**Progress Report**

**Assessment Committee**

**Council for Engaged Scholarship**

**Members:**Kathy Bieschke (chair), Chas Brua, Adam Christensen, Kate Domico, Margaret Gray, Kelly Griffith, Michele Halsell, Noel Habashy, Chang Liu, , Anthony Robinson, Dennis Shea, Shivaani Selvaraj, Nels Shirer, Patrick Tanner, Kristin Thomas, Suzanne Weinstein

The Assessment Committee was charged and began meeting in earnest in November of 2015. Per its charge, the purpose of the Assessment Committee was to develop recommendations for methods of assessment for engaged scholarship and to create metrics for tracking engaged scholarship at the individual, institutional, and community levels. This report documents our progress to date. Below please find an articulation of the principles that guided our work. This progress report identifies two over-arching recommendations that are critical to each level of assessment (i.e., student, institutional, community). A list of next steps is also presented.

To accomplish its task, each member of the committee served on one of three sub-committees (i.e., Student Learning Objectives, Institutional Assessment, and Community Assessment). Each sub-committee produced a separate report that included an overview of the issues as well as a set of recommendations. Please note that though we tackled each area separately, there is considerable overlap between assessment of outcomes at the student, institutional, and community level.

**Guiding principles**

* Assessing the impact of engaged scholarship experiences must be comprehensive, critically examine both expected and unintended outcomes, and be inclusive of voices beyond the Penn State community.
* Assessing engaged scholarship will include examining the impact of such experiences on student, institutional, and community outcomes.
* Ensuring high quality engaged scholarship experiences requires fostering an environment where data is used to improve engaged scholarship practices.
* Drawing from existing, ongoing data collection efforts (e.g., LionPath, iTwo) is preferable.
* Effectively assessing impact includes collecting metrics on rate of participation in engaged scholarship activities.
* Utilizing a combination of qualitative and quantitative data is necessary to determine impact at each level.
* Ensuring that assessment of engaged scholarship occurs in concert with the university-wide assessment plan for academic programs and General Education developed by the Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment fosters the delivery of a coordinated, cohesive curriculum for undergraduate students.

**Over-arching Recommendations**

* Create a full-time position to centrally lead the assessment of the impact of engaged scholarship experiences on students, the institution, and on communities.

**RATIONALE:** Each of the reports from the three sub-committee documents emphasizes that systematically assessing the impact of engaged scholarship on students, the institution, and the communities is an unwieldly task. Central, readily identifiable coordination will be essential given the recommendation that assessment of outcomes should be done at three levels (i.e., student, institutional, community) and that there is considerable overlap between the levels. Further, assessment will need to include assessment of outcomes at all Penn State campuses, including the World Campus.

* Invest in the creation or adaptation of a data infrastructure compatible with existing systems that will both collect and evaluate evidence of Engaged Scholarship.

**RATIONALE:** Data is essential to the systematic evaluation of the impact of engaged scholarship on student, institutional, and community outcomes. Currently, data pertaining to engaged scholarship experiences is being collected in multiple places. Creating an infrastructure to systematically collect the data required to assess engaged scholarship is needed.

**Next Steps**

Each of the sub-committee reports is comprehensive and contains a detailed set of recommendations. Below is a list of recommendations in need of immediate attention.

* Adoption of the Engaged Scholarship student learning objectives presented in Appendix A by the Council on Engaged Scholarship.
* Bring together members of Penn State’s assessment community to identify engaged scholarship sources in existence, and oversee the development of new data sources (see Appendix B).
* Support the efforts of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education to develop a database composed of Engaged Scholarship courses and associated demographic characteristics to allow for preliminary assessment of engaged scholarship experiences (see Appendix B).
* Create a comprehensive inventory of curricular and co-curricular engaged scholarship experiences currently available using the extended set of characteristics in Appendix A.
* To determine the short- and long-term impacts of engaged scholarship in communities, develop a process for systematically including community participants.
* Provide training and guidance for faculty and staff in regard to assessment of engaged scholarship experiences (see Appendix A).
* To facilitate tracking of Engaged Scholarship experiences, assign attributes to courses that have an engaged scholarship component that will include the type of ES experience (see Appendices A and B)
* Explore the utilization of LionPath to track progress toward key Engaged Scholarship milestones (see Appendices A, B, and C).

**Appendix A**

**Council on Engaged Scholarship**

**Student Leaning Objectives Sub-committee Report**

**Team members:** Chas Brua, Adam Christensen, Chang Liu, Dennis Shea, Nels Shirer, Suzanne Weinstein (chair)

**Student Learning Objectives**

***All students in an engaged scholarship experience will meet the following learning objective:***

* Students will be able to apply in-class learning to an out-of-class experience.

In addition, students must also be able to communicate how they met the student learning objectives in at least one of the five categories listed below.

***Global and Domestic Diversity and Inclusion*** (may satisfy Global Learning General Education objective)

* Students will demonstrate awareness of, and respect for, human differences and apply diverse perspectives to complex subjects.

***Civic Responsibility***

* Students will be able to identify and describe their personal civic identity and demonstrate an ability to work collaboratively, effectively, and creatively within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim

***Ethical Behavior*** (may satisfy Social Responsibility General Education objective)

* Students will develop a sense of integrity and clarify their professional, educational, and/or personal values,*and* be able to apply knowledge and abilities to address professional and/or societal problems in ethical ways

***Knowledge Synthesis*** (may satisfy Integrative Thinking or Creative Thinking General Education objectives)

* Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and synthesize ideas, apply theories, and evaluate information to answer questions or solve problems *or*
* Students will demonstrate competence in the creation and interpretation of works of arts and design

***Professional Development***

* Students will demonstrate skills aligned with the expectations of their profession and/or today’s global workplace, *and* clarify their career goals.

(See Supplemental Materials for possible assessment methods and student behaviors)

**Engaged Scholarship Assessment Plan**

***I. Preparation for Assessment of Engaged Scholarship***

1. Inventory the engaged scholarship experiences currently available. Include the following information (this activity is currently being done by the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence).
	* courses/experiences that exist currently,
	* type of ES experience (e.g. study abroad),
	* learning objective(s)
	* assessments used to assess objective(s)
	* whether these experiences occur in courses within the major, General Education courses, or in extracurricular settings
2. Build a database of assessment tools developed by faculty and staff that can be shared with others. Include the type of ES experience and the learning objective(s) associated with each assessment tool. See example matrix below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Learning Objective** | **ES Experience type** | **Example assessment tool** | **Description of the assessment method** | **Data source** |
| 1 | Community Engagement | Multicultural Awareness Survey | Faculty members administer the pre-and post-surveys at the beginning and the end of the class.  | Self-report |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |

***II. Assessment procedure***

Assessment of engaged scholarship could occur in cooperation with the newly-established university-wide assessment plan for academic programs and General Education developed by the Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment. The same procedures should be followed when possible so that the burden on faculty is not increased. Furthermore, the assessment process for engaged scholarship could take advantage of overlap between ES objectives and objectives in the major, General Education and extracurricular programs. In cases in which the objectives are the same, only one assessment would be necessary. Assessment of engaged scholarship should include direct measures of student learning through class assignments as well as student self-reports of their ability to meet the learning objectives. Development of creative products by students that reflect on their Engaged Scholarship experiences might also be included. These products could be short videos, music, art, or other forms of creative expression.

**ES courses in the major**

ES courses in the major could be assessed through the already-established learning outcomes assessment process. The required learning objective, *students will be able to apply in-class learning to an out-of-class experience,* could be assessed on a regular schedule, such as every three years or every year in different classes. The optional objectives could be assessed in the same manner as the program objectives – one objective, chosen by the faculty, assessed each year. In cases in which the learning objective chosen for outcomes assessment matches one of the engaged scholarship objectives, assignments in an ES course could be chosen to provide evidence of student achievement. ES assessment results could be reported with the results of the assessment of the program-level objectives.

**ES courses aligned with General Education**

Several of the engaged scholarship learning objectives overlap with General Education objectives. In these cases, these courses could be included in the assessment process. These objectives could be assessed on the schedule and via the method yet to be determined by the General Education assessment committee.

**Extracurricular ES experiences**

Engaged Scholarship assessment of extracurricular experiences could be incorporated into the process established by the Office of Student Affairs.

**Additional thoughts**

Guidance for faculty assessing ES courses could be incorporated into training materials developed by the Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment. Assessment of engaged scholarship could be piloted in spring, 2017.

Student involvement in engaged scholarship could be tracked through LIONPATH.

**Supplemental Materials:**

**Assessment methods and student behaviors that address each objective**

**Global and Domestic Diversity and Inclusion** (may satisfy Global Learning General Education objective)

***Possible assessment methods***

Essays, blogs, presentations, debates, reflection (written, oral, video), videos

***Possible student behaviors that address the objective***

* Express value in intercultural interactions
* State multiple general domains in which cultural variation may occur
* Analyze similarities and differences among cultures
* Identify cultural factors such as history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, beliefs, and practices that may play a role in current/specific intercultural situations
* Interpret intercultural experience from the perspective of more than one worldview
* Evaluate natural, physical, social, cultural, historical, and economic legacies and hierarchies
* Act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group
* Suspend own judgement in interactions with culturally different others
* Seek complexity in viewpoints and experience
* Identify viable strategies for communicating or negotiating cultural differences in situations
* Analyze power
* Identify and critique interdependent global, regional, and local cultures and systems; evaluate implications for people’s lives

**Civic Responsibility**

***Possible assessment methods***

Presentation, paper, event planning, video, discussion, reflection (written, oral, video), external evaluation (from community members)

***Possible student behaviors that address the objective***

* Describe what they learned about themselves as it relates to a clarified self-awareness as a citizen
* Display a sense of duty or leadership to promote social justice locally or globally
* Express strong interest in public issues
* Express a commitment to taking actions or work toward a solution to a social problem
* Apply knowledge from one’s own academic field of study to community service and problem-solving
* Communicate effectively through expressing, listening, and synthesizing ideas based on others’ perspectives in a civic context

**Ethical Behavior** (may satisfy Social Responsibility General Education objective)

***Possible assessment methods***

Essay, reflection (written, oral, video), video, discussion, external evaluation (from faculty or supervisor or mentor)

***Possible student behaviors that address the objective***

* Describe and analyze both core beliefs/values and the origins of those beliefs/values
* Recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings
* Describe a complex list of ethical issues by determining important facts, stakeholders, consequences, duties, underlying values, and relationships related to the issue
* Apply ethical concepts or theories to understand the perspectives of multiple stakeholders
* Analyze competence and responsibility of stakeholders
* Clarify alternative resolutions
* State a position and defend against the objections from different ethical perspectives

**Knowledge Synthesis** (may satisfy Integrative Thinking or Creative Thinking General Education objectives)

***Possible assessment methods***

Research paper, graphs, data, essay, critique, presentation of work of art

***Possible student behaviors that address the objective***

* Constructs problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors
* Identifies important aspects of the system
* Describes how parts of the system interact
* Relates how the system interacts with the outside world
* Proposes one or more solutions that are sensitive to contextual factors such as ethical, logical and cultural dimensions of the problem
* Develops a logical, consistent, feasible plan to solve the problem
* Analyzes own and others’ assumptions and points of view when making an argument
* Conceptualizes, applies, analyzes, synthesizes, and/or evaluates information gathered from or generated by observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action
* Makes logical conclusions based on previous evidence and evaluation
* Synthesizes existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways; performs, makes, thinks or acts in imaginative ways characterized by innovation, divergent thinking and intellectual risk taking

**Professional Development**

***Possible assessment methods***

Supervisor evaluation, reflection (written, oral, video), completion of a problem-based project, portfolio/CV

***Possible student behaviors that address the objective***

* Clarify self-interest, values, personal qualities, work style and relate them to career goals
* Actively seek professional development opportunities and explore possible careers
* Actively develop skills aligned with career direction
* Understand the expectations of employers and today’s work environment
* Demonstrate skills and ethical behaviors desired by the profession
* Confidently communicate strengths and skills related to a profession
* Reflect and re-assess career goals and actions

**Appendix B**

**Council on Engaged Scholarship**

**Institutional Assessment Sub-Committee Report**

**Group Members:** Kate Domico, Anthony Robinson (chair), Patrick Tanner, Kristin Thomas

**Research Questions, Recommendations, and Guiding Principles**

**Guiding Principles for Institutional Assessment**

Our development of Institutional Assessment research questions and recommendations is guided by the following overarching principles:

* Via direct and indirect evidence, Penn State will need to report on the prevalence and impact of Engaged Scholarship (ES)at Penn State.
* Key audiences for institutional assessment of Engaged Scholarship will include the three sponsoring units (outreach, student affairs, and undergraduate education) as well as Penn State’s students (current, prospective, and alumni), faculty, and the communities in which engaged scholarship occurs. Other audiences include parents, state government, and members of the Board of Trustees.
* Our task is to identify which data should be gathered and procedures should be established to evaluate and improve return on investment for engaged scholarship experiences.

**Institutional Research Questions**

We suggest two key themes for Institutional Assessment of Engaged Scholarship: Prevalence and Broader Impacts. Here we provide examples of Prevalence and Broader Impact research questions that should be pursued. We believe that answers to prevalence questions can be established quickly, while answers to questions on broader impacts may take more effort to develop over time.

Specifically, we recommend moving beyond simply evaluating the so-called *Fabulous Five* metrics that measure the number of students, number of faculty, number of partners, number of hours of service, and estimated economic value of hours of service. We encourage the development of a framework for assessment that expands the scope to address who is doing what, with whom, and for what purpose.

***Prevalence of Engaged Scholarship***

* What ES opportunities do academic units offer?
* How does the prevalence of ES at Penn State vary by type of ES experience?
* Which ES opportunities include inter-unit collaboration?
* Which ES opportunities integrate curricular and co-curricular experiences?
* Which ES opportunities are used in blended and completely online formats?
* How many students participate in Engaged Scholarship and how does that participation change over time?
* How many students participate in more than one experience?
* How many students participate in Engaged Scholarship activities that take place in communities?
* How many hours are devoted to communities from ES experiences?
* How does participation in Engaged Scholarship vary based on Learning Objectives?

***Broader Impacts of Engaged Scholarship***

* What are the demographic characteristics of students who participate in Engaged Scholarship and how does participation vary among types of Engaged Scholarship?
* Does Engaged Scholarship change student perceptions of the University and the value of their education?
* Does Engaged Scholarship change stakeholder, alumni, or donor perceptions of the University?
* Does Engaged Scholarship help students achieve their career and professional goals? If so, how?
* Do employers find our ES graduates to be better prepared for the workforce? If so, how?
* Does Engaged Scholarship impact the number and/or types of employers that attend Penn State career fairs?
* Does Engaged Scholarship influence Penn State’s ability to attract resources, including scholarships or other funding mechanisms intended to support undergraduate students?
* Does Engaged Scholarship impact town-gown relations?
* How does participation in co-curricular activities impact students’ career and professional goals and outcomes (earnings, grad school entry, etc.)?
* What impacts will Engaged Scholarship have on the promotion of our fixed-term and tenure-track faculty (especially our junior faculty)?
* What are the impacts on our staff?
* What are the impacts on student interaction with faculty?
* How does ES impact the recruitment and retention of students, faculty, and staff?

**Recommendations for Institutional Assessment**

To answer key Institutional Assessment research questions, we recommend the following actions:

* Penn State should empanel a committee with members from units like the office of Assessment and Planning, Center for Online Innovation in Learning, Institutional Research, Student Affairs Research & Assessment, Undergraduate Education, Outreach, and other relevant parties to collect key research aims around Institutional Assessment, identify which engaged scholarship data sources already exist, and oversee the development of new data sources to meet Institutional Assessment goals.
* Penn State will need to create and/or adapt infrastructure to collect and evaluate evidence of Engaged Scholarship.
* Primary data sources will include qualitative and quantitative evidence, e.g. direct evidence gathered from course experiences, student self-reports on progress toward learning objectives, creative products developed by students to reflect on their experiences, data from existing sources such as those collected by Student Affairs and the Office of Global Programs, and feedback from community stakeholders.
* We recommend the development of key milestones and suggested timing for those milestones for students to choose, participate in, and reflect on an Engaged Scholarship experience.
* We recommend exploring the utilization of LionPath to track progress toward key Engaged Scholarship milestones. This system should support the ability for academic departments, colleges, and the university to report on participation, achievement, and basic student demographics associated with Engaged Scholarship activities. Specifically, we recommend the use of course attributes to indicate whether or not a class is considered Engaged Scholarship, and if so, which type it is.
* We encourage the Vice President for Undergraduate Education to continue efforts to develop an Engaged Scholarship course database.

**Appendix C**

**Working Document of Suggestions & Findings**

**COES Community Assessment Subcommittee Report**

**Members:**Michele Halsell (chair), Noel Habashy, Kelly Griffith, Margaret Gray, Shivaani Selvaraj

**Community Perspective:**

When assessing the community impacts of Engaged Scholarship, it is imperative to incorporate the perspective of the community members.  The danger exists that an Engaged Scholarship program could be viewed very positively by students and faculty members but viewed very negatively by community members.  Without seeking to understand community perspectives, we risk treating communities as educational tools for the development of students.

 It is important to incorporate community perspectives into the development, design, and assessment of all Engaged Scholarship efforts.  Best practices within community engagement highlight the importance of integrating community members from the very inception of the program rather asking community members their perspectives once a program or project is underway or complete.

 With respect to assessing impacts post-engagement, we recommend that any assessment have a means of capturing the perspective of local community members.  This could be in the form of a survey and open-ended questions to examine various perspectives.  Regardless of the format, there must be a means to evaluate community perspectives of a particular project to determine if the community views the work as meaningful, useful, or good.

**Questions/Considerations:**

 After exploring methods of assessing the community impact of Engaged Scholarship, our committee feels we have only scratched the surface of what is to be known and understood about this topic.  We have therefore put together a list of questions and/or considerations for the Council of Engaged Scholarship to consider as it applies specifically to assessment of Penn State student’s impact on the local, state, regional, national, and global community.  The definition of community is key to all of the recommendations in this document. These considerations include:

**How are we defining community engagement?**Carnegie defines community engagement as follows:

“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.”

**Source:** [**http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=618**](http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=618)

**How are other institutions assessing the impact of community engagement?**

*Carnegie’s Community Engagement Classification* requires institutions to describe how they are collecting the following: (1) community perceptions of the institution’s engagement with the community; (2) whether (and how) the institution aggregates and uses the assessment data; (3) campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community; (4) how data shows the initiatives are impacting the community; and (5) how the community is given voice or a role for input into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement.  Penn State is listed as a Carnegie Community Engaged Institution through 2025. Reapplication will begin in 2023 at which time, the Commonwealth Campuses will have to apply separately for this designation. It would be helpful to review Penn State’s application and how the application addresses these five points.  In addition, it might be helpful to further explore the applications on Carnegie’s website to see how other institutions are addressing these five points.

*AAC&U* refers to a consortium called *“Imagining America”* (of which Penn State is a member) and its assessment model entitled “Assessing the Practices of Public Scholarship.”  This model draws attention to five core values that should be incorporated into any assessment of community engagement.  These values are collaboration, reciprocity, generativity, rigor, and practicability.  Moving forward, these values should be apparent in the work of assessing the community impact of engaged scholarship efforts.  Most notably, the involvement of community members in the identification, development, implementation, and evaluation of projects is a key component of this model.

*Association of Public and Land-grant Universities’ (APLU)* Council on Engagement and Outreach is currently working on some strategies for moving the needle on metrics and indicators for community engagement. APLU’s Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness, and Economic Prosperity (CICEP) created a “[New Metrics Field Guide: Measuring University Contributions to the Economy](http://www.aplu.org/projects-and-initiatives/economic-development-and-community-engagement/economic-engagement-framework/related-resources/cicep-new-metrics-field-guide_201405.pdf)” which may be of interest. This is not specifically about Engaged Scholarship, but addresses some of the challenges related to measurement and indicators for university engagement broadly, in particular, the challenge of identifying outcome metrics that are feasible to collect data on.

*Engagement Scholarship Consortium (ESC)*, of which Penn State is a member, is comprised of 35 higher education institutions. The ESC annual conference includes sessions on measurement and assessment.

IUPUI’s Kristin Norris, Director of Assessment, Office of Community Engagement recommended expanding the narrative beyond the “Fabulous Five” of number of students, number of faculty, number of partners, number of hours of service, and estimated economic value of hours of service.  Universities need to develop an institutional data framework for assessment that shifts the narrative to address who is doing what, with whom, and for what purpose. Include quantitative and qualitative data.  IUPUI conducts an Assessment Institute each year in October.

Other resources: The Community Indicators Consortium (CIC) conducts an annual conference called an Impact Summit that focuses on community impact data collection and assessment. The STAR Community Rating System may also offer insights as to what impacts can be measured at the local level.

**Who will be responsible for facilitating the collection of data of community assessment?**

Cooperative Extension at Penn State may be the obvious place to house assessment of community-level outcomes.  Cooperative Extension not only has the preexisting network of relationships throughout Pennsylvania, but also has the mission of working with communities throughout the state.  Obviously some PSU Engaged Scholarship efforts are located outside of the state and country, but that may be a small hurdle to overcome.

What role might Institutional Research play in the assessment of Engaged Scholarship initiatives at Penn State?  What resources will be required in terms of staffing, software, etc.? Who will be responsible for data entry? Should documenting community impact/outcomes be a part of faculty promotion and tenure process? Faculty members who do community Engaged Scholarship should be encouraged to collect data on community impacts. The university should provide resources to faculty to support this effort such as suggested questions, survey instruments or other tools. Every three years, the university could select a sample of projects for a more thorough follow-up assessment.

Michigan State University administers an annual survey, the Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI). Faculty and staff respond to the survey which collects data about engagement activities including time spent, societal issues, forms of activity, locations, non-university partners, and external support. The survey also solicits qualitative data about impacts on scholarship and impacts on external audiences.

**Additional questions and considerations:**

Community voice is paramount. With respect to community-level impacts and outcomes, it seems essential to begin with community needs on the front end prior to engagement.  Afterwards, it is also important to include community members in the assessment of engaged scholarship by soliciting feedback from community partners. Beyond doing good and having a positive impact, it is also important to assess whether community engagement is causing harm or creating unintended negative impact.

Community-level impacts and outcomes of Engaged Scholarship may be the most difficult assessment challenge.  Communities are complex and dynamic systems where there may be considerable time between the completion of a particular engagement and the realization of a particular outcome or impact.  There will almost certainly be confounding factors that make it difficult to attribute a particular outcome to a particular project.

The *economic impact* of Penn State on the state’s economy is available in terms of direct and indirect jobs created, research funding, and commercializing research (<http://econimpact.psu.edu/>). APLU’s Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness, and Economic Prosperity (CICEP) created a “[New Metrics Field Guide: Measuring University Contributions to the Economy](http://www.aplu.org/projects-and-initiatives/economic-development-and-community-engagement/economic-engagement-framework/related-resources/cicep-new-metrics-field-guide_201405.pdf)” which may be of interest. This report addresses some of the challenges related to measurement and indicators for university engagement broadly, including the challenge of identifying outcomes metrics for which data collection is feasible. To the extent that PSU’s Launch Box initiative includes Engaged Scholarship opportunities for students, is it possible to track the economic impact on the community?

While the motivation and focus of Engaged Scholarship at Penn State is primarily to enhance student learning, improving *town-gown relations* may be considered an ancillary benefit. The impact of engaged scholarship on town-gown relations is a factor that Penn State might monitor using a framework pioneered at Ohio State.

The assessment of community impacts must provide structure while at the same time allowing *flexibility* for individual faculty members to measure success in ways that makes sense for their work.  Because of this, there is a need to allow project managers to define success for their individual projects and to provide evidence of this success at the conclusion of their projects. This should include both qualitative and quantitative data. It is also strongly recommended that community members are able to provide evidence to support the impact of the project has had on their community.

Categorical data on outputs should be collected in order to track the number of participants, amount of time devoted to projects by students, duration of projects, location of projects, number of community partners, etc.

**Recommendations/Next Steps:**

1. Expand subcommittee and/or recruit new members.  Invite Mallika Bose in Landscape Architecture to join the committee. She has written a chapter and edited a book on assessing community-level impacts of engaged scholarship.
2. Send assessment committee members to IUPUI Assessment Institute in October 2016.
3. Consider bringing in a consultant from IUPUI to develop an assessment data framework for Penn State’s Engaged Scholarship initiatives.
4. Explore software systems for tracking outputs and outcomes. May include CBISA Lyon Software, Digital Measures, or Tree Top Commons’ “Collaboratory.”
5. Consider piloting assessment of community impact on a smaller scale, perhaps at the Philadelphia Center or Pittsburgh Center to find out what does or doesn’t work before scaling up to assess community impacts of Engaged Scholarship at University Park.
6. Consider measuring the health of town-gown relations and the impact of Engaged Scholarship on town-gown relations.
7. Consult with APLU’s Valerie Paton on their recommendations for assessing community impacts of Engaged Scholarship.
8. Budget for assessment of the community impacts of Engaged Scholarship should include funding for a meeting with APLU representatives and bringing a subject matter expert from IUPUI.

**Resources explored:**

* Carnegie Community Engagement Classification (<http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92>)
* Assessing the Practices of Public Scholarship - AAC&U Article
(<https://www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2013/summer/bartha-nigro>)
* Brian Bumbarger, Founding Director, EPISCenter and Assistant Director of Knowledge Translation and Dissemination, Prevention Research Center (<http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/node/403>)
* Gavazzi, S. M., Fox, M., & Martin, J. (2014). Understanding campus and community relationships through marriage and family metaphors: A town-gown typology. *Innovative Higher Education*, *39*(5), 361-374.
* Chupp, M. G., & Joseph, M. L. (2010). Getting the most out of service learning: Maximizing student, university and community impact. *Journal of Community Practice*, *18*(2-3), 190-212.
* Furco, A., & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2009*(147), 47-54.
* Community IRB’s and research review boards: Shaping the future of community-engaged research. Albert Einstein College of Medicine, The Bronx Health Link, and Community-Campus Partnership, 2012.
* Gorski, I., Obeysekare, E., Yarnal, C., & Mehta, K. Responsible Engagement: Building a Culture of Concern. Journal of Community Engagement, 8 (2), 2015.