

Evaluating and Documenting Impact For Extension/Engaged Scholarship

Scholarship and creative activity are understood on many campuses to be intellectual work whose significance is communicated to and validated by peers. Such work in its diverse forms is based on a high level of professional expertise; must give evidence of originality; must be documented and validated as through peer review or critique; and must be communicated in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself.

Evaluating Scholarship

A set of core standards for evaluating all forms of scholarship has been offered by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) which include clear realistic goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methodology, results, communication to colleagues and others beyond the campus, and reflective critique. The standards have the following characteristics:

- Set clear, realistic goals and measurable objectives.
- Keep abreast of the issues and determine appropriate and adequate resources for the project.
- Choose appropriate methodology for your project’s goals. Read about the work of others in addressing the issue or problem of interest.
- Document results. Scholarship should be judged by its results. The project should be meeting its goals and contributing to the field or opening up other areas for further expansion.
- Communicate the results of your project with your peers and other practitioners.
- Engage in reflective critique. Think about your work and learn from the process. Ask what went wrong and right as a means of improving the scholarship.

Documenting Impact For Extension/Engaged Scholarship

This tool can be used as a checklist when teams are planning Extension engagement activities.

Assessment Questions	Who will document?	How will this be determined or captured?
To what extent were the project goals and objectives met?		
Did the products or deliverables meet the planning expectations?		
Were intended, unintended, and potential impacts documented and interpreted?		
Was there mutual satisfaction from the project? (agent, faculty, others)		
Were stakeholders satisfied? Did they value the results and apply the knowledge?		
Do impacts have commercial, societal, or academic/professional value? (or lead to scientific advances in the discipline)		
How effectively are the products or results reaching the intended audience?		

To what extent did the project build capacity for individuals, institutions, or social infrastructure?		
To what extent did the project develop mechanisms for sustainability?		
How does the project lead to innovations in curriculum and inform other dimensions of the university mission?		
How did the project increase cross-disciplinary collaborations within the university or with other institutions?		
To what extent did the project leverage additional resources for any partners?		
Describe any peer and citation recognition of the work or how results of your project was communicated with peers and other practitioners.		
Does the project offer new opportunities for student learning or professional staff development?		
How does the project assist the agent's and/or faculty member's progress in developing outreach potential and in using that potential to improve the institution's operations and visibility?		

From Michigan State University (1996). Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning & evaluating quality outreach. Adapted with permission.