ARIS Webinar:
Insights from Carnegie Electives Staff on the ‘24 Cycle & Preparing for ‘26
Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Reinvisioned Carnegie Elective Classifications
   a. Our data
   b. Values and Goals of Elective Classifications
   c. Survey on Institutional Resources Used - 2024
3. 2026 Application Cycle
   a. 2026 Application Updates
   b. Strategies to Approach the Application
   c. Resources
4. Questions
Carnegie Elective Classifications Staff

Marisol Morales, Ed.D. (she, her) Executive Director

Cammie Jones (she/her) Community Engagement Director

Amelia Ortiz, Ed.D. (she/her) Associate Director
Poll
Reinvisioned Carnegie Elective Classification
Elective Classifications: What they do

The Elective Classifications provide an independent and rigorous assessment of an institution's extraordinary commitment to, investment in, and accomplishment at an important aspect of its public purpose.
Carnegie Elective Classifications
Institutional Motivation

**Institutional Identity:** Declare an institutional identity and mission that distinguishes the institution from peers.

**Institutional Self-assessment and Self-study:** Bring the disparate parts of the campus together to advance a unified agenda and identify promising practices that can be shared across the institution.

**Accountability:** Demonstrate that the institution is fulfilling its mission to serve the public good, as well as a new level of legitimacy, public recognition, and visibility for your work.

**Catalyst for Change:** Foster institutional alignment for community-based teaching, learning, and scholarship or interdisciplinary leadership development.
Community Engagement Definition

Community engagement describes the 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. [process of engagement]
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. [purpose of engagement]
Our Data
Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement

352 campuses are currently categorized under the Elective Classification for Community Engagement (2015 and 2020 cycles)

49 states and territories are represented

16 community colleges are represented

79 minority serving institutions are represented

- 5 HBCUs
- 49 HSIs
- 21 AANAPISIs
- 1 PBI
- 1 ANNH
- 2 NASNTIs

205 Public institutions

147 Private institutions
THIRD-TIME APPLICANTS:
Institutions Eligible for Second Re-Classification in 2024 or 2026

- 94 private
- 134 public

45 states and territories are represented.

CLASSIFICATION ATTAINMENT FROM 2020: All Institutions

61%
Community Engagement Elective Classification Roadmap
2020 Application Cycle Data

Community Colleges
14 Applied / 3 Classified
21% Classified

HBCUs
4 Applied / 1 Classified
25% Classified

Hispanic Serving Institutions
29 Applied / 14 Classified
48% Classified

All Applicants
194 Applied / 119 Classified
61% Classified
Values & Goals
Guiding Principles + Criteria

A self-study framework focusing on public purpose themes. Campuses submit the results of the study for a peer-review process.

- Not accreditation!
- **Reflect** manifestations of deep commitment to public purpose at the institutional level and **elevate** particular modes of public purpose into teaching, learning, and scholarly missions.
- Seek to be a "field force" in the direction of continuous improvement and people-centered systems change.
- Rooted in **clear definition** of classification theme
- Existing higher education field where classification theme can be seeded/nurtured
People-Centered, Transformation Focused
2026 Application Cycle
Revision Process for ‘26 Cycle

Purpose of revision is to reconnect the field with our initial goals of creating a CE Classification while acknowledging how have things changed from the initial application launch to now.

SWOT of current CE Classification:
- CE is the theoretical framework that legitimized and institutionalized CE in higher education. CE has value and led to a standard of practice and core definition (Strength)
- Lack of accessibility for underrepresented institutions (MSI’s, HBCU’S, CC’s); Long Application, Redundant (Weakness)
- ACE, Staff Infrastructure, Research Co-Labs, Capacity of partners (Opportunity)
- Different perceptions of CE, Anti-higher ed rhetoric, Resistance to change (Threat)

Critical time to review and revise how we position the classification in an ever changing world that is faced with false-truths and narratives about higher education and democracy.

Goal: Balanced rigor and practical, streamlined process for institutions
Strengths

- Standard **definition** creates standards in field, nationally/internationally
- Used to **legitimize** CE among academic peers and academic institutions
- “The **process** is the prize” - usefulness of framework to guide institutional self-study
- **Research** opportunity to understand “state of the field” and benchmarks
- **Professional development** offered by partner organizations

Weaknesses

- **Burdensome** application; time (96 pgs)
- **Underrepresented** institutional types (e.g., HBCU, MSI, HSI, community colleges)
- Some questions are **not reflective** of what some institutions value or can do creating sense of misalignment
- **Structure** & word count stifles narratives
- Not clear how application process or products support **students/families**
- **Updates** may be needed to reflect spectrum of engaged pedagogies
Opportunities

- Feedback from ‘24 applicants and review team (HBCU and CCs)
- ACE partnership/national presence
- Enhanced staffing
- Research Co-Labs
- Expanded Peer Review Process
- Revise Community Partner Survey
- Future partnerships with organizations for professional development
- Updated technology / application to customize and streamline

Threats

- Anti-education rhetoric and polarization
- “Myths” about classification
- Additional awards/classifications - beyond Carnegie/ACE (instl interest/bandwidth)
- Different perspectives re:
  - Who is the audience?
  - What is the purpose/benefit of classification
  - What are the necessary components?
Considered Additions, Modifications and Revisions to 2026

❖ Demonstration of Community Engagement based on institution type and community (Vision)
❖ Democratic Engagement (embedded and separate section)
❖ Space to elaborate on narrative of CE story
❖ CE Content, Impacts/Outcomes, Finance and Infrastructure, Tracking/Monitoring Assessment
❖ Access and Interest for Underrepresented Institutions
❖ Streamlined, Balanced Rigor, High Quality Work
❖ Specialized Framework Guides to assist 2-YEARS, HBCU’s, MSI’s etc.
❖ Same data collected, streamlined story of CE
2026 Cycle Timeline

2026 Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Application Timeline

- **November 4, 2024**: Deadline to secure application and initiate process
- **December 2025**: Notification to campuses of their classification status
- **January 26, 2024**: Applications Available on GivePulse and Carnegie Elective Classifications Website
- **April 1, 2025**: Application deadline
- **January 2026**: Public announcement of 2026 Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement designated campuses
Application Data

We recognize the many challenges institutions have faced in the wake of COVID-19, many of which have impacted the institutionalization of community engagement.

In the 2026 application, campuses will use data from AY 2021-2022, 2022-23 and/or AY 2023-24 (if the data is assessed).
# 2026 Peer Review Process - Community Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquire by Date</th>
<th>Call for Reviewers</th>
<th>Training Reviewers</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2024: Campuses applying for 2026 cycle must purchase application.</td>
<td>December 14 - January 14, 2025: Call for Reviewers (Last cycle: 105 applicants)</td>
<td>February 2025 - April 2025: Train reviewers and assign review teams</td>
<td>June 1 - September 1, 2025: Team-based reviews, 7-10 applications per reviewer. Senior review committee in Fall 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies to Approach the CE Application
## Transformational Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pervasiveness</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Adjustment (1)</td>
<td>Isolated Change  (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Far-Reaching Change (3)</td>
<td>Transformational Change (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Transformational Change. Adapted from Eckel, Hill & Green (1998)
## Community-engaged vs Community-based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-engaged</th>
<th>Community-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❖ Campus and community share decision-making power</td>
<td>❖ Campus holds decision-making power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Campus and community co-define problems and co-create goals and outcomes</td>
<td>❖ Campus defines the problems, goals, and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ <strong>Asset-based:</strong> strengths, skills, and knowledges of those in the community are validated and legitimized</td>
<td>❖ Campus knowledge prioritized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Team

Institution & Community

Secondary Team

Core Team
Questions We Asked

1. Approximately, how many staff were involved in preparing the application. **Mode: 6+ people**
2. What length of time were staff preparing the application? **Mode: 7-9 months**
3. Averaged across the months your campus prepared the application, approximately how many staff hours (total across all staff involved) were spent per week on the application? **Mode: 2-5 hours**
4. What was the approximate dollars spent on preparing the application? **Average $9,500**
5. Did you hire someone solely to prepare the application? **Only 5 hired someone**
6. What is the approximate rate total you paid for the person you hired? **Range: $2K-$40K**
7. Other than staffing, were there other resources you used to prepare for the application e.g. hosting community meetings, software purchase to track data, campus teams sent to workshops, other?
8. What were the highlights of the application process for your campus?
9. Did you participate in Carnegie Elective sponsored capacity building opportunities? If yes, what did you find most useful and worthwhile? **54% participated in capacity building**
10. Is there anything else would you like to share with the Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification team about your experience preparing for and submitting your application?
Staff hours spent on the application

*What length of time were staff preparing the application? n=26*

The majority of respondents (16) spent between 7 and 15 months on the application.

5 respondents spent longer than 15 months with 2 spending longer than 18 months.
Other resources used

Other than staffing, were there other resources you used to prepare for the application, e.g. hosting community meetings, software purchase to track data, campus teams sent to workshops, other? N=26 (54%)

- Attended Carnegie Elective Classifications trainings and workshops
- Hosted community meetings
- Give pulse workshops
- Collaboratory workshops
- Software purchase
Highlights of the Application Process

- We realized we were too decentralized
- From our report this also gave way to opportunity for state funding request.
- It was a very helpful self-study. It helped to highlight great work that was occurring and to illuminate important areas of growth.
- The fact that we need to strategically align our budget and we need to engage a standard measurement, mixed methods, data collection protocol
- Strengthened relationship with system offices in public engagement, highlighted areas of improvement and strengths, assisted with goal setting for further efforts

- The questions themselves helped provide a road map for us to reflect upon our community engagement and how to continue to grow.
- The application process brought together community-engaged faculty and staff in a new way that allowed us to identify many effective ways we engage with community, and also opportunities for improvement.
- This application was a wonderful opportunity to reflect on where our institution has been, currently is, and hopes to be regarding civic/community engagement. We also were able to celebrate each stage with our community partners. It also provided a great opportunity to hear from a wider range of departments about their community engagement activities.
- The questions themselves helped provide a road map for us to reflect upon our community engagement and how to continue to grow.
Additional Comments

- The application process strengthened my respect for the rigor associated with the Carnegie classification and also deepened my pride for our university's commitment to Community Engagement.

- The process was time consuming, but ended up being some of the more rewarding and impactful work I’ve done in higher ed.

- Our experience was overall positive, and the amount of work was manageable.

- Some of the questions were a bit redundant for our campus. Perhaps they aren't for others. It consumed a great deal of my time, especially during the last couple of months. I do feel that reflection is valuable but wonder if there is a more streamlined method for the Re-Classification process.

- It's a very comprehensive process that helped steer community engagement strategic planning at our institution. I think some consideration should be given to institutions applying for their 3rd+ cycle (maybe a shorter application only asking about growth areas and other relevant topics).
Application Preparation Working Timeline

### Months 1-4
**Process Launched**
- Core Team
- Secondary Team
- Institution and community support
- Buy-In
- Explore where evidence is located

### Months 4-8
**Planning and Gather Evidence**
- Kick off meetings to strategize application approach
- Gather Evidence
- Map out foci areas re:application

### Months 8-12
**Writing & more writing**
- Finalize evidence gathered
- Work towards completing threshold sections
- Ongoing meetings with team(s) and supporters

### Months 12-14/16
**Application Submission**
- Finalize application-prepare for surprises
- Review final draft
- Prepare partners for survey
- Submit application on April 1, 2025

January 24, 2024 to April 1, 2025 (14 months upon app release)
Resources
Resources

1. A guide is available on the website for both applications to offer additional information on questions and sections within the framework.

2. carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu: resources and information on forthcoming webinars and workshops, as well as how to request such training.

3. We do not want to exclude a campus from participating due to the inability to cover the application fee. Campuses may request a fee waiver by emailing us at aortiz@acenet.edu.
Community Engagement Classification Consultants

As service to the field and campuses who are interested in hiring consultants generally, the Carnegie Elective Classifications team has provided training to individuals interested in developing their understanding of the Elective Classification for Community Engagement generally and its application processes in particular.

Twenty three (23) individuals were selected to:

❖ Build up skills and knowledge of the current (2024) Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Framework
❖ Build an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Carnegie Elective Classification consultants
❖ Build a curriculum that will be delivered as a training for future cohorts of Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement consultants
❖ Call for 2026 Consultants will occur late Fall 2023 with trainings Spring 2024
Upcoming Outreach and Engagement

Fall 2023
The Center for Advancing Research Impact in Society (ARIS) Webinar- November 29, 2023
Engaged Scholarship Consortium Webinar-December 6, 2023

On the horizon: Spring 2024
Year In Review-January 9, 2024
AACU Annual Conference- January 16-19, 2024, Washington D.C.
Carnegie in Action workshop (HBCUs) - February/March 2024
Campus Compact Annual Conference - April 7-10, 2024 - Pre-conference, Denver

Drop-In Virtual Office Hours: Spring 2024 (March-May 2024)
2nd Wednesdays at noon to 1pm and
4th Tuesdays at 3pm to 4pm
Year-In-Review
QR Code
Classifying CE and Leadership Forbes Article

QR Code
Q & A