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About APLU and its Commission on Economic and Community Engagement

About APLU: Founded in 1887, the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) is North America’s oldest higher education association serving 242 public research and land-grant universities, university systems, and affiliated organizations in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, four U.S. territories, as well as in Canada and Mexico. APLU works with its members and national partners to strengthen and promote the work of public research universities through funded projects, research, policy, and advocacy from its office in Washington, DC.

To advance its work, APLU convenes a diverse array of senior administrators including presidents and chancellors, provosts, VPs for research, governmental affairs leaders, chief communication officers, senior diversity officers, senior international officers, data and business officers, Cooperative Extension directors, deans of agriculture, chief economic and community engagement officers, senior student affairs officers, and others. APLU’s depth of membership is one of a kind and lends itself to many kinds of institutional transformation projects.

About CECE: APLU’s Commission on Economic and Community Engagement (CECE) is convened by APLU’s Office of Economic Development and Community Engagement (OEDCE) which was established to lead and coordinate APLU’s mission pillar of “expanding engagement.” CECE is APLU’s primary member body convening chief economic and community development leaders as well as presidents and chancellors, senior research officers, provosts, public and government relations officers, and other senior administrators who are responsible for planning, executing, or communicating university economic and community engagement.
Overview of the IEP Universities Program: The Designation and the Awards

Institutions participating in IEP complete the process through a national cohort model, exchanging best practices and addressing shared challenges with peers across the nation, current IEP designees, program reviewers, and APLU staff. Pictured: The 2020 IEP Startup Workshop hosted by Wichita State University.

APLU’s Innovation and Economic Prosperity (IEP) designation program was established by APLU in 2012 as, both, a collaborative institutional strategic planning and transformation program and distinguished recognition.

By earning the IEP designation, any institutions of higher education can better know, measure, tell, and maximize its contributions to “economic engagement” which is defined as the ways in which universities and their public-private partners contribute to economic growth, opportunity, and competitiveness through:

- **Talent** and workforce development
- **Innovation**, entrepreneurship, and tech-based economic development; and
- **Place stewardship** via public service, Cooperative Extension, outreach, and community engagement.

Most importantly, institutions complete the IEP process through a national cohort model leading to the cultivation of a vibrant community of practice.
Is this program right for my institution?
The IEP program is open to any higher education institution including flagship research universities, regional comprehensive institutions, and even two-year institutions located in the United States or around the world. APLU members may participate in the program at no cost. Non-APLU members must participate through the University Economic Development Association and submit a participation fee.

The program emphasizes the qualitative, self-study process and the value it brings to institutional strategic planning and action. Typically, participating institutions have determined that the IEP designation is for them if their objectives for participation are aligned with the following goals:

- My institution is interested in better knowing, measuring, and telling the story of our holistic economic engagement impact
- My institution wants to engage a diverse breadth of on-campus stakeholders (including staff, faculty, students, trustees, and others) and off-campus stakeholders (including industry, government, alumni, community leaders, and others) to deepen relationships while identifying our institutional strengths and areas of growth and improvement in economic and community engagement
- My institution is interested in breaking down silos and better organizing economic engagement activities, metrics, and communication structures
- My institution is interested in participating in a national community of practice to complete the designation process and maximize the impact of our economic contributions.
- My institution is interested in garnering international visibility for our exemplary commitment to economic engagement
- My institution’s economic engagement leaders are seeking an opportunity to advance our enterprise while benefiting from professional development and networking

In order to participate in the IEP Universities program, institutional leaders should contact the IEP Program Director to discuss the institution’s goals for participation (see below).
The IEP Designation vs IEP Awards

The **IEP University Designation** recognizes higher education institutions that have demonstrated a substantial, sustainable, and institution-wide **commitment** to economic engagement. The designation does not compare institutions across benchmarks, nor is it a competitive program in that participating institutions do not compete for a limited number of designee spots every year. Institutions are compared qualitatively to assess the depth and significance of the commitment to and strategy for holistic economic engagement.

IEP Designees complete an intensive, introspective, and earnest process of institutional self-study and engagement with internal and external stakeholders to identify the strengths of the university’s economic engagement enterprise and areas for growth and improvement—all while sharing and learning from peers and experts across North America. The process of earning the designation is an opportunity to strengthen stakeholder engagement, strengthen indicators of success, inventory work in economic engagement, identify strengths and, more importantly, areas of growth and improvement.

Designees are recognized during the CECE Summer Meeting and APLU’s Annual Meeting, one of the world’s largest convenings of university presidents, provosts, vice-presidents and other senior decision-makers. Designees receive a commemorative plaque, along with a certificate signed by APLU’s president and CECE’s chair. The institution’s two IEP Campus Contacts (see below) are also recognized individually upon achieving the designation.

The IEP designation seal is given to be used in the institution’s print materials, websites, and advocacy efforts to promote the institution’s contributions and commitment to economic and community development. Designees also receive a communications toolkit, recognition on the APLU website and via APLU’s public and governmental affairs channels, and they enter an ongoing community of practice of designees. While each institution pursues the designation for its own particular reasons. For many institutions, earning the IEP designation is the beginning—not the end—of engagement.
The IEP University Awards can only be won by IEP designees. Once an institution earns the IEP University designation, they are then eligible to compete for IEP University Awards. Whereas the designation recognizes overall commitment to economic engagement, IEP awards recognizes particular case studies of success. Each year at the APLU Annual Meeting, institutions win awards recognizing exemplary work in three categories of economic engagement in addition to a top-prize Connections Award. (See separate award application guidelines on APLU website – linked above).

University Systems Policy

The primary value of the IEP designation is the self-assessment process that leverages relationship building and stakeholder engagement across the institution. As such, university systems are not permitted to apply for designation since the internal relationships within the institution and external relationships with outside communities and partners are significantly more difficult to measure and strengthen when working across multiple institutions within a university system.

However, university systems interested in supporting and encouraging participation of their member campuses in the IEP universities program are encouraged to do so. Institutions (both APLU members and non-members) may participate in IEP simultaneously to maximize the impact of the self-study process and subsequent follow-on work.

Initiating participation

A new cohort of institutions seeking the IEP Designation – referred to as the “startup cohort” – is launched every December. In order for an institution to formally begin its pursuit of the IEP designation, an institution must follow the following steps:

1. Review designation guidelines (this document), the IEP impact page, and determine goals for participation
2. Contact the IEP Program Director to set up a call to your institution’s interests and objectives for participation, address questions, and to obtain the letter of intent template
3. Identify two administrators to serve as IEP Campus Contacts who will co-lead your IEP campus team (see below)
4. Using the intent letter template provided, presidents and chancellors submit letter of intent to APLU President Peter McPherson by the last business day in October
5. **Recommended:** Attend IEP-related sessions at APLU Annual Meeting
6. **Recommended:** Plan to attend the following year’s CECE Summer Meeting where the annual IEP Universities Workshop takes place
7. Cohort formally launches in December

Once an institution has joined the startup cohort, the institution has 3 years to successfully earn the IEP University designation from entering the startup-cohort. E.g. 2019 IEP startup cohort members must earn the designation before or during the August 2022 submission cycle.

Participation Timeline and Considerations

- Institutions entering the startup cohort may submit an application for “comment” or “decision” as soon as the first Friday in February after joining the cohort (see below). E.g. If a letter of
intent is submitted in Fall 2018, an institution may submit an application as soon as February 2019.

- Once an institution has joined the startup cohort, they must submit an application, either for comment only or for decision, by the second August submission deadline. E.g. 2019 startup cohort members must submit an application by the first Friday of August 2021. This policy is put in place to help institutions remain on track to earn the designation.
- The institution may submit an application up to three times over their 3-year period for either for comment or for decision.
- 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 by submitting a second presidential letter of intent, but must wait a year until re-entering the startup cohort. This policy is in place to encourage institution to take seriously their pursuit of the IEP university designation.

Identifying your institution’s IEP Campus Contacts

Institutions must always maintain two presidentially-appointed contact contacts for the IEP Universities program. There may not be more than two IEP Campus Contacts. These individuals are responsible for co-leading all aspects of the IEP process on behalf of the institution and receive all communications relating to the IEP Universities program. APLU will not send communications to anyone other than those listed on file. It is incumbent on IEP Campus Contacts to transmit pertinent information to campus team members.

IEP contacts should be able to engage in the program at an operational-level on a regular basis including co-developing the application, participating in the monthly IEP startup cohort calls and attending the CECE Summer Meeting. IEP Campus contacts lead the IEP campus team. Team members and contacts are identified in the institution’s presidential letter of intent to pursue the IEP University designation. All contacts may be modified to reflect staff transition or other changes on campus. Please review the IEP Campus Contacts FAQs here.

Designation Submission Deadlines

There are three application submission deadlines per year. Applications may be submitted by 11:59 p.m. (submitter's local time) on the first Friday of the following months: February, May, and August.

Institutions typically use the reviewer rubric and guidelines included in this document to develop their application in Microsoft Word or Google Docs and then complete the Microsoft Word/PDF application form when submission deadlines are upcoming. A reminder of application deadlines will be sent to startup cohort members 2 weeks prior to each deadline. Applications must be submitted via the provided form. Once a designation application has been assessed by a panel of expert reviewers, institutions will receive reviewer comments and a decision (if submitting for decision—see below) within nine weeks of the application deadline.
Applying for “Comment” versus applying “For Decision”

Upon submitting your application, 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. Points to consider when submitting for comment only versus for decision:

- **A complete application must be submitted by the deadline**, 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 regardless of whether you receive a designate now or needs improvement decision. If you receive a needs improvement decision, you may re-submit at the second submission deadline following your first submission deadline (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 section above.)

Once Designated as an IEP Designee

Once an institution earns the designation, they’re then eligible to apply for IEP awards which recognizes particular projects and program case studies in the areas of talent, innovation, place, and connections.
In addition, their IEP campus contacts are invited to join a community of practice and invitation-only CECE Learning Exchange discussion groups which serve as a platform for exchanging economic engagement practices, resources, opportunities and identifying solutions to shared challenges with peers across North America. The Learning Exchange may feature in-person and virtual learning opportunities. Designated institutions are also often called upon to participate in special opportunities and events including national and international speaking engagements, tours of federal agencies/national organizations and other initiatives undertaken by APLU and partner organizations to advance and elevate the profile university economic engagement.

At the 5-year mark, each institution completes a brief 5-year interim reporting exercise which serves as a check-point, an opportunity for APLU to affirm the institution’s commitment to economic engagement and identify institutions in need of assistance. It also serves as a vehicle for institutions to reflect on the past five years, what has been accomplished since earning the designation and what areas need growth and improvement.

At the 10-year mark, a designation re-renewal process takes place.

IEP University Designees are internationally recognized for their exemplary work in economic engagement. Designees and award winners are recognized during each APLU Annual Meeting – one of the largest gatherings of university leaders in the world.

Your institution’s IEP Self-Study and Leveraging APLU Resources

**Design your Self-Study Plan:** In order to prepare your institution’s application for the IEP designation, you will undertake an institutional self-study effort of your campus economic engagement enterprise. 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 substantive 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 APLU’s Economic Engagement Framework:**
1. The publication *Higher Education Engagement in Economic Development: Foundations for Strategy and Practice* provides an overview of the CECE concept of university economic engagement through “Talent, Innovation, and Place.” Review of this publication will be a helpful start for your IEP participation.

2. Virtually all institutions that have participated in the IEP 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.

3. A number of IEP 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 innovative ways to measure and communicate the university’s contributions to the economy.

4. The *Economic Impact Guidelines* publication is helpful if your institution will be conducting an institutional economic impact analysis study during or soon after your IEP participation, you will likely find this publication helpful as you design your self-study.

5. 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, and 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

4) Institutions must **engage** with external stakeholders throughout the processes of knowing, measuring, and telling in order for their contributions to have meaningful impact (use this section to consider how you will “activate” your institutional growth and improvement plan once you achieve the designation)
Beyond the Economic Engagement Framework series, APLU provides several resources to IEP startup institutions applying for the designation:

- **Monthly Web Workshops**: APLU organizes regular web workshops with IEP Campus Contacts to cultivate a community of practice. During the web workshops, participants can share and learn with each other, current IEP designees, IEP reviewers, and the IEP Program Director.

- **Technical assistance**: APLU staff serve as “guides on the side” to help coach and mentor campuses participating in the program. Staff specialize in helping campuses maximize the most value out of the IEP process.

- **IEP Application Database**: In spirit of learning and sharing, many current designees have made available their successful IEP application for the benefit of peers and colleagues on other campuses.

- **CECE Summer Meeting & IEP Universities Workshop**: APLU hosts the annual IEP Universities Workshop in conjunction with its CECE Summer Meeting. The workshop is an excellent opportunity for startup campuses to engage with current designees, each other and APLU staff while discussing promising practices, shared challenges and opportunities, how best to leverage the IEP process and designation to advance economic engagement, and more. The Summer Meeting has become a not-to-miss professional meeting of senior university economic and community engagement leaders.

- **APLU Annual Meeting**: APLU’s Annual Meeting is one of the world’s largest and most premier convenings of university presidents, provosts, vice-presidents, and other higher
education leaders in the world. Each Annual Meeting, APLU and CECE formally recognize each class of IEP University designees and IEP Award winners. CECE also organizes economic engagement-specific programming throughout the Annual Meeting.

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

As noted above, most IEP Universities have used the Assessment Tools document shared above 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 and external stakeholders 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.

Application Review Criteria

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 assess designation for applicants. Criteria for reviewing entries will address the eight sections/subsections 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 Economic Engagement

2. Summary of Accomplishments

3. Growth/Improvement Plan

1. Process and Economic Engagement Narrative
1a. 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 clear areas of strength and needing improvement across 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 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)?

1b. Self-Study Process Experience: Next, the application presents the institution’s experience with the economic engagement self-study. Guiding questions:

- Does the institution make effective use of APLU 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 determine its areas of strength in economic engagement as well as areas for growth and improvement?

1c. The Economic Engagement Enterprise: This section addresses an institution’s self-awareness about and the institutionalization of its campus economic engagement enterprise holistically across talent, innovation, and place. Guiding questions:

- Is the institution working with members of its community (including internal and external stakeholders) toward a shared vision for and definition of the institution’s economic engagement?
- How well does the institution understand both its strengths and the challenges it faces regarding economic engagement?
- Is the institution’s definition of economic engagement consistent with current ideas about the purposes and practices of university engagement (e.g. Higher Education Engagement in Economic Development: Foundations for Strategy and Practice, Carnegie Engagement classification; Kellogg Commission definitions of engagement)?

1d. Economic Engagement Planning: This section addresses the university’s ability to transform its self-awareness into action planning by proactively and prospectively thinking about how to best direct time and resources to support economic engagement moving forward. Guiding questions:

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

1e. Promotion and Communication: This section encourages the institution to do a good job of making its economic engagement efforts and plans meaningful to internal and external stakeholders by actively sharing how economic engagement advances shared objectives. Guiding questions:

• Has the institution demonstrated efforts to identify the internal and external stakeholders are to whom the university needs to communicate 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?

1f. Advancing 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 efforts and processes represent adoptable best practices?
• Is there evidence that the institution has contributed to a broader community of practice, through APLU’s CECE 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?

**Application Evaluation Rubric**

A review panel comprised of at least three experts will assess and comment on each submission. Reviewers will use the assessment rubric included here to evaluate each submission. Note that this rubric is new as of 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.

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

**Reviewer Rubric for Section 1: Process and Economic Engagement Narrative**

**Section 1a: Introduction**

*(NOTE: Reviewers 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) deploy and analyze the CECE tools, or locally-designed mechanisms for data collection; 2) engage stakeholders; 3) determine/identify the institution’s accomplishments and areas for growth/improvement; and 4) develop summary of accomplishments and the growth/improvement plan. Your process may have included something other than the CECE Assessment Tools and/or the CECE 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 designation application, 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 CECE 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; APLU-UEDA Foundations definition of university economic 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, APLU-UEDA 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.”

- APLU-UEDA Foundations: “In higher education, economic development means proactive institutional engagement, with partners and stakeholders, in sustainable growth of the competitive capacities that contribute to the advancement of society through the realization of individual, firm, community, and regional-to global economic and social potential.”

- 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 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 within APLU’s CECE, the IEP Universities startup community, or other groups. 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 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 CECE and/or with other participants in this designation 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):

Reviewer Rubric for Section 2: Summary of Accomplishments
Applying 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):

Reviewer Rubric for 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? (i.e., 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):

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 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. You may include links to additional information located 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) deploy and analyze the CECE Assessment Tools OR CECE New Metrics; 2) engage stakeholders; 3) determine/identify the institution’s accomplishments and areas for growth/improvement; and 4) develop summary of accomplishments and the growth/improvement plan. Your process may have included something other than the CECE Assessment Tools and/or the CECE 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 designation 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 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 CECE or the IEP startup cohort. 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.

**Guidelines for Section 2: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Accomplishment</th>
<th>Related Activities, Programs, or Initiatives</th>
<th>Talent, Innovation, Place, or Connections</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Accomplishment 1</td>
<td>Activity 1.1</td>
<td>Is each accomplishment in the area of talent</td>
<td>What kind of time horizon did the</td>
<td>What resources—money, people,</td>
<td>What evidence or measures did you use to determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Accomplishment 2</td>
<td>Activity 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.—as many as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Accomplishment 3</th>
<th>Activity 3.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etc.—as many as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidelines for Section 3: 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? (i.e., 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth/Improvement Goal</th>
<th>Related Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1 (first area for improvement)</td>
<td>Objective 1.1</td>
<td>What activities will be required to meet objective?</td>
<td>What is the target timeline?</td>
<td>What resources—money, people, facilities, etc.—will be required?</td>
<td>How will you know you have successfully met the objective, and goal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.—as many as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2 (second area for improvement)</td>
<td>Objective 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.—as many as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3 (third area for improvement)</td>
<td>Objective 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.—as many as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>