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Academic knowledge is a tool for engaging in the world to improve the world.

Engaging in the world is a pathway to new knowledge.
“The public purpose of higher education is the creation and dissemination of new knowledge AND ...... People different from me.

... the cultivation of democratic values, skills, habits, and practices.” -Ernest Lynton
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Mapping the Canadian Context

1. National Organizations
2. Initiatives
3. Federal/National/Provincial Govt.
4. Local
“...in addition to improving the rankings, we should develop an international civic engagement classification system.

In the United States, the **Carnegie Community Engagement Classification** has been highly successful, setting a high standard for engagement and determining which institutions meet it.

**World University Rankings blog: should global league tables consider community engagement?**, Anthony Monaco and Cheryl de la Rey, Sept 5 2015
An international classification along similar lines would do more than reward excellence.

- It would provide new **legitimacy**, **recognition** and **visibility**.
- It would promote and support sensible **differentiation** among academic functions.
- It would strengthen **accountability**, helping institutions to demonstrate that they are addressing the important needs of their communities.”

**World University Rankings blog: should global league tables consider community engagement?**, Anthony Monaco and Cheryl de la Rey, September 5 2015
Rankings must take civic engagement seriously, say university leaders

"Gather a group of universities and tell the rankings that you’ll collectively withdraw if they don’t take in civic engagement in the future. I guarantee you that every one of them will listen"

The pressure to move up the league tables can dissuade university leaders from giving civic engagement the attention it deserves. This has to change
Carnegie International Pilot
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Carnegie Classification
Create an elective classification that will depend on voluntary participation by institutions:

“We open the possibility for a special-purpose classification involving only those institutions with special commitments in the area of community engagement.”

McCormick and Zhao, Rethinking and Reframing the Carnegie Classification, Change, 2005.
Background

- **2005**: Pilot of Documentation Framework (13 campuses)
- Common language
- Best practices
- Institutional change
- Rising bar informed by the field
Background

Framework is designed to:

1. **Respect the diversity of institutions** and their approach to community engagement

2. Engage institutions in a process of inquiry, reflection, and **self-assessment**; and

3. Honor institution’s achievements while **promoting ongoing development** of their programs

*Driscoll, Carnegie’s Community Engagement Classification: Intentions and Insights, Change, 2008*
Impact

Framework has created:

1. **Common Language:** CE, ES
2. **Common Institutional Change Strategy:** key benchmarking and planning tool for strategic planning and accreditation; and
3. **Common Field:** best practices, assessment, evaluation, research, funders, profession, Centers and Offices, Chief Engagement Officers, etc.

AND

4. **Movement:** Networks, organizations, journals, public policies
5. **Community of Practice:** continuous learning, solidarity, acknowledgment
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## 2015 Classification

### Re-Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-Classification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that needed to re-classify</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that did not seek re-classification</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that sought re-classification</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that did not receive re-classification</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that received re-classification</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### First-Time Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Time Classification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that received the application</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that submitted an application</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that did not receive the classification</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that received first-time classification</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total number of campuses classified and re-classified in 2015

| Total number of campuses classified and re-classified in 2015 | 240 |

### Classification Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of classified campuses (2010 and 2015)</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses that need to re-classify in 2020</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2015 Classification by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private not-for-profit</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2 but less than 4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc/Pub-U-MC: Associate's--Public Urban-serving Multicampus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S: Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Assoc: Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Diverse: Baccalaureate Colleges--Diverse Fields</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's S: Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec/Arts: Special Focus Institutions--Schools of art, music, and design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec/Health: Special Focus Institutions--Other health professions schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec/Med: Special Focus Institutions--Medical schools and medical centers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why do campuses seek the Classification?

- **Institutional self-assessment and self-study:** A way to bring the disparate parts of the campus together in a way that advances a unified agenda. At the same time it allows for the identification of promising practices that can be shared across the institution.

- **Legitimacy:** Seeking a new level of legitimacy and public recognition and visibility for your work.

- **Accountability:** A way to demonstrate that the institution is fulfilling its mission to serve the public good.

- **Catalyst for Change:** A tool for fostering institutional alignment for community-based teaching, learning and scholarship.

- **Institutional Identity:** The classification is a way to clarify institutional identity and mission that distinguishes the institution from peers.
Institutional Motivation

Campus Leaders:

◎ ...this is one of the highest forms of recognition possible in our field.

◎ ... If you are at all interested in a process of self-assessment and quality improvement, applying for this Carnegie Classification is a fine way to achieve that goal.

◎ ...This opportunity allowed us to lift up elements of our institutional mission and distinctiveness that are not necessarily represented in the national data on colleges and universities, and it also helped us prepare for both re-accreditation and our current strategic planning process.
Your Motivations
Definition
Community Engagement Definition

Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. [process of engagement]
Community Engagement

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

[purpose of engagement]
Reciprocity

"...for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity."

As a core principle – there is a flow of knowledge, information and benefits in both directions between the University and community partners.

Reciprocity is what defines and distinguishes engagement: It defines relationships between those in the university and those outside the university that are grounded in the qualities of mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.
Re-conceptualization of Engagement

*Engagement* "requires going beyond the expert model that often gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration...calls on faculty to move beyond ‘outreach,’...asks scholars to go beyond ‘service,’ with its overtones of noblesse oblige.

What it emphasizes is genuine *collaboration*: that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared. It represents a basic re-conceptualization of...community-based work.”

O’Meara and Rice, Faculty Priorities Reconsidered (2005).
Classification Paradox
Theoretical Underpinnings
Paradox of Partnership

1. Community engagement can only be fully realized through **institutional transformation**.

2. Institutional transformation happens when multiple pathways of engagement (partnership) are enacted.
Engagement leads to Institutional Transformation

A Model of Institutional Change

Where Might Transformative Change Occur for HE?

Connecting institutions to their communities

...institutions form intentional linkages with their communities...these connections can contribute to the reshaping of institutional practices and purposes..., they may cause researchers to rethink the types of grants they seek, the ways they disseminate their findings, and the range and types of audiences for their findings. ...Faculty may incorporate service and outreach in their classes and curricula, and students may participate in co-curricular activities (such as internships or service learning) that place them in the community where they can apply their learning to solving real-world problems.
Institutional Transformations:

1. Alter the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products;

2. Are deep and pervasive, affecting the whole institution;

3. Are intentional;

4. Occur over time
## Transformational Change

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

Adapted from Eckel, Hill & Green (1998)
Engagement as a Core Value for the University of the 21st century

Engagement implies strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world in at least four spheres:

1. Setting universities’ aims, purposes, and priorities;
2. Relating teaching and learning to the wider world;
3. The back-and-forth dialogue between researchers and practitioners;
4. Taking on wider responsibilities as neighbours and citizens.

Dimensions of Engagement

- The Civic Mission of Higher Education Mission Dimension
- Improved Teaching and Learning Pedagogical Dimension
- The New Production of Knowledge Epistemological Dimension
- Connecting to the Community Partnership Dimension

Community Engagement
Documentation Framework

Foundational Indicators Teamwork
2020 Classification Framework Outline

Community Engagement Definition
Applicant’s Contact Information

I. Campus and Community Context
II. Foundational Indicators
   A. Institutional Identity and Culture
   B. Institutional Assessment
   C. Institutional Communication
   D. Institutional - Community Relations
   E. Infrastructure and Finance
   F. Tracking, Monitoring, and Assessment
   G. Faculty and Staff
2020 Classification Framework Outline

III. Categories of Community Engagement
   A. Curricular Engagement
      Teaching and Learning
      Curriculum
   B. Co-Curricular Engagement
   C. Professional Activity and Scholarship
   D. Community Engagement and Other Institutional Initiatives

IV. Outreach and Partnerships
   A. Outreach
   B. Partnerships

V. Reflection and Additional Information
End Day 1
Learning from Day 1
Partnership

1. Requires openness to be changed.
2. Operates through a “power with” framework, not “over” or “on”.
3. Is developmental - deepens and becomes more complex over time.
4. Is a mode, a method, of knowledge generation more than transfer.
5. Is human, and organizational.
6. Is multifaceted and purpose driven.
7. Is slow.
8. Is transformative.
Community Engagement Definition

Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. [process of engagement]
Community Engagement

The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

[purpose of engagement]
Reciprocity

"...for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity."

As a core principle – there is a flow of knowledge, information and benefits in both directions between the University and community partners.

Reciprocity is what defines and distinguishes engagement: It defines relationships between those in the university and those outside the university that are grounded in the qualities of mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.
Carnegie Theory of Change

Step 1
Systematically surfacing institutions that practice ethical, reflective, and deep community engagement practice.

Step 2
Analyzing these institutions to discover best practices (inputs).

Step 3
Curate best practice discoveries.

Step 4
Iterate

Discovery & Curation
Carnegie Theory of Change

**Step 1**
Classification, built around discovery and curation, creates an "epistemic" community.

**Step 2**
Epistemic communities develop common languages, common practices, regular convenings, and other means for connecting across institutions around the institutional changes they are pursuing.

**Step 3**
Epistemic communities exercise collective power to shape and reshape individual institutions through standard setting and validation of change agents within institutions.
Lynton Award - Norms of Engaged Scholarship

- **Participatory epistemology:** & co-creation of knowledge
- **Collaborative research:** academic knowledge combined with community-based knowledge
- **Scholarly artifacts:** expanding the understanding and valuing of scholarly products
- **Knowledge experts from outside the academy (peers):** Who counts as a peer
- **Trans-disciplinarity:** recognizing that interdisciplinary inquiry remains bounded by academic
- **Impact:** academic impact is conceived as “the advancement of scientific knowledge and activities that contribute to achievement of societally relevant outcomes” (NSF) and is shaped by examining the nature of the system within which knowledge is transformed into public policy or social action and how scholars engage others to transform research into actionable and useful knowledge.
Lynton Award - Norms of Engaged Scholarship

The Lynton Award conceptualizes scholarly engagement as grounded in a set of assumptions about knowledge and social change, explicitly advancing social justice in a diverse democracy. Community engagement addresses questions of power, privilege, politics, positionality, identity, and implication, and assumes that:

1. The public purposes of higher education are knowledge creation and dissemination, **AND** cultivation of democratic values, skills and habits - democratic practice

2. The norms of democratic practice reflect the workings of privilege and power in time and place, and often lead to injustice at the individual, institutional, and societal level.

3. All scholarship examines, or reifies by non-examination, the workings of power and privilege as context and constituent of knowledge creation and dissemination and therefore has a political agenda.
Thus, engaged scholarly work must critically examine (historical, racial, economic, gender, social, etc.) contexts of knowledge production—past, present, and future—as part of every scholarly project.
2020 US Classification Cycle Timeline

Jan 2018 2020 Framework announced
May 2018 2020 Online portal open
Apr 15, 2019 2020 Application deadline
Dec 2019 2020 Review process completed
Jan 2020 2020 Classified campuses recognized

2025 Open framework revision process
Input from applicant submissions

Until Jan 2021 Public comments for 2025
Until Apr 2022 Solicited expert comment for 2025
Apr-Dec 2022 NAC finalize proposed changes for 2025
Jan 2023 2025 Framework launch
In each cycle of the classification (every 5 years), there are changes that are made to the documentation framework. These are not major changes, but rather revisions that are incorporated into the existing framework that reflect changes in the community engagement field. In 2015, questions about promotion and tenure policies was revised, and questions about the relationship of community engagement to diversity and inclusion, and to student success were included for the first time.

For the 2020 Classification Framework, there are revisions that represent 1) changes in the field, and 2) gaps in the framework. These include the following:
2020 Classification Changes

Changes in the field
- Non-tenure track faculty
- Broader Impacts research
- IRB
- Social innovation
- Dialogue and deliberation

Gaps in the framework
- Student Voting
- Partnership quality
- Anchor Institution work

Clarifications and Definitions
- Curricular/Co-Curricular
- Outreach
- Partnership

The changes in the framework are reflected in both the First-Time Classification and Re-classification documentation frameworks.
Curricular Engagement

Definition:

“Curricular Engagement describes teaching, learning, and scholarship which engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance the wellbeing of the community, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.”
Co-Curricular Engagement

**Definition:**

“Co-curricular Engagement describes structured learning that happens outside the formal academic curriculum through trainings, workshops, and experiential learning opportunities.

Co-curricular Engagement requires **structured reflection** and **connection to academic knowledge** in the context of reciprocal, asset-based community partnerships.”
Outreach and Partnerships - Defined

“Outreach and Partnerships has been used to describe two different but related approaches to community engagement.

◎ Outreach has traditionally focused on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use.

◎ Partnerships focus on collaborative interactions between communities and universities for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).
Outreach and Partnerships - Defined

◎ The distinction between these two is grounded in the concepts of reciprocity and mutual benefit, which are explicitly explored and addressed in partnership activities.

◎ Community engaged institutions have been intentional about reframing their outreach programs and functions into a community engagement framework that is more consistent with a partnership approach.”
Dimensions of Engagement

Classification Framework

https://www.givepulse.com/survey/response/edit/8455
Areas of Challenge
Reciprocal Partnerships

- Partnerships require a high level of understanding of and intentional practices specifically directed to reciprocity and mutuality.

- Campuses have begun to attend to processes of initiating and nurturing collaborative, two-way partnerships, and are developing strategies for systematic communication.

- Maintaining authentically collaborative, mutually beneficial partnerships takes ongoing commitment, and we urge institutions to continue their attention to this critical aspect of community engagement.
Faculty/Staff Rewards and Development

◎ With regard to faculty rewards for roles in community engagement, it is difficult to create a campus culture of community engagement when there are not clearly articulated incentives for faculty to prioritize this work.

◎ We would like to see more examples of campuses that provide evidence of clear policies for recognizing community engagement in teaching and learning, and in research and creative activity, along with criteria that validate appropriate methodologies and scholarly artifacts.

◎ We urge Community Engagement institutions to initiate study, dialogue, and reflection to promote and reward the scholarship of engagement more fully.
Curriculum and Co-Curriculum

Curriculum and Co-curriculum, when done well, need the following elements of best practice:
- Clear conceptual foundations (definitions),
- Scaffolded, developmental structure,
- Learning Outcomes
- Assessment Processes
Integration & Alignment

Community engagement offers often-untapped possibilities for alignment with other campus priorities and initiatives to achieve greater impact—for example:

- First-year programs that include community engagement;
- Learning communities in which community engagement is integrated into the design;
- Diversity initiatives that explicitly link active and collaborative community-based teaching and learning with the academic success of underrepresented students.
The next series of questions will ask you about Outcomes and Impacts.

Outcomes are the short-term and intermediate changes that occur in learners, program participants, etc., as a direct result of the community engagement activity, program, or experience. An outcome is an effect your program produces on the people or issues you serve or address. Outcomes are the observed effects of the outputs on the beneficiaries of the community engagement. Outcomes should clearly link to goals. Measuring outcomes requires a commitment of time and resources for systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms for the purposes of assessment.

Outcomes provide the measurable effects the program will accomplish. When outcomes are reached new goals or objectives may need to be set, but when outcomes are not achieved it may be time to reassess. Impacts are the long-term consequence of community engagement.

Impacts are the broader changes that occur within the community, organization, society, or environment as a result of program outcomes. While it is very difficult to ascertain the exclusive impact of community engagement, it is important to consider the desired impact and the alignment of outcomes with that impact. Furthermore, institutions can and should be working toward some way of measuring impact as an institution or as a member institution of a collective impact strategy.

For each question in this section please answer for goals, outcomes, and impacts.
Partner Questions
2020 Classification Changes - CPs

E.2. Partnerships: This section replaces the previous "partnership grid" with a series of repeating questions for each of the partnerships you identify.

1. Describe representative examples of partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year (maximum=15 partnerships).

1.1. Project/Collaboration Title
1.2. Community Partner (and email contact information for community partner)
1.3. Institutional Partner
1.4. Purpose of this collaboration
1.5. Length of Partnership
1.6. Number of faculty involved
1.7. Number of staff involved
1.8. Number of students involved
1.9. Grant funding, if relevant
1.10. Impact on the institution
1.11. Impact on the community
As part of this section, we are asking for an email contact for each partnership provided. The following email will be sent to your community partner:

Dear Community Partner,

{Name of Campus} is in the process of applying for the 2020 Elective Community Engagement Classification from the Carnegie Foundation. The classification is offered to campuses that can demonstrate evidence of collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial creation and exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. Partnerships that meet the standards of community engagement are grounded in the qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.

We would like to ask you to assist with this classification process by providing confidential responses to a very brief online survey (LINK provided). Your input and perspective on the activity is valuable input in evaluating campus community engagement.

Many thanks for your response.

Sincerely,

SWEARER CENTER
community. scholarship. action.
BROWN UNIVERSITY
Community Partner Survey Questions:

As a community partner, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your collaboration with this institution? (Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree,, Agree, Strongly agree)

1. Community partners are recognized by the campus.
2. Community partners are asked about their perceptions of the institution’s engagement with and impact on community.
3. My community voice is heard and I have a seat on the table in important conversations that impact my community.
4. The faculty and/or staff that our community partnership works with take specific actions to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.
5. The campus collects and shares feedback and assessment findings regarding partnerships, reciprocity, and mutual benefit, both from community partners to the institution and from the institution to the community.
6. The partnership with this institution had a positive impact on my community

Open –ended questions:

1. Describe the actions and strategies used by the campus to ensure mutuality and reciprocity in partnerships.
2. Please provide any additional information that you think will be important for understanding how the campus partnering with you has enacted reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.
Partner Preparation
Lunch
## Transformational Change

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

According to the Eckel and colleagues (1998) model, depth is a key element of transformation, but it is not enough.

As they point out, “A deep change is not necessarily broad . . . It is possible for deep changes to occur within specific units or academic departments without being widespread throughout the institution” (p. 4).

There could be a few faculty in a few departments, all doing quality community engagement in their courses and in their research, but if the practice is not widespread across the institution, no organizational transformation is occurring.

Eckel, Hill & Green (1998)  
Pervasiveness, according to Eckel and colleagues (1998), “refers to the extent to which the change is far-reaching within the institution. The more pervasive the change, the more it crosses unit boundaries and touches different parts of the institution” (p. 4).

3 Partnerships
That exemplify a set of depth, pervasiveness & reciprocity
20 min in your own teams, report out 3 min each
Cohort Strategy
Canadian Cohort Commitments

Participating Canadian post-secondary institutions have committed to the following:

a. Attend an initial convening to learn about the philosophy and logic of the existing US Carnegie Classification. This workshop event will be conducted by the Swearer Centre, Brown University – the administrative and research home of the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. It is being hosted at Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC from February 26–28, 2019.

b. Provide a one-time participation fee of $5,000 US to cover research and administration costs as well as additional cost sharing for meeting expenses.

c. Complete and submit the existing US Classification application and host individual campus site visits from the existing US Carnegie Classification Team.

d. Work together as a learning community to identify needed adjustments to the existing Classification, recommend solutions and contribute to the development of a Canadian specific version of the Classification, if deemed desirable.
Canadian Cohort Key Milestone

Feb 2019  Initial Convening
Jan 2020  Complete & Submit Classification Application
Mar-May 2020  Host Individual Site Visits from US team
May/June 2020  Closing Convening
Aug 2020  Campuses Receive Final Reports
Provided

the Canadian cohort deems it desirable to author a Canadian Classification Framework

and

the Foundation approves the Canadian Classification
## Canadian Cohort Key Milestone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2021</td>
<td>Finalize Canadian Classification Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Set of Governance Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of National Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2022</td>
<td>Application Deadline for 2023 Cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the Skeleton

What’s the Muscle?
End Day 2
Learning from Day 2
Power Mapping
1. Who has power + could be a challenge/problem

2. Who has power + could be an ally/asset

3. Who doesn’t have power but still could be an ally/you’d be an ally to by involving in this process?

4. Who doesn’t have power and is not necessary to engage

- **Field 1:** Internal to the institution
- **Field 2:** Outside the institution
Tools to Organize
Lunch/Bags
Research & Knowledge Generation
Individual Campus Planning Time