services (e.g., training materials, courses, workshops)
- Professionally and/or peer-reviewed publications

Request for Information for specific Carnegie Classification Questions - Section 9

“Cite three examples of college/school and/or department-level policies, with text taken directly from policy documents, that specifically reward faculty for community engagement across teaching, research, and service.”

“Describe any search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty in any employment status and staff with expertise in and commitment to community engagement and cite at least one example.”

Full text of Carnegie Classification Questions - Section 9

- Describe professional development support for faculty in any employment status (tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track, and part time faculty) and/or staff who seek to develop or deepen community engaged approaches and methods.
- Describe any search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty in any employment status and staff with expertise in and commitment to community engagement and cite at least one example
- Describe the policies for faculty promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) from any level of the institution (campus, college or school, department) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community engaged approaches and methods.
 - Text of policy that reward faculty for **Community engaged teaching and learning**
 - Text of policy that reward faculty for **Community engaged research and creative activity**
 - Text of policy that reward faculty for **Community engagement as a form of service**
- Describe the pervasiveness of the policies in the 3 questions above
- Cite three examples of college/school and/or department-level policies, with text taken directly from policy documents, that specifically reward faculty for community engagement across teaching, research, and service.
- Describe any revisions to the promotion and tenure (at tenure granting institutions) guidelines to reward faculty for community engaged teaching and learning, research, creative activity, and service. Describe when the revisions occurred and the process resulting in the revisions. Describe the involvement of the president/chancellor, provost, deans, chairs, faculty leaders, chief diversity officer, community engagement center director, or other key leaders. Describe any products resulting from the process; i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc. Specify if these policies are different for faculty of different employment statuses (adjunct, full-time contract, tenure track, tenured, etc.).
- If revisions have not taken place but there is work in progress to revise promotion and tenure (at tenure granting institutions) guidelines to reward faculty scholarly work that uses community engaged approaches and methods, describe the current work in progress, including a description of the process and who is involved. Describe how the president/chancellor, vice presidents/chancellors, provost, vice provosts, deans, chairs, faculty leaders, chief diversity officer, community engagement center director, or other key leaders are involved. Also describe any products resulting from the process; i.e., internal papers, public documents, reports, policy recommendations, etc. Specify if these policies are different for faculty of different employment statuses (adjunct, full-time contract, tenure track, tenured, etc.).
- Provide 5-10 examples of faculty scholarship from as many different disciplines as possible - a title may not convey how the example is about community engagement, so please provide a short description of how the activity is related to community engagement

Request for Information for specific Carnegie Classification Questions - Section 10

Community engaged course criteria:

- Mutually-beneficial, respectful, and sustained collaboration that creates reciprocal value for students and community partners
- Enriches the scholarship of the institution by accessing community cultural wealth and expertise
- Addresses community-identified needs and enhances community well-being
- Deepens students' civic and academic learning, and promotes connections between these through opportunities for critical reflection
- Integrated into the course design, including assessment of student learning

Number of for-credit community engaged designated courses (both undergrad and grad)	
Number of faculty teaching for-credit community engaged designated courses (and please designate whether full time or part time; tenure-track or non-tenure track)	
Total number of faculty (FT/PT and tenure-track/non-tenure track) in the department	
Number of students enrolled in for-credit courses community engaged designated courses (UG/G)	
Other relevant community engaged learning activity	

Community-Engaged Teaching and Learning

The XCITE Center is available to support community-engaged teaching and learning

- Pedagogy workshops
- Course design support
- Evaluation and assessment strategies for community-engaged student projects
- Faculty Learning Communities

Open Discussion and Q&A:

- Questions? Concerns? Thoughts?
- What might be some of the actionable next steps we should pursue as a campus?
- What might be some of the departmental or faculty support needs we need to consider?