

The Community Engagement and Partnership Inventory (CEPI)

Mathew H. Gendle & Amanda S. Tapler
Elon University, Elon NC, USA

This work was supported by an Innovate/Collaborate (IN/CO) grant from the CAA Academic Alliance. The authors are indebted to the numerous community-based global learning practitioners who graciously provided us with valuable feedback on earlier drafts of the CEPI. The authors would like to specifically thank Jess Boersma (University of North Carolina Pembroke), Carrie Eaves (Elon University), Caitlin Ferrarini (University of Massachusetts Boston), Bob Frigo (Elon University), Eric Hartman (Haverford College), Allison Karpyn (University of Delaware), Leann Moore (University of Delaware), Phillip Motley (Elon University), Susan Serra (University of Delaware), Maureen Vandermaas-Peeler (Elon University), and Andrew Zitcer (Drexel University) for ongoing critical conversations and professional fellowship that collectively supported the development of the CEPI.

Development and Design

The Community Engagement and Partnership Inventory (CEPI) is designed to serve as a practical, comprehensive, flexible, and open-source instrument for programs and institutions to evaluate and measure CBGL goals in both domestic and international contexts. This instrument is intended to function as an operationalized and comprehensive meta-checklist of best practices in CBGL for academic programs to use for their own internal self-evaluation.

The CEPI can be utilized in multiple contexts from the micro level (individual partnerships) to the macro level (community engagement practice across an entire institution). Regardless of the level of analysis, the CEPI can be effectively employed when conceptualizing a new partnership; as guidance for initiating partnership development; in assessment of ongoing partnerships; in evaluation of program or institutional unit community engagement practices; and ultimately, to assess a college or university's overall community engagement efforts. The CEPI can be used to identify the strengths of community partnerships, potential gaps in community partnerships at the micro level, program/unit level, and macro level, to create and/or maintain strong, mutually beneficial, and ethical community partnerships. The CEPI can also be referenced by a college/university as an "ideal best-practice standard" for what is expected of all programs to work toward that operate under the purview of a specific institution.

The CEPI utilizes program outcomes that are intentionally aspirational. But unlike these other resources, the CEPI is designed to allow for the measurement/tracking of ongoing programmatic improvements in relation to these goals over time. Each academic program, community partnership, and institution is unique and faces specific constraints to temporal, financial, and human resources that inherently limit the ability to fully execute best practices in all cases. The CEPI is intended to serve as a set of benchmarks that support ongoing program development and tracking the progress (and barriers) towards the achievement of these aspirational goals in order to enhance and sustain CBGL programming that is firmly anchored in reciprocity, equity, and justice.

The CEPI consists of 16 topical subcategories with a total of 147 closed-ended response items:

Subcategory number and name	Number of response items
1: Sustainable and equitable partner relationships	17
2: Student curricular/co-curricular matters	13
3: Faculty and staff curricular/co-curricular matters	10
4: Pre-program preparation for students, faculty, and staff	12
5: Post-program activities for students, faculty, and staff	8
6: Program evaluation	10
7: Program reciprocity	6
8: Diversity, equity, and inclusion considerations	9
9: Partnership safety and security	14
10: Financial transparency	5
11: Financial equity for student participants	8
12: Financial issues related to ethical community partnerships	10
13: Navigating power and privilege	5
14: Environmental sustainability	6
15: Public relations/Advocacy of program value	11
16: Integration with broader curricular/co-curricular efforts across campus	3

Each of the CEPI response items consists of a statement related to program goals, activities, practices, philosophy, or orientation (ex. “The partnership is intentionally designed using asset-based approaches, from the beginning, to draw on community expertise as well as strengthen capacities in the local partner community.”). Respondents answer each item in each section using the following 6-point Likert-type scale:

N/A = not applicable to program/academic unit/institution

- 0 = program/academic unit/institution has never considered doing this
- 1 = program/academic unit/institution has considered doing this, but has never executed it in practice
- 2 = program/academic unit/institution occasionally does this
- 3 = program/academic unit/institution does this at least half of the time
- 4 = program/academic unit/institution nearly always does this
- 5 = program/academic unit/institution requires this as part of its everyday operations

Administration

Given the detailed nature of the individual CEPI items, central institutional administrative offices (such as the President, Provost, Deans) may not be able to provide accurate answers regarding specific program operations. For this reason, the completion of the CEPI by senior administrators is discouraged. For all CEPI administrations, it is critical to retain generalized descriptors of who is providing the answers (individual faculty members, institutional program director, etc...), to provide context for interpretation. This information can be provided without the use of personal identifiers but should be included with all CEPI response data. In cases where the CEPI is to be utilized as a macro/institutional level metric, it is recommended that each individual program collect micro-level data on their own programming, and then submit this data to a central administrative entity (such as an Office of Institutional Research) that can then conduct a macro-level analysis using aggregate institutional data.

Scoring

For each of the 16 subcategories, the CEPI Section Score is calculated by summing the total value of responses and dividing that figure by ([the number of items in that section] X 5). The Overall Score for the CEPI is calculated by summing the total value of responses across all items and dividing that figure by 735. The Section Scores and overall Score are expressed as percentages by default. Note that these scoring instructions presume that all items in every subcategory are applicable, and that a 0-6 score is provided by the respondent for each item. In cases where one or more items are not applicable (N/A) or when a response was not given, the denominators must be adjusted accordingly before the Section Score or Overall Score is calculated. The CEPI was designed in a way that allows for repeated administration, and the Section and Overall Scores from such repeated administration can be used to track outcomes from program development efforts over time.

It is important to note that the CEPI has not undergone robust psychometric evaluation. This instrument was conceptualized as a comprehensive meta-checklist of best practices in CBGL for internal use by campus programs, rather than a rigorous research instrument. Due to the highly variable contexts within which CBGL programs operate, the CEPI is not intended for use as a generalizable research tool. Furthermore, while community partner organizations may find the CEPI to be of value, this instrument is primarily intended for use by academic entities. However, in the spirit of equitable co-creation of partnerships with local communities, it remains imperative that CBGL programs use the CEPI to drive active and ongoing conversation with community partners around program activities, development, evaluation, and change.

CEPI Short Form (CEPI-SF)

To facilitate use in situations with substantial temporal limitations, a short form version of the CEPI (CEPI-SF) was also produced. The CEPI-SF captures the fundamental program attributes and practices that the full-length CEPI measures, albeit with significantly less detail. The short form CEPI collapses across the CEPI's 16 subcategories and includes a total of 47 items. The Overall Score for the CEPI-SF is calculated by summing the total value of responses across all items and dividing that figure by 235. Just like with the full-length CEPI, in cases where one or more items are not applicable (N/A) or a response was not given, the denominator must be adjusted accordingly before the Overall Score is calculated. Given the already brief and summative nature of the CEPI-SF, user-based deletion of additional questions is not recommended, unless the questions under consideration are truly irrelevant to the program being assessed. The items on the CEPI-SF can be cross-referenced with the full-length CEPI to identify which subcategory each item belongs.

The Community Engagement and Partnership Inventory (CEPI)

For each of the 16 subcategories, the CEPI Section Score is calculated by summing the total value of responses and dividing that figure by ([the number of items in that section] X 5). The Overall Score for the CEPI is calculated by summing the total value of responses across all items and dividing that figure by 735. The Section Scores and overall Score are expressed as percentages by default. Note that this presumes that all items in every subcategory are applicable, and that a 0-6 score is provided by the respondent for each item. In cases where one or more items are not applicable (N/A) or when a response was not given, the denominators must be adjusted accordingly before the Section Score or Overall Score is calculated.

1) Sustainable and Equitable Partner Relationships

- a. All community partnerships are constructed around the concept of *dual purposes*—where student learning and community outcomes are always accorded equal importance.
- b. Community partners are included as co-creators from the conceptualization of the partnership.
- c. The partnership is intentionally designed using asset-based approaches, from the beginning, to draw on community expertise as well as strengthen capacities in the local partner community.
- d. The partnership is intentionally designed, from the beginning, to minimize potential harms to the local partner community.
- e. Community partners are co-creators of the goals and objectives related to the partnership.
- f. Community partners have the opportunity to co-create memoranda of understanding or similar written partnership agreements (formal or informal), in both English and local language(s), that clearly outline the goals, objectives, and desired outcomes of the partnership.
- g. Community partners have a primary role in determining the timing and duration of the partnership, as well as the number of students, faculty, and staff included in the partnership.
- h. Community partners have a meaningful and central role in the design of curricular/co-curricular program components.
- i. Community partners are offered the opportunity to have a meaningful role in the creation of learning objectives for the partnership and/or class syllabi.
- j. Community partners are offered the opportunity to have a significant role in how students, faculty, and staff are recruited and selected for participation in the partnership.
- k. Community partners are offered the opportunity to have a significant role in how the program is presented to potential participants (i.e. program website and other marketing materials), particularly in regards to language and photos that are used to represent the program.
- l. Community partners have a clear and widely understood mechanism through which they can raise concerns about the partnership, and exercise agency related to these concerns, at every point in development and execution of the partnership.

- m. There is a widely understood process in place for community partners to regularly evaluate, adjust, and re-articulate the goals, scope, and strategies for the partnership at any time, either on their own or in collaboration with the other members of the partnership. This process includes both verbal and written ways to communicate.
- n. Community partners have the agency to initiate dialogue about terminating the partnership, or act to terminate the partnership, without incurring significant hardship or harm, at any time.
- o. The program has specific policies in place regarding the ethical termination of a community relationship
- p. Community partners co-create, co-administer, and co-interpret all evaluation strategies and metrics related to the partnership.
- q. Community partners have a role in deciding formats for dissemination of scholarship resulting the partnership. Community partners are offered the opportunity to serve as co-authors/co-presenters for any presentation, report, or published scholarship resulting from the partnership.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/85) = %

2) Student Curricular/co-curricular Matters

- a. Students encounter significant and consistent messaging related to critical approaches to global citizenship, from the application process through the program’s end.
- b. Students encounter significant and consistent messaging related to critical approaches to cultural humility, from the application process through the program’s end.
- c. Students are required to critically engage with issues related to cultural humility, commitment to human dignity, and critical global citizenship throughout the program’s curricular and/or co-curricular spaces.
- d. Students engage with materials and resources created by members of the partner community and texts and/or other resources about the community.
- e. Students thoughtfully examine their own intersectional identities and positionality.
- f. Students engage in meaningful discourse or other forms of reflection to process their understanding of intersectional identities and positionality.
- g. Students thoughtfully examine their own power and privilege.
- h. Students engage in meaningful discourse or other forms of reflection to process their understanding of their own power and privilege.
- i. Students thoughtfully examine their own cultural assumptions and existence as cultural beings.
- j. Students engage in meaningful discourse or other forms of reflection to process their understanding of their own cultural assumptions and existence as cultural beings.
- k. The types of critical self-reflection described in items e. – j. are intentional and ongoing throughout the partnership.

- l. Students meaningfully examine broader global systems, structures, and contexts that inform and influence (positively or negatively) the community partnership.
- m. There are multiple opportunities for students reflect on how they will specifically bridge what they learned in the program into future behaviors and actions in their everyday lives.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/65) = %

3) Faculty and Staff Curricular/co-curricular Matters

- a. Participating faculty and staff are required to critically engage with issues related to cultural humility, commitment to human dignity, and critical global citizenship throughout the program’s curricular and/or co-curricular spaces.
- b. Participating faculty and staff engage with materials and resources created by members of the partner community and texts and/or other resources about the community.
- c. Participating faculty and staff thoughtfully examine their own intersectional identities and positionality.
- d. Participating faculty and staff engage in meaningful discourse or other forms of reflection to process their understanding of intersectional identities and positionality.
- e. Participating faculty and staff thoughtfully examine their own power and privilege.
- f. Participating faculty and staff engage in meaningful discourse or other forms of reflection to process their understanding of their own power and privilege.
- g. Participating faculty and staff thoughtfully examine their own cultural assumptions and existence as cultural beings.
- h. Participating faculty and staff engage in meaningful discourse or other forms of reflection to process their understanding of their own cultural assumptions and existence as cultural beings.
- i. The types of critical self-reflection described in items e. – j. are intentional and ongoing throughout the partnership.
- j. Participating faculty and staff meaningfully examine broader global systems, structures, and contexts that inform and influence (positively or negatively) the community partnership.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/50) = %

4) Pre-program Preparation for Students, Faculty, and Staff

- a. Students, faculty, and staff have scaffolded opportunities to critically reflect on their own hopes, desires, motivations, and fears related to the community partnership, upcoming program participation, and desired outcomes.
- b. Students, faculty, and staff engage in structured exercises to identify power imbalances that may exist within the partnership.

- c. Students, faculty, and staff understand the challenges that result from power imbalances that may exist within the community partnership.
- d. Students, faculty, and staff are provided access to affordable resources to learn about the partner community.
- e. Students, faculty, and staff have opportunities to engage with the community partner in ways that build trust.
- f. Students, faculty, staff, and the community partner(s) discuss desires, motivations, and fears associated with the partnership.
- g. Students, faculty, and staff are provided multiple opportunities/scaffolded exercises to promote learning about and understanding of the community partner through an asset-based (rather than deficit) model.
- h. Students, faculty, and staff have opportunities to engage in dialogue with members of the community before entering their physical spaces.
- i. Students, faculty, and staff are asked to process their own thoughts, beliefs, and assumptions about the community partner.
- j. Students, faculty, and staff are asked to recognize, state, and deconstruct their own thoughts, beliefs, and assumptions about the nature and extent of their relationship with the community partner.
- k. Students, faculty, and staff are required to identify and formally explore potential ethical issues with the community partnership.
- l. Students, faculty, staff, and the community partner collaboratively explore potential ethical issues, biases, and challenges related to the community partnership.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/60) = %

5) Post-program Activities for Students, Faculty, and Staff

- a. Students, faculty, and staff have multiple/scaffolded opportunities to critically reflect on the community-engaged experience.
- b. Students, faculty, and staff have multiple/scaffolded opportunities to critically reflect on how they have grown, been influenced by, or changed as a product/result of the community-engaged experience.
- c. Students, faculty, and staff have multiple/scaffolded opportunities to safely, openly, and critically discuss issues related to personal, physical, or psychological discomfort or trauma during and/or following the community-engaged experience.
- d. Students, faculty, staff, and the community partner discuss/debrief regarding any ethical issues, biases, and/or challenges that occurred during the community-engaged experience or partnership.
- e. Program/institution is prepared to provide professional referrals for students, faculty, and staff dealing with physical or psychological harm or trauma following the community engaged experience.
- f. Students, faculty, and staff have a formal mechanism to provide feedback regarding the program/partnership.

- g. Students formally articulate their personal and academic development/outcomes associated with the community partnership.
- h. Faculty and Staff formally articulate their personal and professional development/outcomes associated with the community partnership.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/40) = %

6) Program Evaluation

- a. Specific program evaluation plans are created and include all activities related to the partnership. When possible, the use of mixed methods (both quantitative and qualitative) in evaluation is encouraged.
- b. Community partners have the opportunity to co-create or provide feedback on partnership evaluation plans (both quantitative and qualitative assessments).
- c. Community partners have a formal mechanism to provide feedback regarding the program/partnership.
- d. Whenever possible, publicly available assessment instruments are used, to facilitate comparisons across programs.
- e. Evaluation plans equitably focus on the experiences and outcomes for all stakeholders.
- f. Evaluation plans are constructed in ways that allow for public dissemination of outcomes through conference presentations and/or peer-reviewed scholarship.
- g. Formal reports detailing evaluation outcomes are produced, disseminated to all stakeholders, and made publicly available upon request.
- h. Using evaluation metrics, detailed action plans are co-created with the intention of further enhancing programmatic and partnership equity and excellence.
- i. Program evaluation-based action plans for programmatic and partnership enhancement is both encouraged and expected.
- j. There are mechanisms in place that hold the program publicly accountable for following through on evaluation-based action plans for programmatic and partnership enhancement.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/50) = %

7) Program Reciprocity

- a. Program administrators focus attention on the long-term feasibility and sustainability of partnerships that center on the mutual interests of both the program and community members.
- b. Program administrators and community partner(s) work to understand the assets, needs, hopes, and desires of all partnership stakeholders.
- c. Community partners are offered the opportunity to learn about, and prepare to engage with, students, faculty, and staff in meaningful ways, *prior to* their work with the community.

- d. Program administrators prioritize the avoidance of community harm over academic outcomes, even if this means significantly changing, limiting, or terminating the partnership.
- e. Community members are offered the opportunity to participate in partnership programming at no cost (financial, resource, human capital) to them.
- f. As is appropriate, all community partnerships are constructed in ways that align with, and support, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (<https://sdgs.un.org/goals>).

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/30) = %

8) Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Considerations

- a. A formalized DEI plan facilitates the institution/program’s ability to welcome and support faculty, staff, student, and community participants across a variety of identities.
- b. Program/institution requires a meaningful and detailed DEI statement as part of the application materials submitted by faculty and staff to participate as student or project leaders/mentors.
- c. Program/institution requires student participants to demonstrate a written commitment to DEI principles/best practices and/or create a personal DEI development plan before engaging with community members.
- d. Prior to interacting with the community, all student, faculty, and staff participants are required to meaningfully engage with issues of social justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion that are germane to the community partnership.
- e. Program/institution intentionally and strongly encourages faculty and staff participation in professional development opportunities related to DEI.
- f. Formal DEI training is a central component of the student experience.
- g. Program/institution tracks participation across a variety of expressed identities (gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, etc...) and uses this data to guide effective programmatic actions that contribute to inclusive curriculum, training, and reflection practices.
- h. For all community partnerships, program/institution has policies in place to address potential challenges that may arise due to the diverse identities and experiences of student, faculty, staff, and community participants.
- i. Program/institution makes the physical, cognitive, perceptual, and emotional demands of program participation clear, including DEI expectations, and works to provide both trainings and reasonable accommodations to prospective participants to maximize inclusion.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/45) = %

9) Partnership Safety and Security

- a. The program ensures that the operations of all community partner organizations are in full compliance with international, national, and local laws.

- b. Comprehensive safety and emergency response plans are constructed for all partnership locations.
- c. The program consistently follows all emergency and risk mitigation policies put in place by both their institution and community partner organization.
- d. All program locations are fully evaluated regarding potential physical and psychological safety concerns by both the program and community partner.
- e. Specific mechanisms are put in place to provide the efficient and effective communication of safety concerns by participants and community partners.
- f. The program ensures that all faculty and staff are properly trained, and have passed all necessary background checks, in order to provide effective leadership of the partnership.
- g. The program ensures that students, faculty, and staff are appropriately insured against health/medical risk or harm while working with community partners.
- h. The program protects vulnerable community populations from harm through the employment of appropriate safeguards and by providing relevant training for all participants.
- i. The program intentionally avoids engaging in partnerships with orphanages or other residential facilities for minors.
- j. The program intentionally avoids engaging in partnerships that incorporate any aspect of medical care that involves clinical practice or the sharing of private medical information by uncredentialed participants.
- k. The program intentionally avoids engaging in partnerships that allow uncredentialed participants to work directly in care/educator roles with children in education and childcare settings.
- l. The program works closely with community partners to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of any liability risks that might be associated with the partnership and can accept or refuse the assumption of these risks at any time.
- m. Any research program related to the partnership is reviewed by the relevant institutional review board (IRB) and any local oversight bodies prior to the initiation of any research activities.
- n. The program and community partners both have the agency to remove participants or staff and/or terminate the partnership if standards of safety, security, and personal conduct are not met.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/70) = %

NOTE: Sections 10, 11, 12 collectively deal with financial matters. If instrument scorers wish, they can combine the scores from these three sections to obtain a meta-score related to partnership financial practices.

10) Financial Transparency

- a. All financial costs associated with participation are clearly articulated and understood by all stakeholders.

- b. All partnership stakeholders are aware of the reasoning behind all program expenditures.
- c. All decisions related to program expenditures are transparent to all stakeholders.
- d. Annual financial disclosures and reports related to the partnership, for both the educational institution and community partner organization(s), are available to all stakeholders as is deemed appropriate.
- e. All partnership stakeholders have access to complete information that outlines the financial components of their component of the partnership.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/25) = %

11) Financial Equity for Student Participants

- a. All costs associated with programming are frequently scrutinized and evaluated, to maximize the efficient and effective use of available resources.
- b. Cost structures for programming are intentionally designed in ways that maximize student access and inclusion.
- c. Whenever possible, the institution/program employs innovative budgeting solutions that are designed to effectively offset student-borne costs, particularly for underserved and marginalized student populations.
- d. Program budgets are constructed in a way that takes into consideration student opportunity costs related to participation (such as a loss of work opportunities).
- e. The program works closely with institutional offices (Office of Advancement, etc...) to effectively fundraise to offset student-borne costs.
- f. The program engages in meaningful attempts to build a program endowment that will serve to sustainably support student engagement over the long-term.
- g. For experiences that involve significant student costs of participation, the program is intentional in designing low/no-cost alternatives that maximize student inclusion.
- h. Whenever possible, the program works with students to identify times when community engagement experiences can best accommodate students' academic and other external employment commitments.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/40) = %

12) Financial Issues Related to Ethical Community Partnerships

- a. Programs are designed to avoid negative economic impacts in partner communities (such as economic dependency or loss of livelihood).
- b. Positive economic impacts that result from partnerships are intentionally and equitably distributed across multiple community stakeholders.
- c. All partnership stakeholders can openly and critically discuss the financial components of the partnership with all other stakeholders.
- d. If also functioning as service providers for visiting groups (food, lodging, transportation, etc...), all community partners have a meaningful role in determining the forms and amounts of compensation required for their work.

- e. If also functioning as service providers for visiting groups (food, lodging, transportation, etc...), all community partners are properly compensated for their work.
- f. If also functioning as service providers for visiting groups (food, lodging, transportation, etc...), all community partners have a meaningful role in determining how economic benefit will be equitably distributed within the partner community.
- g. Whenever possible, purchases by the program to support the partnership (such as food, transportation of students, the procurement of project materials, etc...) are made at locally owned businesses physically located within the partner community.
- h. Whenever possible, all financial transactions made by the program to support the partnership (such as food, transportation of students, the procurement of project materials, etc...) are conducted with the principles of equity and fair-trade practices in mind.
- i. For all partnerships, the benefit/harm ratio for the community is frequently assessed, in ways that convey and amplify community voices.
- j. Prior to engaging with the community partner(s), participating faculty, staff, and students discuss and practice strategies related to having culturally appropriate conversations about financial matters with community partners.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/50) = %

13) Navigating Power and Privilege

- a. Program administrators are intentional in identifying and deconstructing differentials in power and privilege that may exist between the program and community partners.
- b. Partnership stakeholders openly discuss power and privilege differentials that may exist within the partnership and with community members.
- c. Partnership stakeholders work collaboratively to identify and deconstruct differentials in power and privilege that may exist at different levels of the partnership and community engagement.
- d. Prior to engaging with the community, student, faculty, and staff participants are required to meaningfully engage with issues related to power structures, social structures, and monetary/non-monetary privilege in their partnership work.
- e. Partnership stakeholders work to ensure that both student/faculty/staff and community participants learn about and are mindful of cultural differences that they may encounter during the partnership.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/25) = %

14) Environmental Sustainability

- a. Community partner organizations are thoroughly vetted to ensure that their operations consider, and make good faith attempts to meet, standards of

- environmental sustainability that are reasonable within the physical, socioeconomic, and political contexts of the partnership.
- b. Partnerships include regular risk assessments and interdisciplinary and intersectional approaches to understand and enhance ongoing environmental sustainability efforts.
 - c. Partnership stakeholders collaborate to minimize the environmental impacts of the partnership and balance any negative environmental impacts that might exist with positive benefits to the community.
 - d. The logistical components of community partnerships (such as transportation) are intentionally co-designed to minimize environmental impact and the waste of resources.
 - e. Community organizations that utilize domesticated or wild animals in ways that could reasonably be considered unethical or inhumane are not considered for partnerships.
 - f. Third-party vendors chosen to support community partnerships (such as providers of meals, transportation, supplies, etc...) conduct their business in ways that reasonably minimize environmental impacts and promote sustainability, within the physical, socioeconomic, and political contexts of the partnership.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/30) = %

15) Public Relations/Advocacy of Program Value

- a. Community members are offered the opportunity to participate in the production and dissemination of all products that describe and/or promote the partnership.
- b. Recruitment materials for the program actively promote ethical community engagement and cultural humility.
- c. Reports are co-created by partnership stakeholders whenever possible.
- d. Reports produced by the program/institution that include, describe, or have the potential to impact the community partnerships avoid the misappropriation of community narratives.
- e. Partnership stakeholders participate in the production and dissemination of all products that describe and/or promote the partnership.
- f. Materials (such as written descriptions and photographs) depicting the partnership are vetted by partnership stakeholders to maintain an accurate representation of personal agency, uphold the dignity of community members, and exemplify a strengths-based (rather than a deficit) model of the community and the partnership.
- g. Public relations materials (recruitment materials, reports, web sites, etc...) function to effectively provide timely and relevant education about the historical, social, political, economic, and/or environmental contexts that are foundational to the issue or issues being addressed by the partnership.
- h. Photographs of student participants and community partners are never taken without explicit permission of the subject and are never used in a way that could be considered dishonest, misrepresentative, dehumanizing, or exploitative.

- i. All participants receive training and guidance regarding the appropriate uses of photography and social media in relation to the partnership.
- j. Whenever possible, all partnership/public relations materials use inclusive terms such as community engaged learning or community-based learning to describe program activities.
- k. Clear communication strategies are developed and maintained with partnership stakeholders and with the institution’s senior administrative staff (such as Provost or President).

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/55) = %

16) Integration with Broader Curricular/Co-curricular Efforts Across Campus

- a. Institution/program actively seeks to create meaningful connections between community partnerships and work being done in other campus curricular or co-curricular programs.
- b. Institution/program effectively coordinates with other campus entities to support active collaborations and avoid duplications of effort.
- c. Institution/program effectively disseminates best practices and “lessons learned” across other campus curricular or co-curricular programs.

Total raw score (sum of responses) = CEPI Section Score (total raw score/15) = %

CEPI Overall Score (total sum of responses across all sections/735) = %

The Community Engagement and Partnership Inventory Short Form (CEPI-SF)

The Overall Score for the CEPI-SF is calculated by summing the total value of responses across all items and dividing that figure by 235. Just like with the full-length CEPI, in cases where one or more items are not applicable (N/A) or a response was not given, the denominator must be adjusted accordingly before the Overall Score is calculated. Given the already brief and summative nature of the CEPI-SF, user-based deletion of additional questions is not recommended, unless the questions under consideration are truly irrelevant to the program being assessed.

- 1) All community partnerships are constructed around the concept of *dual purposes*—where student learning and community outcomes are always accorded equal importance.
- 2) Community partners are included as co-creators in all aspects of the partnership from conceptualization to completion.
- 3) The partnership is intentionally designed from the beginning using asset-based approaches that avoid harm and draw on community expertise as well as strengthen capacities in the local partner community.
- 4) There is a widely understood process in place for community partners to regularly evaluate, adjust, and re-articulate the goals, scope, and strategies for the partnership at any time, either on their own or in collaboration with the other members of the partnership.
- 5) Community partners have a role in deciding formats for dissemination of scholarship resulting from the partnership and are offered the opportunity to serve as co-authors/co-presenters for any presentation, report, or published scholarship resulting from the partnership.
- 6) Students, faculty, and staff encounter consistent messaging related to critical approaches to global citizenship, cultural humility, and human dignity, and are required to meaningfully engage with these concepts from the application process through the program's end.
- 7) Students, faculty, and staff engage with materials and resources created by members of the partner community and texts and/or other resources about the community.
- 8) Students, faculty, and staff thoughtfully examine, critically engage with, and meaningfully reflect upon their own cultural assumptions, intersectional identities, positionality, privilege, and power.
- 9) Students, faculty, and staff meaningfully examine broader global systems, structures, and contexts that inform and influence (positively or negatively) the community partnership.
- 10) Students, faculty, and staff engage in structured exercises to both identify power imbalances that may exist within the partnership and understand the challenges that may result from such imbalances.
- 11) Students, faculty, and staff have opportunities to engage in dialogue with members of the community, in ways that build trust, before entering the community's physical spaces.
- 12) Students, faculty, and staff are asked to recognize, state, and deconstruct their own thoughts, beliefs, and assumptions about the community partner and their expected relationship with the partner.
- 13) Students, faculty, staff, and the community partner collaboratively explore potential ethical issues, biases, and challenges related to the partnership.

- 14) Students, faculty, and staff have multiple/scaffolded opportunities to critically reflect on all aspects of the community-engaged experience.
- 15) Students, faculty, and staff have a formal mechanism to provide feedback regarding the program/partnership.
- 16) Specific program evaluation plans are created and include all activities related to the partnership.
- 17) Community partners have a formal mechanism to provide feedback regarding the program/partnership.
- 18) Evaluation plans equitably focus on the experiences and outcomes for all stakeholders.
- 19) There are mechanisms in place that hold the program publicly accountable for following through on evaluation-based action plans for programmatic and partnership enhancement.
- 20) Program administrators focus attention on the long-term feasibility and sustainability of partnerships that centers on the mutual interests of both the program and community members.
- 21) Community partners are offered the opportunity to learn about, and prepare to engage with, students, faculty, and staff in meaningful ways, *prior to* their work with the community.
- 22) Community members are offered the opportunity to participate in partnership programming at no cost (financial, resource, human capital) to them.
- 23) As is appropriate, all community partnerships are constructed in ways that align with, and support, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (<https://sdgs.un.org/goals>).
- 24) A formalized DEI plan facilitates the institution/program's ability to welcome and support faculty, staff, student, and community participants across a variety of identities.
- 25) Prior to interacting with the community, all student, faculty, and staff participants are required to meaningfully engage with issues of social justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion that are germane to the community partnership.
- 26) For all community partnerships, program/institution has policies in place to address potential challenges that may arise due to the diverse identities and experiences of student, faculty, staff, and community participants.
- 27) Program/institution makes the physical, cognitive, perceptual, and emotional demands of program participation clear, including DEI expectations, and works to provide both trainings and reasonable accommodations to prospective participants to maximize inclusion.
- 28) The program ensures that the operations of all community partner organizations are in full compliance with international, national, and local laws.
- 29) Comprehensive safety and emergency response plans are constructed for all partnership locations.
- 30) All program locations are fully evaluated regarding potential physical and psychological safety concerns by both the program and community partner.
- 31) The program protects vulnerable community populations from harm through the employment of appropriate safeguards and by providing relevant training for all participants.
- 32) All partnership stakeholders have access to complete information regarding the financial components of the partnership.

- 33) Whenever possible, the institution/program employs innovative budgeting solutions that are designed to maximize student access and inclusion by effectively offsetting student-borne costs.
- 34) Programs are designed to avoid negative economic impacts in partner communities (such as economic dependency or loss of livelihood).
- 35) Positive economic impacts that result from partnerships are intentionally and equitably distributed across multiple community stakeholders.
- 36) All partnership stakeholders can openly and critically discuss the financial components of the partnership with all other stakeholders.
- 37) Whenever possible, purchases by the program to support the partnership (such as food, transportation of students, the procurement of project materials, etc...) are made at locally owned businesses physically located within the partner community and are conducted with the principles of equity and fair-trade practices in mind.
- 38) The financial/resource benefit/harm ratio of the partnership for the community is frequently assessed by all stakeholders, in ways that convey and amplify community voices.
- 39) Prior to engaging with the community partner(s), participating faculty, staff, and students discuss and practice strategies related to having culturally appropriate conversations about financial matters with community partners.
- 40) Partnership stakeholders openly discuss and work collaboratively to identify and deconstruct differentials in power and privilege that may exist at different levels of the partnership and community engagement.
- 41) Partnership stakeholders work to ensure that both student/faculty/staff and community participants learn about and are mindful of cultural differences that they may encounter during the partnership.
- 42) Partnerships include regular risk assessments and interdisciplinary and intersectional approaches to understand and enhance ongoing environmental sustainability efforts within the partnership.
- 43) The logistical components of community partnerships (such as transportation) are intentionally co-designed to minimize environmental impact and the waste of resources.
- 44) Third-party vendors chosen to support community partnerships (such as providers of meals, transportation, supplies, etc...) conduct their business in ways that reasonably minimize environmental impacts and promote sustainability, within the physical, socioeconomic, and political contexts of the partnership.
- 45) Community members are offered the opportunity to participate in the production and dissemination of all products that describe and/or promote the partnership.
- 46) Recruitment materials for the program actively promote ethical community engagement and cultural humility and avoid the misappropriation of community narratives.
- 47) Materials/web resources depicting the partnership are vetted by stakeholders to maintain an accurate representation of personal agency, uphold the dignity of community members, exemplify a strengths-based (rather than a deficit) model of the community and the partnership, and function to effectively provide timely and relevant education about the historical, social, political, economic, and/or environmental contexts that are foundational to the issue or issues being addressed by the partnership.

CEPI Overall Score (total sum of responses across all sections/235) = %