

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY RUBRIC TO EVALUATE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY-ENGAGED LEARNING

	Level 0	Level 1: Tip of the Hat/ Bronze Ichabod	Level 2: Bowtie/ Silver Ichabod	Level 3: Non Nobis Solum/ Gold Ichabod
Community Engagement 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 in 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.
Thirteen Attributes of Community-Engaged Learning	The course includes none of the attributes 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 outlined in the attachment with its implementation clearly presented.	The course includes the reflection attribute and at least two of the other attributes outlined in the attachment with their implementation clearly presented.	The course includes the reflection attribute and at least three of the other attributes outlined in the attachment with their implementation clearly presented.
Community Identified Need/Want	The course is built around what is learned in the classroom without consideration of actual 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 Topekans 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.

	Level 0	Level 1: Tip of the Hat/ Bronze Ichabod	Level 2: Bowtie/ Silver Ichabod	Level 3: Non Nobis Solum/ Gold Ichabod
Community Partner Relationship	There is no evidence of any 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/ Project Production	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 community engagement project. AND There is an opportunity for the community partner(s) to see a project part way through the development stage & provide feedback about the project 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, must be shared with and evaluated by the community partner(s).

	Level 0	Level 1: Tip of the Hat/ Bronze Ichabod	Level 2: Bowtie/ Silver Ichabod	Level 3: Non Nobis Solum/ Gold Ichabod
Civic Engagement	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 Kristine Hart with input from the Washburn University HICEP Committee based on information from the 2012 inaugural Bonner High Impact Initiative Institute (see <http://bonnernetwork.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/93493661/2012%20High%20Impact%20Program%20%26%20Guide.pdf>) **

Appendix A: What are the attributes associated with Community-Engaged Learning?

The 13 attributes of Community-Engaged Learning (CEL) represent some of the proven practices that support effectiveness in campus-community partnerships. These practices support reciprocal, sustainable relationships and projects that contribute to the success and impact of non-profits, schools, government agencies, and other constituents.

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.

From The Bonner Foundation's 2012 High Impact Institute Program Guide and Workbook.