

Assessing Service-Learning Programs in Academic Libraries: A Rubric in Action

Jennifer E. Nutefall, Maureen Barry, Anne Marie Gruber, and Olivia Ivey

abstract: Service-learning is an important practice in higher education, allowing institutions to combine essential campus functions of research and learning with meaningful engagement in the community. As service-learning has made its way into institutional strategic plans, libraries have sought to support this work by integrating community engagement into such library functions as collection development, instruction, reference work, and events or displays. This article explores the need to assess the support libraries provide for service-learning, introducing the “Self-Assessment Rubric for Development of Service-Learning Programs in Academic Libraries” by Katherine Kott. The rubric is comprehensive, touching on mission and culture, information access, space, programming, relationships, and organizational leadership, with four tiers for each dimension. Thoughtful completion of the rubric, with modifications based on one’s institutional context, allows libraries invested in service-learning pedagogy to identify their strengths, improve their work, and tell their story to stakeholders and decision makers. Adoption across multiple institutions would benefit efforts to tell the story of libraries’ impact on service-learning.

Reflection is “sometimes described as the hyphen in service-learning; it is the link that ties student experience in the community to academic learning.”¹ This paper will hyphenate *service-learning* except in cases where an original source does not.

Introduction

The Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) has identified service-learning, sometimes called community-based learning, as a high-impact practice in higher education, one that is especially effective in achieving desired learning outcomes, as well as increasing student retention and engagement.² More specifically, Janet Eyler supplies this definition: “Service learning in higher education is an experiential learning pedagogy that balances the needs of student and community members involved [and] links the service and learning through reflective processes.”³ Service-learning is also one element within a broader constellation of community engagement efforts by institutions of higher education. While semantics may differ from institution to institu-

tion, community engagement and service-learning are often campus priorities. They appear in mission statements, strategic plans, course catalogs, marketing messages for potential students, and other materials. Indeed, more than 450 college and university presidents and chancellors signed a 2016 pledge with Campus Compact, a national coalition of colleges and universities committed to community partnerships, renewing their pledge to the public purposes of higher education.⁴

As librarians assert academic libraries' value for student learning and other campus impact measures, library backing of community engagement, while not widely institutionalized, is a natural fit. Campus libraries exist to support the university curriculum and the research conducted by their constituents, including community-based learning research projects and undergraduate research within and beyond the classroom. Higher education professionals, however, may have gaps in their understanding of the library's role in high-impact practices, such as community engagement. Adam Murray and Ashley Ireland surveyed provosts and chief academic officers nationwide about their perceptions of the library's part in institutional initiatives; respondents ranked service-learning and internships last in terms of library contributions to high-impact practices.⁵ There is a clear need for tools to assess and communicate the work librarians do to support service-learning, especially to audiences outside the library.

In response to the national conversation about the impact of higher education, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) convened an initiative to help its member libraries demonstrate their value and support for the missions of their parent institutions.⁶ Promoting civic and community engagement is not only a natural fit

Promoting civic and community engagement is not only a natural fit with many institutional missions but also an outgrowth of librarianship's core values, which include democracy, the public good, and social responsibility.

with many institutional missions but also an outgrowth of librarianship's core values, which include democracy, the public good, and social responsibility.⁷ Libraries have been called "hubs of deliberative democracy,"

providing programming in physical and virtual spaces for dialogue and helping students "learn how to identify, evaluate, and utilize information essential for the critical thinking necessary to make choices essential to a self-governing society."⁸ Librarians supporting community engagement and service-learning are "furthering the civic mission of libraries, thereby upholding the values of the profession while fulfilling their obligation to the university community."⁹

Whether campus- or library-initiated, community engagement and service-learning efforts need to be evaluated. While there has been significant research into assessment of service-learning, which includes the creation of a rubric to measure the institutionalization of service-learning campus-wide by Andrew Furco,¹⁰ there is no published study on the institutionalization of service-learning within libraries. To date, the evidence demonstrating the academic library's role in supporting service-learning is primarily anecdotal, which will be explored further in the "Literature Review" section. As academic

library staff and faculty began to think more programmatically about the integration of service-learning, Katherine Kott, an organizational development consultant, created and developed the “Self-Assessment Rubric for Development of Service Learning Programs in Academic Libraries.” This document provides a useful framework for academic libraries to use in building and assessing service-learning programs (see Appendix A). Conducting a self-assessment using Kott’s rubric is a means to evaluate a library’s performance in supporting service-learning experiences, providing a measurement that speaks to the library’s contribution to institutional missions, including community engagement.

This article shares a method for assessing library involvement in service-learning. Specifically, it addresses how Kott’s rubric could help librarians evaluate the status of their libraries, in terms of both practical elements and also broader value. It describes Kott’s process of creating the rubric, grounds it in relevant multidisciplinary literature, and shares the authors’ insights about completing it. Additionally, the authors suggest improvements to the rubric and consider future directions for the institutionalization of service-learning and community engagement programs in academic libraries. The authors hope that the pilot implementations of Kott’s rubric, as presented here, will encourage other libraries to implement and perhaps modify the rubric for their own purposes.

Background and Rubric Development

Kott, who holds an MA and PhD in human and organizational systems, began the work to create the rubric as she researched the status of service-learning programs in academic libraries.¹¹ Her findings showed that “while academic libraries were beginning to think about programmatic approaches to service-learning, there were not yet tools for assessing service-learning programs in academic libraries.”¹² She decided that a rubric would assist libraries to build and evaluate a service-learning program within their institutional context. While drafting the self-assessment tool for service-learning programs in academic libraries, Kott referred to two existing program-level rubrics, one institutional and one departmental, by Andrew Furco¹³ and Kevin Kecskes,¹⁴ respectively. She presented the rubric to librarians at Libraries and the Public Purposes of Higher Education (see <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/libraries-and-service-learning/2016/>), an embedded institute held in conjunction with the 2016 Campus Compact Conference.

At the institute, librarians worked in small groups to review the developmental stages in the draft rubric. Participants contributed additional components and assessment measures for four of the six dimensions: mission and culture, relationships with external stakeholders for service-learning, programmatic support to information literacy and service-learning, and organizational and leadership support.¹⁵ Within each dimension, Kott identified four stages: build awareness, build critical mass, build quality, and institutionalize. Librarians at the institute suggested replacing stages with tiers, which were more consistent with an instructional approach. Kott combined this feedback with the broader literature on academic libraries and service-learning to complete the current version of the rubric.



Literature Review

To situate Kott's rubric, this literature review provides an overview in which service-learning and academic libraries intersect, providing context about the programs the rubric is meant to evaluate. Kott's work is grounded within other program-level rubrics and within service-learning and academic libraries programs separately. For the purposes of this literature review, *program-level* is defined as institutional (university-wide) or departmental (library-wide).

Academic Libraries and Service-Learning

A dedicated group of academic librarians who have supported service-learning courses have contributed their experiences to the professional conversation. Best documented in the literature are case studies of information literacy (IL) instruction in service-learning courses. These range from instruction sessions¹⁶ to embedded librarianship in service-learning courses at the request of a faculty partner.¹⁷ Additionally, a few case studies have described incorporating service-learning pedagogy in credit-bearing IL courses.¹⁸ This work has gained enough traction that the 2019 ACRL Environmental Scan, a biannual summary of key themes in libraries and higher education, specifically noted service-learning as an IL instruction method with which librarians are "experimenting."¹⁹

How does library support for service-learning courses differ from that for other courses? One primary distinction is that faculty, students, and their community partners may need to find and integrate nonacademic resources with scholarly information, thereby requiring higher-level information literacy skills and so unique library instruction. As described by librarian researcher Megan Stark, "Rather than performing a keyword search in a known database environment, students will need to brainstorm the types of information they might be looking for and think broadly about who might produce the information, where it might be held, how they might formulate a request for the information and whether the information is available to the public."²⁰

Beyond library instruction, other opportunities exist for academic libraries to support service-learning courses. One such example comes from Anne Marie Gruber, Angela Pratesi, and Angela Waseskuk, who supported a service-learning art course through information literacy instruction and provided access to the final course projects via the campus online repository.²¹ Well before then, William Miller and Marilyn Billings highlighted the creation of a community engagement section within the digital repository of the University of Massachusetts Amherst,²² intended to provide a more complete record of campus community engagement efforts. Miller and Billings concluded, "Digital repositories have the potential to make complex information about engagement with community partners more visible, more valued, and more thoroughly understood."²³

Efforts to support service-learning among librarians are not yet widespread. In a national survey to gauge librarians' civic-mindedness and interest in and experience with service-learning, roughly one-quarter (28 percent) of respondents indicated they had somehow been involved with service-learning courses; less than one-fifth (18 percent) had no previous experience with service-learning but expressed interest in supporting such courses. A significant number of respondents (46 percent) reported they had no experience with or interest in service-learning. When prompted for their reasons, many



(67 percent) said they had never been asked, others (44 percent) cited time constraints, and still others (20 percent) admitted they had never thought about supporting service-learning.²⁴ Sharing the Kott rubric in the library literature has the potential to raise awareness about service-learning among a wider audience of academic librarians. For those with service-learning experience, Kott's rubric provides a framework for considering and implementing more comprehensive models for supporting service-learning and evaluating such efforts. Additionally, the self-evaluation tool helps libraries to align their intent and practice in service-learning support and engagement.

A significant number of respondents (46 percent) reported they had no experience with or interest in service-learning.

Overview of Program-Level Rubrics

The growing use of rubrics for evaluating programs is mainly concentrated in the education and health fields.²⁵ As such, literature about program-level rubrics in higher education provides relevant grounding for Kott's rubric. This section explores existing scholarship, most of which comes from a broader higher education perspective but is reinforced in the service-learning and academic library literature. In doing so, the section explains the purposes and characteristics of program-level rubrics in higher education, along with the benefits and drawbacks associated with using them. These factors (purposes, characteristics, benefits, and drawbacks) are often the same or similar, whether the creator's intent is to evaluate an individual student's performance or that of a program.

Put simply, "a rubric often looks like a table or matrix that describes different levels of performance."²⁶ The key components are evaluation criteria and performance standards.²⁷ Also essential is "rich descriptive language" that specifies for stakeholders what constitutes quality.²⁸ Julian King, Kate McKegg, Judy Oakden, and Nan Wehipeihana offer a concise explanation of the purpose of rubrics as evaluation tools: "The very endeavour and purpose of rubrics in evaluation is to assist in the reconciling and integrating of values and to provide a warrantable basis for evaluative judgments."²⁹

The benefits of using rubrics are substantial. Most notably, many researchers highlight transparency as a hallmark. Krystin Martens indicates that "systematic evaluative judgments" can be made "based on reasoning that is transparent and explicit."³⁰ Pauline Dickinson and Jeffery Adams describe it well: "Rubrics allow the communication of specific goals or intentions to key stakeholders so that everyone knows what is expected and what behaviour or characteristics constitute the different levels of performance."³¹ Rubrics are also flexible and adaptable. Program evaluators interviewed by Martens emphasize the iterative nature of adapting criteria based on previous experiences and lessons learned.

Researchers acknowledge some challenges associated with rubric use. Among these are the need for significant time to develop, use, and adapt rubrics;³² training assessors who must be familiar with and knowledgeable about their use; and the lack of reward for assessment efforts in institutional promotion and tenure processes or performance



evaluations.³³ Additionally, stakeholder buy-in can be challenging in the beginning, although scholars agree that including stakeholders throughout the development process

Scholars present a strong case that transparency and flexibility make rubrics useful evaluation tools, despite the challenges.

leads to a sense of ownership.³⁴ Scholars present a strong case that transparency and flexibility make rubrics useful evaluation tools, despite the challenges.

Guidance on evaluation practices in the organizational development field emphasizes the need for tools that reflect the values of an organization while engaging

employees in the conversation throughout.³⁵ Due to Kott's background in organizational development, her rubric meets this need, which also aligns with the sense of ownership valued by those conducting program evaluation.

Program-Level Rubrics in Service-Learning

Program-level rubrics are one of many assessment tools focused on measuring institutionalization of community engagement; others include checklists, indicators, benchmarking, and matrices.³⁶ A few were used successfully in assessing service-learning at the institutional level in higher education.³⁷ Kott consulted Furco's "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education" while developing her rubric for assessing library service-learning programs. Evidence suggests that Furco's rubric has been successfully employed both in its original form and in modified versions. While several scholars documented their use of Furco's rubric,³⁸ others indicated that it informed their efforts to develop a tool better suited to their institution-specific needs. For example, Dianne Thurab-Nkhosi, Sandra Gift, Lynda Quamina-Aiyejina, and Claudia Harvey adapted a checklist based on the rubric to analyze the level of institutionalization at a branch campus,³⁹ while Jennifer Amborn, Yorton Clark, and David Wegley developed a tool specific to faith-based institutions.⁴⁰ Carol Mitchell, Kirsty Trotter, and Sherril Gelmon used the Furco rubric, among other tools, as they investigated institutionalization of service-learning at University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg in South Africa.⁴¹ They credited the Furco rubric for reminding "institutions to evaluate and measure their progress in areas that are important in the success of SL programmes and their institutionalisation,"⁴² and they acknowledged a few areas of potential improvement. They observed that the rubric did not account for balancing service-learning with competing institutional priorities, and it lacked specific mention of budget or resource constraints, which are certain to impact an institution's ability to integrate service-learning. Mitchell, Trotter, and Gelmon also suggested that additional stages would better accommodate campuses that are in the conceptual phase, or, at the other end of the spectrum, campuses where service-learning is already well-integrated.

In addition to Furco's rubric, Kott used "Creating Community-Engaged Departments: Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement in Academic Departments"⁴³ by Kevin Kecskes while developing her tool to assess service-learning programs in academic libraries. In comparison to Furco's rubric, the literature does not reflect widespread use of the Kecskes evaluation tool by academic

departments. The authors identified one study which proposed the use of an adapted Kecskes rubric as a tool to support an organizational improvement plan for institutionalizing community-engaged scholarship at a research university.⁴⁴

Some scholarship, however, highlights the role academic departments play in advancing community engagement. In the late 1990s, Campus Compact developed educational programs called Engaged Department Institutes.⁴⁵ During the institutes, participating departments received support for integrating community-based work in their classrooms, their scholarship, and their requirements of students, and for developing “a level of unit coherence that will allow them to successfully model civic engagement and progressive change on the departmental level.”⁴⁶ According to Kecskes, “To move higher education community engagement to level 2.0, we must find ways to collectivize our efforts; one particularly challenging yet promising practice is to move deeper toward the heart of higher education by engaging one idiosyncratic academic department at a time.”⁴⁷ Similarly, Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh concluded that service-learning must become an “integral part of the core work of academic departments” to “contribute to the renewal of American higher education.”⁴⁸

One challenge that stands in the way of engaging departments is faculty autonomy. As Richard Battistoni, Gelmon, Saltmarsh, Jon Wergin, and Zlotkowski put it, “Faculty culture is highly privatized; as a faculty member, my teaching, research, and service are *my* work.”⁴⁹ In addition, how collaborative work is rewarded, or not, in promotion and tenure systems plays a role in the struggle to achieve engaged departments.⁵⁰ These challenges, among others, may explain why applications of the Kecskes rubric are largely absent from the literature. Regardless, Kott found it useful as she developed her own. Although the Kecskes rubric considers a level of community engagement beyond that of service-learning alone, the department-level focus provides relevant context for the academic library unit.

...how collaborative work is rewarded, or not, in promotion and tenure systems plays a role in the struggle to achieve engaged departments.

Program-Level Rubrics in Academic Libraries

For their part, academic librarians also employ rubrics for program evaluation. In fact, the Institute for Museum and Library Sciences funded a multi-institutional research project from 2010 to 2014 to advance the use of analytic rubrics for assessing information literacy at both classroom and program levels.⁵¹ Megan Oakleaf posited that library personnel would benefit from using rubrics because they “facilitate the translation of unmanageable facts and figures” produced by library processes “into data that can be used to support decision-making.”⁵² The processes to which Oakleaf referred included IL instruction in addition to other areas. Several studies detailed the use of rubrics to collect data from such student work as portfolios,⁵³ research papers,⁵⁴ journals,⁵⁵ and worksheets,⁵⁶ all with at least one common objective: to inform necessary changes to IL instruction programs. Librarians at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota, developed a rubric to assess student IL skills that ultimately also contributed to information

literacy program development.⁵⁷ Others adapted the Carleton rubric to evaluate student paper samples and thereby identify improvements to their IL instruction programs.⁵⁸ Employing a similar method, Melissa Beuoy and Katherine Boss used a rubric to analyze syllabi while identifying ideal placement for IL instruction in an academic curriculum.⁵⁹

Another example of rubric use for program evaluation came from librarians at Shippensburg University in Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, who developed a rubric to assess their library liaison program. In doing so, they produced a “snapshot” of their performance as a department⁶⁰ that allowed them to make decisions about refining liaison services.⁶¹ Aaron Dobbs and Doug Cook used data from their own self-designed rubric to better communicate the responsibilities of librarians to campus leaders.⁶² Similarly, employing or adapting the Kott rubric provides an avenue for academic librarians to plan for future service-learning support.

Finally, Sarah Passonneau and Heather Lewin conducted a study to determine availability of assessment data on the websites of Association of Research Libraries member libraries. They advocated for a standardized approach to assessment efforts and the description of those efforts, and they developed a rubric as “an attempt to negotiate best practices and encourage some consistency regarding assessment activities within the library community.”⁶³ Comparably, the Kott rubric provides a framework for conversations among academic library personnel about best practices for service-learning at their own institutions and as a national professional community.⁶⁴

Rubric in Action

In the wake of Kott presenting the rubric at the 2016 Colloquium on Libraries and Service Learning, the authors found it important to put the rubric in action and impart it to the growing community of service-learning librarians. Upon Kott’s 2018 retirement, they sought and received her permission to share the assessment tool.

The authors drew on their own experiences from their functional roles as service-learning librarians and a library dean with a service-learning background and focus to offer insights about and reactions to using the rubric, including its benefits and drawbacks. They also compared it with the existing service-learning rubrics on which it was based. There are similarities and areas of intersection among the Kott, Furco, and Kecskes rubrics. Each component of the Kott rubric with related elements from the Furco and Kecskes rubrics is outlined in Appendix B. The connection is particularly strong under the heading “Mission and culture” but weaker under “Student support.” The process for completing the rubric is manageable, and the authors’ results generally landed in Tier one (Build critical mass) or Tier three (Build quality), despite that some of the libraries’ strategic plans specifically include community engagement (see Appendix A).

At this time, there is no electronic option for completing the rubric, and the authors took various strategies of circling or using check marks within each component. Formatting changes would aid in usability and might include repeating column headings on each page, selective bolding, and using consistent column widths. It is also unclear if all aspects described within a tier box must be met for that box to be selected, or if it is sufficient for one or several aspects to be satisfied. Some components may not apply to every library, thus adding an N/A option could be beneficial. A space for adding

notes may be useful as well. An overall rating or score for each dimension would help libraries by allowing simple comparisons among institutions or at the same institution over time. Another drawback to implementing the rubric in its current form is a lack of guidance on specific actions for libraries to take in each dimension that could increase their support for service-learning.

Although it would add complexity to the task of completing the rubric, bringing in colleagues from within the library and other stakeholders on campus would result in a more useful process and holistic view of the library's implementation of service-learning work.

Collaboration within the library is necessary to accurately complete the rubric, and instructions could indicate which individuals might be best to execute it, such as an information literacy program coordinator or collection management librarian, who could provide details related to those areas. Kott likely intended this collaboration, as inclusive participation throughout an organization is a core tenet of her field, organizational development. Employees at every level of an organization are expected to engage with "assessing the current state

and in planning for a positive future state."⁶⁵ Additionally, evaluation scholars recognize that rubrics "create demand for evaluative thinking well beyond the group of people who think of themselves as evaluators."⁶⁶

The benefit of using Kott's rubric to assess the integration of service-learning in academic libraries is that it looks holistically at the library and includes multiple points of intersection. The rubric should serve as a guide to begin conversations within a library to generate a shared understanding of what service-learning program development might look like. Recommendations for modification and implementation follow, including both guidance for using the rubric overall and specific suggestions relevant to each dimension (see Appendix C).

Discussion and Conclusion

The Kott rubric has potential as a method to gauge existing levels of library support for service-learning and to determine strategies for strengthening such assistance at the institutional level and within the profession. Kott brought her combined expertise in librarianship and organizational development to bear on the task of developing this rubric. Understanding the unique approach of organizational development practitioners can help libraries get the most out of this rubric, or adapt it to meet their own needs. Organizational development asserts a need for patience and long-term effort. Using the rubric once will give a library an understanding of how its current practice aligns with its goals. To be truly effective through the lens of organizational development, however, a library should revisit the rubric at predetermined intervals to inspire continued growth.

Future directions include revising the rubric. Unlike the Furco rubric, the Kott tool does not provide detailed instructions. However, this can be easily remedied with future

... bringing in colleagues from within the library and other stakeholders on campus would result in a more useful process and holistic view of the library's implementation of service-learning work.

iterations, which could provide additional guidance regarding what library staff may be best positioned to complete the rubric, with emphasis on collaboration. The role of those carrying out the rubric is important. The authors, for example, completed the rubric from their perspectives as library faculty, and they were already familiar with the library's role in community engagement. Those with less experience in this area, however, may have a different perspective. While the authors completed the rubric independently, the process revealed a need to collaborate with others both within the library and elsewhere on campus to be most effective and accurate. Instructions accompanying the rubric could include recommendations for what documents to consult while using the rubric (for example, library mission or vision statements, annual reports, and the like). It might be valuable to suggest regular completion of the rubric and adapting it, if necessary, ideally every three to five years as libraries and institutions change priorities.

A broad research agenda should be developed to better analyze and communicate both existing library service-learning collaborations and areas of potential growth. The authors' institutions represent the following Carnegie Classifications: Master's Colleges &

A broad research agenda should be developed to better analyze and communicate both existing library service-learning collaborations and areas of potential growth.

Universities; Doctoral/Professional Universities; and Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity. The rubric has not, to the authors' knowledge, been field-tested at institutions with other classifications, such as community colleges or Research 1 universities, doctoral universities with "very high research activity." This would be a logical next step to determine additional improvements. Libraries that

use or adapt the Kott rubric could also add relevant dimensions, such as support for online service-learning courses, community engaged scholarship, professional development for library personnel, and funding. The rubric could also be adapted for other campus offices that support service-learning, such as institutional research, student life (especially student activities), centers for teaching and learning, and other units. In addition, it would be advantageous to develop a library rubric focused more broadly on community engagement, going beyond the service-learning focus and aligning more closely with the institutionalization efforts of Furco,⁶⁷ as well as the engaged department initiatives of Kecskes.⁶⁸ Use of the rubric and similar tools can illuminate community engagement initiatives, but their usefulness is limited if librarians fail to tell the story to other campus stakeholders. Any research agenda should focus on communicating with constituents beyond libraries.

Librarians are well-positioned, because of their professional values, to be important leaders and partners in campus service-learning. Evaluating the work that is already happening and using the results to plan for future engagement will ensure that library contributions to this high-impact practice achieve their full potential.



Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the development of the rubric by Katherine Kott and her approval of our writing this article. We also acknowledge the review and feedback of an earlier draft by Nicole Branch from Santa Clara University Library in Santa Clara, California.

Jennifer E. Nutefall is the dean of libraries at the University of Northern Colorado in Greeley; she may be reached by e-mail at: jennifer.nutefall@unco.edu.

Maureen Barry is an assistant professor and reference and instruction librarian at Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio; she may be reached by e-mail at: mebarry@bgsu.edu.

Anne Marie Gruber is an associate professor of library services and an instruction and liaison librarian at the University of Northern Iowa in Cedar Falls; she may be reached by e-mail at: anne.gruber@uni.edu.

Olivia Ivey is an associate librarian at American University in Washington, D.C.; she may be reached by e-mail at: oivey@american.edu.

This mss. is peer reviewed, copy edited, and accepted for publication. Portal 21.1.



Appendix A

Self-Assessment Rubric for Development of Service-Learning Programs in Academic Libraries*

Dimension I: Mission and Culture Supporting Service-Learning

An academic library can fulfill its civic mission to “take up the role of preparing a new generation of informed, engaged citizens capable of addressing complex social problems” by incorporating service-learning and community engagement in its mission and culture.[†]

Component	Tier one: Build awareness	Tier two: Build critical mass	Tier three: Build quality	Tier four: Institutionalize
Mission, vision, values, and strategy	The formal mission, vision, values, and strategy of the library do not directly mention or indirectly allude to the importance of service-learning or community engagement. The library has not identified its “public purpose.”	The formal mission, vision, values, and strategy of the library mention service-learning or community engagement as it pertains to a specific area, such as information literacy.	The formal mission, vision, values, and strategy of the library make specific reference to service-learning or community engagement as they pertain to several library functions, such as information literacy and information access.	The formal mission, vision, values, and strategy of the library identify the public purpose of the library. Service-learning and community engagement are integrated into the mission, vision, values, and strategy along various dimensions (information literacy, information access, space, community engagement, etc.) The library’s mission, vision, values, and strategy are aligned with service-learning partners and the college- or university-wide service-learning mission.

Definition of service-learning and related terms and concepts	There is no shared definition of service-learning or other related terms and concepts in the library.	Service-learning is well defined in the context of some library functions, such as information literacy.	There is a shared understanding of service-learning and other related terms and concepts among all members of the library staff.	Library staff members understand service-learning as well as related terms and concepts within the context of institutional programs.
Climate and culture	Library staff members do not participate in service-learning or community engagement at work. The culture is not supportive of participation in service-learning. Service-learning is not part of "what we do." There is a general lack of understanding about why the library should be involved in service-learning.	Some library staff members participate in service-learning or community engagement in partnership with faculty or students. The culture is tolerant of this participation but does not encourage it by including service-learning in position descriptions, goal setting, or performance reviews.	Library staff members are encouraged to participate in service-learning and community engagement activities. The culture supports these activities through training and development, scheduling, including service-learning in position descriptions, goal setting, and performance reviews, etc. Library staff members actively develop library service-learning program outreach (faculty workshops, etc.).	The library actively promotes its public purpose and collaborates regularly on service-learning projects. Contributions to service-learning are included in position descriptions, performance reviews, and criteria for tenure and promotion. Library staff members may serve on campus committees related to service-learning and community engagement and/or be involved in service-learning and community engagement at the campus-wide level.

*Katherine Kott, "Self-Assessment Rubric for Development of Service Learning Programs in Academic Libraries," Katherine Kott Consulting, 2017, <http://katherinekott.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Service-Learning-Rubric-01.24.pdf>.

†Nancy C. Kranich, "Academic Libraries as Hubs for Deliberative Democracy," *Journal of Public Deliberation* 6, 1 (2010): 10.

Dimension II: Information Access Support for Service-Learning

Information access support for service-learning includes purchasing, licensing, or linking to resources for service-learning courses, creating guides for information on community organizations in unpublished materials or other “gray literature,” ensuring that “real-world” information is findable,* and offering preservation and access services for knowledge resources that are generated through service-learning and community engagement courses.

Component	Tier one: Build awareness	Tier two: Build critical mass	Tier three: Build quality	Tier four: Institutionalize
Service-learning resource access and availability	Although the library may provide access to some resources related to service-learning, there is no concerted or organized effort to provide access to material that supports service-learning.	Information access policies mention the need to include service-learning and community engagement resources when purchasing or licensing resources and creating resource guides.	Specific resources are set aside for obtaining and providing access to service-learning and community engagement resources. Access to service-learning and community engagement resources is taken into account when designing and evaluating discovery systems.	The library promotes access to service-learning and community engagement resources to the campus community and beyond.
Provision for collecting, preserving, and providing access to assets generated in service-learning courses	The library makes no provision for collecting, preserving, and providing access to assets generated in service-learning courses.	Assets generated in service-learning courses may be deposited in an institutional repository or otherwise preserved and made accessible on a case-by-case basis (e.g., when a librarian is supporting a service-learning course).	The library offers and promotes a standard service for assets from service-learning courses to be collected, preserved, and made accessible.	The role of the library in collecting, preserving, and providing access to service-learning course assets is recognized and understood within the library and beyond.

*Megan Stark, “Information in the Real World: Building a Bridge between Academic and Community Information through Service Learning,” chap. 4 in *Service Learning, Information Literacy, and Libraries*, ed. Jennifer E. Nuttall (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2016).

Dimension III: Spaces for Service-Learning

The library may offer space for individual reflection, group meetings that include community partners, exhibit space to showcase service-learning and community engagement projects, and space for events that include community partners. Joyce Neujahr pointed out the value libraries offer to their campuses by providing a variety of welcoming and inclusive spaces for the broader community.*

Component	Tier one: Build awareness	Tier two: Build critical mass	Tier three: Build quality	Tier four: Institutionalize
Collaboration spaces	While students may use library spaces for service-learning activities, community members may be excluded from collaborating with student and faculty partners in the library.	Community members may be allowed to use library facilities for collaboration with service-learning partners on a case-by-case basis.	Community members are welcomed into the library to collaborate with their service-learning partners.	The library promotes its collaborative spaces for service-learning and community engagement activities.
Exhibit spaces	Exhibit spaces in the library do not feature service-learning projects.	Library exhibit spaces may feature service-learning projects that library staff have learned about through connection with the project.	The library offers and promotes exhibit space to share information about service-learning projects.	Students and faculty are aware that library exhibit space is available for them to share information about and promote their service-learning projects.

*Joyce Neujahr, "On the Future of Academic Libraries and Service Learning," chap. 8 in *Service Learning, Information Literacy, and Libraries*, Jennifer E. Nutefall, ed. (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2016), 123–46.

Dimension IV: Programmatic Approach to Information Literacy and Service-Learning

Academic library engagement with service-learning often begins with individual librarians providing support to service-learning courses but can be developed into robust service-learning programs by applying best practices for integration of information literacy with service-learning.*

Component	Tier one: Build awareness	Tier two: Build critical mass	Tier three: Build quality	Tier four: Institutionalize
Learning outcomes and objectives	The information literacy program has not yet responded to or been influenced by service-learning in terms of learning outcomes and objectives.	The information literacy program has defined learning outcomes and objectives for service-learning courses—e.g., the ability to “incorporate nontraditional material into . . . research.” ¹	Service-learning and community engagement have transformed the information literacy program. Students are expected to “question the ways in which information is constructed and valued by different communities.” ²	Information literacy learning outcomes and objectives are integrated with campus-wide service-learning outcomes and objectives. Work together in harmony and advocate for enmeshed learning outcomes for service-learning information literacy.
Role of information literacy instruction librarians in service-learning programs	Information literacy instruction librarians have not yet regularized their role in service-learning courses or programs.	Some information literacy instruction librarians are involved in supporting service-learning courses through serendipitous opportunities or liaison roles with individual faculty members.	Information literacy instruction librarians seek opportunities to collaborate with faculty on service-learning courses across the curriculum and integrate support for service-learning into library information literacy course offerings.	Faculty members are aware of information literacy instruction librarians’ expertise in service-learning research and regularly collaborate with librarians when designing service-learning courses.



Role of the library in curricular governance process for service-learning	The library is not involved in curricular governance for service-learning.	Members of the service-learning team and/or information literacy instruction librarians are aware of the curricular governance process for service-learning and stay informed about it through relationships with individual faculty members.	The library is invited to "sit in" on the curricular governance process for service-learning.	The library has a standing membership role on the governing body for the service-learning curriculum.
--	--	---	---	---

¹Christopher A. Sweet, "Information Literacy and Service-Learning: Creating Powerful Synergies," in *Information Literacy and Social Justice: Radical Professional Praxis*, ed. Lua Gregory and Shana Higgins (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice, 2013), 247-74.

²Megan Stark, "Information in the Real World: Building a Bridge between Academic and Community Information through Service Learning," chap. 4 in *Service Learning, Information Literacy, and Libraries*, ed. Jennifer E. Nutefall (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2016), 56.

³*Ibid.*, 62.

Dimension V: Relationship with External Stakeholders for Service-Learning

Component	Tier one: Build awareness	Tier two: Build critical mass	Tier three: Build quality	Tier four: Institutionalize
Campus service-learning offices	There is no awareness in the library of a centralized service-learning function on campus.	An individual in a leadership position in the library becomes responsible for service-learning/contacts the campus service-learning offices to find out how to get involved/provide support.	Members of the service-learning team work with the campus service-learning office to define and develop points of intersection to connect the library to the campus-wide service-learning program.	The library service-learning leadership and team have a regular working relationship with the campus service-learning office. Everyone in the library is aware of the service-learning program and how their work supports it. Library resources for service-learning are well understood and used at the campus level.
Community organizations	Library staff have no direct contact with community organizations that participate in service-learning.	Members of a service-learning team in the library learn about which community organizations are involved in service-learning programs or courses on campus.	Members of the service-learning team work with members of community organizations and the community engagement office to provide resources (access to information, space, etc.) that supports the organizations' participation in service-learning programs.	Everyone in the library is aware of the relationship with community organizations that participate in service-learning and welcome members of the organizations into the library to use information resources and partner with service-learning participants.



Faculty members	There is little awareness of and no programmatic collaboration with faculty members who include service-learning in their courses.	Individual librarians begin to partner with faculty who include service-learning in their courses.	Members of the service-learning team provide information about service-learning support to members of the faculty.	Everyone in the library is aware of the service-learning program and reminds faculty members of the support that is available in their regular interactions.
Students	Library staff members are unaware of student participation in service-learning or community engagement.	Library staff may be aware of student participation in service-learning and community engagement through specific activities, such as library instruction.	Members of the service-learning team provide information about service-learning support to students.	All library staff members are aware of student service-learning activities and support them through library instruction, information access, and allocation of space.

Dimension VI: Organizational/Leadership Support

Component	Tier one: Build awareness	Tier two: Build critical mass	Tier three: Build quality	Tier four: Institutionalize
Library leadership	Library leaders are not aware of library participation in service-learning. Support for service-learning is not built in to position descriptions, etc.	Library leaders are aware that some members of the library staff support service-learning—e.g., through information literacy support for service-learning courses.	Library leaders recognize the importance of service-learning to the library's mission and provide leadership for the library's role in service-learning by ensuring that a high-level position in the library is responsible for the service-learning program. The library allocates human and financial resources to service-learning.	Library leaders ensure that the library is connected to university-wide service-learning and community engagement efforts through integration with service-learning and community engagement programs.
Assessment	Staff in the library do not set overarching goals for service-learning or community engagement, or assess service-learning or community engagement outcomes.	Staff in some areas, such as information literacy, may set goals for service-learning and assess these activities.	All service-learning and community engagement activities are assessed. Library staff members have a shared understanding of service-learning and community engagement goals.	Library metrics for assessing service-learning and community engagement are linked to campus-wide outcomes for service-learning and community engagement.

Appendix B

Rubric Components Comparison

Dimension	Institutional components*	Departmental components†	Library components‡
Mission and culture	Alignment with institutional mission	Mission/Mission, vision, values, and strategy	
	Definition of <i>service-learning</i>	Definition of <i>community-engaged teaching</i>	Definition of <i>service-learning</i> and related terms and concepts
	—	Definition of <i>community-engaged research</i>	—
	Alignment with educational reform efforts	—	—
	Strategic planning	—	—
Community partnerships	—	Climate and culture	Climate and culture
	—	Collective self-awareness and action	—
	Community partner awareness	Placement and partnership awareness	Community organizations
	Mutual understanding	Mutual understanding and commitment	—
	Community partner voice and leadership	Community partner leadership	—
	—	Community partner access to resources	—
	—	Community partner incentives and recognition	—
Leadership	—	—	Campus service-learning offices
	—	—	Faculty members
	—	—	Students
	Faculty awareness	Faculty knowledge and awareness	—
	Faculty involvement and support	Faculty involvement and support	—
	Faculty leadership		—

Appendix B, continued.

Dimension	Institutional components*	Departmental components†	Library components‡
Student support	Faculty incentives and rewards	Faculty incentives	—
	—	Curricular integration	Role of the library in curricular governance process for service-learning
	—	Review, promotion, and tenure process integration	—
	—	Tenure-track faculty	—
	—	—	Learning outcomes and objectives
	—	—	Role of information literacy
	—	—	Instruction librarians in service-learning programs
	Student awareness	Student awareness	—
	Student opportunities	Student opportunities	—
	Student leadership	Student voice, leadership, and departmental governance	—
Components unique to academic libraries:	Student incentives and rewards	Student incentives and recognition	—
	Information access support for service-learning		
	Spaces for service-learning.		
	—		

*Andrew Furco, "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education," Service-Learning Research & Development Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1999, <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1105&context=sleslgen>.

†Kevin Kecskes, "Creating Community-Engaged Departments: Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement in Academic Departments," 2008, <https://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu/cae/files/Engaged%20Department%20RUBRIC%20-%20Kecskes%202009-paginated.pdf>.

‡Katherine Kott, "Self-Assessment Rubric for Development of Service Learning Programs in Academic Libraries," Katherine Kott Consulting, 2017, <http://katherinekott.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Service-Learning-Rubric-01.24.pdf>.

Appendix C

Recommendations

Dimension	Recommendation
All	Collaborate among library stakeholders (internal and external) to complete the rubric.
1: Mission and culture supporting service-learning	Consult the library's mission/vision/values statements (if applicable). Consult the library's strategic plan. Consult position descriptions, criteria for promotion, campus committee service for integration with service-learning.
2: Information access support for service-learning	Consider if research from course projects related to service-learning is preserved in the library's institutional repository.
3: Spaces for service-learning	Review the library collection's policy / approval plan to verify financial support for pedagogical resources for faculty development in service-learning. Promote the library's exhibit spaces to showcase campus-community collaborations. Discuss changing room reservation policies so spaces are reservable to the community outside the institution.
4: Programmatic approach to information literacy and service-learning	Add a space within library instruction statistics gathering to document partnerships with service-learning courses. Promote library instruction through faculty development or other outreach activities.
5: Relationship with external stakeholders for service-learning	Designate a main contact for the campus service-learning office. Conduct outreach to community partners with whom the university partners. Discuss service-learning initiatives and partnerships with library staff through meetings or other venues.
6: Organizational/leadership support	Document library dean/university librarian support of service-learning. Include metrics related to service-learning engagement in the library's assessment plan.



Notes

1. Janet Eyler and Dwight E. Giles Jr., *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999), 171.
2. "30th Anniversary Action Statement of Presidents and Chancellors," *Campus Compact* (blog), 2020, <https://compact.org/actionstatement/statement/>.
3. Janet Eyler, "Service Learning: Higher Education," in *Encyclopedia of Education*, vol. 6, ed. James W. Guthrie (New York: Macmillan, 2003), 2205.
4. "30th Anniversary Action Statement of Presidents and Chancellors."
5. Adam Murray and Ashley Ireland, "Provosts' Perceptions of Academic Library Value & Preferences for Communication: A National Study," *College & Research Libraries* 79, 3 (2018): 336–65, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.79.3.336>.
6. Megan Oakleaf, *The Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 2010).
7. American Library Association, "Core Values of Librarianship," 2019, <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/corevalues>.
8. Nancy C. Kranich, "Academic Libraries as Hubs for Deliberative Democracy," *Journal of Public Deliberation* 6, 1 (2010): 2.
9. Maureen Barry, Laura A. Lowe, and Sarah Twill, "Academic Librarians' Attitudes about Civic-Mindedness and Service Learning," *Library Quarterly* 87, 1 (2017): 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.1086/689311>.
10. Andrew Furco, "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education," Service-Learning Research & Development Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1999, <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1105&context=slceslgen>.
11. Katherine Kott, "Self-Assessment Rubric for Development of Service Learning Programs in Academic Libraries," Katherine Kott Consulting, 2017, <http://katherinekott.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Service-Learning-Rubric-01.24.pdf>.
12. Ibid.
13. Furco, "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education"
14. Kevin Kecskes, "Creating Community-Engaged Departments: Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement in Academic Departments," 2008, <https://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu.caefiles/Engaged%20Department%20RUBRIC%20-%20Kecskes%202009-paginated.pdf>.
15. Kott, "Self-Assessment Rubric for Development of Service Learning Programs in Academic Libraries"
16. Jennifer E. Nuttall, "The Relationship between Service Learning and Research," *Public Services Quarterly* 5, 4 (2009): 250–61, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228950903199271>; Maureen Barry, "Librarians as Partners in Service-Learning Courses (Part I)," *LOEX [Library Orientation Exchange] Quarterly* 38, 1 (2011): Article 5; Maureen Barry, "Librarians as Partners in Service-Learning Courses (Part II)," *LOEX Quarterly* 38, 2 (2011): Article 4.
17. Christopher A. Sweet, "Information Literacy and Service-Learning: Creating Powerful Synergies," in *Information Literacy and Social Justice: Radical Professional Praxis*, ed. Lua Gregory and Shana Higgins (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice, 2013), 247–74; Maureen Barry, "Service Learning: Engaging College Students with the Library and Information Literacy Principles," chap. 9 in *Student Engagement and the Academic Library*, ed. Loanne Snaveley (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2012), 85–94.
18. Jane Blodgett, "Taking the Class Out of the Classroom: Libraries, Literacy, and Service Learning," chap. 4 in *The Experiential Library*, ed. Pete McDonnell (Cambridge, MA: Chandos, 2017), 43–52, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100775-4.00004-2>; Alyssa Wright, "Research for Non-Profits: A Service-Learning Class in Grantseeking Research," chap. 1 in *Library Service and Learning: Empowering Students, Inspiring Social Responsibility, and Building Community Connections*, ed.

- Theresa McDevitt and Caleb P. Finegan (Chicago: ACRL, 2018); Theresa McDevitt, "Community Research Assignments for an Information Literacy Class," chap. 5 in McDevitt and Finegan, *Library Service and Learning*; Maureen Barry, "Research for the Greater Good: Incorporating Service Learning in an Information Literacy Course at Wright State University," *College & Research Libraries News* 72, 6 (2011): 345–48.
19. ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee, "Environmental Scan 2019," 2019, 10, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/publications/whitepapers/EnvironmentalScan2019.pdf>.
 20. Megan Stark, "Information in the Real World: Building a Bridge between Academic and Community Information through Service Learning," chap. 4 in *Service Learning, Information Literacy, and Libraries*, ed. Jennifer E. Nutefall (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2016), 58.
 21. Anne Marie Gruber, Angela Pratesi, and Angela Waseskuk, "Moving Words: Building Community through Service-Learning in the Arts," chap. 7 in McDevitt and Finegan, *Library Service and Learning*, 115–43, https://scholarworks.uni.edu/lib_facpub/9.
 22. William A. Miller and Marilyn Billings, "A University Library Creates a Digital Repository for Documenting and Disseminating Community Engagement," *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 16, 2 (2012): 109–21.
 23. Ibid.
 24. Barry, Lowe, and Twill, "Academic Librarians' Attitudes about Civic-Mindedness and Service Learning."
 25. Krystin S. R. Martens, "Rubrics in Program Evaluation," *Evaluation Journal of Australasia* 18, 1 (2018): 21–44, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1035719X17753961>.
 26. Julian King, Kate McKegg, Judy Oakden, and Nan Wehipeihana, "Evaluative Rubrics: A Method for Surfacing Values and Improving the Credibility of Evaluation," *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation* 9, 21 (2013): 13.
 27. Pauline Dickinson and Jeffery Adams, "Values in Evaluation—The Use of Rubrics," *Evaluation and Program Planning* 65 (2017): 114, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.07.005>; King, McKegg, Oakden, and Wehipeihana, "Evaluative Rubrics," 13.
 28. Dickinson and Adams, "Values in Evaluation," 114.
 29. King, McKegg, Oakden, and Wehipeihana, "Evaluative Rubrics," 16.
 30. Krystin S. R. Martens, "How Program Evaluators Use and Learn to Use Rubrics to Make Evaluative Reasoning Explicit," *Evaluation and Program Planning* 69, 14 (2018): 25–32.
 31. Dickinson and Adams, "Values in Evaluation," 114.
 32. Andrew Furco and William Miller, "Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement," *New Directions for Higher Education* 2009, 147 (2009): 47–54, <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.357>; Laura W. Gariepy, Jennifer A. Stout, and Megan L. Hodge, "Using Rubrics to Assess Learning in Course-Integrated Library Instruction," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 16, 3 (2016): 491–509, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2016.0043>.
 33. Megan Oakleaf, Michelle S. Millet, and Leah Kraus, "All Together Now: Getting Faculty, Administrators, and Staff Engaged in Information Literacy Assessment," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 11, 3 (2011): 831–52, <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2011.0035>.
 34. King, McKegg, Oakden, and Wehipeihana, "Evaluative Rubrics"; Oakleaf, Millet, and Kraus, "All Together Now."
 35. Susan M. Gallant and Daisy Ríos, "The Organization Development (OD) Consulting Process," chap. 8 in *The NTL [National Training Laboratories] Handbook of Organization Development and Change*, ed. Brenda B. Jones and Michael Brazzel, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Wiley, 2014), 170.
 36. Furco and Miller, "Issues in Benchmarking and Assessing Institutional Engagement."
 37. Furco, "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education"; Sherril B. Gelmon, Sarena D. Seifer, J. Kauper-Brown, and M. Mikkelsen, "Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment," *Community-Campus Partnerships for Health*, 2005.
 38. Scott A. Chadwick and Donna R. Pawlowski, "Assessing Institutional Support for Service-Learning: A Case Study of Organizational Sensemaking," *Michigan Journal of Community*

- Service Learning* 13, 2 (2007): 31–39; Kimberly L. Joyce, “The Institutionalization of Service-Learning: A Collaborative Approach” (EdD diss., Rowan University, 2008), <https://search.proquest.com/docview/304821331/abstract/FE9704D32D2A4201PQ/1>; Lorilei Swanson, “The Institutionalization of Service-Learning at Land-Grant Colleges in South Carolina” (PhD diss., Clemson University, 2008), https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_dissertations/219; Leiauanna Allen, “Bridging the Gaps: A Case Study on the Intentional Integration of Service-Learning Assignments into the Academic Arena” (DA diss., George Mason University, 2014), <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1554346832/abstract/B2881A0519F74CC8PQ/1>.
39. Dianne Thurab-Nkhosi, Sandra Gift, Lynda Quamina-Aiyejine, and Claudia Harvey, “Developing the Distinctive UWI [University of the West Indies] Graduate,” 2013, 58.
 40. Jennifer Amborn, Yorton Clark Jr., and David Wegley, “Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Faith-Based Colleges and Universities” (EdD diss., Saint Louis University, 2010), <https://search.proquest.com/docview/854984507/abstract/8909B3838F6C45D4PQ/1>.
 41. Carol Mitchell, Kirsty Trotter, and Sherril Gelmon, “A Case Study of a Higher Education Institutional Assessment on Service Learning,” *Acta Academica* 2005, Supplement 3 (2005): 151–77.
 42. *Ibid.*, 164.
 43. Kecskes, “Creating Community-Engaged Departments.”
 44. Stephanie Hayne Beatty, “Institutionalizing Community Engaged Scholarship at a Research University” (EdD diss., Western University, 2018), <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/oip/46>.
 45. Richard M. Battistoni, Sherril B. Gelmon, John Saltmarsh, Jon Wergin, and Edward Zlotkowski, *The Engaged Department Toolkit* (Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2011).
 46. *Ibid.*, 5.
 47. Kevin Kecskes, “Collectivizing Our Impact: Engaging Departments and Academic Change,” *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement* 6, 3 (2015): 59.
 48. Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh, “The Engaged Department in the Context of Academic Change,” in *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good*, ed. Kevin Kecskes (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006), 288.
 49. Battistoni, Gelmon, Saltmarsh, Wergin, and Zlotkowski, *The Engaged Department Toolkit*, 3.
 50. Lori J. Vogelgesang and Kimberly Misa, “The Engaged Department Institute and the California State University: Progress, Process and Challenges,” Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, 2002, 63, http://www.calstate.edu/cce/initiatives/documents/full_report.pdf.
 51. School of Information Studies, Syracuse University, “Rubric Assessment of Information Literacy Skills,” <https://railsontrack.info>.
 52. Megan Jane Oakleaf, “Using Rubrics to Collect Evidence for Decision-Making: What Do Librarians Need to Learn?” *Evidence Based Library & Information Practice* 2, 3 (2007): 28, <https://doi.org/10.18438/B8WS3W>.
 53. Karen R. Diller and Sue F. Phelps, “Learning Outcomes, Portfolios, and Rubrics, Oh My! Authentic Assessment of an Information Literacy Program,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 8, 1 (2008): 75–89, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2008.0000>.
 54. M. Sara Lowe, Char Booth, Sean Stone, and Natalie Tagge, “Impacting Information Literacy Learning in First-Year Seminars: A Rubric-Based Evaluation,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 15, 3 (2015): 489–512, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2015.0030>; Brianne Markowski, Lyda McCartin, and Stephanie Evers, “Meeting Students Where They Are: Using Rubric-Based Assessment to Modify an Information Literacy Curriculum,” *Communications in Information Literacy* 12, 2 (2018): 128–49, <http://dx.doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2018.12.2.5>.
 55. Dorothy Anne Warner, “Programmatic Assessment of Information Literacy Skills Using Rubrics,” *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 20, 1 (2009): 149–65.
 56. Laura W. Gariepy, Jennifer A. Stout, and Megan L. Hodge, “Using Rubrics to Assess Learning in Course-Integrated Library Instruction,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 16, 3 (2016): 491–509, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2016.0043>.



57. Iris Jastram, Danya Leebaw, and Heather Tompkins, "Situating Information Literacy within the Curriculum: Using a Rubric to Shape a Program," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 14, 2 (2014): 165–86, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2014.0011>.
58. Robin E. Miller, "Information Literacy Learning in First Year Composition: A Rubric-Based Approach to Assessment," chap. 8 in *Putting Assessment into Action: Selected Projects from the First Cohort of the Assessment in Action Grant*, ed. Eric Ackerman (Chicago: ACRL, 2015); Lowe, Booth, Stone, and Tagge, "Impacting Information Literacy Learning in First-Year Seminars."
59. Melissa Beuoy and Katherine Boss, "Revealing Instruction Opportunities: A Framework-Based Rubric for Syllabus Analysis," *Reference Services Review* 47, 2 (2019): 151–68, <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-11-2018-0072>.
60. Aaron Dobbs and Doug Cook, "Performance-Based Self-Assessment of a Library Liaison Program Using a Rubric," chap. 10 in *Using Qualitative Methods in Action Research: How Librarians Can Get to the Why of Data*, ed. Douglas Cook and Lesley Farmer (Chicago: ACRL, 2011), 145.
61. *Ibid.*, 146.
62. *Ibid.*
63. Sarah Passonneau and Heather S. Lewin, "Standardizing the Assessment Cycle: The Development of an Assessment Rubric for Effective Project Planning and Data Reporting," in *Proceedings of the 9th Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measurement in Libraries and Information Services*, ed. Ian Hall, Stephen Thornton, and Stephen Town, York, United Kingdom, August 22–26, 2011 (York, UK: University of York, 2012): 333–43.
64. *Ibid.*
65. William J. Rothwell, Jacqueline M. Stavros, and Roland L. Sullivan, "Organization Development and Change," chap. 1 in *Practicing Organization Development: A Guide of Leading Change*, ed. William J. Rothwell, Jacqueline M. Stavros, Roland L. Sullivan, and Arielle Sullivan, 3rd ed. (San Francisco: Wiley, 2010), 36.
66. King, McKegg, Oakden, and Wehipeihana, "Evaluative Rubrics," 19.
67. Furco, "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education."
68. Kecskes, "Creating Community-Engaged Departments."

This mss. is peer reviewed, copy edited, and accepted for publication, portal 21.1.