



THE CORELLA & BERTRAM F.
BONNER FOUNDATION

Professional Development for Community-Engaged Learning and Scholarship Workshops for a Cohort of Faculty, Student Leaders, and Co-Educators **#5: High-Impact Community Engagement Practices for Course Projects**

Overview

This session builds on the elements of high-impact practices but focuses on empowering faculty to build high-quality community-engaged learning or service-learning experiences and assignments into their courses while building the capacity and impact of their partners. By integrating HICEPs, a set of practices tied to partnerships and projects, faculty can ensure that their courses engage partners as co-educators and producers of knowledge, engage students in developmental and meaningful activities, provide students with appropriate mentoring, promote critical inquiry and reflection, and other indicators of success. High-Impact Community Engagement Practices also invite faculty to think about how their coursework and CEL projects can be scaffolded across more than one semester or term, establishing deep partnerships and the foundation for integrative pathways.

In this facilitator's guide, you will find:

- I. Session Introduction and Outline
- II. Materials Needed (Articles, Handouts, etc.)
- III. Suggested Facilitator's Guide
- IV. Additional Resources
- V. Credits and Citations

Please note that this session is designed to use participatory practices which support the creation and growth of learning communities. Use of AV and technology are minimal or optional. You may download related slides, but all handouts can also be presented without this equipment.

Session Introduction and Outline

This session is intended to be used in conjunction with guiding a cohort of faculty who are involved in building community engaged teaching and learning into their coursework. The session is intended to help participants think more deeply about the structure of their work with community partners, the CEL projects themselves, and the ways that the teaching and experiential engagement can incorporate best practices, especially from the perspectives of partners. Please review and modify sections to fit your institutional context and participant knowledge base, keeping sessions interactive.

Suggested Agenda (60 - 75 minutes):

- I. Check In (10 minutes)
- II. Introducing Two Rubrics and the High-Impact Community Engagement Practices (10 minutes)
- III. Course Planning Work Using HICEPs Rubric (20-30 minutes)
- IV. Sharing and Feedback (10-15 minutes)
- V. Next Steps (10 minutes)

Materials Needed

Print and have copies of the following handouts, or alternatively share these documents electronically with participants before the session. These are intended as resources to build understanding by participating faculty (and others), but reading them is not necessary for preparation for this session.

- Handouts (Included in this document)
- Hart, K. and Ellis, R. (2018). Rubric to Evaluate Academic Course-Based Community Engagement Using HICEPs. Developed by Washburn University in conjunction with its work on the Bonner High-Impact Initiative.
- Hahn, T., Hatcher, J. Price, M, and Studer, M. (2018). IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses – Course Design Centric for Institutional Assessment and Research. Developed by the IUPUI Center for Service and Learning.

Suggested Facilitator’s Guide

I. Check In (10 minutes)

Ideally, this session occurs somewhere midway through your cohort’s meetings (whether these are offered in one week or over the course of a term or year). This session can follow other discussions where faculty have begun to or have identified partners with whom they will work.

You may want to start with a simple check in, using questions like:

- How are things going with your course design and plans?
- Have you solidified a nonprofit, school, or government partner (or more than one)?
- How are conversations going with your partner about the project?
- What requests have the partner made that you might fulfill through your course assignments?
- How have you been able to incorporate partner identified needs into the project design?

Then, set the context for this session, suggesting that it will delve more deeply into ways that the course itself, and the community engaged learning projects you are planning for it, can model best practices for student learning, engaged teaching, and community impact.

II. Introducing the High-Impact Community Engagement Practices and Two Rubrics (10 minutes)

If you did session #3 about High-Impact Practices, you may remember that at the end, you introduced the High-Impact Community Engagement Practices (HICEPs). This session returns to those ideas, providing more time for participants to digest and apply them to their coursework and CEL projects.

You can use the handout, “HICEPS” to acquaint or reacquaint participants with these concepts. These practices support reciprocal, sustainable relationships and projects that contribute to the success and impact of non-profits, schools, government agencies, and other constituents. Briefly walk through these HICEPs again. They include:

- PLACE—the engagement focuses on understanding and responding to the history, assets, needs, politics, economics, and other facets of the community

- **HUMILITY (co-knowledge)**—the engagement approach affirms that each involved individual (student, faculty member, community partner, elected leader, etc.) brings valuable knowledge
- **INTEGRATION**—the engagement is created and carried out in ways that fundamentally build across and break down boundaries
- **DEPTH**—the engagement fosters pathways for students to carry out multiyear projects, for partners to engage in multiyear strategic agreements including capacity building, and for institutions to make sustained commitments
- **DEVELOPMENT**—the engagement is informed by an understanding of appropriate student and organizational (partner and campus) developmental needs and capabilities
- **SEQUENCE**—the engagement is structured to include a progression of projects or roles (i.e., for students and faculty) over time
- **TEAMS**—the engagement involves multiple participants with roles and positions that include multiple levels
- **REFLECTION**—the engagement involves regular structured and unstructured reflection in oral, written, and innovative formats
- **MENTORS**—the engagement involves dialogue and coaching with peers, partners, staff, and/or faculty that contributes to analysis & synthesis
- **LEARNING**—the engagement involves collaborative and responsive teaching and learning, as well as a philosophy that promotes continuous learning by all those involved
- **CAPACITY BUILDING**—the engagement involves work that can build or enhance the organization, school, or agency over time evidence—the engagement involves integration of evidence-based or proven program models
- **IMPACT**—the engagement aims to identify and achieve specific and measurable outcomes, design strategies for evaluation, and document impacts.

Then, introduce one of the rubrics, the **IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses**, used in this session. Both are designed to help faculty achieve greater depth and quality in their integration of community engaged learning within courses. Start with this one as it includes some focus on partnerships but also on general principles for courses tied to student learning.

Pass out the **IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses**. Explain that this rubric was developed at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis by Thomas W. Hahn, Julie A. Hatcher, Mary F. Price, and Morgan L. Studer. Many campuses have a simple definition or conceptualization for service learning or CEL courses which articulates a baseline for practice. Often this is a minimum number of hours for a student's involvement in projects off campus (20 or 30 is common) and the integration of at least one concrete civic student learning outcome. This rubric includes six indicators:

- 1) Reciprocal partnerships and processes shape the community activities and course design.
- 2) Community activities enhance academic content, course design, and assignments.
- 3) Civic competencies (i.e., knowledge, skills, disposition, behavior) are well integrated into student learning.
- 4) Diversity of interactions and dialogue with others across difference occurs regularly in the course.
- 5) Critical reflection is well integrated into student learning.
- 6) Assessment is used for course improvement.

For each of the indicators, there are three levels of practice. Walk through the first one to explain.

For Reciprocal Partnerships and Processes

Level 1:

The instructor contacts a community organization to host students and provides a brief overview of the course (e.g., learning outcomes, syllabus) and the purposes of the community activities.

Level 2:

The instructor meets with the community partner(s) to discuss the course (e.g., preparation/orientation of students, learning outcomes, syllabus), and to identify how the community activities can enrich student learning and benefit the organization.

Level 3:

The instructor collaborates with and learns from the community partner(s) as co-educator in various aspects of course planning and design (e.g., learning outcomes, readings, preparation/orientation of students, reflection, assessment) and together they identify how the community activities can enrich student learning and add to the capacity of the organization.

Ask faculty to take a moment, working alone, to identify the levels of their current work using the rubric. Then, invite them in pairs, triads, or in the full group (if the group is small enough) to share:

- **Identify one of the course attributes that you would like to advance to a higher level. Discuss with each other how you might do that.**

III. Course Planning Work Using the HICEPs and Washburn Rubric

Next, pass out the Rubric to Evaluate Academic Course-Based Community Engagement Using HICEPs. Explain that this rubric was developed by leadership at Washburn University who were working to scale high-impact community engagement across courses and the curriculum. This rubric prioritizes thinking about the nature of the relationship with the partner and the projects themselves. It focuses on several related but also different indicators of quality:

- 1) How Community Engagement is Embedded in the Course(s)
- 2) Using at least FOUR attributes of HICEPs from the list (handout you gave)
- 3) A clearly defined Community Identified Need/Want
- 4) A mutually beneficial and reciprocal Community Partner Relationship
- 5) Both faculty and partner involvement in Knowledge Production (you can note here that this also corresponds to the epistemology articulated in Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton's *Democratic Community Engagement* definition that faculty learned about in an earlier session).
- 6) Articulated best practices for Civic Engagement activities (such as dialogue, deliberation, bridge building, dignity, empathy, critical inquiry, etc.)

You can note that the original rubric included language from Washburn's own institutional icon, the Ichabod, to name the levels. Explain that while the rubric may be more advanced than one's own context, or faculty may want to take insights from it and apply them within their own institutional context.

Ask the faculty:

- **What would be our own articulation or naming of the highest quality or value of CEL work from our own mission or institutional goals?**

Take a few comments.

- **Don't let the dialogue derail the group from the main insights from Washburn's rubric, which are that it asks faculty to apply several indicators of partner satisfaction and perspective to their work.**

Now, give the faculty 20-30 minutes to work more on their own course design, using this rubric. They can do that individually or in small groups (determine what is best).

Give them the following guidelines or questions to do so. These questions are also on Handout 4 as a worksheet with space for writing.

1. What is the **clearly defined community identified need** that your CEL component will address? If you don't know, what steps can you take to gather the partner's input? How will you educate students about the community identified needs and issues in an ethical and effective way within the course?
2. Looking over the list of HICEPs, identify **FOUR HICEPs** that you can actively work to integrate. Circle or check them below. What are your ideas or strategies for integrating these HICEPs.
3. Considering the goals for involving partners alongside faculty (and possibly even students) in **knowledge production**, how might you structure partner involvement in this process? Could the partner participate in class? Have you talked with partners about their roles as co-educators? Could partner expertise be part of the research process?
4. Looking at the aspirations for the nature of the civic engagement experience itself, what comes to mind about **how you are constructing, guiding, and promoting reflection** on that experience?

IV. Sharing and Feedback (10 minutes)

Guide participants in sharing and discussing their ideas. If necessary, steer them into identifying one or two take aways from this exercise that will most help them deepen or enrich the quality of their partnership(s) and the direct experience that students will have in carrying out that work in a way that addresses the needs and requests of community constituents.

V. Next Steps (10 minutes)

Finally, remind cohort members what is happening next and when they will meet again. Clarify what supports and/or assignments should be done at that time.

Credits and Citations (APA):

Developed by Ariane Hoy, Vice President, and Rachayita Shah, Community-Engagement Scholarship Director, and the Bonner Foundation staff team for use by colleges and universities. It includes scholarship including:

- Hart, K. and Ellis, R. (2018). Rubric to Evaluate Academic Course-Based Community Engagement Using HICEPs. Developed by Washburn University in conjunction with its work on the Bonner High-Impact Initiative.
- Hahn, T., Hatcher, J. Price, M, and Studer, M. (2018). IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses – Course Design Centric for Institutional Assessment and Research. Developed by the IUPUI Center for Service and Learning.
- Hoy, A. & Johnson, M. (2013). *Deepening community engagement in higher education: Forging new pathways*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. See in particular Conclusion.

Handout 1

High-Impact Community Engagement Practices

- **PLACE**—the engagement focuses on understanding and responding to the history, assets, needs, politics, economics, and other facets of the community
- **HUMILITY** (co-knowledge)—the engagement approach affirms that each involved individual (student, faculty member, community partner, elected leader, etc.) brings valuable knowledge
- **INTEGRATION**—the engagement is created and carried out in ways that fundamentally build across and break down boundaries
- **DEPTH**—the engagement fosters pathways for students to carry out multiyear projects, for partners to engage in multiyear strategic agreements including capacity building, and for institutions to make sustained commitments
- **DEVELOPMENT**—the engagement is informed by an understanding of appropriate student and organizational (partner and campus) developmental needs and capabilities
- **SEQUENCE**—the engagement is structured to include a progression of projects or roles (i.e., for students and faculty) over time
- **TEAMS**—the engagement involves multiple participants with roles and positions that include multiple levels
- **REFLECTION**—the engagement involves regular structured and unstructured reflection in oral, written, and innovative formats
- **MENTORS**—the engagement involves dialogue and coaching with peers, partners, staff, and/or faculty that contributes to analysis & synthesis
- **LEARNING**—the engagement involves collaborative and responsive teaching and learning, as well as a philosophy that promotes continuous learning by all those involved
- **CAPACITY BUILDING**—the engagement involves work that can build or enhance the organization, school, or agency over time evidence—the engagement involves integration of evidence-based or proven program models
- **IMPACT**—the engagement aims to identify and achieve specific and measurable outcomes, design strategies for evaluation, and document impacts.

Source: Hoy & Johnson (2013) *Deepening Community Engagement in Higher Education*

Handout 2

IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses



IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses – Course Design Centric for Institutional Assessment and Research

Thomas W. Hahn, Julie A. Hatcher, Mary F. Price, and Morgan L. Studer

SL Course Attributes	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
1) Reciprocal partnerships and processes shape the community activities and course design.	The instructor contacts a community organization to host students and provides a brief overview of the course (e.g., learning outcomes, syllabus) and the purposes of the community activities.	The instructor meets with the community partner(s) to discuss the course (e.g., preparation/orientation of students, learning outcomes, syllabus), and to identify how the community activities can enrich student learning and benefit the organization.	The instructor collaborates with and learns from the community partner(s) as coeducator in various aspects of course planning and design (e.g., learning outcomes, readings, preparation/orientation of students, reflection, assessment) and together they identify how the community activities can enrich student learning and add to the capacity of the organization.
2) Community activities enhance academic content, course design, and assignments.	The instructor includes community activities as an added component of the course but it is not integrated with academic content or assignments. The syllabus does not address the purposes of the community activities.	The instructor utilizes the community activities as a "text" to provide additional insight into student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus describes the relationship of the community activities to learning outcomes.	The instructor integrates the community activities and relevant social issue(s) as critical dimensions for student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus provides a strong rationale for the relationship of the community activities to learning outcomes.
3) Civic competencies (i.e., knowledge, skills, disposition, behavior) are well integrated into student learning.	The instructor focuses on discipline-based content with little attention/priority given to civic learning or development of civic competencies.	The instructor focuses on discipline-based content and connects to civic learning and civic competencies when relevant to the community activities.	The instructor focuses on the integration of discipline-based content with civic learning and civic competencies and emphasizes the relevance of the community activities to the public purposes of the discipline in society.
4) Diversity of interactions and dialogue with others across difference occurs regularly in the course.	The instructor and the course and community activities offer students limited opportunities for interaction and dialogue with others across difference.	The instructor and the course and community activities engage students in periodic interactions and dialogue with peers across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives.	The instructor and community partner(s) engage students in frequent interactions and dialogue with peers and community members across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives.
5) Critical reflection is well integrated into student learning.	The instructor asks students, on a limited basis, to create reflective products about the community activities, usually at the end of the semester.	The instructor structures reflection activities and products about the community activities that connect the experience to academic content, require moderate analysis, lead to new action, and provide ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester.	The instructor builds student capacity to critically reflect and develop products that explore the relevance of the experience to academic content, use critical thinking to analyze social issues, recognize systems of power, lead to new action, and provide ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester.
6) Assessment is used for course improvement.	The instructor articulates student learning outcomes but no measurement tool is in place for assessing the service learning component of the course.	The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and uses a measurement tool to assess the service learning component of the course.	The instructor and community partner(s) articulate student learning outcomes, and use measurement tools to assess the service learning component of the course and its influence on community outcomes.

Take a few minutes to assess your current practice for each of the course attributes described.

Then, identify one that you want to advance.

IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses References

Consider that some of these may be good additional reading.



IUPUI

CENTER FOR SERVICE AND LEARNING
Office of Community Engagement



IUPUI

CENTER FOR SERVICE AND LEARNING
Office of Community Engagement

References

- Bradley, B. (1995). America's challenge. Revitalizing our national community. *National Civic Review*, 84(2), 94-100.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. In Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions*. New Directions for Higher Education (pp. 37-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/ Wiley Publishing.
- Bringle, R. G., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Civic education through service-learning: What, how, and why? In L. McIlraith, A. Lyons, & R. Munck (Eds). *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 101-124). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P., & Bringle, K. E. (2015). From teaching democratic thinking to developing democratic civic identity. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 6(1), 51-76.
- Gazley, B., Littlepage, L., & Bennett, T. A. (2012). What about the host agency? Nonprofit perspectives on community-based student learning and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 1029-1050.
- Giles, D. E., & Eyer, J. (2013). Review Essay: The endless quest for scholarly respectability in service-learning research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(1), 53-64.
- Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hahn, T. W., & Hatcher, J. A. (2015, September 30). *What about service-learning matters? Using a taxonomy to identify variables to improve research and practice* [Webinar]. In IARSLCE Webinar Series. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O3W27s3-XTw>.
- Mabry, J. B. (1998). Pedagogical variations in service-learning and student outcomes: How time, contact and reflection matter. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 32-47.
- Mitchell, T. D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice*, 54, 20-28.
- Pigza, J., & Troppe, M. (2003). Developing an infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 106-130). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, M. B., Nowacek, R. S., & Bernstein, J. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Citizenship across the curriculum*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Stokamer, S. T. (2011). Pedagogical catalysts of civic competence: The development of a critical epistemological model for community-based learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17, 113-121.
- Terry, J. D., Smith, B. H., & McQuilla, J. D. (2014). Teaching evidence-based practice in service-learning: A model for education and service. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(1), 55-69.

Handout 3: Washburn University's Rubric for Evaluating Course-Based Community Engagement Using High-Impact Community Engagement Practices (HICEPs)

Indicator	Baseline Community-Engaged Learning			High-Impact Community Engagement Practices
	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
How Community Engagement Is Embedded in the Course(s)	The course may discuss issues facing the community, bring in a member of the community to talk about community issues or send students to an organization to observe what occurs there, but there is no requirement for the students to actually engage with the community outside of the classroom.	Students engage in a service- learning activity (e.g. requiring that the students do 30 hours of service in a 100-level course to get a sense of what types of issues or agencies related to the academic major exist). While it may be embedded in the course each time it is taught, the learning objectives for the course would not change if this component were removed.	A single course that has been developed to engage the students with the community as more than just a “volunteer” and has at least one learning objective related to this engagement.	A course that has been developed to engage the students with the community as more than just a “volunteer” and has at least one learning objective related to this engagement. AND , both of the following: The students in the course are all engaged a project or projects around a common theme and the community engagement is a significant portion of the class content (at least 25%). This class content could include readings, service, meetings with community partners, in-class discussions, time spent on a project either alone or with a group, etc.
Intentional Integration of High-Impact Community Engagement Practices	The course includes none of the attributes of HICEPs outlined in the attachment (Appendix A) in any discernible way or only includes reflection.	The course includes the reflection attribute and at least one of the other attributes of HICEPs outlined in the attachment with its implementation clearly presented.	The course includes the reflection attribute and at least two of the other attributes of HICEPs outlined in the attachment with their implementation clearly presented.	The course includes the reflection attribute and at least three of the other attributes of HICEPs outlined in the attachment with their implementation clearly presented. (See list on prior handout or final page of rubric).
Community Identified Need/ Request	The course is built around what is learned in the classroom without consideration of actual partner and/ or community needs or wants.	The intention of the course is that the students will learn something about the community by being out in the community, but there is no communication with the community partner(s) re: needs that students in this class could meet. (e.g. students are told to contact the volunteer coordinator to set up their volunteer service in the same way any other volunteer from the community would do) .	Prior to developing the syllabus, the community partner(s) are contacted to discuss the course purpose/learning outcomes and whether this could be achieved with an instructor identified activity with the partner(s). (e.g. the instructor wants the finished product to be a video of how poverty affects residents and asks the organization if this video can be filmed at their organization).	Prior to developing the syllabus, the community partner(s) are contacted to discuss the course purpose/learning outcomes and to determine if there are any needs that the organization currently has that relate to the purpose/learning outcomes for the course and the activity(ies)/project(s) are developed/assigned based on this. AND The activity(ies)/project(s) are developed with both input and approval by the partner(s) prior to being assigned to the students.

Indicator	Baseline Community-Engaged Learning			High-Impact Community Engagement Practices
	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Mutually Beneficial and Reciprocal Community Partner Relationship	There is no evidence of ongoing contact/ Communication / Relationship with a community partner.	All contact with the community partner(s) is done through the students. The community partner(s) may serve in a default co-educator role in that they mentor and impart knowledge to the students they work with as part of their normal interaction with volunteers, but without an actual identified role for the course and with no interaction and collaboration about the structure of the course.	There is an identifiable relationship between the community partner(s), instructor and students, but the collaboration is somewhat weak. There is evidence that the partner(s) had some input on the development of at least one learning outcome for the course & the activity(ies)/ project(s) that the students will engage in, but they are not considered a co-educator for purposes of the course and feedback is limited (e.g. a post-project evaluation of the students).	There is evidence that the community partner(s) had input into the development of the learning outcomes, project(s) & assessment and has an identified co-educator role when students are on-site or working on their project. Additionally, the instructor touches base with the community partner regularly to solicit feedback make adjustments if necessary. AND The community perspective is brought into the classroom setting at least once to enrich the learning environment (e.g. bringing a community partner representative in either physically or by Zoom, a panel of community members to discuss the issue being addressed by the class project, etc). AND There is evidence of an ongoing, mutually beneficial relationship . This does not mean that the same group of students must continue working with this organization, but rather that the faculty member continues the relationship in some capacity until it is agreed that it is no longer mutually beneficial or the organizational need no longer exists.
Knowledge Production in the Project	Knowledge and project production are done solely within the classroom setting and/or are not shared with a community partner.	Community engagement efforts are pursued as the end product (e.g. the number of hours in the community is the only accomplishment). AND/OR Communication of knowledge is unidirectional and applied to or on the community where the faculty and students both identify the needs and solutions/project in isolation. All expertise in the development of knowledge and/or a project comes from the academy, not the community.	There is evidence that the community partner(s) had some influence in the knowledge/product that is produced in that they were allowed to provide input into the project that would be produced by the students during the development stage of the course and syllabus.	Everything for a Level 2 AND There is an opportunity for the community partner(s) to see a project part way through the development stage & provide feedback to expand the learning process and appropriateness of what is being produced. AND Knowledge and product production are done with a democratic civic engagement purpose which requires an ongoing multidirectional, reciprocal flow of information in a deliberative, cooperative learning environment of students, faculty and community partner(s). Final products, whether individual written works by students or an actual product done to meet a community identified need, are shared with and evaluated by community partner(s).

Indicator	Baseline Community-Engaged Learning			High-Impact Community Engagement Practices
	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Best Practices for Civic Engagement Experience	Civic engagement is not actively, purposefully discussed or incorporated in the classroom or as part of the curriculum.	Civic engagement is discussed/incorporated, but only minimally/superficially. (e.g. civic engagement is only talked about in terms of the service that is being done or is only talked about at the beginning of the semester to set the context for the community based project/activity).	Civic engagement is purposefully incorporated in the discussion/class assignments on a regular basis (at least four times a semester). There is evidence that this includes not only the service/project, but also the bigger community/societal issues related to the work and the diversity being experienced.	Everything for a Level 2 community engagement project. AND Incorporates dialogue, deliberation and bridge building across difference where multiple perspectives on issues are explored within the context of civility and mutual respect. AND Instills a respect for the following values: human dignity, empathy, open-mindedness, tolerance, justice, equality, ethical integrity and responsibility to a larger good. AND Critical inquiry, analysis, reasoning and problem solving related to a knowledge of individual and collective options, responsibilities and actions inherent in a democracy that effect/influence/change communities and society (this can include political action, advocacy, policy development, etc.). Additionally, there is an understanding that democracy means more than just casting a vote...it means acting as a community for the community.

This rubric was developed by the Washburn University HICEP Committee based on Hoy and Johnson’s HICEPs (2013). The principal authors are Kristine Hart and Rick Ellis. When identifying at least four HICEPs, consider this list:

- **place**—the engagement focuses on understanding and responding to the history, assets, needs, politics, economics, and other facets of the community
- **humility** (co-knowledge)—the engagement approach affirms that each involved individual (student, faculty member, community partner, elected leader, etc.) brings valuable knowledge
- **integration**—the engagement is created and carried out in ways that fundamentally build across and break down boundaries
- **depth**—the engagement fosters pathways for students to carry out multiyear projects, for partners to engage in multiyear strategic agreements including capacity building, and for institutions to make sustained commitments
- **development**—the engagement is informed by an understanding of appropriate student and organizational (partner and campus) developmental needs and capabilities
- **sequence**—the engagement is structured to include a progression of projects or roles (i.e., for students and faculty) over time
- **teams**—the engagement involves multiple participants with roles and positions that include multiple levels
- **reflection**—the engagement involves regular structured and unstructured reflection in oral, written, and innovative formats
- **mentors**—the engagement involves dialogue and coaching with peers, partners, staff, and/or faculty that contributes to analysis & synthesis
- **learning**—the engagement involves collaborative and responsive teaching and learning, as well as a philosophy that promotes continuous learning by all those involved
- **capacity building**—the engagement involves work that can build or enhance the organization, school, or agency over time evidence—the engagement involves integration of evidence-based or proven program models
- **impact**—the engagement aims to identify and achieve specific and measurable outcomes, design strategies for evaluation, and document impacts.

Handout 4: Washburn University's Rubric for Evaluating Course-Based Community Engagement Using High-Impact Community Engagement Practices (HICEPs)

1. What is the **clearly defined community identified need** that your CEL component will address (and with what partner(s)? If you don't know, what steps can you take to gather the partner's input? How will you educate students about the community identified needs and issues in an ethical and effective way within the course?
2. Looking over the list of HICEPs, identify **FOUR HICEPs** that you can actively work to integrate. Circle or check them below. What are your ideas or strategies for integrating these HICEPs.
3. Considering the goals for involving partners alongside faculty (and possibly even students) in **knowledge production**, how might you structure partner involvement in this process? Could the partner participate in class? Have you talked with partners about their roles as co-educators? Could partner expertise be part of the research process?
4. Looking at the aspirations for the nature of the civic engagement experience itself, what comes to mind about **how you are constructing, guiding, and promoting reflection** on that experience?