

APPENDIX



MAKING THE BEST CASE FOR COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP IN PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

SARENA D. SEIFER

Our experience suggests that even those faculty with the belief that a participatory community based approach to research is appropriate and relevant to their work may find the process daunting, given the pressures of academic institutions on faculty to publish and obtain grant money.

ISRAEL, SCHULZ, PARKER, & BECKER (1998)

Note: The portions of this appendix titled “Characteristics of Quality CES” and “Ideas for Documenting Quality CES in Dossiers” are excerpted from *Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion and Tenure Package*, C. Jordan (Ed.), 2007. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Peer Review Workgroup, www.ccpsh.info. Copyright 2007 by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Reprinted with permission.

A frequently cited barrier to faculty conducting community-based participatory research (CBPR) is the risk associated with trying to achieve promotion and tenure (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998; Maurana, Wolff, Beck, & Simpson, 2001; Gelmon & Agre-Kippenhan, 2002; Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005). This appendix is intended primarily to serve as a resource for faculty who are engaged in CBPR and concerned about successfully preparing for and navigating their institution's review, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process.

A good place to start is to become familiar with three influential reports on scholarship that help to "make the case" for community-engaged scholarship (CES): *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990), *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997), and *Linking Scholarship and Communities*, the report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions (2005).

Numerous initiatives are underway to apply the definitions, frameworks, and recommendations in these reports in the health professions and in higher education as a whole. A growing number of higher education institutions are rewriting their RPT policies to recognize and reward CES. Links to these initiatives and policies are included in the online CES Toolkit (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, & Seifer, 2005). Community-engaged faculty might share these with department chairs and RPT committee members as evidence of the growing legitimacy of CES in higher education and to educate these colleagues about this approach.

DOCUMENTING AND ASSESSING CES

Community-engaged scholarship requires the scholar to be engaged with the community in a mutually beneficial partnership. The role of expert is shared, the relationship with the community must be reciprocal and dynamic, and community-defined concerns direct the scholarly activities. A challenge for faculty engaged in CBPR is to describe clearly how accepted standards of scholarship are implemented in the context of community. The Peer Review Work Group of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative (Jordan, 2007) elaborated on Glassick's work to articulate eight characteristics of quality CES. Excerpts from these guidelines, particularly as they pertain to research, are highlighted in the following section. 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.

CHARACTERISTICS OF QUALITY 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.

Possible evidence includes:

- Clearly stating the basic purpose of the work and its value for the public good
- Identifying intellectual and significant questions in the discipline and in the community

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 research depends upon mastering existing knowledge.

Possible evidence includes:

- Investing time and effort in developing community partnerships
- Participating in training and professional development that builds skills and competencies in CES

3. Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement

Meaningful scholarly work must always be conducted with appropriate rigor. In the case of research, rigor facilitates methodologically sound research design, data collection and interpretation and reporting of results, so that valid conclusions can be drawn from the findings. In many instances, the engagement of communities can enhance rigor and facilitate the study of issues and research questions (e.g., research related to health disparities).

Possible evidence includes:

- Refining a research question, or confirming its validity, through co-generation with community partner

4. Substantive and Important Results: Impact on the Field and the Community

Scholars should evaluate whether or not they achieve their goals, and whether this achievement had an important impact on others, and whether the work is used by others. A primary goal of CES 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 project outcomes: The scholar should explicitly state what knowledge was created or applied and what impact it has had or may likely have in the future.

Possible evidence includes:

- The community contributing to as well as benefiting from the research
- Disseminating geographically limited work with clear discussion of issues concerning generalizability and the project's potential role 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 lay audience can understand. Scholars should communicate with appropriate audiences and subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review.

Possible evidence includes:

- Publishing research results in peer-reviewed journals, practitioner journals and professional journals, with community partner co-authors

- Disseminating information through media that reaches community members, practitioners or policy makers (e.g., radio, newsletters, podcasts)

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 them. Scholars further 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? Does this project involve an idea that is deserving of further time and effort?

Possible evidence includes:

- Changing project based on stakeholder 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 CES, 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.

Possible evidence includes:

- Receiving invitations to serve on advisory or policy-making committees at national, regional, state and/or community levels
- Receiving awards or letters of appreciation from community-based organizations

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

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 must consider cultural or community implications as well as university policies.

Possible evidence includes:

- Focusing scholarly work on community assets, and allowing community members to take active, meaningful roles in research rather than simply serving as research subjects
- Appropriately involving community partners in writing and reviewing products of the scholarship before they are published or otherwise disseminated

For additional ideas, including excerpts of actual portfolios, see the CES Toolkit (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, & Seifer, 2005).

IDEAS FOR DOCUMENTING QUALITY CES IN A DOSSIER

The following are examples of documents that could be included in a faculty member's RPT portfolio and ways they can help to "make the case" for promotion or tenure. These ideas, of course, should be implemented in the context of one's institutional culture and requirements. For additional ideas, including excerpts of actual portfolios, consult the CES Toolkit (Calleson, Kauper-Brown and Seifer, 2005). [*Note:* faculty members who have been promoted or tenured based on CES are asked to consider submitting excerpts of their portfolios for posting on the CES Toolkit so that junior colleagues may learn from their experience.]

- *Career statement.* As a part of their career statement, scholars can discuss the role of CES in their career and academic development. Some institutions require scholars to specifically address research and teaching accomplishments in either subsections of the Career Statement or in separate essays. The scholar should take this opportunity to illustrate how CES enhances the rigor of their research or teaching, the reach of their work, community impact, and student outcomes.
- *Curriculum vita.* Scholars can use their vita to highlight the importance of community-engagement to their scholarly work. For example, sections of the vita could be developed to highlight community activities, consultative and advisory positions, and articles or reports co-authored with community partners. It is particularly important that the role of community partners be highlighted and that the work undertaken is scholarly, in that it creates, advances, or extends knowledge. Mere provision of community service, while a form of community engagement, cannot be considered to be CES.
- *Statement of assigned responsibilities/work assignment.* Scholars can also document the importance of community engagement as it relates to their assigned responsibilities. Sadly, in many academic settings, faculty members are evaluated based on criteria that are out of alignment with the responsibilities they are asked to assume on a daily basis. Inclusion of a statement of assigned responsibilities or work assignment may call attention to the importance of community engagement as it relates to a scholar's work.
- *Teaching portfolios.* Teaching portfolios are ideal vehicles for documenting the value of community engagement as it relates to teaching as well as scholarship related to community-engaged teaching activities.
- *Letters of support & appreciation from community members/partners.* Such letters can be used to help document the value of the scholarly work as perceived by community leaders, and to illustrate community impact and breadth of dissemination.
- *Peer review letters from community leaders.* To be valuable, such letters must provide an analytical critique of the scholar's work from the community's perspective. Letters of a general nature that lack critical analysis may be counterproductive to the scholar's promotion or tenure application.

430 Community-Based Participatory Research for Health

As CES is increasingly being recognized and rewarded as a legitimate form of scholarship, the future appears bright for faculty who seek community-engaged careers in the academy.

REFERENCES

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine*, 80(4), 317–321.
- Calleson, D. C., Kauper-Brown, J., & Seifer, S. D. (2005). *Community-engaged scholarship toolkit*. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from <http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info>.
- Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. (2005). *Linking scholarship and communities*. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.
- Jordan, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion and tenure package*. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Peer Review Workgroup.
- Gelmon, S., & Agre-Kippenhan, S. (2002, Jan.). Promotion, tenure, and the engaged scholar: Keeping the scholarship of engagement in the review process. *AAHE Bulletin*, pp. 7–11.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173–202.
- Maurana, C., Wolff, M., Beck, B. J., & Simpson, D. E. (2001). Working with our communities: Moving from service to scholarship in the health professions. *Education for Health*, 14(2), 207–220.