

## **2021-22 BONNER PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT**

### **Bonner Program & Institutional Self-Assessment**

The Bonner Program aims to create positive impact in three areas—student development, community partnerships, and campus infrastructure and culture for community engagement. Since its initial creation in 1990, the Bonner Program has continued to develop frameworks and supporting tools, resources, and work with campuses to achieve excellence in these areas. This instrument — *the Self-Assessment Tool for Bonner Programs and Campus-wide Institutionalization* — is designed to highlight important indicators of a high-quality, comprehensive Bonner Program and a campus-wide infrastructure for community engagement. As part of that, the tool addresses the roles and functioning of centers. The instrument is designed to provide campus administrators who build and manage the Bonner Program and other civic engagement initiatives with a benchmarking tool that can ensure quality and guide planning.

The tool was first developed in 2005 and revised in 2012 and again in 2017-2018 to reflect emerging research and cutting edge practices and remains the same this year. The content overlaps with (and in some cases are informed by) other nationally recognized rubrics for civic engagement, such as those developed by AAC&U, Campus Compact, and Campus-Community Partnerships for Health, as well as Barbara Holland, Andrew Furco, and Marshall Welch (NIIICE). More specifically, this instrument incorporates components that are tied to the frameworks and required activities of the Bonner Program and identified as best practices. With five levels for each indicator, it supports a developmental perspective and can help to identify next stages for progress. In 2022, we have also integrated several items from the Project Here Institutional Assessment Tool, in which Foundation staff participated as co-authors, which gauge important dimensions of the institution’s work on diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism. In 2022, the tool includes 55 items.

The Bonner Foundation encourages campus and Bonner Program staff complete this self-assessment as part of the annual report process. You can then draw on it to set and review goals in a letter to the Bonner Foundation. This ongoing process helps ensure that the Foundation can tailor its campus support and resources to meet the needs of campus programs and centers. Your responses serve as a reference point for ongoing conversations with you and others on your campus about the next steps and stages of program development, management, and strategic direction of the Bonner Program and your broader campus’s work in civic engagement and education.

To complete the tool, we encourage Bonner Program administrators to involve other key stakeholders, as relevant by category. Gathering input from students, faculty members, community partners, and key administrators, may be done in short meetings focusing on a subset of items. For example, consult with faculty to complete the items in the curricular category or with students to complete the items pertaining to student development. Consult with students and student affairs colleagues regarding their perceptions of items related to student support services, curriculum, and degree programs. Consult with colleagues across units for items pertaining to institution-wide collaboration and work.

We suggest that you first print out and review the contents of the Self-Assessment Tool. Use the Summary Grid (below) to record your responses and notes.

If you choose to submit your assessment, please do so using this SurveyMonkey form: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/22BonnerSelfAssessment>.

Thank you!

	AREA AND INDICATORS	LEVEL	NOTES
<b>Part 1 – Program and Center Infrastructure</b>			
1	Bonner Program Staffing		
2	Reporting & Governance		
3	Effective Coordinating Center		
4	Appropriate Center Staffing		
5	Dedicated Budget & Resources		
6	Campus-Wide Definition & Language		
7	Formal Strategic Plan		
8	Alignment of Community Engagement with Institutional Goals		
9	Staff Development		
10	Center Leader Institutional Positionality		
<b>Part 2 – Program Management</b>			
11	Effective Recruitment		
12	Program Retention		
13	Student Accountability Structures		
14	BWBRS Administrator & Student Usage		
15	Federal Work Study Management		
16	Appropriate Financial Supports		
<b>Part 3 – Student Development &amp; Leadership</b>			
17	Developmental Model		
18	Integration of Common Commitments		
19	Developmental Structures & Pathways		
20	Mentoring & Advising		
21	Training, Education, & Reflection		
22	Management and Meeting Structures		
23	Student Leadership Opportunities		
24	Student Engagement in Capacity Building		

25	Campus-wide Student Engagement		
<b>Part 4 – Structured Bonner Cornerstones</b>			
26	Orientation		
27	First-Year Trip		
28	Second-Year Exchange		
29	Junior-Senior Capstone Projects		
30	Senior Presentation of Learning		
31	One-on-One Meetings		
<b>Part 5 – Community Partnerships</b>			
32	Effective Developmental Partnerships		
33	Partners as Co-Educators		
34	Partner Communication and Management		
35	Partner Evaluation		
36	Capacity Building Projects		
37	Inclusive Partnerships with Nonprofits and Civic Entities		
<b>Part 6 – Curricular Integration</b>			
38	Academic Courses and Connections		
39	Faculty and Staff (Personnel) Recruitment, Hiring, and Advancement		
40	Faculty Support and Engagement		
41	Community Voice and Engagement		
42	Community-Based and Policy Research		
43	Faculty Development Opportunities		
44	Faculty Promotion, Rewards, and Tenure		
45	Integrative Pathways		
46	Degrees Tied to Civic Engagement		
47	Relevant, Inclusive Curriculum		
<b>Part 7 – Campus-wide Infrastructure</b>			
48	Campus-wide Evidence and Support for Community Engagement		

49	Collaboration Across Campus Units		
50	Awards and Recognition		
51	Public Relations and Visibility		
52	Comprehensive Center Web Presence		
53	Inclusive Student Support Services		
54	Appropriate Acknowledgment of History		
55	Institutional Benchmarking & Policy Review		

**2021-22 SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL:  
THE BONNER PROGRAM AND CAMPUS-WIDE  
INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

CATEGORIES AND INDICATORS OF HIGH QUALITY

**Category 1 – Program and Center Infrastructure**

- 1. Bonner Program Staffing:** The Bonner Program has appropriate staffing levels and management capacity to run a program of its size (including meeting the required ratio of one full-time staff member for every 40 students).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We do not meet the staffing requirement (less than 1 FT person for 40 students) and are significantly understaffed.	We do not meet the staffing requirement (fewer than 1 FT person for 40 students) and are understaffed.	We meet the staffing requirement at a minimum level and utilize a minimum of student leadership positions (Senior Interns).	We meet the staffing requirement and utilize a broad range of student leadership positions (Senior Interns and Bonner Leadership Team).	We exceed the staffing requirement, including a broad range of student leadership positions (Senior Interns and Bonner Leadership Team) and other appointed positions (such as Faculty Fellows).

Notes:

- 2. Reporting & Governance:** The reporting line and governance for the Bonner Program provides it appropriate access to institutional resources and support from senior leadership, while also ensuring the program has appropriate direction and supervision.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We have poorly defined lines of access and accountability within the institution; the Bonner Program is not adequately resourced and supported.	The reporting line for the Bonner Program and community engagement provide limited access to authority, resources, and direction.	The reporting line for the Bonner Program and community engagement provides adequate authority and resources, while also providing limited direction and connections to institutional priorities.	The reporting line for the Bonner Program and community engagement provides excellent access to senior leadership and resources, while also providing limited connections to institutional priorities.	The reporting line for the Bonner Program and community engagement provides the Director/Coordinator with excellent access to senior leadership and resources, direction and autonomy, and consistent connections to institutional priorities.

Notes:

- 3. Effective Coordinating Center:** The campus has visible and clearly defined center(s) (or coordinating structures) which can provide effective and appropriate coordination—in terms of location, roles, size, staffing, and resources—for community engagement.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We do not have a visible or clearly understood structure and entity (e.g., a center) for civic engagement and other activities.	We have one or several visible structures and entities (e.g., a center) for civic engagement, but they are not appropriately structured, funded, or understood by students.	We have one or several visible structures and entities (e.g., a center) for civic engagement, and the center(s)' work is/are fairly effective but could improve (in terms of location, size, visibility, staffing).	We have one or several visible structures and entities (e.g., a center) for civic engagement, and the center(s)' work is/are strong and well-supported, acknowledged, and resourced.	We have one or several visible structures and entities (e.g., a center) for community engagement. The center(s)' work is effectively resourced and poised to expand or enhance institutional community engagement.

Notes:

- 4. Appropriate Center Staffing:** The center is stably staffed and equipped—in terms of full-time and half-times dedicated positions—for building and managing community engagement initiatives as appropriate to the size of the institution and its level of institutionalization (*recommended: one FTE per 500 undergraduates*).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We do not have a designated center at this time; program and center staffing is shared with other functions at the institution.	We are in the process of creating a designated center at this time; program and center staffing is shared with other functions at the institution.	We have a designated center at this time; program and center staffing is limited to the staffing of the Bonner Program and shared with other community engagement roles.	We have a designated center with full-time staff positions; program and center staffing include designated Bonner staff plus additional positions that oversee campus-wide engagement opportunities.	We meet or exceed the staffing recommendation (of one FTE per 500 undergraduates). Our Center staffing includes designated Bonner staff, additional programs, and clear links with faculty and student life.

Notes:

- 5. Dedicated Budget & Resources:** The center has an appropriate budget for both the Bonner Program and other campus-wide engagement opportunities – and this includes dedicated institutional funding (i.e., “hard” money) as well as other sources (i.e., grants, aid, donations, fees, etc.) to sustain its work.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The center does not have a clear or consistent annual budget.	The center (including Bonner Program) has a start-up budget. The institution is not yet committed to funding its ongoing operations.	The center (including Bonner Program) has a working budget. The institution has made some investments to funding its ongoing operation and programs.	The center (including Bonner Program) has an appropriate budget (which may include endowment resources). The institution has made clear investments to funding its ongoing operation and programs.	The center (including Bonner Program) has an appropriate budget (which may include endowment resources). The institution has made clear investments to funding its ongoing operation and programs. Center staff raise funds and/or work with institutional advancement.

Notes:

- 6. Campus-wide Definitions and Language:** The campus has clear, accessible, and readily used common language for community engagement, community engaged learning, service-learning, community-based research, and other terms related to its work.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There are no clear definitions for community engagement, CEL, and community-engaged scholarship. The terms are used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based activities.	There are unclear or competing definitions for community engagement, CEL, and community-engaged scholarship. The terms are used inconsistently and not widely understood on campus.	There is a definition for community engagement, CEL, and community-engaged scholarship but the terms are used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based activities and are poorly understood.	There is a formal definition for community engagement, CEL, and community-engaged scholarship, but they are not universally accepted, used or understood.	There are formal, public, consistently used and understood definitions for community engagement, CEL, and community-engaged scholarship. These are acknowledged by staff and faculty and serve to track activities.

Notes:

7. **Formal Strategic Plan:** The institution and/or units/Center(s) have a formal, accessible strategic plan and/or set of objectives for the center and community engagement (community engaged learning/scholarship, etc.) This information is public (i.e., shared on webpages, in reports, at meetings, etc.) and revisited regularly.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There is no official strategic plan for advancing the institution's community engagement.	There is are some reports, but they do not include a formal, official strategic plan for advancing the institution's community engagement; reports and goals are not readily accessible (i.e., by staff, faculty, students, partners).	Although certain short- range and long-range goals for the institution's community engagement have been defined, these goals have not been formalized into an official strategic plan that will guide the implementation of these goals.	There is an official strategic plan for advancing the institution's community engagement, which includes short-range and long-range institutionalization goals, but implementation of these goals has not been successful.	There is an official strategic plan for advancing the institution's community engagement, which includes short-range and long-range institutionalization goals that have been implemented successfully and shared publicly.

Notes:

8. **Alignment of Community Engagement with Institutional Goals:** Community engagement is named as a high priority along with other efforts (such as student success, diversity and inclusion, teaching and learning, accreditation initiatives, etc.).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Community engagement is not a high priority or stands alone and is not tied to other important, high priority efforts on campus (such as student success, diversity and inclusion, teaching and learning, accreditation initiatives, etc.).	Community engagement is mentioned but is not tied to other important, high profile efforts on campus (such as student success, diversity and inclusion, teaching and learning, accreditation initiatives, etc.).	Community engagement is tied loosely or informally to other important, high profile efforts on campus (such as student success, diversity and inclusion, teaching and learning, accreditation initiatives, etc.).	Community engagement is tied formally and purposefully to other important, high profile efforts on campus (such as student success, diversity and inclusion, teaching and learning, accreditation initiatives, etc.).	Community engagement is named as a high profile effort on campus along with other efforts (such as student success, diversity and inclusion, teaching and learning, accreditation initiatives, etc.).

Notes:

9. **Staff Development:** The institution provides staff of the Bonner Program and/or center with opportunities for professional learning and growth (i.e., graduate schooling, conferences, feedback, coaching, etc.).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The institution does not currently provide professional development for community engagement staff.	Some individuals can access professional development opportunities, but these are tied to individual status and initiative.	Staff members can access professional development opportunities, but taking advantage of these is limited (due to other factors).	Staff members can access professional development opportunities. Most program and center staff do so and are able to grow in their roles.	Staff members regularly access professional development opportunities. Program and center staff consistently do so and are able to grow in their roles and cultivate new opportunities and leadership as well.

Notes:

10. **Center Leader Institutional Position:** The center and designated administrative leadership (staff and/or faculty) are recognized for their knowledge, skills, and expertise in community engagement and community engaged teaching and learning pedagogies. They are included in broader institutional processes designed to integrate such work and have access to both Academic and Student Affairs leadership.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The center and its staff face challenges with institutional identity. Evidence that the work is valued is weak. Center leadership are rarely included in related broader initiatives.	The center and its staff face challenges with institutional identity. Evidence that the work is valued is spotty. Center leadership are rarely included in related broader initiatives.	The center and its staff have elements of an institutional identity, but that identity is shifting. There is some evidence that the work is valued, such as reports or plans. Center leadership is sometimes included in related broader initiatives.	The center and its staff have elements of clear institutional identity. There is evidence that the work is valued, including in institutional reports. Center leadership is sometimes included in related broader initiatives.	The center and its staff have a strong institutional identity. There is evidence that the work is valued, including in institutional reports and in the active inclusion of the center and its staff in related broader initiatives.

Notes:

## Category 2 – Program Management

11. **Effective Recruitment:** The Bonner Program has an effective, timely recruitment strategy that results in a diverse, highly committed group of students who will participate in the four years of college and the Bonner Program.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our recruitment and selection process needs major attention. Students selected are not a good fit, and the process needs an overhaul.	Selection is completed late or there are some problems with the process; diversity needs to be addressed (gaps by gender/ethnicity), and selection fails to meet Bonner Program guidelines.	Selection is completed over summer; diversity levels fair (including for gender/ethnicity) and selection meets most Bonner Program guidelines.	Selection is completed before Orientation; diversity levels are strong (including by gender/ethnicity) and similar to the institution, and selection meets all Bonner Program guidelines.	Selection is completed well before Orientation; diversity matching or exceeding institution's (gender, ethnicity, style, etc.), and selection meets all Bonner Program guidelines.

Notes:

12. **Program Retention:** The Bonner Program has retention rates as high (or higher than) the institution's retention. Few students drop the program. For those students that do drop from the program, it is for the right reasons (poor performance, lack of interest, poor fit not because of lack of supports).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We have challenges with retention for Bonners, with a rate less lagging behind the institution or indications of poor selection. We do not handle student withdrawal or dismissal well.	We have poor retention for Bonners, with a rate less than for the institution. Student withdrawal from the program needs to be improved and our replacement strategy is lacking.	We have good retention for most classes of Bonners, with a few issues. Student withdrawal from the program could be improved and our replacement strategy could be better.	We have good retention for Bonners, meeting the rate for the institution. Student withdrawal from the program is handled well, and replacements are found fairly smoothly. Systems of support and accountability are moderate.	We have excellent retention for Bonners, exceeding the rate for the institution. Student withdrawal from the program is handled well, and replacement selection is strong. Systems of support and accountability are strong. We have great student morale.

Notes:

- 13. Student Accountability Structures:** For the Bonner Program (as well as other student programming), we have a clearly defined policy and system of accountability. This structure helps prevent and address challenges with ensuring that all students can fully engage and attain success in the program and at the institution.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We do not have a clearly defined policy or working system of accountability. We are experiencing challenges with student performance and program management.	We have a clearly defined policy but lack a working system of accountability. We are experiencing challenges with student performance and program management.	We have a clearly defined policy and a functioning system of accountability. Still, we experience too many challenges with student performance (linked to other issues).	We have a clearly defined policy and a working system of accountability. We experience occasional challenges with student performance and program management and handle them.	We have a clearly defined policy and a working system of accountability. We experience few challenges with student performance and program management and handle them easily when they arise.

Notes:

- 14. BWBRS and Tracking Platform:** The Bonner Program staff and students are effectively using Bonner Web-Based Reporting System (BWBRS) or another system for tracking student usage and administrative reporting to Foundation.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our program does not utilize BWBRS well and needs more staff training.	Our program utilizes aspects of the BWBRS and meets some of the requirements but is incomplete.	Our program utilizes BWBRS fairly well. Student and staff usage meet the minimal requirements in terms of accurate information and timeliness.	Our program utilizes BWBRS well. Student and staff usage is complete and on time, and responsive to the Foundation for information and reports.	Our program utilizes BWBRS extremely well, is thorough, on time. Students and staff are responsive to the Foundation for reports and engage with the Foundation to utilize and improve the system.

Notes:

- 15. Federal Work-Study Management:** The Bonner Program effectively integrates the use of Community Service Federal Work Study (CSFWS) in its program, and it implements this integration in a way that goes above and beyond the 7% requirement for community service.

N/A	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Does not have	Our program struggles with CSFWS and we need some support to more fully utilize and manage it.	Our program is working okay with CSFWS, but it also needs attention and support in key areas.	Our program is able to utilize CSFWS (at basic levels) and manage it effectively most of the time. It meets the 7% mandate.	Our program effectively utilizes and manages CSFWS, taps available slots, and works well with Financial Aid. It exceeds the 7% mandate.	Our program utilizes and manages CSFWS very well, integrates a high proportion of available slots (exceeding mandate), and works well with Financial Aid.

Notes:

- 16. Appropriate Financial Support:** Students in the Bonner Scholar and/or Leader Program are able to access appropriate levels of financial aid support (as appropriate to either a Bonner Scholar or Bonner Leader model), which enables the program to function as a tool for enhancing educational access for students. This may include scholarship dollars, work study, and/or stipends.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Students in the Bonner Program receive no financial aid or stipend support.	Students in the Bonner Program receive a minimal stipend, but the program does not target low-income students. There are issues with the wage levels or stipend amounts for students.	Students in the Bonner Program receive some financial support, but the arrangements are uneven. This affects student recruitment and selection, such that a majority of students are not from low-income backgrounds.	Students in the Bonner Program receive an appropriate stipend and financial assistance. The Bonner Scholar Program targets 80+% low-income students, and the Bonner Leader Program targets at least 40% low-income students.	Students in the Bonner Program receive an appropriate stipend and scholarship or tuition dollars. The Bonner Scholar Program targets 85+% low-income students, and the Bonner Leader Program targets at least 60% low-income students.

Notes:

### Category 3 – Student Development & Leadership

- 17. Developmental Model Integration:** The Bonner student developmental framework is integrated and implemented throughout the program, including with an intentional education, training, and reflection calendar by class year. Students are aware of and engaged in the student developmental framework and have an understanding of what knowledge areas, skills, and habits they are developing.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our program is struggling to implement the model; students are not knowledgeable of the model, and it is not supported through intentional meetings.	We implement the model only in some levels with an incomplete calendar. Students hear of the model at Orientation but not as an on-going feature.	We implement the model fairly well at most levels but have some gaps in the calendar. Many students understand and internalize the model and recognize their own development.	We implement the framework well at all levels, with an intentional calendar. Most students internalize the framework and can articulate stages in their own growth.	We implement the framework very well at all stages, with an intentional calendar. Most or all students internalize the model and are engaged in creating and reflecting on their growth.

Notes:

- 18. Integration of Common Commitments:** The Common Commitments and relevant values of the college philosophy are integrated in consistent ways. Students are fully engaged in exploring the relevance of these themes to their own learning and work.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We struggle to integrate the Common Commitments or values in a clear or meaningful way and need help with this.	We integrate some of the Common Commitments but not fully; students are introduced to them but struggle to explore related themes (i.e., global) deeply.	We integrate the Common Commitments in a discernible way; the majority of students explore these concepts routinely.	We integrate the Common Commitments and values in a clear and consistent way; most students engage with these concepts deeply.	We integrate the Common Commitments fully; most or all students are thoughtfully and routinely engaged in these ideas and make connections to their work.

Notes:

- 19. Developmental Structure and Pathways:** Within the program there is a developmental structure, including student leadership positions that are progressive, with positions at each class level, on Bonner Leadership Teams, as site coordinators, and in other program management positions. There are clear pathways for students to participate in a developmental experience within and beyond the Bonner Program.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We struggle to integrate developmentally appropriate leadership positions into our organizational structure. There are no clear indications of a developmental model (such as levels and trainings articulated by center) and few visible pathways through the undergraduate experience (none academic).	We have a basic developmental structure but only a few students participate in leadership positions. There are few indications of a developmental model (such as levels and trainings articulated by center) and a lack of visible pathways through the undergraduate experience (few academic).	We integrate developmentally appropriate leadership positions including project coordinators, and many students participate. There are some indications of a developmental model (such as meetings and trainings) and some visible pathways (i.e., academic) through the undergraduate experience.	We integrate developmentally appropriate leadership positions into our organizational structure, and all students participate. There are indications of a student developmental model (trainings by center) and visible pathways through the undergraduate experience.	We fully integrate developmentally appropriate leadership positions into our organizational structure, and students participate and design & shape them. There are indications of a developmental model (training, student positions, etc.) and visible pathways through the undergraduate experience.

Notes:

- 20. Mentoring:** Within the program there are clear, visible and well-utilized opportunities for mentoring, including by peers, faculty, staff, and even community partners. Mentoring supports student development and reflection.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There are no clear or underdeveloped opportunities for peer mentoring (such as programs that pair students, use small cohorts) and students navigate pathways individually.	There are few or other sporadic opportunities for peer mentoring (such as programs that pair students, use small cohorts) and students navigate pathways individually.	There are some opportunities for mentoring (such as programs that pair students, use small cohorts), but these are only open to few students or students must find these on their own.	There are clear opportunities for mentoring (such as programs that pair students, use small cohorts), and these are known to students through effective outreach (courses, learning communities, organizations, programs, etc.).	There are clear, visible opportunities for mentoring (such as programs that pair students, use small cohorts), and these are well utilized by students through effective outreach (courses, learning communities, organizations, programs, etc.).

Notes:

- 21. Training, Education, and Reflection Calendar:** The Bonner Program has a clear calendar designed to support student learning and engagement, with a developmental progression of topics across the four years. These activities (i.e., meetings, courses, reflections, etc.) incorporate student learning outcomes that are communicated to students. At best, activities are accessible and connected with other campus and community programs and resources (i.e., engaging partners, faculty, other units).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We do not have a clear calendar of developmental activities (meetings, trainings, course) in place.	We have a calendar for some years but not across the four years; a developmental progression is not really in place and education/reflection relies on individual student initiative.	We have a calendar of developmental activities (meetings, trainings, course) for all four years but it is not implemented well. Trainings are more random or not well attended. We do not have a clear way of integrating developmental and student led elements.	We have a calendar of developmental activities (meetings, trainings, course) for all four years and it is implemented fairly well. Students are aware of the progression. Activities include intentional and student led elements.	We have calendar of developmental activities (meetings, trainings, course) for all four years and it is implemented well. Students can articulate their learning, referring to outcomes. Activities include intentional and student led elements.

Notes:

- 22. Management and Meeting Structure:** The Bonner Program has a meeting structure with adequate time (from 15-20% of total hours, at a frequency of two meeting per month or more by class) for effective learning and program management. The structure (which may involve in person, online, co-curricular, and course based meetings) provides a comprehensive array of learning, advising, training, and reflection opportunities.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We struggle with providing adequate or structure for enrichment and program management; meetings occur less than two times per month.	We provide minimal time and structure for enrichment and program management; meetings occur less than two times per month.	We provide good time and structure for effective program management and training; meetings are held at least two times per month.	We have a well-articulated meeting and management structure, with frequent meetings and an articulated calendar or plan, allowing for blend of training, reflection, & management.	We have a highly effective meeting and management structure, with frequent meetings and an articulated calendar or plan; these meetings support other aspects of the campus or educational experience.

Notes:

- 23. Student Leadership Opportunities:** The Bonner Program has formalized student leadership roles – including Senior Interns, a Bonner Leadership Team, and Congress Representatives. Student leadership roles are woven into the fabric of the program, including with and at community partner sites, with training and reflection, and for supporting campus-wide connections and engagement.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We do not have or have struggled with incorporating and sustaining formalized student leadership roles (such as a BLT or Congress Reps).	We have a minimal level of sustained formalized student leadership roles; we have had issues with student leaders in these roles this year.	We have moderately strong sustained formalized student leadership roles, but we could strengthen leadership in one or more parts of the program (such as a BLT or Congress Reps).	We have strong sustained formalized student leadership roles, including Senior Interns, a BLT and Congress Representatives that are integrated in ways that support the program.	We have outstanding sustained formalized student leadership roles across the program and sites, including Senior Interns, a BLT, site leaders, and Congress Representatives that are integrated in ways that support the program.

Notes:

- 24. Student Engagement in Capacity Building Projects:** Our Bonner Program and broader center have structures – such as site management, student leadership roles, training, and advising – that intentionally supports students to engage in capacity-building roles during their four years and that can prepare them for capstone projects.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Weak intentional structures like Bonner Meetings, advising and 1-on-1s, training and/or courses, and stated expectations are in place to support this work. Most of our students do not do these projects.	Few intentional structures like Bonner Meetings, advising and 1-on-1s, training and/or courses, and stated expectations are in place to support this work. A few graduating seniors do this on their own.	A few intentional structures like Bonner Meetings, advising and 1-on-1s, training and/or courses, and stated expectations are in place to support this work. A few graduating Bonner seniors do a capacity-building capstone.	Some intentional structures like Bonner Meetings, advising and 1-on-1s, training and/or courses, and stated expectations are in place to support this work. Some of our graduating Bonner seniors do a capacity-building capstone.	Intentional structures like Bonner Meetings, advising and 1-on-1s, training and/or courses, and stated expectations are in place to support this work. Most or all of our graduating Bonner seniors carry out a capacity-building capstone.

Notes:

- 25. Campus-wide Student Engagement:** There are multiple opportunities (i.e., clubs, organizations, multiyear programs, multiple centers) at the institution for students to engage in off campus community experiences, and the institution communicates the value of this engagement to students in clear ways.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There are few supports for campus-wide student engagement. Such engagement is minimal and happens mostly through the Bonner Program and one-time projects.	There are some supports for campus-wide student engagement. Such engagement is low and happens mostly through the Bonner Program, one-time projects, short-term clubs and organizations, and single courses.	There are moderate supports for campus-wide student engagement. Such engagement is moderate and includes the Bonner Program, one-time projects, short-term clubs and organizations, single courses, and other programs that last a year.	There are significant supports for campus-wide student engagement. Such engagement is moderate to high and includes the Bonner Program, one-time projects, short-term clubs and organizations, single courses, academic pathways, and multiyear programs.	There are structural supports for campus-wide student engagement. Such engagement is intentional, high and includes the Bonner Program, one-time projects, short-term clubs and organizations, single courses, academic pathways, and multiyear programs.

Notes:

#### Category 4 – Structured Bonner Cornerstones

- 26. Orientation:** The Bonner Orientation covers key elements of the program (campus and Bonner Program history, context, and frameworks), models key process points (student leadership, professionalism), and meets recommended requirements for time (at least one full day before the school year). Orientation may be held in person and/or online but builds a sense of community.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our Orientation fails to include key elements or model key process points. It is too short or at the wrong time. It doesn't build cohesion.	Our Orientation does not include most key elements and falls short on recommended processes or time. It builds some cohesion.	Our Orientation covers most key elements and models most key process points; it is adequate in length and at the right time.	Our Orientation solidly covers the elements and process, including frameworks and student leadership, meets time requirements, and builds a sense of community.	Our Orientation goes above and beyond in addressing key elements and process points; it exceeds time requirements and builds a sense of community.

Notes:

27. **First-Year Trip:** The First-Year Trip successfully takes first-year (and/or new) Bonners through an immersion experience in a different context, including preparatory educational, service, reflection, and group building activities. If necessary, activities that serve this purpose are held online or perhaps in the context of a course.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our First-Year Trip did not happen or struggles to accomplish its key goals for an immersion service experience.	Our First-Year Trip occurs but needs improvement in meeting key elements, such as preparatory education, service, reflection, and group building.	Our First-Year Trip meets the basic expectations as an immersion service experience with adequate preparation, reflection, and group building.	Our First-Year Trip is a strong example of an immersion experience with good educational preparation, service, reflection, and group building.	Our First-Year Trip provides an excellent immersion experience, includes strong educational preparation for students, context-setting, service, reflection, and community building.

Notes:

28. **Second-Year Exchange:** The Second-Year Exchange effectively provides an opportunity for students to come together with students from one or more campuses for an experience involving reflection, action, and/or education that also provide a larger context for students' understanding of their involvement in service.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our Second-Year Exchange did not happen or did not meet our goals in providing students with an educational service immersion with a partner campus.	Our Second-Year Exchange needs improvement in organization or providing students with a strong service immersion with a partner campus.	Our Second-Year Exchange is effective at providing students across campuses with an effective immersion in service and reflection, action, and/or education.	Our Second-Year Exchange is a strong example of an effective set of activities to engage students across campuses in reflection, action, and education. It focused on a broader purpose.	Our Second-Year Exchange is an excellent example of engaging students across campuses in reflection, action, and education in a meaningful, thoughtful way and exploring a broader vision.

Notes:

- 29. Junior-Senior Capstone Projects:** The Bonner Program effectively structures and provides support for students so that they can complete a capstone-level community-based project or experience in the third and/or fourth year (e.g., high level service placement, capacity building projects, CBR project, etc...). This project may or may not have credit, but it provides students with integrative learning.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our program struggles to provide Capstone experience, in terms of their service placement and leadership within the Bonner Program.	Our program needs some improvement in providing with a consistent capstone-level experiences, though a small proportion of students do so.	Our program has effective structures for capstone experience, and about half of students have a capstone-level placement.	Our program has strong structures for a capstone experience, most students have a capstone-level placement.	Our program has very strong structures for a capstone experience, most or all students have a capstone-level placement. These capstones involve a faculty and partner connection.

Notes:

- 30. Senior Presentation of Learning:** The Bonner Program structures and provides support for students to reflect and articulate their learning over the four years, culminating in a well defined and supported process (i.e., retreats for seniors, required written reflections, and support for a meaningful presentation) for students to make a final presentation of learning.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our program struggles to provide fourth-year students with the resources and support in developing a Senior Presentation of Learning and does not require them.	Our program needs some improvement in providing seniors with the resources and support in developing a Senior Presentation of Learning, though a small proportion of students do so.	Our program has effective resources and support for students to develop a Senior Presentation of Learning. The majority make a senior presentation, but it is not necessarily integrative of their service and learning.	Our program has strong resources and support for students to create a Senior Presentation of Learning. Many students create strong senior presentations that reflect a developmental, integrated experience.	Our program has intentional resources and support for students to develop a Senior Presentation of Learning, even tied to outcomes. Students create presentations that integrate their four-year experiences.

Notes:

- 31. One-on-One Meetings:** The Bonner Program implements at least two one-to-one meetings (one per semester) for students in the program with a member of the campus (Bonner or larger) staff, and these meetings provide students with individualized advising and support for their development and performance in the Bonner Program and on campus.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our program struggles to implement one-on-one meetings each term. They are not very effective.	Our program is able to implement the advising meetings but not fully, and they need some improvement in being helpful for staff or students.	Our program effectively implements the advising meetings at least two times per year, and they are fairly effective for reinforcing accountability.	Our program effectively implements the advising meetings at least two times per year, and they are a helpful element of the program for students and staff.	Our program effectively implements the advising meetings at least two times per year. They reinforce development and success, serving as an avenue for advising and integration.

Notes:

**Category 5 – Community Partnerships, Projects, and Impact**

- 32. Effective, Developmental Partnerships:** The Bonner Program has in place an appropriate, effective strategy for creating, selecting or confirming community partners including nonprofits, schools, and government organizations. Ideally, this strategy involves annual planning, including in written form (applications or agreements) with partners with whom the program has multi-year, developmental partnerships. Partners are educated around the Bonner Program models, frameworks, expectations, and opportunities.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our program struggles with designing or implementing a doable strategy for partner selection, and we need support in this area.	Our program has and implements a strategy for partner selection, but it doesn't include much orientation, or it needs much improvement.	Our program effectively implements a strategy for partner selection, including basic processes and written forms for most partners.	Our program implements a process for partner selection, including applications or higher-level agreements with key partners.	Our program implements a process for partner selection, including applications, higher-level agreements, and long-term strategic planning with key partners.

Notes:

- 33. Partners as Co-Educators:** The Bonner Program and other campus stakeholders actively engage community partners as co-educators. Community partners are informed and engaged in providing training, orientation, guidance, mentoring, and other structured or innovative learning opportunities to students.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Our program struggles to engage partners as co-educators. We need some help with changing the philosophy and approach for working with partners or how they work with students.	Our program has the basic approach for working with partners as co-educators, but the practice of them doing so is inconsistent and needs improvement.	Some community partners are engaged as co-educators and actively provide training and educational guidance to students.	Community partners are engaged as co-educators in a consistent way. We have solid strategies and activities, but academic links could be enhanced.	Community partners actively act as co-educators of students. They provide training and educational support in diverse ways, including readings, discussions, and classroom participation and linkages.

Notes:

- 34. Partner Communication and Management:** The Bonner Program maintains consistent communication with community partners, including at least one annual site visit by a designated representative (staff or student) and other communication at least each semester or more often). Communication channels and strategies are effective, so that partners are comfortable with initiating and maintaining contact with program staff and students.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We struggle to maintain consistent or effective communication with partners. We are not able to conduct site visits for the most part, and communication with partners is an area requiring much improvement.	We maintain effective, consistent communication with some partners but are unable to do site visits with all of them. We initiate communication, and some communication needs to be improved.	We are able to maintain effective, consistent communication with the majority of partners but unable to do site visits with all of them. We initiate communication in most cases.	We are able to maintain effective, consistent communication with most partners, including annual site visits, but we initiate most communication.	We are able to maintain very effective, consistent communication with partners, including annual or more frequent site visits. Partner initiate communication with staff and site coordinators.

Notes:

- 35. Partner Evaluation Process:** The Bonner Program utilizes a partner evaluation process, which involves providing both partners and students with the opportunity to provide formal (written) evaluation and feedback at least once each year (or each semester). In addition, the program provides partners and students with ongoing informal opportunities for feedback and recognition.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
We currently aren't able to carry out a partner evaluation process in an effective or consistent manner. Opportunities for feedback tend to be crisis-oriented. Recognition of partners and students needs much improvement.	We have a partner evaluation process that is effectively utilized with some partners. However, this information isn't often integrated with meetings and placement arrangements. We need more ongoing feedback and recognition.	We have a partner evaluation process that is effectively utilized with the majority of partners. However, we need to improve integration of this information with meetings and placement arrangements, as well as ongoing feedback and recognition.	We execute a strong partner evaluation process, but we could improve how we use this information to ensure best service. Formal and informal opportunities for feedback and recognition exist but aren't fully utilized.	We execute a very strong partner evaluation process. Information is integrated into meetings with students and partners. Formal and informal opportunities for feedback and recognition are utilized.

Notes:

- 36. Capacity Building Projects:** Clear mechanisms are in place for gathering requests from partners that build their program and community capacity. These include the use of the Bonner Foundations' capacity build metrics and tool, used to create students' positions, as well as collect information on the impact of such projects from partners.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
No or few mechanisms are in place for defining, tracking, and reporting outcomes for partners or community impact.	Few mechanisms are in place for gathering requests from partners that build their program and community capacity. Year-end reporting reflects few capacity building projects	Some mechanisms are in place for gathering requests from partners that build their program and community capacity. Year-end reporting reflects some capacity building projects.	Clear mechanisms are in place for gathering requests from partners that build their program and community capacity. Year-end reporting reflects many capacity building projects across the program.	Clear mechanisms are in place for gathering requests from partners that build their program and community capacity, including for academic courses. Year-end reporting reflects many capacity building projects across the program and institution.

Notes:

37. **Place-Based Partnerships with Nonprofits and Civic Entities:** This institution demonstrates a commitment its roles as a steward of place and to educating and supporting the *full participation* and success of its members (including students, staff, and faculty) as reflected in its sustained partnerships, community and civic engagement, collaborative research, and social action. Full participation alludes to the ability for all members to engage, inclusive of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status, ability, and other dimensions of identity.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The institution does not have sustained, visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. There may be some efforts by groups of students, staff, and faculty, but these are often confined to volunteerism and not tracked, rewarded, or recognized through institutional policies and resources.	The institution has some visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve some students, staff, and faculty, but they are not strategic, sustained, or designed to provide systemic solutions. Moreover, they are not tracked, rewarded or recognized through institutional policies and resources.	The institution has visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve many students, staff, and faculty. Additionally, some are strategic, sustained, and designed to provide systemic solutions. There are some incentives, rewards and institutional policies and tracking that signify the value of this work.	The institution has visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve many students, staff, and faculty. The institution is working to develop campus-wide strategic, sustained, and systemic approaches including systematized assessment. There are clear incentives, rewards and institutional policies that signify the value of this work.	The institution has visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve a majority of students, staff, and faculty. The institution is working to develop campus-wide strategic, sustained, and systemic approaches. There are clear tracking and incentives, rewards and institutional policies that signify the value of this work, including external recognition (such as Carnegie or grants).

Notes:

**Category 6 – Curriculum Integration and Community-Engaged Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship**

38. **Relevant Academic Coursework and Connections:** The campus can cite relevant academic coursework, which may include coursework without service projects but addressing relevant themes (e.g., poverty, public policy), service-learning courses, community-based research courses, and independent avenues for academic-service connections. Many Bonner Program students and other student leaders enroll in relevant coursework across their four years. A broad cross-section of students, faculty, and staff appear to be informed about these options.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There are no or very few courses; there is little institutional support for fostering relevant academic connections, CBR, or service-learning. There is resistance to these practices.	A handful of courses are offered, but there is no broad integration of service-learning, CBR, or independent options. Most faculty and students are not aware of the merits of these approaches or how to be involved.	Relevant coursework is offered in some disciplines. A small number of faculty is involved in providing coursework or study options, but a majority of faculty are not informed about how to do this. Some students enroll on their own, but it is not systematic.	Relevant coursework is offered in several disciplines. A core constituency of faculty is involved in providing coursework or study that augment or link to students' civic involvement. Many Bonner students are involved in relevant coursework at some stages.	A variety of relevant coursework is offered, and a broad cross-section of faculty are involved in providing coursework or study options that augment or link to students' civic involvement. Most Bonner students are involved in relevant coursework, often tied to degree programs or other incentives.

Notes:

39. **Faculty and Staff (Personnel) Recruitment, Hiring, and Advancement:** This institution demonstrates commitment to supporting the full participation, advancement, and success of a diverse faculty and staff as reflected in recruitment, hiring, and retention. This demonstrates an understanding of the links of community engagement with diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The institution has no or few faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds. It also lacks a clear, intentional recruitment strategy to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color or others from historically underrepresented groups.	The institution has a few faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds in some departments. A few administrators work to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color or others from historically underrepresented groups.	The institution has some faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds in many (but not a majority of) departments. Some key departments have made efforts to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color, and the institution is working on a more systematic plan.	The institution has faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds in a majority of departments, and some are in leadership roles. Most departments have made efforts to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color. The institution also has a clear intentional strategy, with some success.	Historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds are found in most or all departments, and many are tenured and in leadership roles. The institution can demonstrate a clear intentional strategy and its implementation, with cross-departmental support and action.

Notes:

40. **Faculty Support and Engagement:** There is a high level of support for faculty involvement in civic engagement and community-engaged learning, structured through committees, interdisciplinary collaboration, tenure and promotion guidelines, and other rewards and policies. As a result, there is a high level of faculty involvement.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Faculty involvement in service or civic engagement is virtually nonexistent; support for it is very low.	Faculty involvement is low, confined to campus duties, committees and a disciplinary focus.	Faculty involvement is relatively low; some faculty are involved in community volunteerism or relationships with agencies and pro bono consulting.	Faculty involvement is moderate. Tenured/senior faculty pursue community-based research and teach service-related courses.	Community research and community-based/ service-learning are a high priority for faculty. Faculty are even involved in co-curricular work. Many faculty are involved in interdisciplinary, collaborative work.

Notes:

41. **Community Voice and Engagement:** There are accessible channels by which community individuals and/or agencies can be involved in contributing to, designing, carrying out, and/or evaluating academic, research and service-learning activities. Involvement may include representation on institutional or center boards, presenting to classes, teaching, and shaping the research agenda through partnerships.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There is virtually no involvement by community individuals or agencies in academic or research activities, and we need support in this area.	There is sporadic, random, or limited individual or agency involvement in academic or research activities.	There is some community representation on advisory boards for departments, the center, or schools.	Community representatives are involved actively in academic or research activities or through part-time teaching.	Community individuals and/or agencies are involved in designing, conducting, and evaluating academic, research and service-learning activities.

Notes:

42. **Community-Based and Policy Research:** The institution is engaged in community-based and/or policy research, working with community partners to identify their research needs that can be met through academic research or work. Partners make requests, which extends the type of engagement in which the institution collaborates to provide to the community. Students and faculty collaborate with community residents to produce knowledge.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There is no CBR or policy research currently and there is resistance or lack of interest. We need support with this issue.	There is minimal interest in and activity with CBR or policy research; current efforts (courses and faculty) are few or scattered, and we could improve.	There is moderate interest in and activity with CBR or policy research; current efforts (courses and faculty) are underway and growing, with a strong core.	There is strong interest in and activity with CBR or policy research; efforts (courses and faculty) have been successful and are expanding, with broad-based involvement.	There is strong interest in and activity with CBR or policy research; efforts (courses and faculty) have been successful and replicable. There is broad-based involvement and support.

Notes:

43. **Faculty Development Opportunities:** The center/institution provides professional development for faculty to be involved in community-engaged scholarship, community-based learning, service-learning, community-based research, and other forms of publicly engaged work. This training and support promotes higher quality and more sustained involvement by faculty, so that they utilize best practices (such as sustained relationships, community voice, reflection, mentoring, etc.). This training also includes attention to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
In general, faculty members are not encouraged to participate in community engagement; few incentives are provided (e.g., mini-grants, conferences, workshops). Significant cultural barriers exist.	Faculty development is mostly depending on their own initiative. Few if any structured opportunities or incentives are provided for pursue community engagement (e.g., mini-grants, conferences, workshops). Faculty lack training in DEI.	Although faculty members are not explicitly encouraged to participate in community engagement, some faculty have used institutional incentives (e.g., mini-grants, support to attend conferences, workshops). Faculty have some training in DEI.	Faculty members are encouraged to pursue community engagement through modest incentives for that purpose (e.g., curriculum development mini-grants, support to attend conferences, faculty development). Faculty develop competencies in DEI.	Faculty are intentionally trained and encouraged to try community engagement through widespread availability of various incentives put in place for that purpose (e.g., curriculum development mini-grants, conferences, faculty fellowships, etc.). Faculty teach and advocate around DEI.

Notes:

44. **Faculty Promotion, Rewards, and Tenure:** The institution has clearly articulated rewards or incentives for faculty involvement in service, service-learning and/or community-based research. For example, tenure and promotion guidelines build in support for service-learning and CBR.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There is virtually no support or reward structure for service-learning and CBR; in fact, many perceive this work to be an obstacle to faculty tenure, promotion, and recognition.	Tenure and reward structures define service in relationship to campus committees or disciplines; only in those cases is service-learning or CBR rewarded.	Community service and/or engaged learning is mentioned in the tenure and promotion guidelines; it may count in certain cases.	Formal guidelines for documenting and rewarding service, service-learning, and CBR are in place.	Community-based research and teaching are key criteria for hiring and tenure. There is strong institutional support for faculty involvement in these endeavors.

Notes:

45. **Integrative Pathways:** There are recognizable academic programs through which students can pursue an interest (i.e., issue, discipline, or multidisciplinary topic like education, food, health, social enterprise, etc.) that combines course-based and experiential learning. These programs include well structured opportunities for community engagement (i.e., cohorts, involving reciprocal relationships with partners, producing work for civic aims).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There are no recognizable academic programs through which students pursue interests that combines course-based and experiential learning. Applied opportunities that exist do not involve community partners.	There are few recognizable academic programs through which students pursue interests that combines course-based and experiential learning. However, these programs are seen as disconnected from community engagement.	There are some recognizable academic programs through which students pursue interests that combines course-based and experiential learning. However, these programs are seen as disconnected from community engagement.	There are several recognizable academic programs through which students pursue interests that combines course-based and experiential learning. Some of these programs include some dimensions of community engagement.	There are several recognizable academic programs through which students pursue interests that combines course-based and experiential learning. These programs make public their integration of community engagement and public purposes.

Notes:

46. **Degree Programs Tied with Community Engagement:** The institution has created one or more academic programs—such as a certificate, minor, concentration, or major—that are tied to community or civic engagement (or a related theme that parallels the multiyear co-curricular model). At least some Bonners or other highly engaged students enroll in these programs.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The institution does not have an academic program that offers a corollary to the developmental model; there is resistance to this idea or we need help with this project.	The institution is in the design and conception stages of an academic program that offers a corollary to the developmental model; we could benefit from support of the process.	The institution is in the process of approving a minor, certificate, or other academic program. Faculty interest is increasing, and student interest is being developed through recruitment strategies.	The institution has an approved minor, certificate, major, or other academic initiative but student involvement in the program has not occurred yet or is at low levels.	The institution has an approved minor, certificate, major, or other academic initiative. Students are enrolled in one or more relevant degree programs, and faculty support is high.

Notes:

47. **Inclusive Curriculum:** The institution demonstrates commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of a diverse student body as reflected in its curriculum, courses, textbooks and resources, majors and departments). The curriculum reflects a commitment to diversity, inclusion, and equity, that that corresponds with the engagement of students in community contexts to address public purposes.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
No centralized institution wide or department level planning or goals related to curriculum about issues related to race, ethnicity, gender, systemic racism, or injustice. Community members perceive the curriculum as exclusionary of important voices (curriculum is predominantly white, male, etc.).	No centralized institution wide or department level planning or goals related to curriculum about issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations. Some faculty or course syllabi include diverse perspectives as add-ons and in a tokenized way.	Some signaling from senior administration about importance of including issues of race, structural racism. Efforts to include issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations are scattered with some faculty members who are taking this seriously.	Senior administration committed to including issues of race, structural racism in the curriculum. Efforts for implementation is issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations in the curriculum are inconsistent across departments.	A specific set of institution wide goals, department level goals, and curricular design resources to support inclusion of issues related to race, ethnicity, class, gender, systemic oppression, and even reparations in the curriculum. Community members perceive the curriculum as an inclusive and representative of experiences of historically and currently marginalized voices and epistemologies.

Notes:

## Category 7 – Campus-wide Culture and Infrastructure

48. **Campus-Wide Evidence and Support for Community Engagement:** Key stakeholders at our institution, including faculty and senior academic leaders, understand community engagement as a high-impact practice for enhancing student learning and/or vital component of student success. Evidence (i.e., reports, scholarship, and/or assessment) is routinely collected and shared. This literacy around the practice and its link to positive outcomes (such as retention, critical thinking, teamwork, thriving, well-being, etc.) enables continued integration with curriculum and campus life. This translates into structures for faculty engagement and building engaged departments.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Key stakeholders are unaware of high-impact practices. Related evidence is not shared. Campus-wide literacy around community engagement is minimal, posing significant barriers to further integration.	Key stakeholders do not understand community engagement as a high-impact practice. Little evidence is collected and shared. Campus-wide literacy around community engagement is low, posing barriers to further integration.	A few stakeholders understand community engagement as a high-impact practice. Some evidence is shared (usually by individual programs). Campus-wide literacy around community engagement is low, enabling integration in some units. Some faculty are rewarded.	Some stakeholders embrace community engagement as a high-impact practice. Some evidence is collected and shared. Campus-wide literacy and policies around community engagement is moderate, enabling integration in some units.	Key stakeholders are champions for community engagement as a high-impact practice. Evidence is routinely collected and shared. The literacy around community engagement enables ongoing innovation and integration. Faculty are incentivized to do this work.

Notes:

49. **Collaboration Across Campus Units:** There is strong, consistent collaboration between the Bonner Program and the office/department that houses the program and other entities on campus, including student life/affairs, academic affairs, career services, financial aid, development, the President's office, and other major departments.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Collaboration between key departments and offices is very weak or non-existent and presents problems to the program.	Collaboration between key departments and offices is minimal or only between a few of the key departments and needs to improve.	Collaboration between key departments is moderate and includes most of the key entities on campus. Collaboration helps shape the program.	Collaboration between key departments is strong and includes most or all key entities on campus. It contributes to a strong program, including student development, impact, and infrastructure.	Collaboration between key departments is comprehensive and dynamic, including key entities on campus in innovative ways that strengthen student development, community impact, and campus infrastructure.

Notes:

50. **Awards and Recognition:** The institution clearly recognized the contributions and achievements of students, faculty, and community members involved in service and community engagement, for example through awards and other recognition initiatives.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Recognition of students, faculty, and community members' civic work is very weak or non-existent.	Recognition of students, faculty, and community members' civic work is inconsistent or lacking; one or more of these constituents does not have awards.	Recognition of students, faculty, and community members' civic work is partially in place but is not very visible or consistent.	Recognition of students, faculty, and community members' civic work is partially visible and present, including a formal awards program.	Recognition of students, faculty, and community members' civic work is strongly visible and consistent, including a formal awards program and other public documentation.

Notes:

51. **Public Relations and Visibility:** Community service and engagement is visible and positive in the institution's public relations and branding. Related programs and stories (i.e., individuals, programs, evidence, etc.) receive coverage in major campus publications, including for admissions, marketing, and educational purposes (i.e., strategic plans, accreditation plans, reports, etc.).

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Public relations efforts are poor, and service and community engagement receives little positive coverage.	Public relations efforts are minimal, and service and community engagement receives minimal coverage. A few stories can be found from time to time.	Public relations efforts are moderate, and service and community engagement receives occasional coverage. Stories or mentions are found in alumni and admissions materials.	There are elements of strong public relations, and service and civic engagement is visible and positively covered. Alumni publications, admissions, and other units frequently mention community engagement.	There are highly effective mechanisms for public relations, and service and community engagement is highly visible and regarded in documentation, online, and practices. Such content is systematically part of admissions and across departments.

Notes:

52. **Comprehensive Center Web Presence:** The Bonner Program and larger center in which it resides has a strong, visible, and comprehensive web presence. The website includes information for students, faculty, and partner audiences – which reinforces the roles and resources that the center plays for each of those constituents and exposes them to scholarship and best practices from the field.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The Bonner Program is not easily found on the campus website. The center does not have a functional web presence.	The Bonner Program is mentioned but not fully described. The center has a basic web presence. From the homepage, these links are difficult to find.	The Bonner Program has an effective web presence. The center also has a somewhat comprehensive web presence but does not address all audiences (i.e., faculty or partners).	The Bonner Program has an effective web presence. The center also has a comprehensive web presence including resources for students, faculty, and partners.	The Bonner Program has an effective web presence. The center also has a comprehensive web presence including resources for students, faculty, and partners. Links to both can be found on the campus homepage.

Notes:

53. **Inclusive Student Support:** The institution demonstrates commitment to educating and supporting the *full participation* and success of a diverse members in its centers and activities. Structures support equity and inclusion. Community engagement moves beyond charity to justice.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The institution does not have formal, visible and functioning support services for students, especially students of color, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Additionally, mainstream programs and services, such as orientation, largely targeted at students' who identify as White.	The institution has a few informal support services for students, especially students of color, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. There is token recognition of students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.	The institution has several formal support services for students, especially students of color, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Student-facing programs are working to include and recognize students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.	The institution has formal support services for most students, especially students of color with significant populations at the school, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Student-facing programs include and recognize students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.	The institution has formal support services for all students, including an anti-racist and equity lens, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Student-facing programs support the full participation and recognition of students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.

Notes:

54. **Appropriate Acknowledgment of History:** This institution demonstrates commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members and surrounding community as reflected in its truthful inquiry and acknowledgment of historical roles, connections with slavery, classism, or oppression, and/or need for truth and reconciliation.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
The institution has not examined its historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression. Moreover, the institution is failing to respond appropriately to calls by its members, such as students, staff, and/or faculty, to examine this history and rectify past wrongdoing.	A few individuals and/or units within the institution have begun to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The actions of these individuals and/or units, however, are being met with resistance.	Several individuals and/or units within the institution have begun to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The actions of these individuals and/or units are being met with some level of support.	A cross-functional team has been (or was) established within the institution to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The actions of these individuals, units, and team are being met with support, including by senior leaders.	A cross-functional team has been (or was) established within the institution to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The institution has actively sought to learn from and respond to this inquiry, including in ways that demonstrate its willingness to rectify past

Notes:

55. **Institutional Benchmarking and Policy Review:** The institution demonstrates commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members and surrounding community as reflected in its use of related structures, assessment tools, and external reviews. Internal evaluation and benchmarking tracks progress on issues of equity and impact, including on dimensions of the well-being of the surrounding community.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>The institution has not examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. Moreover, there have been clear, visible incidences that suggest a climate of tension, intolerance, racism, bigotry, and/or other conditions of ongoing oppression to members of the institution's community and/or its surrounding community.</p>	<p>A few actors within the institution are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. When there have been clear, visible incidences that suggest a climate of tension, racism, and/or oppression to members of the institution's community and/or its surrounding community, there are some units that respond.</p>	<p>Several units/departments within the institution are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. When there have been clear, visible incidences that suggest a climate of tension, racism, and/or oppression to members of the institution's community and/or its surrounding community, members attempt to respond with campus-wide actions.</p>	<p>Institutional leadership, including a multitude of units/departments, are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. There are campus-wide actions to address incidences of tension, racism, and/or oppression, and these are supported through the alignment of time, resources, and policies.</p>	<p>Institutional leadership, including a multitude of units/departments, are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. There are campus-wide actions to prevent incidences of tension, racism, and/or oppression. The institution can point to policies, practices, education, and other ongoing activities to create and sustain a climate of full participation and equity.</p>

Notes:

## References:

Sources consulted in the development of the Bonner Self-Assessment Tool include:

- Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S. T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(3), 7-27.
- Furco, A. (2005). *Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Gelmon .S.B., Seifer, S.D., Kauper-Brown, J. and Mikkelsen, M. (2005) *Building capacity for community engagement: Institutional self-assessment*. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved from [www.ccpb.info](http://www.ccpb.info)
- Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4(1), 30-41.
- Hoy, A. and Johnson, M. (2013). (2013). *Deepening community engagement in higher education: Forging new pathways*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Project HERE (2012). Project Here (Higher Education Reparations Engagement) institutional assessment tool. Available at <https://www.givepulse.com/event/access/265370>
- Sturm, S., Eatman, T., Saltmarsh, J., & Bush, A. (2011). Full participation: Building the architecture for diversity and public engagement in higher education. *White Paper, Columbia University Law School, Center for Institutional and Social Change*.
- Welch, M. and Saltmarsh, J. (2013). Best Practices and infrastructures for campus centers of community engagement. In Hoy and Johnson (Eds.) *Deepening community engagement in higher education: Forging new pathways*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Welch, M. (2017). The National Inventory of Institutional Infrastructure for Community Engagement (NI-IICE).