



THE CORELLA & BERTRAM F.
BONNER FOUNDATION

Professional Development for Community-Engaged Learning and Scholarship
Workshops for a Cohort of Faculty, Student Leaders, and Co-Educators
Workshop #2b: **Community-Engaged Scholarship**

Overview

This session includes review of sample faculty dossier, which provides an effective way to understand and evaluate community-engaged scholarship for promotion and tenure. Participants read work in small groups to review a sample faculty dossier based on eight characteristics of community-engaged scholarship. The session is designed to support your faculty (and other scholars) to think about how they might best capture their work for professional advancement and scholarship achievement.

In this facilitator's guide, you will find:

- I. Session Introduction and Outline
- II. Materials Needed (Articles, Handouts, etc.)
- III. Suggested Facilitator's Guide
- IV. Additional Resources
- V. Credits and Citations

Please note that this session is designed to use participatory practices which support the creation and growth of learning communities. Use of AV and technology are minimal or optional. You may download related slides, but all handouts can also be presented without this equipment.

Session Introduction and Outline

This session is intended to be used in conjunction with guiding a cohort of faculty who are involved in building community engaged teaching and learning into their coursework. The session will begin with a discussion of Ernest Boyer's four functions of scholarship, and whether and how those functions are reflected in respective institution's promotion and tenure guidelines. This will be followed by reviewing eight characteristics of community-engaged scholarship and a sample faculty dossier to develop a better understanding of institutional culture regarding community-engaged scholarship, and ways of presenting one's work to promotion and tenure committee. Please review and modify sections to fit your institutional context and participant knowledge base.

Suggested Agenda (60 minutes):

- I. Understanding Community-Engaged Scholarship, Using Ernest Boyer's Model
- II. Review of Sample Faculty Dossier
- III. Evaluation & Discussion of Faculty Dossier
- IV. Next Steps & Meeting Announcement

Materials Needed

Print and have copies of the following handouts, or alternatively share these documents electronically with participants before the session. These are intended as resources to build understanding by participating faculty (and others), but reading them is not necessary for preparation for this session.

Materials Needed for Part 2 (Workshop 2b)

- Sample Faculty Dossier: Peer Review Workgroup of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative (2007). Jordan C (Editor). Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion & Tenure Package. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.
- Handouts (Included in this document)

Suggested Facilitator’s Guide

I. Understanding Community-Engaged Scholarship, using Boyer’s Model (suggested time 10-15 minutes)

Start the session with some highlights from participants’ survey responses from previous session about community-based research (CBR), and add that this session will be focused on the third area of CBR – community-engaged scholarship. You could start the session by asking something like, “How is scholarship defined in your departments? What is valued as ‘Scholarship?’”

If you think it would be useful for faculty to review their respective department’s promotion and tenure guidelines, either ask them to read those guidelines in advance or to bring them to the session for group discussion. Clarify that the purpose of the whole exercise is to acknowledge where they (as department) stand in terms of their understanding of scholarship and what they consider “worth rewarding.”

Then, distribute “Handout 1: Ernest Boyer’s ‘Scholarship Re-considered’ ” (See the table below) and ask participants to share what are some of the “measures of performance” explained in the table that are considered or not considered for faculty portfolio evaluation in their departments, and why.

Type of Scholarship	Purpose	Measures of Performance
Discovery	Build new knowledge through traditional research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publishing in peer-reviewed forums • Producing and/or performing creative work within established field • Creating infrastructure for future studies
Integration	Interpret the use of knowledge across disciplines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing a comprehensive literature review • Writing a textbook for use in multiple disciplines • Collaborating with colleagues to design and deliver a core course
Application	Aid society and professions in addressing problems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving industry or government as an external consultant • Assuming leadership roles in professional organizations • Advising student leaders, thereby fostering their professional growth
Teaching	Study teaching models and practices to achieve optimal learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advancing learning theory through classroom research • Developing and testing instructional materials • Mentoring graduate students • Designing and implementing a program-level assessment system

II. Review of Sample Faculty Dossier (suggested time 30 minutes)

Distribute handout 2 on the eight characteristics of community-engaged scholarship (CES) as explained by the Peer Review Workgroup of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative at Community-Campus Partnership for Health (CCPH). Explain that the group will be using that handout as a framework to examine dossier of (Ann Brooks, PhD) (or insert another name), A Fictitious Community-Engaged Scholar. The faculty member's dossier is available in "Peer Review Workgroup of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative (2007) Jordan C (Editor). Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion & Tenure Package. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH)"

Distribute Handout 3 and pages 26-35 of the CCPH article, which includes the dossier of Ann Brooks.

Ann Brooks demonstrates her specific contributions to each of the eight areas of community-engaged scholarship in handout 3. Divide the group in eight, and explain that each group will focus on one characteristic/criteria from the eight described, and review specific sections of pages 26-35 of the CCPH article to analyze the faculty member's dossier.

Give each group about 20 minutes to review the criteria assigned to them, and make notes, and spend last 5 minutes for group discussion. This would help the group to review materials in that category as well as focus on specific examples given by Ann Brooks.

Each group will discuss whether the candidate – Anne Brooks needs to provide more evidence, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for that criteria (characteristic). Now, distribute the second handout,

III. Evaluation & Discussion of Faculty Dossier (suggested time 10-15 minutes)

Ask each group to share their evaluation for respective criteria.

Note: Pages 36 – 41 of the CCPH tenure package includes "answer key" / analysis of each criteria by the CCPH group. You could either distribute copies of respective "answer keys" to each group or highlight key observations of CCPH group during the discussion, when other groups offer their evaluation.

If time permits, faculty could look at current P&T policies at their institution to see if and how community-engaged scholarship is defined.

IV. Next Steps and Meeting (suggested time 3-5 minutes)

Wrap this session with some open reflection (i.e., what did people think, *what's the scope of integrating CES in their institution's P&T guidelines, what could be the next steps etc.*). If you have elected to save some concepts for discussion in a future meeting, reiterate what participants should do next. Remind people when the cohort is meeting next and what will be happening.

You may want to be prepared to discuss policies at your institution, dynamics within departments, rank, and other issues. If your institution is working on addressing these issues, this may be an opportunity to lay out next steps with the process.

Credits and Citations (APA):

This workshop and the series of Professional Development for Community-Engaged Learning and Scholarship has been developed by Rachayita Shah, Community-Engagement Scholarship Director, and

Ariane Hoy, Vice President, and the Bonner Foundation staff team for use by colleges and universities. It integrates scholarship including:

- Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., and Seifer, S. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine*, 80(4), 317-321. Calleson et al 2005 - Community-Engaged Scholarship.pdf
- Gelmon, S., Blanchard, L., Ryan, K., & Seifer, S. D. (2012). Building capacity for community-engaged scholarship: Evaluation of the faculty development component of the faculty for the engaged campus initiative. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 21-45. Gelmon et al 2012 Building Capacity for Community-Engaged Scholarship.pdf
- Hoyt, L. (2012). Sustained city-campus engagement: Developing an epistemology for our time. In Saltmarsh, J & Hartley, M. (Eds). *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*, (265-288). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Stoecker, R. (2009). Are we talking the walk of community-based research? *Action Research*, 7(4), 385-404. Stoecker 2009 Are we talking the walk of CBR.pdf
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., Donohue, P. (2003). *Principles and practices: Community-based learning and higher education*. Stanford, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Handout 1: Ernest Boyer's Types of Scholarship
(Drawing on Ideas articulated in *Scholarship Reconsidered*)

Type of Scholarship	Purpose	Measures of Performance
Discovery	Build new knowledge through traditional research	<p>Publishing in peer-reviewed forums</p> <p>Producing and/or performing creative work within established field</p> <p>Creating infrastructure for future studies</p>
Integration	Interpret the use of knowledge across disciplines	<p>Preparing a comprehensive literature review</p> <p>Writing a textbook for use in multiple disciplines</p> <p>Collaborating with colleagues to design and deliver a core course</p>
Application	Aid society and professions in addressing problems	<p>Serving industry or government as an external consultant</p> <p>Assuming leadership roles in professional organizations</p> <p>Advising student leaders, thereby fostering their professional growth</p>
Teaching	Study teaching models and practices to achieve optimal learning	<p>Advancing learning theory through classroom research</p> <p>Developing and testing instructional materials</p> <p>Mentoring graduate students</p> <p>Designing and implementing a program-level assessment system</p>

Source: http://www.facultyguidebook.com/test/2_5_1.htm

Handout 2: Eight Characteristics of Community-Engaged Scholarship

The following 8 characteristics are intended as the basis for the evaluation of the quality and significance of Community-Engaged Scholarship (CES):

1. Clear Academic and Community Change Goals

A scholar should clearly define objectives of scholarly work and clearly state basic questions of inquiry. Clarity of purpose provides a critical context for evaluating scholarly work.

Evidence of clear goals includes:

- Clearly stating the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good
- Defining goals and objectives that are realistic and achievable
- Identifying intellectual and significant questions in the discipline and in the community
- Articulating one's program of research and objectives
- Articulating one's goals for teaching and student learning

2. Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community

A scholar must be well-prepared and knowledgeable about developments in his or her field. The ability to educate others and conduct meaningful work depends upon mastering existing knowledge.

Evidence of adequate preparation and grounding in the community includes:

- Investing time and effort in developing community partnerships
- Participating in training and professional development that builds skills and competencies in CES or specific models such as service learning, community-based participatory research, respective field
- Demonstrating an understanding of relevant existing scholarship

3. Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement

Meaningful scholarly work must always be conducted with appropriate rigor. In the case of research, rigor facilitates valid research design, data collection, as well as interpretation and reporting of results, so that valid conclusions can be drawn from the findings. In the case of teaching, rigor ensures that teaching methods and curriculum are grounded in practices known to produce student learning outcomes and in appropriate theoretical frames and research-based evidence. In many instances the engagement of communities can enhance rigor and facilitate the study of issues and research questions that would not be as effectively studied apart from such communities (for example, research related to health disparities). Community engagement can also enhance the rigor of teaching and facilitate understanding of environmental, sociological, and political contexts of issues or theories treated in the classroom. Therefore, it is imperative for community-engaged scholars to provide evidence to demonstrate that rigor is maintained, or even enhanced, through community engaged approaches.

Evidence of scientific rigor and community engagement includes:

- Enhancing curriculum by incorporating updated and real-world information from community members critical to student learning of course material
- Deepening and contextualizing the learning experience in a course by involving community experts in design and implementation
- Leveraging funds for course development or a research project as a result of community involvement
- Revising curriculum and community placement with community partner based on student feedback and community partner observation
- Refining a research question, or confirming its validity, through co-generation with community partner
- Involving the community in grant management, fiscal control and accountability to increase community support for the success of the work
- Involving the community to improve study design – including: improving or reinforcing the conceptual framework; creating better understanding and characterization of study variables; and improving acceptability to the community, ultimately resulting in increased study validity
- Using community member input to enhance plans for recruitment and retention of study participants
- Utilizing community member feedback to improve the design of measurement instruments and/or collection of data
- Involving community members in interpretation of data allowing deeper understanding of the study's findings
- Developing policy recommendations and application or intervention ideas based on study's findings through brainstorming with community partners
- Disseminating findings more broadly through partnership with community organizations
- Improving ethical credibility by directly addressing specific issues/concerns with the community
- Reducing potential for faculty presuppositions through learning from community partners

4. Significant Results: Impact on the Field and the Community

Scholars should evaluate whether or not they achieve their goals and whether or not this achievement had an important impact on and is used by others. A primary goal of community-engaged scholarship is to beneficially impact the communities in which such scholarship is conducted. The assessment of CES impact must go beyond just the reporting of positive, neutral, or negative outcomes of any given project. The scholar should explicitly state what knowledge they created or applied and what impact it has had or may likely have in the future. It is important to note here that “significant results” is intended to be broadly defined and not only “statistically significant results.”

Evidence of significant results/impact includes:

- The community contributing to as well as benefiting from the research or learning project
- Making progress towards social equity

- Securing increased funding to continue, expand or replicate the initial project or course
- Securing increased funding for community partners
- Increasing capacity of individuals in the community and community organizations to advocate for themselves
- Enhancing the ability of trainees or students to assume positions of leadership and community engagement
- Utilizing the work to add consequentially to the discipline and to the community
- Opening up additional areas for further exploration and collaboration through the work
- Utilizing the work to make a contribution consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time
- Disseminating geographically limited work with clear discussion as to its generalizability to other populations or as a model that can be further investigated in other settings

5. Effective Presentation/Dissemination to Academic and Community Audiences

Central to scholarly pursuits is the effective presentation and dissemination of results. Scholars should possess effective oral and written communication skills that enable them to convert knowledge into language that a public audience can understand. Scholars should communicate with appropriate audiences and subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review.

Evidence of effective presentation and dissemination includes:

- Publishing research results or teaching innovations in peer-reviewed journals, practitioner journals, professional journals
- Publishing in periodicals or newspapers read by community members
- Disseminating information through other media used by community members, practitioners or policy makers (radio, newsletters, podcasts, etc.)
- Utilizing video, computer or distance programs that reach community
- Producing policy documents directed towards service providers, policy makers or legislators
- Presenting at community events
- Co-authoring any of the above with community partners

6. Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement

Community-engaged scholars should demonstrate an ability to critically reflect on their work, their community partnerships, the issues and challenges that arise and how they are able to address these (for example, issues of power, resources, capacity, racism, etc). Community-engaged scholars should demonstrate an ability to consider such questions as: why did this project succeed or fail to achieve its intended outcomes; what could be done differently in succeeding projects to improve outcomes; is this project an idea that is deserving of further time and effort?

Evidence of reflective critique includes:

- Conducting debriefing sessions with community members

- Seeking evaluations from community members
- Changing project or course design based on feedback and lessons learned
- Engaging in personal reflection concerning, for example, issues of privilege or racism

7. Leadership and Personal Contribution

One of the most consistent criteria for promotion or tenure in the academy is evidence of a national or international reputation. Community-engaged scholars should demonstrate, within their discipline, within the arena of community-engaged scholarship, or both, that their work has earned them a reputation for rigor, impact and the capacity to move the discipline or community change work forward. In addition, community-engaged scholars should demonstrate an ability to serve in leadership roles.

Evidence of leadership and personal contribution includes:

- Receiving invitations to present to professional society meetings, national or international conferences
- Receiving invitations to present to community audiences
- Receiving invitations to testify before legislative bodies
- Receiving invitations to appear in the media
- Receiving invitations to serve on advisory or policy-making committee at national, regional, state and/or community levels
- Receiving invitations to serve on editorial boards
- Directing community-based activities
- Organizing partnerships with community organizations to improve health
- Receiving awards or letters of appreciation from community-based organizations for contributions to community health
- Mentoring students, junior faculty and community partners
- Being asked to be a peer observer of colleague's teaching

8. Consistently Ethical Behavior: Socially Responsible Conduct of Research and Teaching

Consistently ethical behavior links scholarship to personal virtues. This reference suggests that scholarly work must be conducted with honesty, integrity, perseverance and courage. Ethical behavior considers that scholars will foster a respectful relationship with students, community participants, peers, and others who participate in or benefit from their work. Ethical behavior ensures the responsible conduct of research and the respectful engagement of communities and individuals to conduct research and teaching. Ethical behavior must consider cultural or community implications as well as university policies.

Evidence of consistently ethical behavior includes:

- Cultivating the conduct of “good science”, sound research techniques and appropriate engaged pedagogies that result in meaningful and beneficial contributions to communities
- Following the human subject review process and all other policies concerning the responsible conduct of research when conducting research projects, and specifically subjecting work to a

community IRB or a university IRB committee focused on community-based research, if these exist

- Engaging communities in a respectful manner
- Recognizing and valuing community knowledge systems and incorporating them into the research process and courses as appropriate
- Acknowledging that customs and practices vary from one cultural community to the next and therefore should not be assumed when initially engaging a community
- Approaching communities as mutual partners to foster trusting, equitable relationships
- Focusing scholarly work on community assets not deficiencies, allowing community members to take active, meaningful roles in research and courses, not for example, simply serving as research subjects. The goal is to maintain an open, trusting relationship—one that empowers the community and reflects a true partnership
- Appropriately involving community partners in writing and reviewing products of the scholarship before they are published or otherwise disseminated
- Appropriately acknowledging community partners when writing, presenting, etc about the collaborative work

**Handout 3: Table of Accomplishments & CES Characteristics
Example of a Faculty Member's Dossier**

Characteristics	Explanation
Clear Goals	For example, see career goals under the narrative heading Focus of Scholarship and History and project goals stated for Comunidades de la Salud and Promoting the Occupational Health of Indigenous Farm workers in my narrative statement and under Grants in my CV
Adequate preparation	For example, see descriptions of my investment in building community relationships, described under Research in my narrative statement. Also relevant is my WK Kellogg postdoctoral fellowship, which prepared me to undertake partnership work with rural communities and to mentor students in this work. See my book chapters and articles for more details.
Appropriate Methods	Enhancing Rigor through Community Engagement See Promoting the Occupational Health of Indigenous Farmworkers in my narrative statement for how the CBPR model strengthened the research design.
Significant Results	See narrative statement for Comunidades de la Salud findings of improved health and decreased depression as well as increased civic participation. See letters from community partners concerning community empowerment
Effective Presentation / Dissemination	I have disseminated my work through high quality peer-reviewed journals and peer reviewed and invited presentations at national conferences and in graduate courses. I have given equal attention to dissemination of findings and systemic and policy implications at local workshops and community meetings. Co-authoring papers and co-presenting with community research partners has been a particularly effective mode of dissemination for both professional and public audiences

<p>Reflective Critique</p>	<p>I have written many articles and presentations about the CBPR model, using my work with communities of color as an illustration. Undertaking these pieces of work allows me to reflect on what worked and didn't work in the projects, consider the feedback provided by community members, and offer my students and audiences suggestions for improving on the model. My willingness to alter the recruitment design of Promoting the Occupational Health of Indigenous Farmworkers illustrates my ability to reflect and change my plan based on feedback from the community</p>
<p>Leadership & Personal Contribution</p>	<p>I have held training positions of prestige including my NIH predoctoral training fellowship and my WK Kellogg postdoctoral fellowship. I serve as the PI on a number of grants and projects and I have demonstrated my ability to manage a large, complex project and sizable budget. At the University level, I serve on a number of committees including faculty senate, curriculum committee, search committees, etc. At the national level, I serve on a number of workgroups, board of directors, and advisory boards. I have served as a reviewer for journals and CDC and NIH grants. I have won several awards . . .</p>
<p>Consistently Ethical Behavior</p>	<p>Letters from community partners document my consistently ethical behavior, trustworthiness and integrity. I have also studied and demonstrated my understanding of ethics (for example, my book chapter "Methodological and ethical considerations of community-driven environmental justice research...."</p>