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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Low level of community engagement*** | ***Mid level of community engagement*** | ***High level of community engagement*** |
| **IDENTIFYING SHARED INTERESTS, POTENTIAL PARTNERS & POSSIBLE PROJECTS**  | * Project is designed primarily by one partner, with little input from the other partner (s).
 | * The project emerges in a context of knowledge of all partners’ interests, needs and abilities.
* Partner involvement may be intermittent, unequal, incomplete or unsatisfactory.
 | * Project emerges in context of mutual interest, needs and abilities.
* Partners are actively involved in all aspects of the collaboration—from identifying participants, to design, implementation, dissemination, and continuation of the project.
 |
| **ESTABLISHING A PLAN THAT FULFILLS COMMUNITY AND UNIVERSITY INTERESTS**  | * One partner addresses the project’s objectives, timetable and mode of communication, but there is little dialogue with the other partner about leadership and work roles, or equitable allocation of time or other resources.
* Issues of trust and responsibility are lacking.
 | * Partners consider the project’s objectives, timetable and mode of communication, but may not have a formal agreement about leadership and work roles, equitable allocation of time and other resources.
* Issues of trust, information flows and responsibility are unclear.
 | * Partners have a clear understanding of the project’s objectives, timetable and mode of communication.
* Partners have determined an equitable allocation of time and resources.
* Partners may have a formal agreement about leadership and work roles.
* Issues of trust, information and responsibility are balanced.
 |
| **FOSTERING RECIPROCITY AND MUTUAL RECOGNITION**  | * Partners have little discussion about how the project’s objectives, implementation process and outcomes fulfill the wishes of either partner.
* Efforts to ensure reciprocity, mutual recognition and reward are non-existent.
 | * Partners intermittently discuss whether the project’s objectives, implementation process and outcomes are meeting the needs of each partner.
* Efforts to ensure reciprocity, mutual recognition and reward are not clearly articulated.
 | * Partners have ongoing in-depth discussions to consider whether the project’s objectives, processes outcomes are meeting the needs of each partner.
* Efforts to ensure reciprocity, mutual recognition and reward are ongoing.
 |
| **ASSESSMENT GUIDES DECISION MAKING ABOUT PROJECTS** | * No assessment process is in place.
 | * Formative and summative assessment process is informal and inconsistent
 | * A formalized formative and summative assessment process exists and guides decisions about current and future project development.
 |
| **LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT****AND DISSEMINATOIN OF OUTCOMES** | .* Partners have no plan to deepen or expand project, except on a one time or short term level.
* No dissemination plans exist
 | * Partners informally discuss next steps for continued engagement. However, one or both partners may not be fully committed to continuing partnership.
* The dissemination process is informal
 | * Partners formally and informally consider ways to improve, initiate changes that will strengthen levels of reciprocity and mutual reward, and actively acknowledge and support the value of the partnership.
* Partners formally disseminate project ooutcomes
 |