

Building Capacity for Faculty Rewards for Community Engaged Scholarship: Institutional Self-Assessment

Background: This tool is designed to assess the capacity of a faculty rewards system at a given higher educational institution (or unit therein) to embrace community engagement and community-engaged scholarship, and to identify opportunities for action. This assessment builds upon existing and validated prior work.¹ It is intended to serve as a baseline for follow-up assessments, enabling institutions to track their progress and focus their work, while developing a longitudinal profile of their developing capacity for a faculty rewards system supporting community engagement and community-engaged scholarship over time.

The Self-Assessment: The self-assessment is constructed around four dimensions:

1. Leadership for Faculty Rewards (3 elements)
2. Campus Culture (5 elements)
3. Faculty Rewards Policies (7 elements)
- 4: Faculty Rewards Processes (6 elements)

For each element of each dimension, four "levels" are articulated which represent a summary of the literature and knowledge on institutional best practices with respect to commitment to community engagement and community-engaged scholarship. It is not expected that a given institution would necessarily align on the same level throughout the entire self-assessment. Rather, the results of the assessment can be used to offer a profile of where the institution is at presently, and where opportunities for change might be identified.

Definitions: Three terms used in this self-assessment are particularly important to define: By "*community engagement*" we mean applying institutional resources (e.g., knowledge and expertise of students, faculty and staff, political position, buildings and land) to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities. The methods for community engagement of academic institutions include community service, service-learning, community-based participatory research, training and technical assistance, capacity-building and economic development.

By "*community-engaged scholarship*" we mean "teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement that involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community and has the following characteristics: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique, rigor and peer-review."²

The word "*institution*" is used as a generic term for the level of the organization on which the self-assessment is focused (e.g., a department, college, school, university).

1. This work is adapted from a) Gelmon SB, Seifer SD, Kauper-Brown J and Mikkelsen M. (2005) Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. www.ccpb.info, b) Ellison J and Eatman TK (2008) Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design. www.imagingamerica.org, and c) Carnegie Foundation's Elective Classification: Community Engagement 2008 Documentation Framework. www.carnegiefoundation.org

2 Linking Scholarship and Communities. Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. (2005) Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

Building Capacity for Faculty Rewards for Community Engaged Scholarship: Institutional Self-Assessment

Adapted from a) Gelmon SB, Seifer SD, Kauper-Brown J and Mikkelsen M. (2005) *Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment*. Seattle, WA: *Community-Campus Partnerships for Health*. www.ccpf.info and b) Ellison J and Eatman TK (2008) *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design*. www.imaginingamerica.org and c) Carnegie Foundation's *Elective Classification: Community Engagement 2008 Documentation Framework*. www.carnegiefoundation.org

1. Leadership for Faculty Rewards				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
1.1 Institutional Leaders Value Community-Engaged Scholarship	The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans and department chairs do not support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution.	The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans and department chairs do not collectively support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution, although some may express individual support for this form of scholarship.	The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans and department chairs support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution, and there is a faculty governance committee with responsibilities for community engagement. However, the institutional leaders do not visibly and routinely support this form of scholarship through their words and actions.	The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans and department chairs visibly support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution, and demonstrate this support through their words and their actions. There is a faculty governance committee with responsibilities for community engagement.
1.2 Community-Engaged Faculty as Institutional Leaders	No community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.	A few community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.	Several community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.	Most of the community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.
1.3 Rank and Seniority	Most of the community-engaged faculty are junior in rank (e.g. instructor, assistant professor).	Many but not all of the community-engaged faculty are junior in rank (e.g. instructor, assistant professor).	Some of the community-engaged faculty are junior in rank (e.g. instructor, assistant professor), but many are more senior in rank (e.g. associate or full professor).	There is a mix of seniority and rank among the community-engaged faculty.

2. Campus Culture				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
2.1 Definition of Community Engaged Scholarship	There is no definition for community-engaged scholarship. The distinctions between the <i>practice</i> of community engagement and community-engaged <i>scholarship</i> are not clear. Terms are used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based teaching, research and service activities.	There is a definition for community-engaged scholarship, but the distinctions between the <i>practice</i> of community engagement and community-engaged <i>scholarship</i> are not clear. Terms are used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based teaching, research and service activities.	There is a formal definition for community-engaged scholarship, for example in faculty handbooks or provost's documents, but it is not universally accepted or used. Some inconsistency in use persists across the institution.	There is a formal, universally accepted definition for community-engaged scholarship that is used consistently and is distinct from community engagement. Terms are used consistently to describe a variety of community-based teaching, research and service activities.
2.2 Valuing of Community-Engaged Scholarship	Community-engaged scholarship is valued in fewer than 10% of faculty appointment categories.	Community-engaged scholarship is only valued in 10-30% of appointment categories, for example for those faculty appointed in clinical, teaching and/or practice tracks.	Community-engaged scholarship is recognized as a potential area of emphasis for those faculty in tenure tracks, and is valued for those faculty in clinical, teaching and/or practice tracks, ~30-70%	Community-engaged scholarship is recognized and valued for all categories of appointments, regardless of tenure and/or clinical, teaching and/or practice emphasis
2.3 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Research	Community-based research is not acknowledged as an essential component of the institution's involvement in research.	Community-based research is infrequently acknowledged as an essential component of the institution's research activities.	Community-based research is frequently acknowledged as an essential component of the institution's involvement in research	Community-based research is acknowledged and valued as an essential component of the institution's involvement in research.
2.4 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Education	Community-based learning is not acknowledged as important to the education of students and is not incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.	Community-based learning is infrequently acknowledged as important to the education of students and is not incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.	Community-based learning is frequently acknowledged as important to the education of students and is incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.	Community-based learning is acknowledged and valued as essential to the education of students and is incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.
2.5 Tenure-Track Appointments	None of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.	Some of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.	Many of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.	Almost all of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.

3. Faculty Rewards Policies				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
3.1 Review, Tenure and Promotion Policies Regarding Community-Engaged Scholarship	Community-engaged scholarship is not recognized or considered during the review, tenure or promotion process.	Community-engaged scholarship is somewhat recognized and considered during the review, tenure or promotion process, but is not explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.	Community-engaged scholarship is significantly recognized and considered during the review, tenure or promotion process and is explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.	Community-engaged scholarship is substantially recognized and rewarded during the review, tenure or promotion process. It is explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.
3.2 Range of Acceptable Products of Scholarship	Review, promotion and tenure policies only recognize and value traditional products of scholarship such as publication in peer-reviewed journals.	Review, promotion and tenure policies allow for dissemination of scholarship through a range of venues, but in practice only publication in peer-reviewed journals is valued.	Review, promotion and tenure policies indicate support for dissemination of scholarship through a range of venues, and in practice these products of scholarship are valued.	Review, promotion and tenure policies support and encourage dissemination of scholarship through multiple venues, and in practice these products of scholarship are valued.
3.3 Range of Acceptable Funding Sources	The review, promotion and tenure policies place the highest value on national research grants, and in practice only these grants are valued.	The review, promotion and tenure policies acknowledge the potential of funding of community-engaged scholarship from a variety of funding sources, but in practice only research grants from the National Institutes of Health and/or the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality are valued.	The review, promotion and tenure policies recognize and value funding of community-engaged scholarship from a wide variety of sources, but in practice faculty recognition for such funding varies across units within the institution.	The review, promotion and tenure policies recognize and value funding of community-engaged scholarship from a wide variety of sources. In practice, faculty are recognized and valued for receiving funding from these sources.
3.4 Defining and Valuing Scholarly Community Partnerships	There is no definition for or value placed on scholarly community partnerships	There is some recognition that scholarly partnership requires skill, but no place to evaluate the demonstration of that skill in the faculty rewards process.	Scholarly community partnerships are frequently acknowledged as valuable in the rewards process, but there is little in the way of evaluation of the partnerships in the process	Scholarly community partnerships are recognized as an essential part of the rewards process, and are included and evaluated in portfolios in a regular and consistent manner.
3.5 Scope of Community Impact	Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is not considered or valued in the review, promotion and tenure process.	Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is occasionally considered or valued in the review, promotion and tenure process.	Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is valued in the review, promotion and tenure process. However, the emphasis is on broad-scale impact affecting multiple populations, with little emphasis on local community impact.	Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is valued and rewarded in the review, promotion and tenure process, with at least equal emphasis placed upon local community impact as that placed on regional, national and/or international impact.

3. Faculty Rewards Policies, continued				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
3.6 Value of Interdisciplinary Scholarship	The review, promotion and tenure process places the highest value on disciplinary scholarship, rewarding faculty only for first-authored or single authored papers in disciplinary journals.	The review, promotion and tenure process acknowledges the viability of interdisciplinary scholarship, but in practice faculty are rewarded for first-authored or single authored papers in disciplinary journals.	The review, promotion and tenure process recognizes Interdisciplinary scholarship and in practice faculty are rewarded for multiple authored papers in journals that are interdisciplinary or outside of the faculty member's discipline in addition to single-authored pieces.	The review, promotion and tenure process actively supports and encourages interdisciplinary scholarship, and in practice multiple authored papers in journals that are interdisciplinary of outside of the faculty member's expertise are given at least equal weight to first-authored or single authored papers in disciplinary journals.
3.7 Valuing a Broad Definition of Peer Review	Peer reviewers are only valued if they are members of the candidate's academic discipline, and have tenure themselves.	Peer review by faculty outside of the candidate's academic discipline is allowed in cases where research is interdisciplinary in nature.	The tenure committee actively considers which academics and partners with relevant experience would serve well as peer reviewers from a variety of perspectives in order to get a balanced picture of a community-engaged faculty's scholarly contribution.	The tenure committee actively considers which academics and non-academics would serve well as peer reviewers from a variety of perspectives in order to get a balanced picture of an engaged faculty's scholarly and community contribution.

4. Faculty Rewards Processes				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
4.1 Faculty Recruiting Criteria	The institution does not recognize interests or expertise in community engagement in their faculty recruiting efforts.	The institution does not encourage academic departments to recruit faculty with interests or expertise in community engagement, although some departments may do so.	The institution encourages academic departments to recruit faculty with interests or expertise in community engagement and 25 - 50% of departments do so.	The institution has search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement and more than 50% of departments do so.
4.2 Documentation of Assessment/Impact	The institution has no means of assessing the impact/effectiveness of community engagement.	The institution does not encourage faculty to assess the effectiveness of their community engagement, although some faculty do so independently.	Faculty are encouraged to assess their community engagement work and its impact on students, community, the institution and themselves.	There is institutional documentation of engagement and its impact on students, community, faculty and the institution, itself. This documentation is acknowledged and valued.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
4.3 Preparation of Junior Faculty for the Faculty Rewards Process	In general, faculty members are not encouraged to participate in community engagement; few if any incentives are provided to pursue it (e.g. curriculum development mini-grants, conference support, faculty development)	Faculty members are encouraged to pursue community engagement through availability of incentives, though there is no connection between this encouragement and the rewards system.	Faculty are strongly encouraged to pursue community engagement through incentives, and support for including that engagement in rewards portfolios is available in an informal manner.	Faculty are strongly encouraged to pursue community engagement through incentives, and are mentored and supported throughout the years leading up to tenure review via various supports (mentoring by a senior engaged scholar, professional development on documenting & disseminating community-engaged work, etc).
4.4 Training and Orientation of Review, Promotion and Tenure Committee Members	There is no training provided for review, promotion and tenure committee members with respect to community-engaged scholarship.	There is no formal training provided for review, promotion and tenure committee members with respect to community-engaged scholarship, although some schools/departments do spend time discussing this as part of the review process.	There is some formal training provided for members of review, promotion and tenure committees to ensure a broad understanding of the definition, nature, documentation and assessment of community-engaged scholarship.	There is mandatory training for members of review, promotion and tenure committees to ensure a broad understanding of the definition, nature, documentation and assessment of community-engaged scholarship
4.5 Community Partner Participation in the Review, Tenure and Promotion Process	There is no role for community partners in the review, tenure or promotion process for community-engaged faculty members	Community partners are allowed to participate in the review, promotion or tenure process of community-engaged faculty members by writing letters of support. In practice, these letters are not seriously considered	Community partners are allowed to participate in the review, tenure or promotion process of community-engaged faculty members by writing letters of support. In practice, these letters are seriously considered.	Community partners are regularly invited to participate in the review, tenure or promotion processes in ways that go beyond writing letters of support. In practice, these community partner contributions to the process are seriously considered and valued.
4.6 Peer Reviewer Preparation	Peer reviewers are sent portions of the candidate's portfolio along with the institution's tenure and promotion guidelines and asked to comment.	Peer reviewers are sent portions of the candidate's portfolio, relevant pieces of the tenure and promotion guidelines, and a generic letter outlining their review task.	Peer reviewers are sent portions of the candidate's portfolio, relevant pieces of the tenure and promotion guidelines, and a letter specific to their expertise in outlining their responsibilities.	Peer reviewers are sent highly tailored packages of portfolio sections, tenure and promotion guidelines and a letter specific to their expertise that outlines only the questions they are qualified to answer.

-Campus Compact in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, Spring 2009, contact mainecompact@bates.edu for more info.