

# **The Scholarship of Engagement**

**Presented by:**

**Jed Metzger, Asst. Professor, Social Work**

**Shirley Szekeres, Dean School of HHS**

**With consultation from:**

**Marie Watkins, Director CSL**

# The Scholarship of Engagement

## Scholarship of Engagement Defined

The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement defines the scholarship of engagement as that which “engages faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs. Engagement is a scholarly agenda that incorporates community issues and which can be within or integrative across teaching research and service. In this definition, community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good.” (retrieved from <http://schoe.coe.uga.edu>).

This definition expands upon Boyer’s (1996) earlier definition for the Scholarship of Engagement as “connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic and ethical problems” (pg 11). The engagement, through a sequence of activities, “yields artifacts of public and intellectual value” (Elison & Eatman, 2008, pp iv).

Michigan State University (MSU) has been a leader in the movement towards a scholarship of engagement and has differentiated engaged teaching, research and service.

- a) Engaged teaching occurs when *credit bearing learning opportunities* are presented to students in online and community-based settings to address *community questions*.
- b) Engaged research occurs when collaborative college-community partnerships are used to address community problems or questions and results *are reported back or “owned” by the community*.
- c) Engaged service occurs when college *faculty, staff and/or students are involved in community based efforts* to address community generated concerns, questions or problems.

From this perspective, engagement efforts are viewed as scholarly activities. Work is tied to the faculty area of academic expertise, makes a contribution to the public good and, has the capacity to show a demonstrated impact through assessment of outcomes. Outcomes specifically are seen via generated artifacts of the engagement. These artifacts can demonstrate a continuum of engagement to include the generation of new knowledge related to community challenges, a potential change in methods to address those challenges and ultimately a rise in the public good.

The scholarship of engagement is gaining traction at colleges and universities challenging institutions to review their evaluation criteria for tenure and promotion and to consider artifacts of public and intellectual value. The Imagining America consortium has been encouraging colleges to avoid hierarchal value setting and to make artifacts meaningful across disciplines (Elison & Eatman, 2008).

At Nazareth College, there is a strong emphasis on civic engagement and many faculty contribute their time to the community. For that reason, it is useful to distinguish engaged scholarship from community service and service learning. In community service, the focus is on providing a service (e.g. serving food at a homeless shelter, providing therapy to an underserved population, building houses in storm destroyed communities). In service learning, the activity involves students in the community with a primary emphasis on student learning and student learning outcomes, in short it is intentional, active and connected to the curriculum. In engaged scholarship, the focus is on collaborating and partnering with members or organization in the community to address community questions, problems or concerns for the public good.

Some scholarly activities may combine elements of service and scholarship such as when a new community program is developed (the artifact) and students or faculty are involved in implementing the program through a service learning project. Following the CIC/Committee on Engagement (2005) draft, engagement is seen as a scholarly act of bringing the college and the community together such that it generates an artifact that is useful to the community. This CIC report includes excellent exemplars of engaged scholarship.

In the table below, Barker (2004) describes a “taxonomy” of five distinct practices of engaged scholarship.

**Table 1: A taxonomy based on five practices of engaged scholarship**

<b>Practice</b>	<b>Problems Addressed</b>	<b>Artifacts/Methods</b>
Public scholarship	Complex “public”, problems requiring deliberation	Face to face, open forums
Participatory research	Participatory democracy	Face to face collaboration with specific publics
Community partnership	Social change, structural transformation	Collaboration with intermediary groups
Public information networks	Problems of networking, communication	Databases of public resources
Civic literary scholarship	Enhancing public discourse	Communication with general public

These five practices reflect the core ideas that engaged scholarship must:

- a) Relate to a public problem.
- b) Be reciprocal and collaborative with the “public”.
- c) Address problems that are broadly public in nature.

- d) Extend the boundaries of discipline-specific knowledge.
- e) Require the faculty to demonstrate a leadership role.
- f) Focus in increasing public knowledge.
- g) Involve discovery, integration, and application of knowledge.

### Evaluation Criteria for the Scholarship of Engagement

The National Review Board of the scholarship of engagement has defined a set of assessment and evaluation criteria for such scholarship. It is important to note that the criteria recommended for judging the quality of publicly engaged scholarship will not differ fundamentally from those used to judge traditional scholarship. A faculty member should address each of the questions listed below in tenure and promotion portfolios to provide evidence of engaged scholarship.

#### **Goals/Questions**

- Does the scholar state the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good?
- Is there an "academic fit" with the scholar's role, departmental and college mission?
- Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?
- Does the scholar identify intellectual and significant questions in the discipline and in the community?

#### **Context of theory, literature, "best practices"**

- Does the scholar show an understanding of relevant existing scholarship?
- Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to the collaboration?
- Does the scholar make significant contributions to the work?
- Is the work intellectually compelling?

#### **Methods**

- Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions and context of the work?
- Does the scholar describe rationale for election of methods in relation to context and issue?
- Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?
- Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

#### **Results**

- Does the scholar achieve the goals?
- Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the discipline and to the community?
- Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration and collaboration?
- Does the scholar's work achieve impact or change? Are those outcomes evaluated and by whom?
- Does the scholar's work make a contribution consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time?

#### **Communication/Dissemination**

- Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present the work?

- Does the scholar communicate/disseminate to appropriate academic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the institution?
- Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to the intended audience?
- Does the scholar present information with clarity and integrity?

### **Reflective Critique**

- Does the scholar critically evaluate the work?
- What are the sources of evidence informing the critique?
- Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique?
- In what way has the community perspective informed the critique?
- Does the scholar use evaluation to learn from the work and to direct future work?
- Is the scholar involved in a local, state and national dialogue related to the work?

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Nazareth College:

1. Continue to embrace Boyer's (1996) broader concept of scholarship of engagement and value efforts of faculty to contribute to the public good.
2. Differentiate, service to the community, service learning, and the scholarship of engagement.
3. Expand the traditional artifacts (e.g. publications in peer reviewed discipline journals) to include those associated with the advancement of public knowledge and service (e.g. public database creation, public forums). These engaged scholarship artifacts need to be directed at *new* knowledge with attention to current public challenges/problems/questions.
4. Evaluate the scholarship of engagement with the same rigor, objective thought, and significance as traditional scholarship.
5. Adapt the National Review Board Criteria for the assessment and evaluation of the scholarship of engagement.
6. Discuss the merits of working towards having the Scholarship of Engagement be an institutionalized practice at Nazareth College.

Jed Metzger

Shirley Szekeres

1/12/10



## Appendix with links and exemplars (from campus compact)

### 1. Rationales for Giving Engaged Scholarship Standing in Research University RPT Processes

- Ellison, J & Eatman, T. (2008). Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university, Imagining America, Syracuse University. <http://imaginingamerica.org/TTI/TTI.html>

In this comprehensive report Imagining America's Tenure Team discusses and recommends rationales, policies, and strategies for strengthening public engagement within a continua of: 1) scholarship with which academic public engagement has full and equal standing, 2) scholarly and creative artifact, 3) professional pathways for faculty, including the choice to be a civic professional, and 4) actions for institutional change

Emphasis is on enabling engaged faculty to prepare for and successfully gain tenure and promotion. Curricular models are also provided.

- Jackson, E.T., Schwartz, K., Andree, P. (2008). Aligning tenure and promotion procedures for community-university engagement: Dialogue for action, <http://www.cuexpo08.ca/program/abstracts/aligningtenureandpromotion.pdf>
- Jackson, E.T., Schwartz, K., Andree, P. (2008). Aligning tenure and promotion procedures for community-university engagement: Dialogue for action, <http://www.cuexpo08.ca/program/abstracts/aligningtenureandpromotion.pdf>

From the proceedings of the CUExpo08 conference, held in Victoria, BC a call for action on reforming tenure and promotion processes in Canadian universities to encourage and support community-university engagement. Provides a summary of relevant literature and progress made in the US and Canada.

- Jordan C. (2006). Developing criteria for review of community-engaged scholars for promotion or tenure, Community- Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative [http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf\\_files/Developing%20Criteria%20for%20Review%20of%20CES.pdf](http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Developing%20Criteria%20for%20Review%20of%20CES.pdf)

This document provides edited, distilled information from the websites of several institutions (including research universities) and entities that have recognized and seek to reward community-engaged scholarship (CES). Most are health science schools or departments. Three are not: one represents an entire university, one a social science department and the other a national body. For the most part, the information gathered from each institution's website is organized into three general headings—definition of scholarship or faculty work, criteria for review, and documentation. In some areas, such as teaching, sections are skipped as they did not appear directly relevant to CES.

- Scott, J. (2007). Engaging academia in community research: Overcoming obstacles and providing incentives, Center for Urban and Environmental Solutions (CUES), Florida Atlantic University, [http://consensus.fsu.edu/bog-fcrf/pdfs2/Engaging\\_Academic\\_in\\_Community\\_Research\\_FAU.doc](http://consensus.fsu.edu/bog-fcrf/pdfs2/Engaging_Academic_in_Community_Research_FAU.doc)

In 2007, in order to learn more about the disconnect between university goals to be engaged in their home community and a university culture and structure that devalue or lack support for that engagement CUES initiated a scan, summarized in this report, highlighting an upward trend: An increasing number of universities (particularly land grant and urban universities) are emphasizing the importance of engaged-community research and starting to address the mismatch between university goals for engaged-community research and the university culture and structure that typically do not value and nurture such research. The core information for this report was gathered through a review of literature on engaged-community research and a scan designed to identify what a sample set of universities across the country are doing to create a more supportive environment for community-engaged research.

- University of Illinois at Chicago. (2000). Report of the task force on the scholarship of engagement, <http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/TFSEreport.pdf>

The Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement, appointed by Provost Elizabeth Hoffman in 2000, met and discussed how UIC could better evaluate and reward the scholarship of engagement as one aspect of the mission of UIC as a public land grant university. In this report, the term scholarship of engagement is used to highlight a way of thinking of what is often called public service: a focus on partnerships, not one-sided outreach; the co-creation of knowledge; and involvement in real-world problems that can enrich research and teaching rather than be separate from them.

Drawing heavily on “A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process” (1993), prepared by the UIC Senate Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service, the report discusses characteristics of the scholarship of engagement and suggests ways to document it in order to evaluate and reward it.

- Giles, D., Saltmarsh, J., Ward, E., & Burlion, S. “An Analysis of Faculty Rewards Policies for Engaged Scholarship at Carnegie Classified Community Engaged Institutions.” Paper presented at the Association for the study of Higher Education Conference, Jacksonville, FL (November, 2008).

Paper outlining how Carnegie classified academic institutions hit and miss the mark with regard to institutional practices.

## 2. Policies for Assessing Engaged Scholarship in RPT Processes

- Campus Compact, Strategies for creating an engaged campus: Faculty development, an advanced service-learning toolkit. <http://www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/faculty.html>

Creating faculty reward and evaluation systems that take faculty community based work into account is a critical step in moving a campus toward engagement. Here you will find a wealth of material – handbooks, policies, and criteria – from colleges and universities that have grappled with this issue, some of which are research institutions.

- Glass, C., Doberneck, D., & Schweitzer, J. (2008). Outreach and engagement in promotion and tenure, National Center for the Study of University Engagement, Michigan State University

In 2001, Michigan State University’s Office of University Outreach and Engagement significantly revised the university’s reappointment, promotion, and tenure review form to embed opportunities to report outreach and engagement throughout the form. The revisions reflected MSU’s definition of outreach and engagement as a form of scholarship that cuts across institutional missions of teaching, research, and service; emphasized the use of multiple forms of evidence to document quality; and encouraged reporting of integrated scholarship. Six years later,



researchers examined how and to what extent outreach and engagement activities were reported on the revised form. The study focused on over 200 forms of current MSU faculty who successfully underwent promotion and tenure between 2002-2006. Data from the faculty section of the forms were analyzed by demographic variables (i.e., gender, ethnicity), appointment variables (i.e., college, recommended rank) and engagement variables (i.e., type, intensity, degree). Study findings are summarized in a poster, [http://ncsue.msu.edu/files/PT\\_Poster.pdf](http://ncsue.msu.edu/files/PT_Poster.pdf), and the research process is explained in a Powerpoint presentation (<http://ncsue.msu.edu/files/OutreachEngagementPromotionTenure.pdf>).

- Lowenstein, S. & Harvan, R. (2005). Broadening the definition of scholarship: A strategy to recognize and reward clinician-teachers at the University of Colorado School of Medicine. In O'Meara K.A. and Rice, R.E, Eds. Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship (pp. 230-251). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This chapter describes a school of medicine's attempt to reform policies and procedures for promotion and tenure in ways that recognize and reward teaching and clinical practice. By restructuring faculty appointments on a single track and redefining scholarship to include teaching, integration and application (Boyer, 1990), the school sought to reform a practice that consigned faculty who emphasize teaching and clinical practice to second-class status. The authors provide profiles of clinician-teacher promotion candidates, both successful and not, which include alternative forms of scholarship in teaching, integration and application. While this case study was not focused on recognition and rewards for community-engaged research, those concerned with strengthening recognition and rewards for this kind of scholarship may wish to pursue a similar change in RPT policies.

- O'Meara, K.A. (2001). Working Paper No. 25 Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship in promotion and tenure, New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE). [http://www.nerche.org/working25/working\\_paper\\_25.html](http://www.nerche.org/working25/working_paper_25.html)

This paper examines how four colleges and universities with exemplary programs for assessing service as scholarship implemented these policies within colleges of education. Case studies suggest that policies to assess service as scholarship can increase consistency among an institution's service mission, faculty workload, and reward system; expand faculty's views of scholarship; boost faculty satisfaction; and strengthen the quality of an institution's service culture.

- Michigan State University Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, 2000). Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning & evaluating quality outreach, Michigan State University, available at: <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents/pod.pdf>

MSU's Committee on Evaluating Outreach defines outreach "as a form of scholarship that involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit mission." It encourages units to "adopt specific operational definitions, as needed, to establish consensus on what types of activities will be viewed as outreach, the relative value of those activities compared to other aspect's of a unit's mission, and how these activities will be evaluated and rewarded." The Committee's Guidebook seeks to develop a campus-wide understanding of what constitutes high quality outreach, assist units in articulating definitions and expectations consistent with their mission, values, and context, and suggests ways of rewarding outreach achievements in tenure, promotion, and annual salary reviews.

- Task Force on the Institutionalization of Public Sociology (2007). Standards of public sociology: Guidelines for use by academic departments in personnel reviews, [http://pubsoc.wisc.edu/e107\\_files/public/pandt.html](http://pubsoc.wisc.edu/e107_files/public/pandt.html)

The American Sociology Association encourages public sociology activities, public sociology research, and the education of future sociologists who will engage in such work. In this context, this Task Force developed and recommended standards of public sociology to insure continued rigorous research and professional development. The standards are intended for use by sociology departments as they review departmental academic personnel guidelines, and as they advise colleges and universities on elements of broader university tenure and promotion guidelines that relate to public scholarship. The standards do not reflect any official policy of the American Sociological Association, but should be treated as a working document that can be of value to departments considering revision of tenure and promotion guidelines.

### 3. Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Engaged Scholarship in RPT Processes

- Clearinghouse and National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement, Evaluation criteria for the scholarship of engagement, [http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/evaluation/evaluation\\_criteria.html](http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/evaluation/evaluation_criteria.html)

The National Review Board conceives of engaged scholarship as academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs. It should incorporate communities' issues which can be within or integrative across teaching, research and service. The Review Board's criteria are designed to be used by institutions to assess and evaluate engaged scholarship, especially in tenure and review processes. They have been adapted from Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on Faculty Evaluation, (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997) to more closely reflect a unique fit with engaged scholarship. Specific evaluative criteria are offered related to goals and objectives; context, literature, and best practices; methods; results; communication and dissemination; reflective critique of the scholar.

- Mikkelsen M, Gelmon SB, Seifer SD, Kauper-Brown J (2005). Community-engaged scholarship for health collaborative: Review, tenure and promotion analysis protocol. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/healthcollab.html>

This protocol was used by the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative to assess school and university review, promotion and tenure guidelines against criteria established by the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. For information on the Collaborative go to: <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/kellogg3.html>

- Office of Community-Based Research, Recognizing excellence in community-engaged scholarship: Guidelines for promotion and tenure decisions, University of Victoria. [http://web.uvic.ca/ocbr/assets/pdfs/CBR\\_Recognizing%20excellence.pdf](http://web.uvic.ca/ocbr/assets/pdfs/CBR_Recognizing%20excellence.pdf)

These Guidelines were prepared to encourage departments to develop policies and procedures for recognizing and evaluating community-engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure review processes.

In addition please see:

Michigan State University Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, 2000). Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning & evaluating quality outreach, Michigan State University, available at <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents/pod.pdf>

This guidebook contains several relevant items, including Criteria for Measuring Quality Outreach (pp. 12-13), a Matrix for Evaluating Quality Outreach (pp. 18-26), and a tool for Evaluating Unit Outreach (pp. 36-37).

- Michigan State University, Reappointment, promotion, and tenure review form. <http://ncsue.msu.edu/research.aspx>

In 2001, MSU's Office of University Outreach and Engagement (UOE) undertook a major revision of the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review Form to embed outreach and engagement as well as extension, urban, and international work into the form. A form was produced that reflects MSU's definition of outreach and engagement as scholarly activity that cuts across teaching, research, and service. The form suggests types of evidence candidates can report on, and chairs and deans review, within the teaching and research sections, as well as a revised community-based service section.

- North Carolina State University (2006). Policies: "reappointment, promotion and tenure"□ and "statements of mutual expectations."□

One of the strategies of the University of North Carolina Tomorrow initiative, with respect to outreach, societal engagement, and both economic and community development, is that campuses set high standards in their faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies that encourage and reward public service by faculty. North Carolina State University addressed these issues in its recent revisions of policies for reappointment, promotion and tenure:

<http://www.ncsu.edu/policies/employment/faculty/POL05.20.1.php>

and development of statements of mutual expectations:

<http://www.ncsu.edu/policies/employment/epa/REG05.20.27.php>

The policies focus on definition of six realms of faculty responsibility, development of statement of mutual expectations, and the importance of creative scholarship in all six realms.

#### **4. Demonstrating Quality and Impacts of Engaged Scholarship**

- Calleson D, Kauper-Brown J, & Seifer S. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship toolkit, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit.html>

CCPH has developed an [online toolkit](#) to provide health professions faculty with a set of tools to carefully plan and document their community-engaged scholarship and produce strong portfolios for promotion and tenure. The toolkit includes sections advising faculty in preparing for promotion and/or tenure review, specific details for creating a strong portfolio, examples of successful portfolio components from community-engaged faculty and references and resources.

- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E.A. (1999). [Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach.](#)

This book responds to the need of faculty members to document the scholarship of service and professional service activities by providing insights, guidelines, and examples for faculty as they prepare to review and reward such work. Sixteen examples of documentations are given in a style and format appropriate for submission to peer review on the faculty member's campus. This book is best used with "[Making the Case for Professional Service.](#)"

- Gelmon, S. & Agre-Kippenhan, S. (2002). Keeping the scholarship of engagement in the review process, <http://web2.bio.utk.edu/outreach/pdfs/Promotion,Tenure,%20Engaged%20Scholar.pdf>

This article summarizes advice and suggestions on how to prepare for and navigate the tenure and promotion process as an engaged scholar. While many of the suggestions are specific to those seeking advancement in the context of the scholarship of engagement, most are relevant to all who seek tenure and promotion.

- Jordan, C. (2009). Practical tools for overcoming the challenges of advancing your career as an engaged scholar, Original Toolkit Essay. [Practical tools.pdf](#).

The community-engaged scholar often experiences challenges to career advancement (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005). Fortunately, a variety of resources and tools are emerging to assist in overcoming these hurdles. This article reviews the challenges, in terms of developing skills, securing recognition for community-engaged scholarly work, and particularly in successfully navigating the promotion and tenure (P and T) system. This review is followed by presentation of several resources for addressing these challenges.

- Jordan C, Ed. (2007). Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion & tenure package. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit.html>

This resource and guide describes eight characteristics of quality community-engaged scholarship, and includes a sample dossier that shows how a community-engaged scholar may present his or her work to review, promotion, and tenure (RPT) committees. A group exercise simulating an RPT committee process can be used as an educational tool with RPT committees.

- Michigan State University Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, 2000). Developing a faculty outreach portfolio, Tool E, in Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning & evaluating quality outreach, p. 38, Michigan State University, <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents/pod.pdf>

Suggestions for developing an outreach portfolio for peer review committees to evaluate the quality of an individual's outreach efforts, especially for promotion and tenure.

- King, G & Currie, M (2002). Background: Measuring the impact of community-university research partnerships, Research Alliance for Children with Special Needs of Canada, [http://impactmeasure.org/files/Backgrounder\\_Info\\_on\\_Impact\\_Study.pdf](http://impactmeasure.org/files/Backgrounder_Info_on_Impact_Study.pdf)

This brief paper provides background for an impact study of community-university research alliances and partnerships that address social/health issues. Researchers from five community-university partnerships joined together to develop a reliable and valid survey measure of the community impacts of research partnerships between universities and community agencies that address social or health issues. The focus was to be on mid-term impacts—the influence of partnerships on individuals, partner agencies, and target communities or systems. The aim of this project is to benefit members of research partnerships who wish to evaluate their effectiveness and adjust their activities to meet community needs. The instrument also allows community stakeholders and advisory boards to capture the success of their collaborative research initiatives.

- National Center for the Study of University Engagement, Assessment of impact of embedding of outreach and engagement in the 2001 revision of the reappointment, promotion, and tenure review form, Michigan State University, <http://ncsue.msu.edu/research.aspx>

In 2001, MSU's Office of University Outreach and Engagement (UOE) undertook a major revision of the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review Form to embed outreach and engagement as well as extension, urban, and international work into the form. Along with UOE, a faculty team, academic governance, and the Office of the Provost, a form was produced that better reflects MSU's definition of outreach and engagement as scholarly activity that cuts across teaching, research, and service. The form suggests types of evidence candidates can report on, and chairs and deans review, within the teaching and research sections, as well as a revised community-based service section. The form also provides opportunity for candidates to describe integration of their work.

- Sandmann, L. (2008). Engaged scholarship in context: Approaches and issues. [http://www.ukv.edu/UE/KEC2008/Presentations/Sandmann\\_Keynote.pdf](http://www.ukv.edu/UE/KEC2008/Presentations/Sandmann_Keynote.pdf)

In this presentation and “Documenting and Evaluating Engaged Scholarship” (below), Sandmann offers practical guidelines for assessing community-engaged scholarship, “making the case,” and preparing portfolios.

- Sandmann, L. (2007). Documenting and evaluating engaged scholarship. [http://www.unh.edu/outreach-scholars/pdf/workshop3\\_documenting\\_presentation.pdf](http://www.unh.edu/outreach-scholars/pdf/workshop3_documenting_presentation.pdf)

A PowerPoint presentation with guidelines for documenting and evaluating engaged scholarship.

- Seifer, S. (2007). Making the best case for community-engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure review, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, <http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/news/documents/Seifer-Ap-E-CBPR.pdf>

The Peer Review Work Group of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative (Jordan, 2007) articulated eight characteristics of high quality engaged scholarship. Excerpts from these guidelines, particularly as they pertain to research, are highlighted in this brief essay. They may be useful both to community-engaged faculty to guide the documentation needed for their review, promotion, and tenure portfolio, and to RPT committees as a tool for assessing cases that emphasize community-engaged scholarship.

- Eyler, J. & Giles, D. (1999). *Where is the Learning in Service-Learning?* S.F.: Jossey-Bass.

Seminal work that outlines best practices.

## 5. Tenure and Promotion Portfolio Exemplars

- Community Campus Partnerships for Health (2008). Appendix A: Portfolio Examples <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit-portexamples.html>
- Liese, L. H. (2002). Personal statement for final tenure review, University of Utah. [liese-personal-stmt.doc](#)

Tenure review statement by social work faculty member who presents himself as a “civically engaged scholar, an identity which I believe is not only reflected in my research, teaching, and service but which, importantly, allows me to integrate my scholarly activities in these three critical areas.” (Used with permission.)

- Stanton, T. (2009). Interview with Hank Liese, associate professor-social work, University of Utah. Inverness, CA. [stanton-liese-interview.pdf](#)

This interview summary provides reflections from Hank Liese on his tenure review process at the University of Utah. Serves as context and background to Liese’s “Personal Statement” (Liese, L.H., 2002), above. (Used with permission.)

## 6. Other important policy

- \* Committee on Institutional Cooperation (2005) Engaged scholarship: A resource guide. [www.cic.uiuc.edu](http://www.cic.uiuc.edu)