Developing Criteria for Review of Community-Engaged Scholars for Promotion or Tenure
Background Information Compiled by Cathy Jordan, Chair, Peer Review Workgroup,
Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative
http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/healthcollab.html
February 2006

Executive Summary – page 2

Institutions and Entities Reviewed:

Executive Summary

This document provides edited or distilled information from the websites of several institutions and entities that have recognized and seek to reward community-engaged scholarship (CES). Most are health science schools or departments. Three are not, one representing 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.

Summary

Definition of Scholarship or Faculty Work
The definitions offered fell into two main types:

1. Those that preserve a research/teaching/outreach and perhaps practice classification scheme.
    Some of these institutions offered separate definitions of scholarship for each activity: research, teaching, outreach and practice. For purposes of this review, research, outreach and practice were considered. These definitions stress generation or acquisition of knowledge (for purposes of either advancing the field or solving a public health problem), advancement or evaluation of the application of knowledge, and analysis and interpretation of knowledge. These definitions were often consistent with Boyer's broader definition of scholarship (discovery, teaching, integration, and application) but not specifically organized according to Boyer's four areas of scholarship. These institutions noted the importance of the work advancing the field and having impact beyond the immediate sphere of influence.

2. Those that offered a different taxonomy, one that cuts across research, teaching, outreach and practice.
    This approach basically turns the above approach on its head. Some institutions conceptualized scholarship according to Boyer's broader definition. Another devised a new system: disciplinary work, outreach work (uni-directional; transmitting knowledge, for example, to the community), and engagement work (work done in collaboration with those outside the academy, with the intention of influencing practices and policies in the community)

Criteria
There was considerable variability in stated criteria. Some institutions offered somewhat global statements such as "progressive productivity and regional or emerging national recognition" or "effectiveness in teaching, professional distinction in research, outstanding service, potential for future growth, national recognition." Others offered lists of criteria including things such as importance to the discipline; moves the discipline forward; published in high quality, high impact, peer reviewed journals; stimulates work of others; influenced faculty member's teaching activities; influenced activities in the community; incorporates new developments; and transfers knowledge. Others classified these same types of criteria into broader, "meta-criteria" such as quality, innovation, responsiveness/collaboration, and support structure. Another, specifically referencing community engaged scholarship, focused on impact to unify disparate criteria: impact on the external partner, the fulfillment of their needs, and the growth of their capacity; on

the faculty member's capacity to do work in the future, on their teaching, and on their research; on the institution and department in terms of consistency with mission, influence on the curriculum, provision of student involvement opportunities, influence on the research of others and the collective research program; and impact on the knowledge base of the discipline. And another offered a set of criteria generally consistent with Glassick's six characteristics: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

Documentation

Documentation was at times difficult to separate from criteria. Typically the options for documentation offered were non-specific to CES. High quality, high impact, peer-reviewed journal articles remain the gold standard amongst the institutions reviewed. Grant funding was also highly valued.

Most also offered documentation options that recognized the nontraditional quality of some products of CES. For example, technical reports or reports to an agency or community that assist in the assessment of public health problems, improve service delivery or result in policy change were mentioned. A couple institutions recognized the value of multimedia products and things like popular media appearances if impact of these activities on practice or policy change could be demonstrated. Overall, evidence of impact of the faculty member's work was key for most institutions. Impact typically referred to changes in practice or policy change resulting from the faculty member's practice or research, or the use of the faculty member's research by others, such as by advocates in their attempt to influence policy.

For those that offered specific documentation options for activities consistent with CES, publications and grant funding (specifically for the community engaged activity) were key. Some explicitly stated requirements for scholarship around community engagement. This is taken to mean journal articles about such things as community based research models or service learning models, rather than about the area of inquiry per se. This could be referred to as the "scholarship of engagement," though it is not discussed in this way by the institutions reviewed. Another key factor was evidence of tying community involvement directly to the faculty member's field of expertise, but for the purpose resolving a problem or addressing an issue in the community.

Some institutions refer to establishing patterns of work that document scholarship resulting from community engaged activities. For example, "multiple, complementary products reflecting a cycle of scholarship integrating teaching, research and service. Ex – a refereed journal article, community education materials, and media stories, all emerging from one project."

The role of community members was mentioned by only two institutions. One discussed submitting a summary of involvement of community stakeholders as collaborators and co-creators. One suggested that statements by community members, in the form of letters of support or other statements, are valued.

University of Arkansas Medical School College of Public Health

Definition of Scholarship

For purposes of faculty evaluation, scholarship is construed to encompass both research and practice. A faculty member may choose to emphasize original research, i.e. the generation of new knowledge pertinent to public health; to emphasize public health practice, i.e. the advancement and /or evaluation of the application of knowledge to enhance the public's health; or to maintain a balance between the two. Both original research and scholarly public health practice require originality of thought and effective dissemination of knowledge through publications, presentations and other appropriate means.

Criteria

The research or area of practice:

1. is important to the discipline, human health or health of the public.
2. has moved the discipline or practice arena forward.
3. is published in peer-reviewed, high quality, high impact journals.
4. has resulted in contributions in policy or program design, lead to new developments in the field or been incorporated to address a public health problem and will influence public health status in the community.
5. has stimulated the work of other researchers or practitioners.
6. has influenced teaching activities of faculty member or the department.
7. has influenced activities in the community, in other communities or with other agencies or organizations or has resulted in the creation of a new, ongoing partnership to address public health issues in a community (local, state or national).
8. demonstrates the faculty member's ability to incorporate new developments in the field and transfer knowledge and techniques to problems influencing public health.
9. has resulted in the advancement of capacity building for delivery of the core functions of public health at the local, state or national level.

Documentation

1. Publications
   a. Journal Publications
   b. List of citations, references by others
   c. Textbooks or scholarly books
   d. Monographs, technical reports, reports to an agency or community that assist in the assessment of public health problems, assurance of the delivery of public health services or development of public health policy.
2. Funded Research or Practice-based Activities
   a. Funded grants, contracts, fellowships or other awards for research, public health practice or training activities.
3. Dissemination other than publication
   a. Oral and poster presentations, seminars, short courses or training sessions.
   b. Presentation at professional meetings, advisory group meetings, hearings before Congressional or legislative committees, oversight or board meetings.

c. Dissemination using multi-media technology such as the Internet.

  d. Communications to non-professionals in newspapers, newsletters or other lay publications.

4. Awards and Honors

5. Influence on policy/practice

  a. Legislation enacted to implement recommendations from research or practice.

  b. Agency regulations/statement of policy/or requests for proposals incorporating approach resulting from research or practice in a new program design or implementation of a new program.

  c.   Research, model or theory cited in floor statement for legislation pending before Congress or the state legislature.

  d. Research cited by advocacy organizations attempting to influence legislation or policy at the state or national level.

University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
http://www.uchsc.edu/som/faculty/document/NEW%20CRITERIA.doc

Definition of Scholarship:
"scholarship refers to advanced study which leads to the acquisition of knowledge in a particular field, along with accuracy and skill in investigation, and the demonstration of powers of critical analysis in interpretation of such knowledge. While the foregoing primarily refers to the scholarship of discovery, it may also include exceptional examples of the scholarship of application, integration and teaching…"

Criteria
"the first requisite for an award of tenure is excellence in scholarship…"

Documentation
"…products of scholarship must be in a format that can be evaluated, which would normally mean a written format, but could include video or computer formats. The School will recognize the following four types of scholarship as adapted and modified from concepts developed by Ernest Boyer…"

Promotion Matrix
http://www.uchsc.edu/sm/sm/CriteriaMatrix.doc
Authorship in peer-reviewed journals, external funding, patents, presentations at national meetings is how they determine Meritorious or Excellent Research work.

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill School of Public Health
http://www.sph.unc.edu/faculty/appointments/appointment_promotion.pdf

Research
Definition of Scholarship
Research is defined to include the systematic collection and analysis of information for the generation of new knowledge or for solving important public health problems. Included under research are studies which involve laboratory, field, clinic, library and other sources of information. Also included are studies which are conducted in collaboration with public or private organizations and/or communities for the purpose of helping them assess public health problems, ensure the delivery of public health services, ensure the quality of health services, or develop public health policies.

Criteria
Quality (moving the discipline forward, judged by others to be important, publications in high quality, high impact journals, high impact presentations, awards for outstanding research, leadership positions of national/international scientific organizations, or advisory committees based on research activities, ability to procure funding)
Innovation: new areas or application of new methods, incorporating or transferring knowledge to current problems influencing public health
Responsiveness/collaboration (capacity to sustain and build relationships and teams, engagement in collaborative research, contributions to dept. and school missions
Support Structure; Contributions to research support structure of dept and school, advancement of research enterprise through service, leadership for others in developing maximum [research] potential

Documentation
[Faculty]… "should explicitly state what knowledge they created or applied and what impact is has had or may likely have in the future. Numbers of publications weighted by the impact factor of the journals…participation on national panels, national presentations, major interventions directed, policy changes accomplished, and peer-reviewed funding can all be supporting measures for this assessment… the ultimate assessment of impact is the advancement of the public's health that can be attributed to the contributions of the faculty member." (p. 10)

Public Health Practice
Definition of Scholarship
For promotion and tenure on the basis of public health practice, innovative application of knowledge must be deemed to be "scholarly." That is, the practice must be shown to have affected not only a given policy, community, agency or program, but it must also be shown that the practice has in some way contributed to advancing the state-of-the-art of public health practice itself.

Criteria – very similar to research
Quality (important to human health; development policy/program with PH impact; incorporate new developments and apply knowledge to current problems; moves field forward;

publication in high impact journal; participation in task forces; practice impacts policy or community, organization or program; practice resulted in development of new PH system; practice contributes to teaching of the faculty or department; new knowledge, methods or policies have diffused to other community or organization; disseminated through publications- "publication" can mean producing technical reports with equiv of peer review; honors or awards; invitation by other institutions or health agencies to help plan, organize or review PH practice activities; appointments to national commissions, committees, boards, etc. related to PH practice; Competitive peer-reviewed funding.

Innovation Identifies new areas or applies new methods or approaches; Participation in new partnerships; Cost-effectiveness of practice approaches developed.

*Responsiveness and Collaboration (*capacity to sustain and build relationships and teams; Engagement in collaborative practice projects; Contributions to department and School practice missions; incorporate new developments in the discipline and transfer knowledge or technique to current PH problems; Publications in high quality, high impact journals; Presentations with high impact; Participation in task forces and joint ventures; practice contributions have had important effects on policy, and/or on a community, organization or program; practice activities involved or resulted in development of new PH systems; practice activities have contributed to the teaching activities of the faculty member and/or the department; new knowledge, methods, or policies derived from the candidate's practice have diffused to other communities or health organizations; practice ideas, policies, programs, methods, etc. have been disseminated through publications. In addition to articles in refereed journals,

"publication" can mean producing technical reports; The equivalent of peer review of such technical reports is evidence of their impact; honors or awards; Invitations by other institutions or health agencies to help plan, organize or review public health practice activities; Appointments to national commissions, committees, boards, etc. related to PH practice; Grants and contracts received

*Support Structures (*Contribution to practice support structures of department and School; Advancement of practice enterprise through service on panels, mentoring, etc.; Leadership in the design, delivery and evaluation of application of knowledge.

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Department of Family Medicine
http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/UNC.pdf

Definition of scholarship

*Scholarship of discovery, the exploration of fundamental processes and relationships in clinical care, health services research and policy.

*Scholarship of integration, which interprets, draws together or brings new insight to bear on original work.

*Scholarship of application, which emphasizes engagement with practical problems and the development of new approaches to dealing with these issues.

It is important to distinguish between teaching and scholarship. Teaching is one of our most important commitments, but teaching, per se, does not represent scholarship, unless it has direct impact outside of one's own setting and peer group. Likewise, service and advocacy are fundamental parts of the ethos of Family Medicine. To be scholarship, however, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge, flow directly out of ones special field of expertise, and to have reference to and impact outside of the immediate context of the service.

Criteria

PERSONAL QUALITIES. These are: Citizenship, Leadership, Integrity, and Willingness to Collaborate.

Tenure Track: Excellence must be demonstrated in two of the following areas - Clinical Work; Teaching, Research. Excellence in Community Professional Service will add strength to the case for promotion. As an independent criterion, Scholarship must be demonstrated in any of the following five areas: Clinical Work; Teaching; Research; Administration or Community Professional Service. In addition, there must be evidence of progressive productivity and regional or emerging national recognition.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Non-tenure track faculty play a critical role in making the system work. Documentation should include both personal qualities and this quality of "importance to the mission." For non-tenure track faculty, promotion can be obtained via two routes – excellence in three of five possible areas (clinical, teaching, research, administration and community professional service) or excellence in two areas and scholarship. There should be evidence of regional or emerging national reputation.

Documentation: Assistant to Associate

 1. CLINICAL WORK. Excellence in clinical practice is an essential part of academic medicine and should combine superior performance with concern for the welfare of patients. This can occur in 2 areas: 1) Recognition by peers within and outside the institution and 2) Professional contributions to patient care. Clinical roles and responsibilities should be documented in the program director's letter.

Possible criteria and documentation methods include:

HIGH VALUE
a) Peer Review of clinical skills. Documentation and supporting letters.
b) Clinical roles and responsibilities need to be documented.
c) Innovations that improve patient care
d) Published case reports or clinical articles:
e) Obtaining funds to conduct clinical service/programs
f) Mentoring learner who publishes or develops academic materials.
g) Directing a clinical fellowship.
h) Documentation of excellent outcomes of patient care

MEDIUM VALUE
i) Invited consultation outside own clinical center.
j) Clinical presentations at main departmental or CME conferences.
k) Production of materials for clinical care, i.e., protocols, procedure guides, etc.
l) Organizing/moderating CME programs (leadership).
m) Description of special clinical skills development and expertise.
n) Presenting at institutional or other clinical workshops.
o) Development of clinical educational materials for patients/public
p) Mentoring learner skills/projects.
q) Participation in State or national Clinical Committees.

LESSER VALUE
r) Participation in clinical trials
s) Participation and leadership in Departmental, Hospital committees.
t) Teaching in a clinical fellowship

2. TEACHING. The program director letter and teaching portfolio should document the nature
and scope of teaching, summarize evaluations and give demonstration of initiative, creativity,
availability; excellent learner evaluations and scholarship support excellence.

Criteria can include:
HIGH VALUE
a) Achievement of students. High scores, awards, projects, publications and presentations
   (evidence of mentoring by promotion applicant).
b) Directing an Educational program or course in medical school.
c) Directing an Educational program or course outside of medical school.
d) Development of innovative syllabi and course, which include handouts, well defined
   objectives and bibliographies. These must be provided as documentation.
e) Superior teaching evaluations by students and peers
f) Publication of a description/evaluation of an educational innovation.

MEDIUM VALUE
g) Documentation of specific teaching commitments and activities (at least three years of
   documented experience)
h) Giving a visiting professorship at another institution
i) A national presentation on an educational topic

j) Consultation on education to local, regional and national groups or organizations.

3. INVESTIGATION/RESEARCH. The faculty member must demonstrate evidence of focused work which is a significant contribution to the field of Family medicine. There should be evidence that the applicant has developed his/her own ideas and direction rather than just collaborated as a co-investigator. Recent scholarship should be predictive of continuing activity and a description of research in progress and future plans must be supplied. Evidence of a lack of scholarship should be of significant concern to the promotion process.

Criteria may include:
HIGH VALUE
a) Principal investigator on funded research projects in last three years
b) Articles presenting own work in refereed or non-refereed journals (approximately four/year should be a goal). Greater weight should be given to first author articles and those published in major highly selective national journals such as JAMA, New England Journal of Medicine, Annals of Internal Medicine, BMJ and Lancet.
c) Evidence of methodological innovation
d) Membership on study section or external grant review board
e) Supporting letters from national references
e) Membership of Funding Study Section or refereed journals/editorial boards
f) Direction of Research Fellowship Program

MEDIUM VALUE
g) Editorials and Abstracts
h) Presentations at local, regional or national meetings (at least one).

LESSER VALUE
i) Supervision of student/fellow and resident research projects.
j) Supporting letters from local colleague reference on research ability.

4. ADMINISTRATION.
skipped

5. COMMUNITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICE. Consistent with the mission of the UNC Department of Family Medicine and the University of North Carolina, community and public service is highly valued. Community service can occur in local, regional, state, national and international settings. Excellence in community professional service is that which: a) makes a substantial contribution to the health of a community over and above the clinical contributions of the individual and b) is closely integrated into the traditional academic missions of clinical care, teaching and research. Many accomplishments in community service may occur outside of or in addition to the time traditionally devoted to faculty scholarship or clinical activity.

HIGH VALUE
a) Community or public service award by statewide, national or international organization/institution
b) Serving as an elected officer of local service agencies

c) Serving on the Board of Directors as volunteer for national service organization/institution
d) Giving a presentation on some aspect of community service to a national or international organization/institution
e) Media accomplishments- state or national interviews/media stories generated on radio, television, magazines and newspapers
f) Successful grant writing for service related activity
g) Publication in peer-reviewed journal on one or more aspects of community service
h) Recognition of accomplishments by colleagues through supporting letters

MEDIUM VALUE
i) Overseas service and leadership
j) Committee Chair of a local or state organization/institution
k) Giving a presentation on some aspect of community service to a statewide organization/institution
l) Director of free medical or indigent clinic
m) Public Service Award by local organization/institution
n) Participating in a research project on community service
o) Serving on the Board of Directors of local service agencies
p) Serving as a faculty advisor for a student service organization
q) Mentoring students, fellows or faculty in service projects
r) Media accomplishments- local interviews/media stories generated on radio, television, magazines and newspapers
s) Developing a curriculum for or teaching a community service course/elective
t) Initiation of a new program or service that meets community need

LESSER VALUE
u) Serving on a committee of a local or state charitable organization/institution
v) Giving free medical care at a homeless or indigent clinic
w) Volunteer in faith-based religious institutions (e.g. church, synagogue, etc...)
x) Volunteer in non-profit community organization (e.g. United Way, Rape Crisis or Domestic Violence Center, Habitat, etc.)
y) Supervision of student/resident projects in community service
z) Giving a presentation on some aspect of community service to a local organization/institution (e.g. school talk on tobacco, grand rounds' lecture, etc...)
aa) Attendance at a conference involving community service
bb) Membership in professional and volunteer organizations that perform community service (e.g. AMA, AAFP, STFM, etc)

DOCUMENTATION GUIDELINES - SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship may relate to any of core domains (clinical work, teaching, research, administration and professional community service). The Department of Family Medicine acknowledges a broad definition of scholarship (see Appendix B). Within this framework, however, emphasis should be placed on publication, progressive productivity, and a theme, with special recognition of reports in major journals and funding quality and quantity from external sources.

What follows are guidelines for scholarship in each of the domains.

1. CLINICALWORK

 HIGH VALUE
a) Published a book or clinical articles modeling care: Minimum of one every two years.
   (Refereed or non-refereed journals)
b) Obtaining funds to conduct clinical service/programs
c) Mentoring learner who publishes or develops academic materials.

MEDIUM VALUE
d) Invitation for consultation outside own clinical center.
e) Production of materials for clinical care, i.e., protocols, procedure guides, etc.
f) Organizing/moderating CME programs (leadership).
g) Description of special clinical skills development and expertise.
h) Presenting at institutional or other clinical workshops.
i) Development of clinical educational materials for patients/public

LESSER VALUE
j) Mentoring learner skills/projects.
k) Participation in State or national Clinical Committees.
l) Presentation at national meeting.
m) Participation in clinical trials
n) Participation and leadership in Departmental, Hospital committees.
o) Community clinical services; e.g., volunteer at Shelter, Migrant Clinic.
p) Teaching in a clinical fellowship

2. TEACHING

 HIGH VALUE
a) Authoring/editing sections or books on education.
b) Development of educational/audiovisual materials for distribution outside the institution.
c) Minimum of one refereed articles on education every two years.
d) Directing a teaching fellowship program.
e) Leadership (PI, CO-PI) in obtaining training grant.

MEDIUM VALUE
f) Participating in educational committees in the Medical School/the local institution.
g) Participating in a teaching fellowship program.
h) Presentation of paper/program/workshop at state, regional (two in the last three years).
i) Active participation in writing one training grant in past two years.
j) Presentation of paper/program/workshop at national level.

LESSER VALUE
l) Participating in specific educational conferences at the local institution as well as regionally
   and nationally.

m) Participating in education committees at regional level.
n) Membership in appropriate professional organizations.

3. INVESTIGATION/RESEARCH

HIGH VALUE
a) Authorship/editorship of books from a reputable publisher
b) Refereed publications-guideline of 4/ year, with greater weight given to first authorships and
    to publications in national highly selective journals.
c) Principal investigator on Grant (> $50K) funded outside the institution.
d) Editorship of journal/project/conference proceedings

MEDIUM VALUE
e) Presentations/posters at regional and national conferences (two in the last three years)
f) Mentoring research publications of colleagues, learners (provide details).
g) Principal Investigator on a funded grant outside the Institution (<$50K).
h) Active membership of national research committee(s)
i) Principal investigator on Research grant funded within institution
k) Organization of research training/research conference
l) Consultant to program/agency outside institution
m) Invitation to present research at other universities.

LESSER VALUE
n) Collaboration on unfunded research project
o) Development of research grant proposal. Manuscript available to committee
p) Membership of local, regional research committees
q) Teaching participation in a research fellowship/or teaching research course

4. ADMINISTRATION
      skipped

5. COMMUNITY SERVICE

HIGH VALUE
a) Publications regarding community service projects
b) Success in obtaining grant support of community professional service projects
c) Institution and institutionalization of new program/service that impact state or national service

MEDIUM VALUE
d) Invited presentation at national or state level
e) Presentation at state or national conferences
f) Published editorials in regional or state print media
g) Institution and institutionalization of new program/services that impacts local service
h) Mentoring fellows or other faculty on service related publications

LESSER VALUE

i) Oral presentation at local meeting
j) Collaboration on funded service project
k) Published letters to editor in print media

GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SOCIAL SCIENCE
University of Minnesota
http://fsos.che.umn.edu/

Comment: There is widespread consensus that the movement towards publicly engaged research universities will stall without a new reward structure for faculty tenure and promotion. In this revised tenure document, we aim to put high quality faculty work in the public arena on a par with traditional forms of scholarship as the basis for tenure. This document comes out of three years of study and deliberation during which we concluded that the traditional typology of faculty work—teaching, research, and service—is inadequate for the next generation of tenure guidelines. In this categorization, teaching and research inevitably are emphasized as core faculty contributions that lend themselves to high standards and rigorous evaluation, while service is framed as worthy volunteer activity that may round out a tenure portfolio but cannot serve as a basis for awarding a life time academic position. In fact, junior faculty are often advised to postpone their service work until after they secure their foundation in research and teaching. We aim to transcend this conceptual and pragmatic bind with a new framework for faculty work based on the categories of disciplinary work, outreach work, and engagement work—all three involving teaching, research, and service, and each one potentially serving as the basis of tenure when meeting standards of excellence.

Definition of Scholarship

Faculty work can be categorized into the following three types, each of which can serve as the basis for tenure when the work meets the evaluation criteria described in Section IV of this document.

Disciplinary work is the faculty work of teaching and advising students within the academy, service to the profession and the academic community, theory building, and basic and applied research that contributes to knowledge about families.

Outreach work is research, teaching, and service that involves faculty with members of the public and with community professionals working outside of the University. Outreach research responds to concerns of stakeholders outside of academia and feeds results back to these stakeholders and other groups. Outreach teaching responds to the educational needs of families or other stakeholders outside of academia and may occur off-campus in non-credit workshops or other teaching venues such as distance education. Outreach service involves faculty bringing their expertise to families or other stakeholders in forms such as media work, speaking and consulting to community organizations, board leadership positions, and testifying at legislative hearings.

Engagement work combines research, teaching, and service in projects that involve families or other stakeholders outside of academia as co-creators and collaborators, generally with the goal of developing useful knowledge for innovations in community practices, public policies, or social or economic change. Engagement work may involve a combination of activities listed above for disciplinary and outreach work, plus other activities, but adds the dimension of the "cycle of scholarship" in which research, teaching, and service complement and mutually inform one another in a planful way.

Criteria
The Board of Regents' general criteria for awarding tenure are as follows: "The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that the achievements of an individual have demonstrated the individual's potential to continue to contribute significantly to the mission of the University and to its programs of teaching, research, and service over the course of the faculty member's academic career. The primary criteria for demonstrating this potential are effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research. Outstanding discipline-related service contributions will also be taken into account when they are an integral part of the mission of the academic unit" (Board of Regents, *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7.11).

The Department of Family Social Science applies the following evaluation criteria in tenure decisions. These criteria apply across all three types of faculty work--disciplinary, outreach, and engagement.

- Effectiveness in teaching
- Professional distinction in research
- Outstanding service
- Potential for future professional growth
- National recognition for the candidate's work

Documentation

Following are some of the ways that faculty members can document their disciplinary work, outreach work, and engagement work. In writing their tenure materials, candidates will specify the kind of work they have conducted and provide the documentation pertinent to that work. The first set of sources of documentation (Section V. A.) applies to all three kinds of scholarly work. The second set (in Section V. B.) subsumes the first and adds additional documentation for outreach and engagement work. The third set (Section V. C.) subsumes the first two and adds documentation specific to engagement work. The Department acknowledges that outreach and engagement work may blur traditional distinctions between research, teaching, and service. Candidates for tenure may provide unique forms of documentation beyond those listed below. Section VII of this document provides candidates with guidance on the specific materials to be included in their tenure and promotion portfolio.

A. <u>Documentation for Disciplinary, Outreach and Engagement Work</u>

- Peer-reviewed articles
- Academic books and chapters
- Edited special issues of journals
- Research and Technical reports
- Conference presentations
- Special invited presentations
- Grants record
- Journal editorial board memberships
- Summary of teaching activities
- Syllabi, curricula**,** program plans

- Evaluations from students/learners/stakeholders
- Peer evaluations
- Student advising record
- Honors, awards
- Leadership positions
- Departmental, Collegiate, Extension, and University citizenship record
- Record of service to the academic and professional community
- Record of professional service in local, state, national, or international communities or organizations
- Articulated plans for systematic scholarly work

B. Additional Documentation for Outreach and Engagement Work

- Summary of sustained programs, projects, and partnerships
- Products such as videos, websites, CD-ROMs, educational manuals, trade books.
- Popular media, with information on types of media, populations reached, circulation, influence, citations
- Summary of public influence such as involvement in policy development, policy changes, new laws, or changes in agency practices

C. Additional Documentation for Engagement Work

- Multiple, complementary products reflecting a cycle of scholarship integrating teaching, research, and service. Example: a refereed journal article, community education materials, and media stories -- all emerging from one collaborative project.
- Summary of involvement of community stakeholders as collaborators and co-creators of projects

Documentation of an individual's scholarship manifested in a community outreach project should provide information about the following principal elements, using an appropriate combination of narrative and illustrative materials, and whatever sequence and format is appropriate to the specific activity.

THE PURPOSE: Defining the task

The documentation needs to describe and explain:

• The nature and context of the project;
• Its responsiveness to the needs and priorities of the external client, its consistency with institutional and departmental mission, and its appropriateness to the individual's development;
• The utilization of the complementary expertise and experiences of the individual and external partners;
• The diagnostic steps taken to understand the principal characteristics of the situation, as well as to identify the situation-specific aspects requiring adaptation of commonly used approaches and the available and potential resources.

No matter how these elements are presented and where they occur within the overall documentation, they should give the reader of the portfolio with an understanding of the activity's context and circumstances, of the applicable knowledge base as well as situation-specific aspects, and of the needs and expectations of the several stake holders.

THE PROCESS: Carrying it out

The elements listed under 'PURPOSE' must be used to describe and explain the rationale for the design of the project, i.e., the reasoned, situation-pertinent choice of attainable goals and appropriate method. The documentation must in addition describe the reflective delivery or implementation--how it was monitored and what adaptations were made in an ongoing design. The principal elements of process are:

The outcomes of a community outreach project include these four elements:
• The impact on the external partner, including (1) how the specific goals were met in terms of responding to the partner's immediate needs and expectations; and (2) how the activity enhanced the partner's understanding and capability of dealing with similar situations in the future.
• The impact on the individual (faculty member), including (1) what was learned from the project by the individual and how this enhanced his/her own capability of undertaking similar projects in the future; (2) how the activity enriched the individual's teaching; and (3) how it influenced her/his research or scholarship.
• The impact on the institution and department including (1) how the activity contributed to the institutional and departmental missions and priorities; (2) how it influenced the curriculum and

the teaching of colleagues; (3) how it provided direct or indirect opportunities for student involvement; and (4) how it reinforced collective research programs and the research of colleagues.

• The impact on the knowledge base of the individual's discipline including (1) how the activity contributed to existing principles and/or methodology and (2) how these contributions were communicated to fellow specialists, as well as to others engaged in similar activities, including external stake holders.

It is important to realize that the importance of the above items will vary from discipline to discipline, and depend on the particular nature of the project. Furthermore, the list is not necessarily complete, and may need to include additional items. Remember, the portfolio should tell a coherent story through a combination of narrative and illustrative material. Community outreach projects are often carried out in a non-linear fashion, starting at different points with continuous reflection, ongoing collaboration with external partners, and multiple feedback. Projects are often begun by a trial or pilot phase which implies flexibility in the development of the framework. Likewise, the guidelines provided here should be subject to the same flexibility in the development of a Community Outreach Portfolio.

Portland State University Promotion and Tenure Code

Definition of Scholarship
The term *scholar* implies superior intellectual, aesthetic, or creative attainment. A scholar engages at the highest levels of life-long learning and inquiry. The character of a scholar is demonstrated by academic achievement and rigorous academic practice. Over time, an active learner usually moves fluidly among different expressions of scholarship. However, it also is quite common and appropriate for scholars to prefer one expression over another. The following four expressions of scholarship apply equally to Research, Teaching, and Community outreach.

1. Discovery: the rigorous testing of researchable questions suggested by theory or models of how phenomena may operate. Active experimentation, or exploration, with the primary goal of adding to the cumulative knowledge and of enhancing future prediction of the phenomena. May also involve original creation in writing, as well as creation, performance, or production in the performing arts, fine arts, architecture, graphic design, cinema, and broadcast media or related technologies.
2. Integration: places isolated knowledge or observations in perspective. Integrating activities make connections across disciplines, theories, or models. Integration illuminates information, artistic creations in the literary and performing arts, or original work in a revealing way. It brings divergent knowledge together or creates and/or extends new theory.
3. Interpretation: the process of revealing, explaining, and making knowledge and creative processes clear to others or of interpreting the creative works of others. Involves communicating knowledge and instilling skills and understanding that others may build upon and apply.
4. Application: involves asking how state-of-the-art knowledge can be responsibly applied to significant problems. Application primarily concerns assessing the efficacy of knowledge or creative activities within a particular context, refining its implications, assessing its generalizability, and using it to implement changes.

Criteria
Quality and significance of scholarship are the primary criteria. A consistently high quality of scholarship, and its promise for future exemplary scholarship, is more important than the quantity of the work done.
1. Clarity and Relevance of Goals.
2. Mastery of Existing Knowledge
3. Appropriate Use of Methodology and Resources
4. Effectiveness of Communication. ...
Scholars should communicate with appropriate audiences and subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review. Usually the results of scholarship are communicated widely through publications (e.g., journal articles and books), performances, exhibits, and/or presentations at conferences and workshops.
5. Significance of Results. Scholars should evaluate whether or not they achieve their goals and whether or not this achievement had an important impact on and is used by others. Customarily, peers and other multiple and credible sources (e.g., students, community participants, and subject matter experts) evaluate the significance of results. Faculty engaged in community outreach can

make a difference in their communities and beyond by defining or resolving relevant social problems or issues, by facilitating organizational development, by improving existing practices or programs, and by enriching the cultural life of the community. Scholars should widely disseminate the knowledge gained in a community-based project in order to share its significance with those who do not benefit directly from the project.

6. Consistently Ethical Behavior.

Documentation

1. Documentation for promotion and tenure normally includes:

Self-appraisal of scholarly agenda and accomplishments.   A self-appraisal should include:

A curriculum vitae

A representative sample of an individual's most scholarly work

Evaluations of accomplishments by peers and other multiple and credible sources (e.g., students, community participants, and subject matter experts). Peers include authoritative representatives from the candidate's scholarly field(s).

2. Research and Other Creative Activities (Research)

      skip

3. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching)

      skip

4. Community Outreach

A significant factor in determining a faculty member's advancement is the individual's accomplishments in community outreach when such activities are part of a faculty member's responsibilities.   Scholars can draw on their professional expertise to engage in a wide array of community outreach. Such activities can include defining or resolving relevant local, national, or international problems or issues. Community outreach also includes planning literary or artistic festivals or celebrations. PSU highly values quality community outreach as part of faculty roles and responsibilities.[1]

The setting of Portland State University affords faculty many opportunities to make their expertise useful to the community outside the University. Community based activities are those which are tied directly to one's special field of knowledge. Such activities may involve a cohesive series of activities contributing to the definition or resolution of problems or issues in society . These activities also include aesthetic and celebratory projects. Scholars who engage in community outreach also should disseminate promising innovations to appropriate audiences and subject their work to critical review.

Departments and individual faculty members can use the following guidelines when developing appropriate community outreach. Important community outreach can:

-contribute to the definition or resolution of a relevant social problem or issue

-use state-of-the-art knowledge to facilitate change in organizations or institutions

-use disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise to help groups organizations in conceptualizing and solving problems

-set up intervention programs to prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes for individuals or groups or to optimize positive outcomes

- contribute to the evaluation of existing practices or programs
- make substantive contributions to public policy
- create schedules and choose or hire participants in community events such as festivals
- offer professional services such as consulting (consistent with the policy on outside employment), serving as an expert witness, providing clinical services, and participating on boards and commissions outside the university.

Faculty and departments should evaluate a faculty member's community outreach accomplishments creatively and thoughtfully. Contributions to knowledge developed through community outreach should be judged using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarship (see II.D). It is strongly recommended that the evaluation consider the following indicators of quality and significance:

_ publication in journals or presentations at disciplinary or interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of community outreach
_ honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition received for community outreach
_ adoption of the faculty member's models for problem resolution, intervention programs, instruments, or processes by others who seek solutions to similar problems
_ substantial contributions to public policy or influence upon professional practice
_ models that enrich the artistic and cultural life of the community
_ evaluative statements from clients and peers regarding the quality and significance of documents or performances produced by the faculty member.

Excerpt from RPT Guidelines from the University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine http://sphcm.washington.edu/gateway/handbook/index.asp

Academic Public Health Practice

I. Introduction

To encourage the advancement of scholarship in academic public health practice (academic PHP), the School of Public Health and Community Medicine has established guidelines to evaluate scholarly academic PHP activities of faculty being considered for promotion. It is recognized that individual faculty will differ in their respective emphases on academic PHP. Some faculty may have little or no involvement in academic PHP, while others may have contributed significantly to advancing academic PHP. Faculty may choose to have their suitability for promotion be evaluated based in part upon their documented contributions to advancing academic PHP. It is important that faculty who choose to become involved in academic PHP plan these activities as early as possible in the promotion cycle, and establish clear, explicit objectives for these activities. The academic PHP plan should be discussed with the departmental chair at annual reviews and should be updated as needed to reflect changes in objectives.

If a faculty member exercises the option of being considered for promotion based upon documented academic PHP activities, the guidelines outlined below will be applied to the review process. As discussed in section V of these guidelines, faculty electing to have academic PHP considered in their promotion will still be expected to have some evidence of activity in traditional research as indicated by peer-reviewed publications.

II. Definition of Academic Public Health Practice

Academic PHP is the "applied, interdisciplinary pursuit of scholarship in the field of public health." Faculty involved in academic PHP carry out the mission of "developing, integrating and applying new knowledge to improve public health in the population, and practice in public health agencies and in community, medical, and other public health organizations."[7] Critically important to academic PHP is the fundamental role of scholarship in creating and disseminating new knowledge. The above mission also recognizes the importance of developing interdisciplinary, collaborative approaches in carrying out academic PHP activities. The definition of academic PHP expressly includes practice activities related to the delivery, financing, management, and organization of personal and public health services. Examples of academic PHP activities include:

- Performing a program needs assessment
- Evaluating a public health program or activity
- Designing or conducting a public health survey
- Providing technical assistance to a public health or health care organization to help that organization improve its operation
- Designing training materials
- Providing training or mentoring to public health practitioners or professional groups
- Developing programmatic or organizational linkages among public health or health care agencies for the purpose of addressing a health-related problem or policy
- Assisting local, state or federal policy makers with analysis or development of health policy
- International Health projects

[7] Association of Schools of Public Health (ASPH), Demonstrating Excellence in Academic Public Health Practice, (unpublished report), June 1999.

II. Criteria for Evaluating Contributions to Academic Public Health Practice

Academic PHP includes a wide array of activities. Regardless of the specific activities undertaken, the candidate's portfolio of academic PHP activities should be of high quality and demonstrate: (1) scientific rigor; (2) positive impact on the target community, population or organization; (3) effective dissemination; and (4) leadership. The quantity of documented academic PHP activities expected for promotion depends upon the anticipated weight being given to these activities in the candidate's review. A clear trajectory of increasing impact, that includes plans for future years, should be explained in the self-assessment or highlighted in the SPHCM CV, since this will carry weight in the review for promotion.

A. Scientific Rigor

Academic PHP activities should reflect an appropriate degree of scientific rigor. Evidence of scientific rigor could include:

- Use of rigorous quantitative or qualitative methods
- Use of conceptual frameworks that reflect recent developments in practice methods or theoretical understanding
- Use of evidence-based approaches that are well grounded in public health sciences

B. Impact

The candidate's participation in academic PHP should have some positive impact. This impact may take different forms. Evidence that the candidate's activities have had an impact could include the following:

- Improvement or refinement of practice methods
- Improvement in a health policy, program, or organization
- Improvement in methods of disease or injury surveillance, prevention or control
- Progress towards social equity in public health
- Reduction of worker or community exposures to health risks
- The ability of trainees to assume positions of leadership as public health practitioners

C. Dissemination

Central to academic PHP is disseminating the results of practice activities to appropriate groups. The candidate's record will be strengthened by having peer-reviewed publications. Evidence of dissemination could include:

- Publishing in peer-reviewed journals or in high-quality practitioner or professional journals or other periodicals
- Publishing in periodicals or newspapers read by the target population
- Presenting to large numbers of persons that include the target population
- Developing video, computer, or other distance programs that reach a substantial number of persons in the target audience
- Writing policy documents directed toward agency officials, policy makers or legislators

D.. Leadership and Personal Contribution

The candidate should present evidence of leadership and personal contribution in carrying out academic PHP activities. It is recognized that for some academic PHP activities effective leadership may take nontraditional, more collaborative forms. Evidence of leadership and personal contribution could include:

- Serving as the chair or playing a key role on an important task force
- Directing an important public health, community-based activity
- Organizing ongoing partnerships with community agencies that significantly enhance the quantity and/or quality of public health activities
- Receiving an award(s) for accomplishments in academic PHP

**The Scholarship of Engagement, National Review Board
Evaluation Criteria for the Scholarship of Engagement**

www.scholarshipofengagement.org

(THIS SERVICE WILL PROVIDE AN EXTERNAL REVIEW OF COMMUNITY ENGAGED
SCHOLARS IN THEIR P AND T PROCESS, BUT IS NOT SPECIFIC TO, AND RARELY
USED IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES)

These criteria are used by the National Review Board to assess and evaluate the Scholarship of
Engagement. Drawing from the criteria presented in Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on
Faculty Evaluation, (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997), they have been adapted to more closely
reflect the unique fit with the Scholarship of Engagement.

The Scholarship of Engagement is a term that captures scholarship in the areas of teaching,
research, and/or service. It 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 communities 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.

In applying these criteria, the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement is
mindful of the variation in institutional contexts, the breadth of faculty work, and individual
promotion and tenure guidelines.

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 university 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 styles 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?