The Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package: A Guide for Faculty and Committee Members

Catherine M. Jordan, Kristine A. Wong, Paul W. Jungnickel, Yvonne A. Joosten, Rebecca C. Leugers, Sharon L. Shields

Abstract

The Peer Review Workgroup of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative developed a novel set of quality community-engaged scholarship characteristics and a resource package aimed at two primary audiences: faculty seeking promotion or tenure based on community-engaged scholarship; and review, promotion, and tenure committee members seeking to understand how to evaluate community-engaged scholars. We describe this package and its development, illustrate its use in a faculty development initiative, and offer recommendations for future application.

Review, promotion, and tenure (RPT) has been identified as a key challenge influencing higher education's success in the formation of meaningful community-higher education partnerships (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 2005; Dodds et al. 2003; Nyden 2003; Maurana 2000; Sandmann 2000; Richards 1996). Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) took a significant step toward addressing this challenge when it established the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship (the "Commission") in fall 2003 with funding from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The Commission convened a diverse group of leaders from academic institutions, professional associations, community-based organizations, philanthropy, and government to understand how a more supportive culture and reward system could nurture and sustain community-engaged scholars in the health professions and to provide recommendations for establishing such a system (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 2005).

Taken together, the Commission's recommendations called for health professional schools to take a series of actions that would lead to an increased institutional commitment to community-engaged scholarship (CES) in a number of areas including those policies and procedures related to RPT. In response, CCPH created the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative (the "Collaborative") which convened teams from universities across the United States representing a variety of health profession and academic administrators in an effort to build capacity within

their institutions as well as their peers, for *community-based participatory research*, teaching, *service-learning*, and other forms of CES (Seifer et al. 2009)

In the first year of the Collaborative, members identified peer review of CES as a critical issue to address. As a result, the Collaborative's Peer Review Workgroup (the "Workgroup") was formed, led by Collaborative member (and community-engaged scholar) Cathy Jordan from the University of Minnesota and CCPH. The Workgroup's charge was to assess the key peer review-related issues affecting community-engaged scholars' career advancement, identify existing relevant resources, identify gaps in available supports, and develop a tool or take an action that would address the unmet needs of community-engaged scholars seeking promotion in rank or tenure as well as RPT committees charged with reviewing their dossiers.

The Workgroup began its work in person at the inaugural Collaborative meeting in February 2005 and subsequently collaborated via phone conferences and emails to determine priority areas to concentrate efforts. Possible activities considered included developing peer review criteria for CES, training RPT committees on how to evaluate CES, encouraging increased publication outlets for CES, creating a peer review system for CES products, and establishing a network of external reviewers with expertise in CES. After considering each of these options, the Workgroup concluded that they could make the most significant contribution by defining characteristics of quality CES and developing a companion resource and guide for community-engaged scholars and university RPT committees.

Development of the Package

The Workgroup's decision to create such a resource was informed by a search of national and institutional resources such as the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement guidelines, MedEd Portal, the book *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997), and the promotion and tenure guidelines of the University of Colorado Medical School, Michigan State University, Portland State University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Public Health, and the University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine (Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Peer Review Workgroup 2006). This review found that: (1) the various RPT criteria reviewed lacked explication of key competencies of CES necessary to establish a common language and understanding between community-engaged scholars and RPT committees, (2) existing definitions of CES seemed, at times, to miss the spirit of CES and demonstrated a lack of recognition of the community as a valid source that could evaluate the competency of a community-engaged scholar, and (3) the field lacked tools and resources for both community-engaged scholars and RPT committees (e.g., examples that demonstrate how CES should be documented for RPT using a mock dossier and CES products).

Foremost in the authors' minds were the unique needs of recognizing various forms of knowledge creation through scholarly engagement as well as the output, results,

dissemination, and impact of the results from CES. Communicating these unique aspects of CES and devising a framework to evaluate the quality of the scholarship became the Workgroup's focus. The Workgroup developed the Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package (the "Package") (Jordan 2007) for use by both community-engaged scholars preparing their dossier for review, promotion, or tenure, and RPT committees seeking to understand and appreciate the scholarly rigor and impact of CES and how these can be documented for RPT.

The authors recognized the importance of respecting institutions' existing RPT criteria and the individual differences between institutions. We determined that what was needed was a set of characteristics of quality CES, not a new set of RPT criteria meant to supplant an institution's existing criteria in cases of evaluating community-engaged scholars. When used in combination with an institution's RPT criteria, the characteristics should enhance the ability of community-engaged scholars to present their unique contributions and the ability of RPT committees to evaluate the quality and rigor of a community-engaged scholar's portfolio.

The Package is grounded in key competencies of CES, taking the first step toward establishing a common language and understanding between scholars and RPT committees of the definition, scholarly rigor, and applied impact of CES. Utilizing Glassick's six standards of excellence in scholarship (the scholar must have clear goals, be adequately prepared, use appropriate methods, achieve outstanding results, communicate effectively, and reflectively critique his or her work) as a foundation (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997), along with resources from other institutions, the group devised eight characteristics by which the quality and significance of CES could be assessed. The characteristics were initially named as follows: Clear Goals, Adequate Preparation, Appropriate Methods: Scientific Rigor and Community Engagement, Significant Results/Impact, Effective Presentation/Dissemination, Reflective Critique, Leadership and Personal Contribution, and Consistently Ethical Behavior.

The Glassick criteria that proved the most difficult to conceptualize in the context of CES were "use appropriate methods" discussed further below and "achieve outstanding results." Discussion among Collaborative members and within the Workgroup highlighted the need for explicit criteria to assess dissemination of research to communities, translation of research for action and application, and documentation of community impact. These are, indeed, the hallmarks of CES, and the Workgroup took care to reflect them in the criteria.

The Workgroup engaged in much discussion regarding how a faculty RPT candidate could supply evidence supporting a claim of excellence in CES that would satisfy a review committee utilizing the quality CES characteristics. The RPT process essentially is a claim of criteria being met by the candidate, evidence to support the claim supplied by the dossier, review of the claim and evidence by committee, and determination by that committee whether or not the criteria have been met. A concern of the Workgroup was that a scholar who has embraced CES may be evaluated by a committee comprised of faculty who are not necessarily knowledgeable about CES,

thus potentially risking career advancement due to misunderstandings about the quality of the scholarly activity. The Package was designed therefore to assist community-engaged scholars in effectively presenting to audiences that might be largely unfamiliar with CES the merits of their work and the ways that they meet RPT criteria.

The Workgroup determined at the outset that the development of the characteristics should be supplemented with a means to evaluate them. Therefore, each characteristic was defined, followed by a listing of evidence that could be supplied by a candidate to substantiate a claim of possession of that characteristic. Each listing was offered with the intent that it should not be considered to be inclusive of all types of evidence, but as an example of what an RPT candidate might be expected to provide in order to support their claim.

In an attempt to assist both CES scholars and the RPT committees that will review the dossiers of these individuals, the Workgroup decided that the development of a sample dossier would be beneficial. This dossier was intended to show examples of a CV, a body of research, and supporting documentation that might accompany the claim of meeting RPT criteria as a community-engaged scholar at a research-intensive institution. This sample dossier was developed based on an actual faculty member's work and modified to highlight the types of evidence that could help substantiate effective scholarship through community engagement. This dossier could be utilized by faculty as a model for highlighting their CES and could be used in training RPT review committees in evaluating CES.

At this point in its development, the Package was presented at a variety of meetings and conferences to gather feedback from a diverse sample of potential users. In order to gain substantive feedback, the first author devised a mock RPT committee exercise that would allow participants to offer comments based on actual use of the Package. This exercise was utilized at several of the meetings; at other times, the participants were asked to comment after a verbal presentation of the Package's features. The Collaborative held annual meetings throughout the duration of the project and the Package was presented at the final two meetings in February of 2006 (Jordan 2006) and 2007 (Jordan 2007). In May of 2006 the Package was presented as part of a pre-conference workshop for CCPH's annual conference held in Minneapolis, Minnesota (Calleson et al. 2006). Discussion of the Package was also held at a brown-bag seminar during that conference (Jordan 2006). During October of 2006, the Package was presented as part of a pre-conference workshop (Balshem, Jordan, and Seifer 2006) and at a master class (Jordan 2006) at the International Association of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement conference held in Portland, Oregon. This association's 2007 conference in Tampa, Florida also featured a pre-conference workshop (Gelmon, Agre-Kippenhan, and Jordan 2007) and a concurrent session (Gelmon et.al. 2007) during which the Package was presented. Finally, in November of 2006 the University of Minnesota's Community-Campus Network reviewed and commented on the Package during its monthly meeting (Jordan 2006).

Feedback about the Package was positive. Participants agreed that the Package was a

useful resource and that the criteria were clear and well-stated. The modification of the Glassick framework was considered appropriate and effective. The availability of a model dossier excerpt was, in principle, critical. Participants felt the mock RPT exercise was an effective training tool. Participant suggestions for improvement focused on: (1) providing context for the Package, (2) ensuring balance between research and teaching emphases and between academic and community emphases, (3) conceptual questions about the impact of engagement on scientific rigor, (4) the appropriateness of the specific dossier excerpt chosen, (5) the need for alignment with traditional RPT criteria, and (6) ideas for additional helpful resources. Each of these is discussed below.

Some participants expressed confusion about the definitions of engagement, scholarship, and CES. Others, though clear about these definitions in their own minds, felt that we should use the Package as an opportunity to educate users. We therefore created a Definitions section. Some participants felt there should be a clearer distinction between activities that provide evidence for possession of a characteristic of quality CES and how one might document such evidence in a dossier. Therefore, definitions of evidence and documentation were added to the Definitions section, and a detailed discussion of strategies for documentation was added at the end of the Characteristics section. An introduction was added at the front of the Package to provide overall context and information about intended use.

Participants felt that the initial draft of the Package used language and examples of evidence that over-emphasized research. The authors reviewed the document and added additional teaching-relevant examples for each characteristic (e.g., "deepening and contextualizing the learning experience in a course by involving community experts in design and implementation"). Some participants felt that the characteristic names and descriptions over-emphasized the academy. The characteristics' names and descriptions were modified to portray the important balance of community and scientific benefit unique to CES. The final characteristic names were revised as follows: (1) Clear Academic and Community Change Goals, (2) Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community, (3) Appropriate Methods: Rigor *and* Community Engagement, (4) Significant Results: Impact on the Field and the Community, (5) Effective Presentation/Dissemination to Academic and Community Audiences, (6) Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement, (7) Leadership and Personal Contribution, and (8) Consistently Ethical Behavior: Socially Responsible Conduct of Research and Teaching.

Participants at several meetings undertook a conceptual conversation about Criteria 3, Appropriate Methods: Rigor *and* Community Engagement. Some participants felt that the crux of the characteristic concerned rigor and that community-engagement should be emphasized elsewhere in the document. Others felt that CES is, at its core, about blending scientific rigor with engagement and that it was imperative to illustrate that rigor can be strengthened through substantive interaction with communities. The authors shared the latter opinion and spent considerable time experimenting with different language to best communicate this idea. Table 1, "The Enhancement of

Scientific Rigor in Research Through Community Engagement," was created to better present our argument. This table was initially placed under Criteria 3, but participants strongly felt that this format was cumbersome and that the table was out of place within the body of the Characteristics section. They argued that all criteria should follow a similar format. The authors chose to create a separate section of the Package for this table. To achieve appropriate balance between research and teaching emphases, the companion Table 2, "The Enhancement of Teaching through Community Engagement," was developed.

The sample dossier excerpt was modified from an actual dossier of a community-engaged scholar (pseudonym Dr. Ann Brooks) who successfully completed the RPT process. Participants felt that the candidate offered many examples of traditional evidence of scholarship (e.g., peer reviewed journal articles and grants) and fewer non-traditional products of CES. They felt that she could have been tenured based on usual RPT criteria, not as a result of the quality of her CES or possession of critical characteristics of an engaged scholar. They suggested providing additional samples from candidates who emphasized engaged teaching as well as scholarly products in forms other than journal articles. In the interest of space, the authors chose to further modify the dossier of Dr. Ann Brooks to address the issues raised rather than add additional samples.

Though participants saw value in the use of the Glassick framework, they also stressed the practical need to align the Package with traditional RPT criteria such as peer review, reputation, quality, and impact. We included in the Definitions section a discussion of peer review as a criterion for CES. Within the section entitled Ideas for Documentation we discussed ways to direct RPT committee members' attention to products that were peer reviewed. Criteria 7, Leadership and Personal Contribution, was revised to address the need to document a national or international reputation. Quality was addressed primarily through Criteria 3, Appropriate Methods, and the detailed explanations of ways that engagement enhances the rigor and quality of research and teaching as presented in the two tables discussed above. Criteria 4, Significant Results: Impact on the Field and the Community, explicitly addresses the need to create and document positive impact on the discipline and benefit for the community.

Participants requested two additional resources be included in the Package—instructions for conducting the mock RPT exercise and the PowerPoint slides used at the various workshops noted above.

The real proof of the utility of the Package will come from the feedback of faculty and RPT committee members who put the Package to use. In the final section of this paper we review plans for creating opportunities to do just that. Some individuals, based on their participation in an early workshop, have already taken such action. One participant shared the Package with key campus administrators which resulted in an invitation to present at a campus-wide workshop and an invitation by her provost to speak to an academic governance committee. The latter resulted in a request that she disseminate the Package to RPT committees, department heads, deans, and associate

deans to consider as the university's RPT guidelines came under review. Her opinion of the Package's utility is summarized in a statement from her letter of appreciation: "Thank you for your efforts to disseminate material on community-engaged scholarship. Your work is making an impact at [our institution]."

Presentation of the Package

The full Package is available on CCPH's Web site at www.ccph.info. A discussion of each section of the Package follows.

Overview

Definitions. The definitions section at the beginning of the Package was developed with the primary goal of helping to frame the discussion around the nature of CES. Using a question and answer format, it focuses on key questions that must be asked and answered so as to enable community-engaged scholars to characterize their work and, more importantly, to communicate it to other members in the academic community who are unfamiliar with CES. This section focuses on questions such as: What is community engagement? How is engagement different from outreach? What makes an activity *scholarship*? How is CES different than *service*?

Characteristics of Quality Community-Engaged Scholarship. Characteristics of quality CES are discussed in this section and are intended to form the basis for the evaluation of the quality and significance of CES, and are of use to scholars in planning for and evaluating the results of their work as well as for RPT committee members charged with evaluating the work of community-engaged scholars. This section concludes with ideas for documenting quality CES in career statements, curriculum vitae, statements of assigned responsibilities/work assignments, teaching portfolios, letters of support/appreciation from community members/partners, peer review letters from community leaders, publications in media aimed at community partners, and peer reviewed publications that report on CES. Reference is made to the CES Toolkit (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, and Seifer 2005).

Dossier of a Fictitious Community-Engaged Scholar. With a particular focus on helping faculty members more effectively present their credentials for promotion and tenure, the Package includes a sample of a dossier that might be prepared by a community-engaged scholar. While recognizing that dossier content and format may

vary among colleges and universities, the dossier shows how community-engagement and quality CES can be emphasized and highlighted throughout an RPT dossier. The dossier includes a table where the applicant for promotion and/or tenure evaluates her accomplishments as defined by the eight characteristics of quality CES, provides supporting evidence, and directs RPT members to the various letters, statements, and listings of presentations and publications which focus the reviewers on the critical aspects of her scholarship and facilitate an understanding of the scholarly nature of her community engagement. In the narrative section, the applicant describes her community-engagement and the ways that it has been the focus of not only quality research and scholarly work but also how it has positively impacted her professional and community service activities as well as her teaching. Lastly, the dossier includes samples of letters from community partners that highlight the impact of the scholar's community-engagement, both from the standpoint of benefit to the community and also from community partners' roles in improving the scholarly work.

Answer Key. The dossier is followed by an "answer key" which focuses on addressing the question, How well does the fictitious community-engaged scholar meet the criteria for evaluation of CES? An assessment (e.g., "sound," "semi-solid," "weaker") is made for each of the eight criteria based on the evidence documented in the dossier. For each of the criteria, multiple references are made to various portions of her dossier to support the assessments that are made.

Tables Describing the Enhancement of Scientific Rigor in Research and the Enhancement of Teaching through Community Engagement. Within the academy, community settings are not frequently thought of as prime venues for research or other types of scholarly work. Likewise, communities are far different than the traditional academic classroom setting. To demonstrate potential advantages of communities as valuable locations for and as partners in scholarly work and teaching, two tables have been created—one that describes how community engagement can enhance scientific rigor in research and one describing how engagement enhances teaching in the form of improved curriculum development. For each research or curricular development phase, the table includes a list of benefits of community engagement to the research or teaching, evidence that would support the achievement of these benefits, and a list of ways to document the benefits in an RPT dossier. Tables 1 and 2 contain excerpts of materials from the complete tables found in the Package.

Table 1. Excerpts from table demonstrating the enhancement of scientific rigor in research through community engagement.

Research Phase	Benefits of Community Engagement	Evidence	Documentation
Identify key issues/research questions	• With behavioral/ community health issues, it can be difficult to identify the research question. Community involvement can help define the research question or confirm its validity. • When community members feel involved and perceive equity in power and decision-making they are invested in seeing that the right questions are addressed.	Activities that would create the benefits: • Conduct community focus groups or surveys (environmental scans) that document community health needs and concerns. • Create mechanisms for two-way communication between investigators and community members. • Serve as a resource to community representatives requesting assistance on specific health issues. Their issues can generate research questions.	Ways to document the activity in dossier: • Include statements in personal narrative about situations in which community input helped define or changed the research question. • Include statement in personal narrative that illustrate how relevance was improved as opposed to similar types of work conducted in alternative settings. • Explain in personal narrative why your research questions can be addressed with greater validity than in alternative research settings—include findings obtained from alternative settings (if available and relevant). • Include in the personal narrative statements that compare your level of subject/patient/ client participation to results obtained with other research settings or methods. • Include letters from community partners that show community commitment and the community's role in defining the research questions.

Author: Yvonne Joosten. Excerpted from the Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package (Jordan 2007a).

Table 2. Excerpts from table demonstrating the enhancement teaching through community engagement.

Curriculum Development	Benefits of Community Engagement	Evidence	Documentation
Identify theoretical framing and practical integration for curriculum development	• Faculty and community partners working on connecting course content with service-related activities can insure reciprocity of benefit and deepening of the learning experience. • When community members are involved in course planning there is a perception of equity of engagement and student learning.	Activities that would create benefit: • Identify community partners that would benefit from knowledge, skill, and professional objectives learned by the students through course content. • Conduct focus/training sessions w/ community partners to share course content, objectives, and outcomes. • Conduct joint planning for community engagement activities and field learning experiences. • Serve as a resource and volunteer within the partner organization so that more understanding of need and contributions can be incorporated into the coursework.	• Name a community partner teaching advisory committee. Report this committee formulation. • Create a folder related to focus/training sessions with community partners and supply agendas for each of the meetings. • Keep log of joint planning meetings with outcomes reported. • Keep log of hours devoted to community resource contributions.

Author: Sharon Shields. Excerpted from the Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package (Jordan 2007a).

PowerPoint Slides from Conference Presentations. The Package has been presented at several conferences. Selected slides from these conferences can be found at www.ccph.info.

Mock RPT Committee Exercise Instructions. We have developed a useful training tool, the "mock RPT committee meeting," to allow participants to work interactively with

the Package materials and gain insights from other participants as they pursue three learning objectives:
1. Learn the characteristics of quality CES.
2. Identify what activities might exemplify those characteristics.
3. Determine how one might document those activities in a dossier.

The mock review can be used in faculty development workshops on preparing for promotion as well as RPT committee training sessions to provide committee members with information about what makes for high quality and rigorous CES and where to look for evidence of it in a dossier.

This exercise has been piloted at pre-conference workshops and revised based on participant feedback. The heterogeneity of attendees at such events (junior faculty, senior faculty, administrators, and diverse disciplines) can make it challenging to tailor the exercise to meet everyone's needs. The same could be true for faculty development offerings. However, we have found that individuals glean the information they need given their motivation for attending the session. Participants tend to personalize the experience, reflecting on how the materials apply to their own situations, even though they may be being asked to play an unfamiliar role (e.g., junior faculty pretending to be RPT committee member).

The mock review exercise is simple to prepare for and conduct. Prior to the exercise, participants should be sent two sections of the Package to review, the Characteristics of Quality CES and the dossier of Dr. Ann Brooks. Approximately one hour is needed to complete the exercise. The facilitator should review with the participants the characteristics and ensure that they understand what activities might be evidence of possession of each characteristic and how such activities might be documented in a dossier. Slides are available at www.ccph.info for this purpose. The facilitator should then instruct participants to break into groups of three to five individuals and explain that for the next forty minutes they will be pretending to be an RPT committee that will utilize the characteristics to evaluate the quality of Dr. Brooks' CES. Mock committee members should ask themselves four questions:
1. Does the candidate possess these characteristics?
2. How do you know? (What is the evidence?)
3. What is the documentation of the evidence?
4. What other evidence would you want to make a judgment?

Groups may not have time to complete a review using all characteristics, however, learning objectives can still be met. After the small groups complete their review a large group discussion should focus on questions that arose and insights about the characteristics, illustrative evidence, or documentation strategies. During our pilot sessions, groups frequently asked for "the right answers." The Answer Key, also available on the Web site, describes, from the authors' perspective, the degree to which we believe Dr. Ann Brooks demonstrates each characteristic and adequately documents the evidence in her dossier.

Characteristics of Quality CES

The descriptions of the eight characteristics of CES are perhaps the most important components of the Package and, therefore, are described in more detail below. In the Package a description of each characteristic is provided along with a list of example activities that would serve as evidence for embodying the characteristics. If community-engaged scholars are to plan and execute their work in a quality manner, then they need to have a good understanding of the characteristics of quality CES. CES has not been highly regarded in many academic circles, not because quality work cannot be performed in the community setting but primarily because it has not been well understood by individuals who utilize more traditional approaches to research. These criteria will help to provide more traditional academicians with a better understanding of CES and how, when performed well, CES can stand on solid ground with more traditional modes of scholarly work.

Clear Academic and Community Change Goals. As is the case for any scholarly endeavor, the scholar must clearly define and state the objectives of his or her scholarly work and basic questions of inquiry. Since a key tenet of CES is the involvement and benefit of the community(ies) being studied, goals for community change must also be articulated. It is important that goals be realistic and achievable.

Evidence of clear goals might include clearly stating the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good, indentifying intellectual and significant questions in the discipline and in the community, or articulating one's goals for teaching and student learning. RPT committee members are likely to find such evidence within a candidate's narrative essays on research and teaching scholarship.

Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community. Like other scholars, community-engaged scholars must demonstrate that they are knowledgeable and well prepared to conduct meaningful work.

Evidence for adequate preparation might include investing time and effort in understanding their discipline as well as developing community partnerships and participating in training and professional development that builds skills and competencies in CES or specific models such as service-learning, community-based participatory research, or public health practice. RPT committee members can look to the curriculum vitae for evidence of professional development endeavors and to letters from community partners for evidence of investment in developing community partnerships.

Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement. Meaningful scholarly work must always be conducted with appropriate methods and academic rigor. Therefore, it is imperative that community-engaged scholars demonstrate that rigor is maintained or even enhanced through community-engaged approaches. For example, involvement of community partners might result in reframing research questions for a study and thus make the results more valid in a real world setting. Community-engaged scholars

should provide evidence that involvement of the community results in valid scholarship that could not be conducted in other settings or produces better results.

Evidence of appropriate methods might include enhancing curriculum by incorporating updated and real world information from community members critical to student learning of course material, or using community member input to enhance plans for recruitment and retention of study participants. RPT committee members could look to the narrative essays on research and teaching scholarship and letters from community partners for documentation of such evidence.

Significant Results: Impact on the Field and the Community. The assessment of CES must go beyond just the reporting of positive, neutral, or negative results of a project. The scholar should also specifically report the knowledge that was created or applied and the impact that it has had on the community or may have in the future.

Evidence of significant impact could include effects such as changing policy, improving community processes or outcomes, increasing the capacity of individuals in the community and community organizations to advocate for themselves, or enhancing the ability of trainees or students to assume positions of leadership and community engagement. RPT committee members will likely find documentation of such evidence in essays, community partner letters, and a teaching portfolio.

Effective Presentation/Dissemination to Academic and Community Audiences. Effective communication of results is a central component to all scholarly pursuits. In the case of CES, results must be shared with the community as well as academia. Thus, community-engaged scholars must communicate with an array of audiences, and need effective skills to do so. Besides publication in peer reviewed and other professional journals, results need to be disseminated to the communities that are impacted by the CES. Community partners can become valuable co-authors in many instances.

Evidence of effective presentation might take the form of presenting at community events; publishing or broadcasting through local media; producing policy documents directed toward service providers, policy makers, or legislators as well as publishing in peer reviewed journals. RPT committees will find evidence for the array of appropriate dissemination mechanisms in the curriculum vitae and in examples of written work provided in the dossier.

Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement. It is important that community-engaged scholars possess the ability to critically reflect on their work to appropriately assess its impact and improve the planning for future work. Questions that might be considered include: Why did this project succeed or fail to achieve its intended outcomes?, What could be done differently in succeeding projects to improve outcomes?, and Is this project an idea that is deserving of further time and effort? Projects or outcomes might be effectively improved due to reflection based on community feedback and lessons learned.

Evidence of reflective critique might include conducting debriefing sessions with community members or seeking their evaluation of work completed. Teaching faculty might make substantive changes in a service-learning course based on the feedback of students and community partners during the course as well as after. Information provided in narrative essays, the teaching portfolio, and in community partner letters will likely provide appropriate documentation for RPT committee members.

Leadership and Personal Contribution. Development of a national or international reputation is a consistent criterion for promotion or tenure in most colleges and universities that require scholarship as a faculty responsibility. To achieve this, community-engaged scholars must demonstrate, within their discipline, within the arena of CES, or both, that their work has earned them a reputation for rigor, impact, and the capacity to move their 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 might include invitations to present at professional meetings, to present to community audiences, to testify before legislative bodies, to appear in the media, to serve on advisory and policy-making committees, or to serve on editorial boards. The curriculum vitae, narrative essays, and the letters of external reviewers will provide RPT committee members with documentation of such evidence.

Consistently Ethical Behavior: Socially Responsible Conduct of Research and Teaching. Ethical behavior is a core expectation of all scholars and is even more important for those engaged in CES. Communities may be affected in profound ways and must be approached as mutual partners to foster trusting and equitable relationships. CES must be conducted in a manner that complies with the policies and approval of the Institutional Review Board of the scholar's university, but ethical behavior must also consider cultural or community implications that may be unique to the setting in which the work is completed. Appropriately involving community partners is essential to ethical conduct.

Evidence of consistently ethical behavior could be recognizing and valuing community knowledge systems and incorporating them into the research process and courses as appropriate or appropriately acknowledging community partners when writing and presenting about the collaborative work. Documentation of evidence for ethical behavior will likely be found in the curriculum vitae, narrative essays, and letters from community partners.

The Package provides many more examples of evidence for each characteristic as well as ideas for how the faculty member can document such evidence for RPT committees reading the candidate's dossier. For example, community-engaged scholars are encouraged to use the narrative essays or career statement to discuss the role of CES in their career and academic development as well as illustrate how CES enhances the rigor of their research or teaching, the reach of their work, community impact, and

student outcomes. Although it is important to follow the formatting requirements of one's institution, the curriculum vitae can effectively help tell the story of partnership between the faculty member and communities and express the impact the faculty member's work has had on the community and advancement of knowledge. For example, the faculty member might place a code, such as a star or asterisk, next to publications that were completed in collaboration with community members. The candidate might also annotate his or her lists of publications, presentations, and other scholarly products to describe the respective roles of community members and himself or herself, cite evidence of positive benefit to the community, or describe the peer review process for nontraditional products of scholarship (non-peer reviewed journal articles). Teaching faculty are encouraged, if permitted by their institution, to prepare a teaching portfolio. Within the portfolio the faculty member might describe a new or revised class that involves the community as a teaching innovation, provide letters about community impact from service-learning course community partners, and summarize student reflections about the value of their community-engaged learning.

It is equally important for RPT committee members to be familiar with these ideas for documenting evidence of quality CES so that they know where to look within the dossier and can recognize the evidence woven throughout the dossier as they review the candidate's materials. The Package also refers the reader to the Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit for additional ideas for documentation (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, and Seifer 2005).

Future Applications
The Collaborative aimed to build capacity within its member institutions, as well as their peers nationally, for community-engaged research and teaching as well as other forms of CES. Through the Collaborative's work, RPT issues were identified as major impediments to sustaining and expanding CES. The Package was intended to address some of these issues by building the capacity of its users to effectively present themselves as high quality community-engaged scholars or make informed decisions about a candidate's promotion or tenure based on their CES. Institutions that were members of the Collaborative and those that were not have been able to use the Package to build knowledge and action around CES. However, methods to systematically apply this tool and to institutionalize approaches for supporting faculty as community-engaged scholars are lacking.

CCPH's second FIPSE grant, Faculty for the Engaged Campus, offers an opportunity for application (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 2009). Participating institutions have initiated the design of faculty development programs for their campuses to support the acquisition of community engagement competencies and skills in creating and documenting CES. The Package has been offered as a resource or foundation for teams' plans for developing faculty capacity to present their best case for promotion or tenure. An evaluation plan is being developed to document how participating campuses have implemented their plans, the ways the Package is being utilized, and the impact it is having on faculty. The Package's quality criteria for CES also form the basis of a Web

site, CES4Health.info, a new mechanism for peer reviewing and disseminating innovative products of CES that is being pioneered by CCPH.

The Package is available on the CCPH Web site at www.ccph.info. Evaluation information is being collected from Web users on an ongoing basis to document users' satisfaction with the format of the Package, perceptions of the utility of each section, anticipated or actual application of the Package and its impact, and recommendations for improvement. Periodic teleconference trainings are offered to demonstrate the utility of the tool to faculty seeking promotion or tenure and RPT committee members as they receive an increasing number of dossiers from faculty pursuing community-engaged careers.

Conclusion

In an era when community-engaged approaches to teaching, research, and service scholarship are touted as pathways to eliminating the gap between theory and practice and a valuable approach to addressing pressing societal challenges, community-engaged scholars still have to work harder than their more traditional institutionally-focused peers to vie successfully for promotion and tenure. RPT guidelines have not kept pace with the widely acknowledged obligation of academic institutions to be more responsive to the communities in which they dwell. Across the nation, campus leaders promote a vision of community partnerships for improved outcomes and strengthened communities. To support this vision, faculty are encouraged to engage the community in their scholarly work, yet at the same time RPT committees do not recognize nor reward the results of CES.

With the development of the CES RPT Package, we hope to arm the community-engaged scholar with the means to organize and present his or her work as disciplined, innovative, replicable, and significant; in other words, scholarly (Diamond 2000).We also offer the RPT committees a guide for understanding and judging fairly the work of community-engaged scholars.

Community-engaged scholars themselves have an obligation to work together to legitimize their scholarship. They can begin to do so by:
1. becoming change leaders in the transformation process (Kotter 1995) and actively participating in committees that set RPT policies;
2. validating existing and creating new methodologies that meet standards for scientific rigor and demonstrate the impact of community-engaged research;
3. making the case that scholarly work that examines complex social systems such as a community is much more effectively transitioned from theory into practice when it is done in context.

We also challenge colleges and universities to respond by beginning to change the culture and conventions that promote and reward scholarship. If we truly value scholars who are committed to the public good, we must, as Cantor and Lavine (2006) have so strongly asserted, close the gap between praise and reward. Academic

institutions can begin to do this by:
1. committing to a change of culture, and moving from a climate of verbalizing commitment to CES to offering sound rewards that are institutionalized in policy and practice;
2. incorporating the community as part of the process in research development and as full partners in the research team so that benefits of training, expertise, and reciprocity of relationship are realized;
3. creating meaningful ways to reward faculty who engage community within the scholarship of teaching. Effective teaching that engages community can inform community-engaged research and the opposite also holds true. Community-engaged research can inform teachers and learners in the classroom by connecting it to community-engaged learning initiatives and teaching strategies;
4. creating and supporting institutional advocacy groups to move toward this model of scholarship that leaves research in context so that the gap between practice and theory is narrowed;
5. educating RPT committee members about CES and asking community-engaged scholars to serve on RPT committees.

Only by taking these steps can we begin to create a more supportive culture and reward system that will nurture and sustain community-engaged scholars and build and sustain productive, mutually beneficial community partnerships.

Acknowledgment

References

Balshem, M., C. Jordan, and S. Seifer. 2006. Making your best case for promotion and/or tenure: Documenting community-engaged scholarship. Pre-conference workshop at the Sixth International Association of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement Conference, Portland, OR.

Calleson, D., S. Gelmon, C. Jordan, and G. Narsavage. 2006. Making your best case for promotion and/or tenure: A toolkit for community-engaged faculty members. Full day workshop for the Pre-conference Institute of the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Annual Conference, Minneapolis.

Calleson D, J. Kauper-Brown, and S. D. Seifer. 2005. *Community-engaged scholarship toolkit.* Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info (accessed April 12, 2009).

Cantor, N. and S. Lavine. 2006. Taking public scholarship seriously. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 52 (40): B20.

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. 2005. *Linking scholarship and communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions.* Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. 2009. *Faculty for the engaged campus.* www.ccph.info (accessed April 12, 2009).

Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Peer Review Workgroup. 2006. *Developing criteria for review of community-engaged scholars for promotion or tenure.* www.ccph.info (accessed April 10, 2009).

Diamond, R. M. 2000. *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dodds, J. M., D. C. Calleson, E. Eng, Lm Margolis, and K. Moore. 2003. Structure and culture of schools of public health to support academic public health practice. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* (November/December) 9 (6): 504-512.

Gelmon, S., S. Agre-Kippenhan, and C. Jordan. 2007. Recognition for community-engaged scholarship: Practical suggestions for presenting your work. Pre-conference workshop at the Seventh International Association of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement Conference, Tampa FL.

Gelmon, S., R. Koch, C. Jordan, and S. Seifer. 2007. New directions in the study of community-engaged scholarship. Seventh International Association of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement Conference, Tampa, FL.

Glassick,, C. E., M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate.* Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Jordan, C. 2006a. Development of the CES RPT package. Presented at the second meeting of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Memphis, TN.

-----. 2006b. Documenting community engagement in academic dossiers. Presented to the Community-Campus Network, University of Minnesota Academic Health Center.

------. 2006c. Rewarding the community-engaged scholar: Proposed guidelines for evaluating community-engaged scholarship in the promotion and tenure process. Presented with Judith Ramaley, past-president of Portland State University and president of Winona State University at a Master Class at the Sixth International Association of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement Conference, Portland, OR.

------. 2006d. Rewarding the community-engaged scholar: Proposed review, promotion, and tenure guidelines for evaluating the community-engaged scholar. Brown-bag session at Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Annual Conference, Minneapolis.

Jordan, C., ed. 2007a. *Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion, and tenure package*. Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Peer Review Workgroup. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. www.ccph.info (accessed April 12, 2009).

------. 2007b. Final stages in the development of the CES RPT package. Presented at the second meeting of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Washington, DC.

Kotter, J. 1995. Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review* (March-April): 59-67.

Maurana, C., M. Wolff, B. J. Beck, and D. E. Simpson. 2000. Working with our communities: Moving from service to scholarship in the health professions. Prepared for Community-Campus Partnerships for Health's 4th Annual Conference, Washington, DC.

Nyden, P. 2003. Academic incentives for faculty participation in community-based participatory research. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 18:576-585.

Richards, R.W., ed. 1996. *Building partnerships: Educating health professionals for the communities they serve*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sandmann, L. R., P. G. Foster-Fishman, J. Lloyd, W. Rauhe, and C. Rosaen. 2000. Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change* 32: 44-52.

Seifer, S. D., K. Wong, S. Gelmon, and M. Lederer. 2009. The community-engaged scholarship for health collaborative: A national change initiative focused on faculty roles and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities* 20 (2).

Author Information

Catherine M. Jordan, PhD, is Associate Professor of Pediatrics in the Division of Pediatric Clinical Neuroscience at the University of Minnesota and Director of the University of Minnesota Children, Youth and Family Consortium. She has served in a leadership capacity on the University's Council on Public Engagement.

Kristine Wong, MPH, was Program Director at Community-Campus Partnerships for Health during the CES Collaborative. Her work has spanned the areas of community-based participatory research, community organizing and advocacy, and multimedia production with a focus on environmental justice and issues affecting low-income communities and communities of color.

Paul W. Jungnickel, PhD, RPh, is Professor of Pharmacy Practice and Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs at Auburn University Harrison School of Pharmacy. Dr. Jungnickel is active in various pharmacy organizations and currently serves the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy as Pharmacy Practice Section Chair and the Rho Chi Pharmacy Honor Society as National Secretary.

Yvonne A. Joosten, MPH, is Executive Director of the Office for Community Engagement at the Vanderbilt Institute for Medicine and Public Health.

Rebecca C. Leugers, MS, PT, is Assistant Professor of Physical Therapy in the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences in the College of Allied Health Sciences at University of Cincinnati.

Sharon L. Shields, PhD, is Professor of Human and Organizational Development and Director of the Community Development and Action M.Ed. Program at Peabody College of Vanderbilt University.

Catherine M. Jordan, PhD
Children, Youth and Family Consortium
270A McNamara Alumni Center
200 Oak Street
Minneapolis, MN 55455
E-mail: jorda003@umn.edu
Telephone: 612-625-7591
Fax: 612-625-7815

Kristine Wong, MPHP
Graduate School of Journalism
121 North Gate Hall #5860
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-5860
Email: kristine@u.washington.edu

Paul W. Jungnickel, PhD, RPh
Harrison School of Pharmacy
Auburn University
2316 Walker Building
Auburn, AL 36849-5501
E-mail: jungnpw@auburn.edu
Telephone: 334-844-8348
Fax: 334-844-8353

Yvonne A. Joosten, MPH
Vanderbilt University Medical Center
1215 21st Avenue South
6000 Medical Center East
Nashville, TN 37232-8300
E-mail: yvonne.joosten@vanderbilt.edu
Telephone: 615-936-5260
Fax: 615-936-1269

Rebecca C. Leugers, MS, PT
College of Allied Health Sciences
University of Cincinnati
3202 Eden Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45267-0394
E-mail: rebecca.leugers@uc.edu
Telephone: 513-558-7480
Fax: 513-558-7474

Sharon L. Shields, PhD
Peabody College of Vanderbilt University
Box 90 Peabody
Nashville, TN 37203
E-mail: sharon.l.shields@vanderbilt.edu
Telephone: 615-322-8273
Fax: 615-322-1141