

**Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU)
Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness, and Economic Prosperity**

**Innovation and Economic Prosperity University
Designation and Awards Program**



2017 Designation Application Guidelines

(NOTE: The 2017 Award Application Guidelines are in a separate document.)

Version: 03/21/2017

Overview

Through the APLU Innovation and Economic Prosperity (IEP) Universities program, institutions are recognized for their efforts in economic engagement by receiving this designation. The designation identifies institutions working to advance the economic wellbeing of their states, regions, and the nation through a variety of efforts. Each year at the APLU Annual Meeting, four institutions also receive awards recognizing exemplary work in this arena (see separate award application guidelines).

Designees have worked through an intensive process of institutional self-study and engagement with stakeholders to identify the strengths of the university's economic engagement enterprise as well as areas for growth and improvement.

Awardees are named in four categories:

- the Economic Prosperity Connections Award, for exemplary overall economic engagement, and demonstration of making connections across efforts in Talent, Innovation, and Place;
- the Talent Award, for exemplary focus on education and workforce development;
- the Innovation Award, for exemplary focus on innovation- and technology-based economic development; and
- the Place Award, for exemplary focus on social, cultural, or community development.

Designees receive a commemorative plaque, along with a certificate and a logo that can be used in the university's print materials and web sites to promote the institution's recognition. *Awardees* receive an additional plaque.

Designation Application Submission Deadlines

The IEP Universities program is divided into two submission processes—one for the designation and one for the award. A university must be a recipient of the designation before it can apply for the award. Following are details about submission deadlines for the designation process. Included in the next section are details about awards submission deadlines.

Application items must be submitted via APLU's OpenWater awards submission web site. A link to create an Open Water account and submit materials will be provided to institutions applying for IEP designation or awards at least two weeks prior to the application due date.

Applications must be submitted online via OpenWater. Included attachments must be in Microsoft Word—no PDFs. No applications will be accepted via email or postal mail.

There are four application submission deadlines per year. Applications may be submitted by 11:59 p.m. on the first Friday of the following months: February, May, August, or December.

NOTE:

- To be included in the current year's "class" of designees (that is, announced as a newly-designated IEP University at the APLU Annual Meeting in November), you **MUST** submit your

application by the first Friday of August and receive a “designate now” decision from the reviewers.

- To participate in the current year’s IEP Awards program, you **MUST** submit your application by the first Friday of May and receive a “designate now” decision from the reviewers, then meet the Awards submission deadline. (see below)

The designation submission dates for 2017 are:

- Friday, February 3rd
- Friday, May 5th
- Friday, August 4th
- Friday, December 1st

After application submission, institutions will receive reviewer comments and a decision (if submitting *for decision*—see below) within two months. February submitters can expect results by the first Friday of April; May submitters, by the first Friday of July; August submitters, by the first Friday of October; and December submitters, by the first Friday of February.

For Comment Only Versus For Decision Submissions

Upon application submission, you will be asked whether you are submitting *for comment only* or *for decision*. You may opt to submit *for comment only* if your institution would like to receive formative feedback from reviewers before you submit *for decision*.

Notes related to submitting *for comment only* versus *for decision*:

- If you submit *for comment only*, you will not be able to submit *for decision* until at least the second submission deadline after you submit *for comment only*. For example, if you submit *for comment only* on the first Friday of May, you will not be able to submit *for decision* until the first Friday of December, meaning that you will not be able to be listed as part of the current year’s class of designees. Some institutions may prefer such slowing of their submission timeline to gather and incorporate formative feedback.
- A complete application must be submitted, even if *for comment only*. No partial applications will be reviewed.
- You may only submit *for comment only* once before submitting *for decision*.
- When you submit *for decision*, you will still receive comments from reviewers, along with a *designate now* or *needs improvement* decision. If you receive a *needs improvement* decision, you may re-submit at the second submission deadline after your first submission (see example above) or later.
- Note that you are limited to three submissions (either *for comment only* or *for decision*) in three years. After a third submission, you must either have received the designation or you must wait two years to join a new “startup cohort.” (See “Designation Timeline and Clock” below.)

Designation Timeline and Clock

A new IEP Designation cohort is launched once each year, in September. Participating in the startup cohort requires a letter of intent from your institution’s president or chancellor. Letters of intent are accepted through the first Friday of September. The letter of intent template is available upon request.

- Once an institution has joined a startup cohort, the “designation clock” begins.
- Members of a startup cohort can submit an application as soon as the first Friday in February after the startup.
- Once an institution has joined a startup cohort, they must submit an application, either *for comment only* or *for decision*, by the second August submission deadline after they begin. For example, if an institution joins the startup cohort in September 2017, they must submit an application by the first Friday of August 2019.
- The institution has three years (the August submission deadline in the third year after you join a startup cohort), and up to three application submissions, to receive a “designate now” decision from reviewers. For example, if an institution joins the startup cohort in September 2017, they must have submitted *for decision* and received a “designate now” decision by the first Friday of October 2020.
- In the event that an institution has not received the designation by the time the clock runs out, the institution can join a new startup cohort, but must wait until the second September after their clock has run out.

Award Application Submission Deadlines

Should you qualify for the 2017 awards program, applications for the **2017 awards** will be due **Friday, August 4th, 2017**.

Award applications will include two parts:

1. Institutional Economic Engagement Overview
2. Case Studies

Note that awards are submitted in one of three categories: Talent, Innovation, and Place. One additional award is presented in a category called Connections. The Connections award is the top honor for IEP Universities award winners, and the winner of the Connections award is drawn from the finalists of the other three award categories.

Award finalists and winners will be notified of their status by October 13, 2017. Note that all finalists are expected to make a brief presentation about their submission at the APLU Annual Meeting in November (in 2017, the meeting is November 12 – 14 in Washington, DC).

See separate Award Application Guidelines document.

Before You Prepare Your Submission: The Institutional Self-Study and IEP Universities Learning Community

Before you prepare your institution’s application for the IEP Universities designation, you will undertake an institutional self-study effort. The design of your self-study is largely up to your campus team. You will want to design your self-study in a way that gives you the information you need to prepare your submission, so be sure to read through this entire guidelines document before you design your self-study process.

While the design of your self-study is up to you and your campus team, we strongly recommend the following components:

Use tools from the CICEP Economic Engagement Framework. This framework and the tools that comprise it are available online at <http://www.aplu.org/CICEPFramework>.

- The publication [Higher Education Engagement in Economic Development: Foundations for Strategy and Practice](#), created in collaboration with the University Economic Development Association, provides an overview of the CICEP concept of university economic engagement through “Talent, Innovation, and Place.” Review of this publication will be a helpful start for your IEP Universities participation.
- Virtually all institutions that have participated in the IEP Universities program have used the [Assessment Tools for Examining the Role of Universities in Economic Engagement](#), one publication in the Framework, as the primary platform for data collection in their self-study.
- A number of IEP Universities have also found the [New Metrics Field Guide](#) helpful to their self-study, including efforts to collect data on some of the most salient measures discussed in the Guide. We encourage your institution to include this tool in some way in your self-study if it is an institutional priority to find new ways to measure and communicate the university’s contributions to the economy.
- The newest tool in the Framework is the [Economic Impact Guidelines](#) publication. If your institution will be conducting an institutional economic impact analysis study during or soon after your IEP Universities participation, you will likely find this publication helpful as you design your self-study.
- In general, the ideas embodied in the [Economic Engagement Framework](#), which you will find in the opening pages of all of the publications referenced above (with the exception of “Foundations for Strategy and Practice”) should be central to your self-study. The core ideas of the Framework are “Know, Measure, Tell, Engage”: 1) institutions should KNOW what they’re doing well and what they need to improve with regard to economic engagement; 2) institutions should be able to MEASURE the extent to which they are engaged; 3) institutions should TELL the story of their contributions to economic engagement; and 4) institutions must ENGAGE with external stakeholders throughout the processes of knowing, measuring, and telling in order for their contributions to have meaningful impact.

Design multiple forms of stakeholder engagement into your self-study.

- As noted above, most IEP Universities have used the Assessment Tools as the primary tool for their self-study, and most have included the external stakeholder input tool as part of their deployment of the surveys recommended in the Assessment Tools publication. Most universities have also found other ways to engage their stakeholders in the process, and your self-study should do the same. Consider holding an in-person workshop or summit meeting with your external stakeholders, for example, either before or after you deploy the survey. Other ideas include one-on-one interviews, focus groups, or visits with campus economic engagement leaders focused on soliciting feedback and input on the university's efforts in this arena.

Design a self-study process tailored to your institution's mission, and stakeholders' needs. The self-study design should reflect the distinctive qualities of your economic engagement enterprise.

- No two IEP Universities self-study designs are the same. All institutions have adapted the individual tools (surveys, metrics, etc.) to best fit their goals and the characteristics of their institution's economic engagement efforts. The broader set of activities, including stakeholder engagement, also reflect each institution's individual community and interests.
- Designing the self-study process will in itself be a tremendous learning opportunity for your campus team—as you think through the elements of your self-study, you will inevitably discover aspects of your institution's economic engagement enterprise that will be important to focus on in your designation submission.

Take advantage of opportunities to learn from other universities' experiences.

- You will be able to learn from others in your IEP Universities cohort through bi-weekly “community” conference calls. Participants in these calls share ideas and strategies for undertaking the self-study and writing up application submissions.
- You will also be assigned to a peer learning group and will be able to ask questions of IEP University designees from previous cohorts.
- Share examples from your design and ask your peers to share. The designation program is an opportunity for institutions to learn from one another.

Criteria for Review: Designation

Designation Application Review

The following definitions and guiding questions for designation review criteria have been adapted to an application review rubric, which is included after the descriptions and questions. The rubric will be used to approve designation for applicants.

Criteria for reviewing entries will address the eight sections/sub-sections of the submission:

1. Process and Economic Engagement Narrative
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Self-Study Process Experience
 - c. The Economic Engagement Enterprise
 - d. Economic Engagement Planning
 - e. Promotion and Communication
 - f. Advancing University Economic Engagement
2. Summary of Accomplishments
3. Growth/Improvement Plan

1. Process and Economic Engagement Narrative

a. Introduction

The submission begins with a clear, coherent introduction that provides an overview of the institution's economic engagement activities, how this enterprise fits within the institution's mission, and areas of strength and needed improvement in the enterprise.

Guiding questions:

- Does the institution convey a clear and coherent understanding of its economic engagement efforts, including fit with institutional mission, accomplishments, and areas for improvement?
- Does the institution's application include some indication of "innovation" in economic engagement? NOTE: Being "innovative" in approaches to economic engagement can mean finding practices and methods that are proven in the field, but that are new or novel to your university, and adopting them. It could also mean creating or adopting practices and methods that are new or novel to the field as a whole. Both kinds of innovation are valuable, and either kind would be an indicator of innovation in economic engagement.
- To what extent does the institution demonstrate attention to a broad array of contributors to economic prosperity—from financial wealth to development of human and social capital and to nurturing community and cultural assets (talent, innovation, and place)?

b. Self-Study Process Experience

Next, the application presents the institution's experience with the economic engagement self-study.

Guiding questions:

- Does the institution make good use of CICEP tools and/or locally-designed mechanisms for data collection?

- Has the institution engaged the right stakeholders (both internal and external) effectively to help in understanding the current economic engagement landscape as well as making plans for the future?
- Is it clear how the self-study has helped the institution to determine its areas of strength in economic engagement, as well as areas for growth and improvement?

c. The Economic Engagement Enterprise

This section addresses an institution's self-awareness about and institutionalization of the entire array of economic efforts that the university undertakes.

Guiding questions:

- Is the institution working with members of its community (including internal and external stakeholders) toward a shared vision for and definition of university economic engagement?
- Is/are the institution's emerging definition(s) of economic engagement consistent with current ideas about the purposes and practices of university engagement (i.e. Carnegie Engagement Classification; Kellogg Commission definitions of engagement)?
- How well does the institution understand both its strengths and the challenges it faces with regard to economic engagement?

d. Economic Engagement Planning

This section addresses the university's ability to transform its self-awareness into action by proactively and prospectively thinking about how best to direct efforts and resources to support economic engagement moving forward.

Guiding questions:

- Does the institution show evidence of thinking through a plan for advancing its economic engagement enterprise?
- Is the institution working toward including economic engagement in university-wide strategic plans as well as planning for academic programs, research agendas, and university outreach?
- Is the institution developing resource allocation mechanisms to support the goals of the economic engagement enterprise?

e. Promotion and Communication

This section encourages the institution to do a good job of making its economic engagement activities and plans meaningful to internal and external stakeholders by actively promoting this work and interacting with stakeholders as a basis for advancing shared goals.

Guiding questions:

- Has the institution demonstrated efforts to identify the internal and external stakeholders are to whom the university needs to promote its economic engagement accomplishments and with whom it needs to design economic engagement goals?
- Is the university developing communication strategies for both promoting economic engagement efforts and communicating with stakeholders?
- Overall, is there evidence that the university is working at telling its story to external and internal stakeholders?

f. Advancing University Economic Engagement

This section explores the university's current and prospective role as a leader in the field, demonstrating leadership not only through exemplary practice but also through actively engaging, learning with, and guiding other institutional leaders.

Guiding questions:

- Has the institution demonstrated that consideration has been given to the extent to which economic engagement accomplishments and processes represent adoptable best practices?
- Is there evidence that the institution has contributed to a broader community of practice, represented by CICEP members and/or other participants in this process?
- To what extent do members of the institution engage in learning from and sharing best practices in economic engagement with other institutions through associations, conferences, or other forums?

2. Summary of Accomplishments

In this section, the university will describe its accomplishments in university economic engagement.

Guiding questions:

- Is it clear how the institution has determined its accomplishments through the self-study and in particular through engagement of internal and external stakeholders?
- Has the institution demonstrated that it is ready to build on its accomplishments to advance economic engagement?
- Does the institution demonstrate significant thought given to accomplishments, including the activities related to each area of accomplishment, timelines and resources, and indicators/measures of success?

3. Growth/Improvement Plan

In this section, the university will describe areas in its economic engagement enterprise needing growth and improvement.

Guiding questions:

- Is it clear how the institution has determined its areas for growth/improvement through the self-study and in particular through engagement of internal and external stakeholders?
- Has the institution demonstrated that it is ready to undertake planned growth/improvement to advance economic engagement?
- Does the institution demonstrate significant thought given to plans for growth and improvement, including the related objectives and activities each area of improvement, timelines and resources, and indicators/measures of success?

APLU Innovation and Economic Prosperity Universities Designation Program

Designation Application Evaluation Rubric

A review panel will review and comment on the submissions. At least three reviewers will read each submission. Reviewers will use the assessment rubric included here to evaluate submissions. Note that this rubric is new in 2016. The rubric has been adjusted from previous versions to better align with the submission format. Based on assessment of the submission, reviewers will make a determination of whether to recommend the submitting university for designation.

Recipients of the designation are qualified to apply for an Innovation and Economic Prosperity Universities award (see separate award application guidelines).

The following rubric is what reviewers are presented with in the online designation submission review system.

Evaluation Rubric

Section 1: Process and Economic Engagement Narrative

Section 1a: Introduction

(NOTE: On the online form, you will rate the Introduction last. In addition to rating how well the Introduction is crafted, you are asked to rate how the phrases “innovation” and “economic prosperity” are interpreted throughout the application.)

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

In this section, provide an overview of your institution’s submission for the designation program. Include highlights of items described in more detail in later sections. Describe how the phrases “innovation” and “economic prosperity” have been interpreted by your campus team and how your submission reflects these ideas.

Your review:

Please review the Introduction, and note the interpretation of “innovation” and “economic prosperity” throughout the application. Note the following description of an exemplary introduction and interpretations of “innovation” and “economic prosperity”:

The Introduction conveys a clear and coherent understanding of the institution’s economic engagement efforts, including accomplishments and areas for improvement.

The Introduction, and the application throughout, demonstrates “innovation” in economic engagement:

- The application demonstrates that the institution is committed to innovation by making the products of learning, discovery, and engagement relevant and useful.
- Moreover, the university has demonstrated that some of its approaches to economic engagement are innovative. That is, the university has included some indication that it has either (or both): 1) sought practices and methods to economic engagement that are proven in the field, but new to the

institution, and adopted them; or 2) created or adopted economic engagement practices or methods that are new or novel to the field as a whole.

- Innovation can be seen across more than one or two of the following areas: technology transfer, entrepreneurship, talent and workforce, social, cultural, and community development.

The Introduction, and the application throughout, demonstrates attention to a broad array of contributors to economic prosperity—from financial wealth to development of human and social capital and to nurturing community and cultural assets, and across talent, innovation, and place.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description
- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Section 1b: Self-Study Process Experience

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

Provide a summary of the campus team’s experience in participating in the process. Describe the approach used to: 1) deploying and analyzing the CICEP tools, or locally-designed mechanisms for data collection; 2) engaging stakeholders; 3) determining/identifying the institution’s accomplishments and areas for growth/improvement; and 4) developing summary of accomplishments and the growth/improvement plan. Your process may have included something other than the CICEP Assessment Tools and/or the CICEP New Metrics—in addition to or instead of. For example, you may have been working on the Carnegie Engagement Classification process at the same time as the IEP Universities designation. You may feel it is important to include information about more than just the IEP self-study and stakeholder engagement, because there were other processes underway at your campus that helped you determine your institution’s accomplishments and/or plans for improvement. You are welcome to describe other activities in your “process experience,” as long as you are mindful of word count and page limits.

In describing the institution’s determination of accomplishments and areas for growth/improvement, include indicators and data (quantitative and qualitative) used to scaffold these determinations. Explain not only how these processes helped the institution prepare its materials for award entry submission, but also if/how they helped the institution in thinking more broadly about its economic engagement efforts, and in particular how economic engagement affects the core learning, discovery, and engagement missions of the institution.

Your review:

Please review the Self-Study Process Experience section. Note the following exemplary description of this section:

The institution has made use of CICEP tools and/or locally-designed mechanisms for data collection, and has described the use of tools clearly. The institution has engaged the right stakeholders (both internal and external), and has engaged them effectively to help develop an understanding of the current economic engagement landscape, as well as for making plans for the future. It is clear how the self-study has helped the institution to determine its areas of strength in economic engagement, as well as areas for growth and improvement.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description
- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Section 1c: The Economic Engagement Enterprise

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

In this section, describe the breadth of activities undertaken by your institution related to economic engagement. Provide whatever working definition the institution uses for economic engagement, and explain the extent to which there is a shared vision for and definition of economic engagement among both internal and external stakeholders. Identify how the university's internal structure supports economic engagement efforts (coordinating office? cross-campus committee or task force? advisory boards?). Explain the extent to which the university's definition of economic engagement is consistent with current ideas about the purposes and practices of university engagement (i.e. [Carnegie Engagement Classification](#); [Kellogg Commission definitions of engagement](#)). Summarize the institution's current understanding of its strengths and challenges with regard to economic engagement, and describe if/how this process has helped with this understanding.

Your review:

Please review the Economic Engagement Enterprise section. Note the following exemplary description of this section:

- The institution demonstrates efforts to identify both internal and external stakeholders with whom to promote economic engagement, and with whom to design such efforts. The application identifies some of the stakeholders in each category (internal and external). Examples of stakeholder efforts include both promotion of efforts and engagement in goal setting.
- Definitions of economic engagement are completely or nearly completely consistent with Carnegie, Kellogg, etc.
 - Carnegie: “Community Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.”
 - Kellogg: “Engagement – in which institutions and communities form lasting relationships that influence, shape, and promote success in both spheres – is rare. More frequently,

there is evidence of unilateral outreach, rather than partnership based on mutual benefit, mutual respect, and mutual accountability.”

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities: “The publicly engaged institution is fully committed to direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit.”
- The institution has a well-developed and articulated sense of both strengths and challenges it faces with regard to economic engagement. Where challenges exist, there are clear strategies to address them.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description
- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Section 1d: Economic Engagement Planning

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

Describe how, moving forward, the institution will both build on its accomplishments and strengths, and also address areas for growth and improvement. Refer to your Summary of Accomplishments and Growth and Improvement Plan for details on these. Explain how economic engagement plans are and/or will be reflected in university-wide strategic plans, academic program planning, research agenda development, and outreach strategy creation. Note briefly how the institution insures that resources are available for the economic engagement enterprise (specifics are not necessary in this section—just overall evidence that the university is committed to advancing this work by allocating appropriate resources. However, try to be as specific and thorough as possible in the “Summary of Accomplishments” table and the “Growth/Improvement Plan” table, to demonstrate that careful consideration has been given to the resources question).

Your review:

Please review the Economic Engagement Planning section. Note the following exemplary description of this section:

- There is strong evidence that economic engagement leaders at the institution have worked to develop a plan for advancing the economic engagement enterprise, both by building on accomplishments and by addressing areas for growth and improvement. (Reviewers: In addition to the “Economic Engagement Planning” section of the submission, please also consider the “Summary of Accomplishments” and “Growth/Improvement Plan.”)

- The institution has demonstrated inclusion of economic engagement in university-wide strategic plans, as well as in planning for academic programs, research agendas, and university outreach/engagement.
- The institution has demonstrated that resource allocation mechanisms are in place, and that appropriate resources can be dedicated to supporting the economic engagement enterprise.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description
- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Section 1e: Promotion and Communication

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

Describe the target audiences the university has identified for strategic communications about economic engagement—those to whom the university needs to promote these efforts, and those with whom the institution needs to design goals. Summarize the university’s communication strategies for reaching stakeholders. Provide examples of the ways in which the institution is currently telling the economic engagement story to internal and external stakeholders.

Your review:

Please review the Promotion and Communication section. Note the following exemplary description of this section:

- The institution has demonstrated efforts to identify internal and external stakeholders, both to whom the university needs to promote economic engagement, and with whom it needs to design goals.
- There are clear and demonstrated communication strategies both for promoting economic engagement efforts and communicating with stakeholders.
- The university has demonstrated efforts, with clear examples, to tell its story with regard to contributions to economic development to both internal and external stakeholders.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description
- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Section 1f: Advancing University Economic Engagement

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

Describe the ways in which the institution has taken on or is moving toward a leadership role in economic engagement. Detail the ways in which members of the university community engage with peers at other institutions around these issues, including the extent to which the institution has been a contributing member to the CICEP and Innovation and Economic Prosperity Designation and Awards Program communities. Explain the ways in which the university's experiences in economic engagement represent adoptable best practices, and the work that the university does to disseminate these practices.

Your review:

Please review the Advancing University Economic Engagement section. Note the following exemplary description of this section:

- The university has demonstrated noticeable consideration given to the extent to which their economic engagement accomplishments represent adoptable best practices by, for example: citing best practices literature and experiences of other universities; demonstrating conscious efforts to compare the best practices of other universities to its own practices; demonstrating that it has altered its own economic engagement practices by learning from other institutions. These are examples only and there may be other ways universities have demonstrated consideration to adoptability of practices.
- There is evidence that the institution has contributed to a broader community of practice regarding what they are learning, through CICEP and/or with other participants in this designation/award process.
- The institution has demonstrated economic engagement leaders frequently participate in a variety of associations, conferences, and other forums to share learning about best practices in economic engagement.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description
- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Section 2: Summary of Accomplishments

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

(The guidelines present the following “Questions to Consider” with a note that they may not be able to answer all the questions in the narrative, and that they should take advantage of the accomplishments table to include some of the detail.)

- *What are the main institutional strengths or desirable outcomes your accomplishments reveal?*
- *What method did you use to identify each area of accomplishment? How did the assessment tools or metrics help? What else led you to identify these?*
- *Do all levels of the institution recognize these as areas of accomplishment?*
- *What metrics or other evidence support your assertions that these are areas of accomplishment?*
- *In what ways are the areas of accomplishment replicable? What lessons can be learned for improving activities in other areas of your institution’s economic engagement enterprise? How could other institutions learn from these areas of accomplishment?*
- *Describe the top three success factors that supported accomplishments in these areas. What are the most important (types of) resources that helped you achieve success? (This question is addressed by the “Resources” column on the summary table.)*
- *Is each accomplishment in the area of talent development (education, workforce)? Innovation (translational research, applied activity, commercialization, tech transfer, entrepreneurship)? Place development (social, cultural, community development)? Or does it integrate activities across two or more of these categories? (This question is addressed by the “Talent, Innovation, Place, or Connections” column on the summary table.)*

Your review:

Please review the Summary of Accomplishments section. Note the following exemplary description of this section:

- The institution has provided clear information about how it determined what its areas of accomplishment are. In particular, the institution has described how internal and external stakeholder engagement has helped them determine accomplishments, and has provided clear information about what measures or indicators were used to determine accomplishment.
- The institution has demonstrated that it is fully aware of what will be required to build on its accomplishments. In the details of the accomplishments table, it is clear that the institution has a complete understanding of the resources and timelines necessary to achieve similar accomplishments in the future.
- The accomplishments table represents a complete and thorough understanding of university accomplishments—complete information is included in each column, activities are clearly aligned with each accomplishment, and clear and complete information are included about timeline, resources, and measures/indicators of success.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description
- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Section 3: Growth/Improvement Plan

Participating universities have been provided with these instructions:

(The guidelines present the following “Questions to Consider” with a note that they may not be able to answer all the questions in the narrative, and that they should take advantage of the accomplishments table to include some of the detail.)

- *What are the main problems or undesirable outcomes these challenges reveal?*
- *What method did you use to identify each area for growth and improvement? How did the assessment tools or metrics help? What else led you to identify these?*
- *Do all levels of the institution recognize the need for improvement in these areas?*
- *What metrics support your assertions and/or desired outcomes?*
- *What would it look like if this improvement plan proves successful? (ie., how would you know in the future if you have successfully addressed these growth areas?) (This question is addressed by the “Indicator/Measure of Success” column on the summary table.)*
- *Describe the top three barriers to a successful improvement plan implementation? What are the most important (types of) resources that would need to be deployed to address these? (This question is addressed by the “Resources” column on the summary table.)*
- *How do you envision your improvement plan to be sustainable after going through the APLU IEP designation process?*

Your review:

Please review the Growth/Improvement plan section. Note the following exemplary description of this section:

- The institution has provided clear information about how it determined what its areas for growth and improvement are. In particular, the institution has described how internal and external stakeholder engagement has helped them determine areas for growth and improvement, and has provided clear information about what measures or indicators were used to determine needed growth or improvement.
- The institution has demonstrated that it is fully aware of what will be required to execute its plans to grow and improve. In the details of the growth/improvement table, it is clear that the institution has a complete understanding of the resources and timelines necessary to achieve growth and improvement goals.
- The growth/improvement table represents a complete and thorough understanding of areas for attention—complete information is included in each column, activities are clearly aligned with each growth/improvement goal, and clear and complete information are included about timeline, resources, and measures/indicators of success.

Reviewer response:

- Application *aligns well* with above description

- Application *aligns somewhat* with above description
- Application *does not align* with above description

Reviewer comments (please provide constructive feedback):

Designation Submission

Guidelines for Section 1: Process and Economic Engagement Narrative

Your process and economic engagement narrative section can be between 1500 and (no more than) 2500 words (about 6 - 10 double-spaced pages).

NOTE: You will enter text into an online form, though you may wish to copy and paste these from a Word document. The online form will allow you the following word count limits on each of the six parts of Section 1. The total of these allowances is greater than 2500, so that you have flexibility in including more information in sections as you feel appropriate. **HOWEVER, the total word count of these six parts combined should not exceed 2500 words—this will be manually checked after online form submission and you will be required to edit if you have exceeded the 2500 word limit.**

- Introduction (300 words)
- Self-Study Process Experience (600 words)
- The Economic Engagement Enterprise (600 words)
- Economic Engagement Planning (600 words)
- Promotion and Communication (600 words)
- Advancing University Economic Engagement (600 words)

Tables or figures included as attachments to the process narrative do not count toward the 2500 word limit (see qualifier below). A process narrative longer than 10 pages is okay, as long as it remains within the 2500 word limit.

A table or figure in the process narrative section (Section 1) that is mostly words (more than just table/figure title, labels, etc.) will count toward the word limit. **DO NOT use tables/figures in Section 1 as a way to provide extra narrative information**—such submissions will be returned for editing.

On the other hand, the tables that you will include as attachments in Sections 2 and 3—accomplishments summary and growth/improvement plan—are *designed to be mostly words*, and there is no word limit for these tables.

[NOTE: the following is being reviewed for compatibility with the online submission process. Some adjustments may be required.] You may include links to additional information online. Additionally, you may include appendices that expand on your process narrative. Your submission may not include a total of more than five pages of appendices, however, and note that reviewers will not be required to read material at web links or appendices.

The process and economic engagement narrative should include all of the following sections. As you craft responses to the following, refer back to the guiding questions, the review criteria, and the rubric included in an earlier section of this document to help decide what information to include.

- **Introduction.** In this section, provide an overview of your institution’s submission for the designation program. Include highlights of items described in more detail in later sections. Describe how the phrases “innovation” and “economic prosperity” have been interpreted by your campus team and how your submission reflects these ideas.
- **Self-Study Process Experience.** Provide a summary of the campus team’s experience in participating in the process. Describe the approach used to: 1) deploying and analyzing the CICEP Assessment Tools OR CICEP New Metrics; 2) engaging stakeholders; 3) determining/identifying the institution’s accomplishments and areas for growth/improvement; and 4) developing summary of accomplishments and the growth/improvement plan. Your process may have included something other than the CICEP Assessment Tools and/or the CICEP New Metrics—in addition to or instead of. For example, you may have been working on the Carnegie Engagement Classification process at the same time as the IEP Universities designation. You may feel it is important to include information about more than just the IEP self-study and stakeholder engagement, because there were other processes underway at your campus that helped you determine your institution’s accomplishments and/or plans for improvement. You are welcome to describe other activities in your “process experience,” as long as you are mindful of word count and page limits.

In describing the institution’s determination of accomplishments and areas for growth/improvement, include indicators and data (quantitative and qualitative) used to scaffold these determinations. Explain not only how these processes helped the institution prepare its materials for award entry submission, but also if/how they helped the institution in thinking more broadly about its economic engagement efforts, and in particular how economic engagement affects the core learning, discovery, and engagement missions of the institution.

- **The Economic Engagement Enterprise.** In this section, describe the breadth of activities undertaken by your institution related to economic engagement. Provide whatever working definition the institution uses for economic engagement, and explain the extent to which there is a shared vision for and definition of economic engagement among both internal and external stakeholders. Identify how the university’s internal structure supports economic engagement efforts (coordinating office? cross-campus committee or task force? advisory boards?). Explain the extent to which the university’s definition of economic engagement is consistent with current ideas about the purposes and practices of university engagement (i.e. Carnegie Engagement Classification; Kellogg Commission definitions of engagement). Summarize the institution’s current understanding of its strengths and challenges with regard to economic engagement, and describe if/how this process has helped with this understanding.
- **Economic Engagement Planning.** Describe how, moving forward, the institution will both build on its accomplishments and strengths, and also address areas for growth and improvement. Refer

to your Growth and Improvement Plan for details on the latter. Explain how economic engagement plans are and/or will be reflected in university-wide strategic plans, academic program planning, research agenda development, and outreach strategy creation. Note briefly how the institution insures that resources are available for the economic engagement enterprise (specifics are not necessary in this section—just overall evidence that the university is committed to advancing this work by allocating appropriate resources. However, try to be as specific and thorough as possible in the “Summary of Accomplishments” table and the “Growth/Improvement Plan” table, to demonstrate that careful consideration has been given to the resources question).

- **Promotion and Communication.** Describe the target audiences the university has identified for strategic communications about economic engagement—those to whom the university needs to promote these efforts, and those with whom the institution needs to design goals. Summarize the university’s communication strategies for reaching stakeholders. Provide examples of the ways in which the institution is currently telling the economic engagement story to internal and external stakeholders.
- **Advancing University Economic Engagement.** Describe the ways in which the institution has taken on or is moving toward a leadership role in economic engagement. Detail the ways in which members of the university community engage with peers at other institutions around these issues, including the extent to which the institution has been a contributing member to the CICEP and Innovation and Economic Prosperity Designation and Awards Program communities. Explain the ways in which the university’s experiences in economic engagement represent adoptable best practices, and the work that the university does to disseminate these practices.

Designation Submission

Summary of Accomplishments

Please describe three areas of accomplishment identified via the self-study process. Your description for each can be about 500 words. Your summary of accomplishments should be a total of about 1500 to (no more than) 2000 words, NOT including the summary table as described below.

In developing these descriptions, please consider the following questions but note that you will not likely have room to answer all of these questions in your 500-word description. These are simply suggested questions for consideration.

Further, note that some of these questions are addressed in the summary table, and since there is no word-count limit for the summary table, you will be able to address these questions on the table. We have indicated which questions are addressed by columns in the table.

You may include links to additional information online. Additionally, you may include appendices that expand on your summary of accomplishments. Your submission may not include a total of more than five pages of appendices, however, and note that reviewers will not be required to read material at web links or in appendices.

Questions for consideration:

- What are the main institutional strengths or desirable outcomes your accomplishments reveal?
- What method did you use to identify each area of accomplishment? How did the assessment tools or metrics help? What else led you to identify these?
- Do all levels of the institution recognize these as areas of accomplishment?
- What metrics or other evidence support your assertions that these are areas of accomplishment?
- In what ways are the areas of accomplishment replicable? What lessons can be learned for improving activities in other areas of your institution's economic engagement enterprise? How could other institutions learn from these areas of accomplishment?
- Describe the top three success factors that supported accomplishments in these areas. What are the most important (types of) resources that helped you achieve success? (This question is addressed by the "Resources" column on the summary table.)
- Is each accomplishment in the area of talent development (education, workforce)? Innovation (translational research, applied activity, commercialization, tech transfer, entrepreneurship)? Place development (social, cultural, community development)? Or does it integrate activities across two or more of these categories? (This question is addressed by the "Talent, Innovation, Place, or Connections" column on the summary table.)

In addition to your description, provide a summary of your accomplishments using the following template. You may modify the "Timeline," "Resources Required," and/or "Indicator/Measure of Success" column headings as appropriate for your institution and in a way that will help you, during subsequent years as you work to build on your accomplishments, to take advantage of the thinking that you put into development of this summary.

Area of Accomplishment	Related Activities, Programs, or Initiatives	Talent, Innovation, Place, or Connections	Timeline	Resources	Indicator/Measure of Success
Area of Accomplishment 1	Activity 1.1	Is each accomplishment in the area of talent development (education, workforce)? Innovation (translational research, applied activity, commercialization, tech transfer)? Place development (social, cultural, community development)? Or does it integrate and make connections across activities in two or more of these categories?	What kind of time horizon did the accomplishment happen over? Was it a short-term effort? Or did it build over many years?	What resources— money, people, facilities, etc.— were required to achieve success?	What evidence or measures did you use to determine that this is an area of accomplishment in your institution’s economic engagement enterprise?
	Activity 1.2				
	Etc.—as many as needed				
Area of Accomplishment 2	Activity 2.1				
	Activity 2.2				
	Etc.—as many as needed				
Area of Accomplishment 3	Activity 3.1				
	Activity 3.2				
	Etc.—as many as needed				

Designation Submission

Growth/Improvement Plan

Please describe three areas of improvement identified via the self-study process. Your description for each should be about 500 words. Your growth/improvement plan should be a total of about 1500 to (no more than) 2000 words, NOT including the summary table as described below.

In developing these descriptions, please consider the following questions, but note that you will not likely have room to answer all of these questions in your 500-word description. These are simply suggested questions for consideration.

Further, note that some of these questions are addressed in the summary table, and since there is no word-count limit for the summary table, you will be able to address these questions on the table. We have indicated which questions are addressed by columns in the table.

You may include links to additional information online. Additionally, you may include appendices that expand on your growth/improvement plan. Your submission may not include a total of more than five pages of appendices, however, and note that reviewers will not be required to read material at web links or in appendices.

Questions for consideration:

- What are the main problems or undesirable outcomes these challenges reveal?
- What method did you use to identify each area for growth and improvement? How did the assessment tools or metrics help? What else led you to identify these?
- Do all levels of the institution recognize the need for improvement in these areas?
- What metrics support your assertions and/or desired outcomes?
- What would it look like if this improvement plan proves successful? (ie., how would you know in the future if you have successfully addressed these growth areas?) (This question is addressed by the “Indicator/Measure of Success” column on the summary table.)
- Describe the top three barriers to a successful improvement plan implementation? What are the most important (types of) resources that would need to be deployed to address these? (This question is addressed by the “Resources” column on the summary table.)

In addition to your description, provide a summary of your plan using the following template. You may modify the “Timeline,” “Resources Required,” and/or “Indicator/Measure of Success” column headings as appropriate for your institution and in a way that will help you, during subsequent years as you work to implement growth and improvement to take advantage of the thinking that you put into development of this plan.

Growth/Improvement Goal	Related Objectives	Activities	Timeline	Resources	Indicator/Measure of Success
Goal 1 (first area for improvement)	Objective 1.1	What activities will be required to meet objective?	What is the target timeline?	What resources— money, people, facilities, etc.— will be required?	How will you know you have successfully met the objective, and goal?

	Objective 1.2				
	Etc.—as many as needed				
Goal 2 (second area for improvement)	Objective 2.1				
	Objective 2.2				
	Etc.—as many as needed				
Goal 3 (third area for improvement)	Objective 3.1				
	Objective 3.2				
	Etc.—as many as needed				