

University of Minnesota Office for Public Engagement

Task Force on Faculty Scholarship, Development, and Rewards

FINAL REPORT
22 June 2009

Introduction

The University of Minnesota (UMN) Office for Public Engagement (OPE) is implementing a *Ten-Point Plan for Advancing and Institutionalizing Public Engagement* at the University. In January 2009, to help implement the Plan, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement Andy Furco appointed several Task Forces, including a Task Force on Faculty Scholarship, Development, and Rewards. This Task Force was charged with articulating a set of institutional policies and practices to enhance faculty members' capacity to participate in engagement initiatives and to support their engaged research and teaching. The Associate Vice President's charge summarized the rationale for the Task Force, outlined five tasks, and listed related questions to explore. Members of the Task Force were selected to be broadly representative of the University system and to include faculty with significant expertise and experience in publicly engaged scholarship. Appendix 1 is a copy of the charge to the Task Force. Appendix 2 is a list of faculty who served as members of the Task Force.

The Task Force met six times during the Spring 2009 semester, discussed each of the questions posed by Associate Vice President Furco, and reviewed a number of documents and papers related to strategies for institutionalizing engaged scholarship in research institutions. Through deliberation and discernment, members of the Task Force reached consensus on findings related to each of the five tasks. This report summarizes findings and presents a set of recommendations for the Associate Vice President and OPE to consider as they continue their work to implement plans for institutionalizing public engagement at University of Minnesota.

Task Force members agreed on several observations and comments that provide context for this report:

- The Task Force embraces the definition of public engagement adopted by the University of Minnesota in 2004 as a frame of reference and has not attempted any nuanced reinterpretation of it. This definition is:

Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to: 1) enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; 2) enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; 3) prepare educated, engaged citizens; 4) strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; 5) address critical societal issues; and 6) contribute to the public good.

Public engagement involves diverse partners from the private, public, and nonprofit sectors and may be focused locally in neighborhoods, across cities or regions, or even across nations.

- The University of Minnesota has a long history and tradition of public engagement that includes involving the public in the academic enterprise. Although emphases on the language of engagement as distinct from public service may sometimes convey that engagement involves principally new approaches to research and teaching, the Task Force strongly believes that the University's tradition of engagement is the underpinning for new, broader initiatives. For example, plant geneticists with University of Minnesota Extension and the College of Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resource Sciences have a long, successful history of developing disease

resistant strains of fruits, vegetables, and other crops. New collaborations with venture capital firms that help reduce times to commercialize and market new products are one illustration of publicly engaged scholarship. The University's Office for Technology Commercialization, which includes both the Licensing Center and the Venture Center, is another good example of the University's efforts to support publicly engaged scholarship.

- Despite the University of Minnesota's historic commitment to and manifest successes in public engagement, its programs of public engagement need to be expanded and strengthened. Expanding and strengthening our public engagement will require changing some of the bedrock foundations of academic culture, overcoming constraints in higher education outside the control of a single institution, and years of effort. Nevertheless, the Task Force believes change and transformation are possible. Specific issues to be addressed include:
 - Expanding the set of indicators used in promotion and tenure processes that historically have governed faculty careers;
 - Developing new systems of incentives, reviews, and rewards that clarify the meaning of public engagement and reward faculty who excel at it; and
 - New emphases on the public mission of the University of Minnesota as the context in which the disciplinary expertise of faculty and students is developed and deployed.

Report and Findings

Task 1. Assess faculty members' current attitudes towards engaged research and teaching.

University of Minnesota faculty members' attitudes towards publicly-engaged research and teaching comprise a wide spectrum, from enthusiastic endorsement to dismissive disdain. Some faculty believe engaged scholarship ought to epitomize and embody the University of Minnesota, while others believe the language of engagement is simply trendy administrative jargon to describe the University's historic nod to public service. The attitudes of most faculty fall somewhere between these poles, with differences reflecting traditions in the disciplines, the different colleges, schools, and departments, and the faculty members' own training and experience. Members of the Task Force find that:

- Faculty across the University do not share a common understanding of publicly engaged scholarship.
- Publicly engaged scholarship is viewed in many, if not most disciplines as less serious, more risky, and less significant than traditional approaches to research and teaching.
- Many faculty likely believe that engaged scholarship is tolerated by peers and administrators rather than supported and encouraged.
- Disciplinary loyalties and the necessity of communicating with academic peers outside University of Minnesota often can be hindrances and barriers to institutionalizing engaged research and teaching.
- New emphases on translational research at the National Institute of Health, the National Science Foundation, and other federal funding agencies are reinforcing trends in support of public engagement, are likely to have great impacts in shaping faculty attitudes towards publicly engaged scholarship in the long term, and represent opportunities for the University to leverage efforts to institutionalize publicly engaged scholarship.
- Faculty will continue to be evaluated on traditional measures of research and teaching, but, as illustrated by many successful scholars at the University of Minnesota, public engagement can both enhance achievements in the areas of research and teaching and be documented effectively.

The Task Force concluded that the University of Minnesota needs to help faculty understand that public engagement:

- Is more than traditional public service and dissemination of information to the public.
- Involves meaningful partnerships with individuals, institutions, and communities outside the university who help shape academic activities.
- Includes partners in private industry, public institutions, and neighborhood nonprofits, who may be located in the region or state or across the country or globe.
- Recognizes the inherent value of external partners in defining research questions and teaching objectives and in co-creation of knowledge.
- Is a strategy that all faculty can pursue to develop and enhance their careers, but not something that all faculty need to do all the time.
- Is best when fully integrated into a faculty member's agendas for research and teaching, thereby maximizing relevance and impact.
- May lead to breakthroughs in science and teaching while providing the public with answers it needs to important problems.
- Is relevant to all disciplines, and not just to the professions such as health sciences, education, law, or public affairs that link naturally to individuals and organizations outside the academy.
- Is essential to fulfillment of the University of Minnesota's land grant mission and implies faculty responsibilities that provide the foundation and context for pursuit and application of their disciplinary expertise.

Members of the Task Force noted that tenure track faculty may be especially interested in publicly engaged scholarship but may be discouraged from pursuing their interests because of the risks it entails with peers, the ambiguity associated with measuring outcomes and impacts outside traditional measures like peer-reviewed articles, and the time required to develop external partnerships. The paradoxical effect of discouraging engagement early in a faculty career is that, following tenure when opportunities for engagement are higher and risks are lower, tenured faculty lack the experience to excel and may therefore be less likely to alter their career trajectories. Development of better measures to assess and reward high quality publicly engaged scholarship may address this problem.

Task 2. Describe the ways that publicly-engaged research and teaching are interpreted in different disciplines.

As noted in findings related to Task 1, disciplinary traditions and training influence practice and perceptions of publicly engaged scholarship, and engaged scholarship is better accepted in some academic units than in others. While commitment to engaged scholarship may be strongest in professional schools because of their historic links to external constituencies that continue to help define their missions, there may be surprising biases against engaged scholarship in other units where it might be expected to be a norm. For example, one Task Force member noted that he studies public engagement in the field of education but that his own research is not "engaged," a paradox he attributed to the barriers associated with prevailing attitudes towards engaged scholarship noted previously and the need to establish the social science bona fides for the discipline.

Members of the Task Force concluded that:

- OPE may be able to help the University of Minnesota continue recent work to further develop common principles of engagement (as opposed to a single definition of engaged scholarship) that cut across disciplines.
- The principles of engagement need to reflect a continuum or the multiple dimensions of engagement and address questions such as the role of external partners in asking research questions, defining research agenda, and interpreting findings.
- OPE may be able to support leaders in academic units historically skeptical of engagement to reinterpret ongoing faculty activities as publicly engaged scholarship, thereby minimizing

perceptions that engagement is another demand on faculty. For example, the University of Minnesota can celebrate industry-funded research that leads to new patents, products, and jobs in the community as publicly engaged scholarship. Similarly, research by geographers and anthropologists that reshapes understanding and processes of international development and informs policies of agencies like the U.S. Agency for International Development also needs to be understood as publicly engaged scholarship.

- The manner in and degree to which engaged scholarship will be institutionalized will vary across the disciplines and academic units and that it would be fruitless to pursue plans or strategies to make them uniform. For example, the Task Force observed that in the health sciences, there is a trend to support both engaged teaching and research and to acknowledge it in promotion and tenure processes but that in law, engaged scholarship is unlikely to be acknowledged unless it leads to traditional outputs such as papers in law journals or other peer-reviewed research.

The Task Force reviewed the new University of Minnesota promotion and tenure guidelines and found that they provide a foundation for institutionalization of engaged scholarship. The Task Force concluded, however, that the guidelines are insufficient by themselves and that broader changes in culture will be required if barriers associated with the promotion and tenure process are to be overcome. The Task Force identified several opportunities to change culture that may support institutionalization of engaged scholarship. These opportunities include creative use of space at the university to foster collaborations with external partners and engaging with the public to address strategic priorities related to diversity.

The Task Force also identified other issues related to processes for promotion and tenure that might be useful to explore. Members noted that time required to develop an engaged research agenda may be an important obstacle and that it may be fruitful to consider longer probationary periods for scholars interested in engaged research. Some universities already have 10 year probationary periods. Jones and Gold (1998) reported more than a decade ago that nine percent of 116 medical schools had tenure clocks of 10 or more years. Another issue to explore involves peer-review of outcomes of engagement, including impact on the public. Any approach to incorporate peer-review of engaged scholarship would differ by discipline. With respect to changes in culture, members of the Task Force noted that, beginning with orientation of new faculty, greater emphasis could be placed on the University of Minnesota engaged mission.

Task 3. Identify faculty development needs that can advance engaged scholarship and teaching.

As part of its exploration of faculty development needs, the Task Force reviewed a set of matrices prepared by a national task force in the health sciences and concluded that models for faculty development exist and can be very useful at the University of Minnesota. These models establish core competencies for engaged scholarship, illustrate how competencies differ as a faculty member progresses in his or her career, provide a framework for faculty development plans, and identify how faculty can draw on different resources to support their career development. Faculty development plans, for example, need to address learning content, resources for guidance and support, available incentives, and strategies for development of portfolios and other documentation for their review and promotion. Types of resources vary from those available from informal networks of peers, to those provided by the department, college, or University, to those from professional associations and organizations. The models reviewed by the Task Force are included as Appendix 3.

The Task Force identified a number of general ideas, opportunities, and strategies that could provide context for faculty development and also a number of more practical strategies for addressing needs. The more general observations included recognition that:

- Competencies are cumulative and development strategies will be stronger if tiered or hierarchical systems of development are integrated into support structures.

- Apprentice types of approaches that pair experienced and novice faculty members warrant consideration, but these need to provide opportunities for shared practice that extend beyond typical university mentoring relationships.
- Behaviors are more difficult to measure than knowledge, and observation by peers (as is used sometimes in teaching) may be needed to gauge progress in development of competencies in public engagement.
- Following established models for faculty development in other institutions may be fruitful, including British models that pair mentors from other institutions with faculty members at all ranks.
- Opportunities need to be provided for public partners to have input into assessment of competencies.
- Clarification of rationales and justification for publicly engaged scholarship will assist with faculty development and development of an academic culture that empowers engaged scholars.
- Indirect structural changes may induce more engaged scholarship. For example, increasing student demand for service learning may create incentives for faculty and academic units to support faculty who wish develop this competency
- Consistent with the idea that competencies are cumulative, resources for faculty development need to be allocated across faculty ranks. For example, academic units like the Office of Technology Commercialization or Center for Urban and Regional Affairs may need to provide different types of assistance to faculty at different ranks. New faculty may need assistance with beginning new partnerships, while faculty in rank may need more assistance with assessment or troubleshooting. However, a developmental model recognizes that senior faculty may be new to engaged research or teaching while their junior colleagues may have greater experience. Faculty development programs need to be tailored to the developmental level of the faculty member, not their rank.

In addition to these observations, Task Force members noted that creating opportunities and space for engaged scholars to flourish in a research university is a higher priority than tenuring specific numbers of faculty on engagement because the goal of faculty development is to enable faculty, not dictate modes of scholarship. Task Force members also noted that the focus on changing culture needs to be pervasive and enduring. For example, the Mayo Clinic motto is “the needs of the patient come first.” We speculated how faculty work might be different if a creed based on the University’s land grant mission (e.g., “the needs of the public come first,”) guided the faculty work. Practical strategies for addressing faculty development are presented with other recommendations.

Task 4. Identify priorities for investment to further the institutionalization of engaged scholarship.

The Task Force engaged in wide-ranging discussions and identified many potential strategies for institutionalizing and strengthening publicly engaged scholarship at the University of Minnesota. Activities and programs that potentially could augment the array of support programs now offered at the University of Minnesota and warrant exploration are listed here.

Professional development, mentoring, and apprenticeships

The University of Minnesota New Faculty Orientation has been strengthened in recent years and now offers a comprehensive introduction to the University. Additional, intentional emphases on public engagement at this orientation could strengthen our culture of public engagement. Examples of potential additions include meetings with senior, award winning publicly engaged scholars, meetings with external partners, and trips to the Office for Technology Commercialization, public agencies, health care facilities, or clinics or organizations in North Minneapolis or Cedar Riverside where the University maintains significant ongoing commitments. These new orientation activities could be reinforced with periodic “booster” shots – follow-up professional development programs supported with various incentives.

The Task Force noted that faculty members often have mentors for research and teaching and that, given the length of time required to develop collaborations essential to publicly engaged scholarship, more in-depth apprentice-like programs may be useful. The University of New Hampshire's Outreach Scholar's Academy (see discussion Task 5) is an example of a structured program that goes beyond informal mentoring. Models also exist in other areas, including the Works in Progress Seminar that the University of Minnesota will host this summer. This program pairs 12 emerging scholars with senior scholars or public partners to strengthen scholarship on k-12 education.

The Task Force noted that IRB training for principal investigators ensures that investigators understand potential risks to human subjects and noted that publicly engaged scholarship also requires responsible interaction with the public. Web-based training and certification programs related to responsible and effective engaged scholarship may be a useful approach to professional development. The IRB training modules are good examples of useful tools for professional development. Although Task Force members agreed that training modules would be useful, many expressed concern about additional requirements for faculty interested in publicly engaged scholarship.

Annual merit, promotion and tenure, and post tenure reviews

The Task Force noted that departmental and college leaders can encourage and reinforce publicly engaged scholarship in annual, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure reviews. The University can encourage departmental and collegiate reviewers to consider the impacts and outcomes of publicly engaged scholarship in these review processes in different ways, including solicitation of external assessments. Because of the difficulty in gauging impact, the University could provide examples of acceptable documentation, including model letters of review from external partners and collaborators. The Task Force members noted that when and where engagement activities are atypical for a unit, it may be helpful to seek the external review services of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement (<http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/>).

The University of Minnesota recently completed a major review of the 7.11 and 7.12 statements that govern tenure and promotion processes. New language in these statements provides for consideration of public engagement activities, but no cross-sectional analyses of the various ways that the different colleges have chosen to operationalize these statements have been attempted. University leaders can enhance the climate for public engagement by compiling and disseminating language on public engagement from the new collegiate 7.12 statements and tracking over time outcomes related to these new provisions.

In recognition of the time required to develop the collaborations integral to publicly engaged scholarship, the Task Force discussed the merits of a longer (e.g., 10 year) tenure clock for publicly engaged scholars. While many institutions have longer tenure clocks, and some institutions have different probationary periods for different categories of faculty, faculty noted potential drawbacks to this innovation, including the reluctance of departments to invest in longer probationary periods and the potential for institutionalizing pernicious faculty classifications.

The Task Force noted that publicly engaged scholarship can invigorate the careers of faculty members and that colleagues and departmental leaders involved in peer review may wish to recommend professional development opportunities in public engagement among strategies for increasing the impact of scholarship and strengthening careers.

Support for publicly engaged scholarship

Major funding organizations, including the National Institutes of Health and the National Science

Foundation, increasingly are emphasizing the importance of translational research, including research developed in collaboration with potential users and beneficiaries of the research. These emphases on application of the knowledge present new challenges for faculty. The University of Minnesota can support faculty who compete for these awards by providing both training and proposal templates for public engagement that have proven effective in meeting expectations for translational research or for requirements for discussing the “broader impacts” of the proposed research.

The Task Force noted that the University of Minnesota can support faculty interested in publicly engaged scholarship by making long-term commitments to provide new opportunities and outlets for their scholarship. For example, the University could allocate resources to support faculty who propose special volumes or editions on publicly engaged scholarship to highly regarded peer-reviewed journals. In addition, the University of Minnesota Press could develop series of publications on the scholarship of public engagement.

Another strategy for supporting faculty involves strengthening the University of Minnesota’s capacity to locate and work with strong public partners. Many partnerships evolve informally or serendipitously. The University could do more to assist faculty in developing these connections, possibly through better use of information technology and Web 2.0 technologies. CURA’s [University Neighborhood Network](#), for example, encourages neighborhoods to post their research interests online, hoping to attract student or faculty response.

In recent years, the number of service and experiential learning opportunities at the University has increased. Task Force members observed that faculty who develop and deliver service learning courses sometimes also initiate new lines of publicly engaged scholarship. Hence, one strategy to induce more publicly engaged teaching and research is to increase opportunities or requirements for service learning courses. These demands will provide faculty opportunities to learn the skills of public engagement that then can be used to expand their approaches to and agendas for research. With appropriate resources the Career and Community Learning Center may be able to support expansions of service learning courses.

Awards for publicly engaged scholarship

The Task Force noted that the University of Minnesota has awards for research, teaching, and community service but that no particular award focuses on publicly engaged scholarship. The merits of new awards for publicly engaged scholarship warrant consideration. These awards will be considered more attractive if they carry permanent salary increases. In addition, current efforts to nominate University of Minnesota faculty for national awards should be continued because these awards carry greater prestige among faculty.

Measuring and monitoring public engagement

The Task Force noted that faculty respond to incentives and that measurement itself can function as an incentive. Hence, the Task Force believes that factors that influence commitment to and achievement of outcomes in public engagement need to be measured and monitored. One specific example would be to include questions related to public engagement in the University’s Pulse Survey.

Task 5. Explore the status of faculty engagement at peer institutions.

The Task Force initiated a scan of public engagement activities at Big 10 institutions and the Universities of California-Berkeley and Washington, but did not analyze peer institutions in depth due to time and resource limitations. Like the University of Minnesota, most of our peer institutions have established offices to encourage and support public engagement, but fewer than half appear to have received the

Carnegie elective classifications for public engagement (Appendix 4). Carnegie classifies institutions in two categories:

- Curricular Engagement, which is assigned to “institutions where teaching, learning and scholarship engage faculty, students, and public in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration,” and
- Outreach and Partnerships, which is assigned to institutions that focus on the “application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community.”

The University of Minnesota appears to be ahead of many of its peers in that we have received both classifications. Other comparative information obtained about peer institutions was not sufficiently systematic to permit meaningful conclusions.

Task Force members also shared knowledge of activities at other institutions and one program in particular piqued the interest of the Task Force. The University of New Hampshire annually conducts an Outreach Scholar’s Academy, a multi-day, semester long professional development seminar that brings 10 to 15 faculty together from across the institution and matches participants to coaches. Among other activities, participants explore strategies for focusing career development on public engagement and for documenting public engagement for promotion and tenure reviews. The logic behind the Academy is that, over time, public engagement will be better integrated into and become a part of faculty culture.

Observations, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The Task Force observed that the University of Minnesota has a long, successful history and tradition of serving the public but that more can be done and that new emphases on public engagement as distinct from public service provide a useful way to frame and enhance these efforts. A principal challenge in enhancing current efforts will be to change academic culture and practices, principally those related to faculty career development and promotion and tenure. Among the challenges related to academic culture is the fact that faculty historically have built their careers and reputation by writing for journals of interest to their disciplinary colleagues across the globe. The importance of disciplinary publication will not diminish, but academic culture and practices can be broadened to provide opportunity and space for publicly engaged research and scholarship.

The University of Minnesota’s academic culture can be changed by providing more opportunities for faculty professional development in the area of public engagement, continuing to refine processes and procedures for faculty review, increasing support and awards for public engagement, and measuring and monitoring public engagement activities. The following recommendations are options the Office for Public Engagement can consider as it determines priorities and next steps to implement its 10-point plan.

Professional development, mentoring, and apprenticeships

1. Consider implementation of more formal professional development, mentoring, and apprentice-like programs, including more activities focused on the University of Minnesota’s mission of public engagement at new faculty orientation, publication of online and other resources to support faculty skill development, and an engaged scholarship academy modeled after a successful program at the University of New Hampshire.
2. Develop web-based training modules based on published competencies for public engagement that can be incorporated in or used to certify expertise in publicly engaged scholarship.

Annual merit, promotion and tenure, and post tenure reviews

1. Provide faculty guidance in review of publicly engaged scholarship through online publication of model dossiers from different disciplines and colleges and strong, detailed letters of review from external partners that provide solid evidence of outcomes and impacts.
2. Assess how the new Digital Measures software for reporting faculty activities may be used to strengthen programs of public engagement.
3. Conduct a cross-college analysis of language in new 7.12 statements related to public engagement to illustrate how the different disciplines define public engagement and the weight being provided to public engagement in departments and colleges, and monitor outcomes related to public engagement in new promotion and tenure cases. Models like the 7.12 statement from Department of Family Social Science in the College of Education and Human Development can be distributed among colleges.
4. Appoint a committee to explore the merits and disadvantages of lengthening the probationary period for faculty who choose a career path in publicly engaged scholarship.

Support for publicly engaged scholarship

1. Develop models and templates for describing translational objectives and broader impacts of research for use by faculty when competing for grants from major funding organizations such as the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation.
2. Ask each college and department to specify its external partners that use or are impacted by its scholarship and to collaborate with these partners in development of agendas for research and teaching that can be integrated into collegiate strategic plans.
3. Review and strengthen existing institutional infrastructure for collaboration with particular external partners (e.g., Office of Technology Commercialization, the Hennepin University Partnership; the University Northside Partnership, Extension's Regional Sustainable Development Partnerships, and the Community Health Liaison) and develop new infrastructure on all University of Minnesota campuses to support units and faculty interested in collaboration with particular partners (e.g., specific state agencies or individual cities like the cities of St. Paul or Duluth). Community Campus Partnership for Health, a national organization dedicated to institutionalizing public engagement, is an important resource.
4. Expand existing programs for engaged departmental institutes and other mechanisms that provide faculty the opportunity to collaborate in creation of strategic plans for engaged research and teaching.
5. Continue to expand opportunities and requirements for service learning and other experiential learning opportunities in curricular revisions because they will induce and support publicly engaged scholarship.
6. Strengthen brokering functions for connecting faculty and public partners.
7. Identify new sources of funds to support efforts of public partners to link with particular faculty or academic units, including honoraria for their participation on task forces and advisory committees, and training sessions to help external partners develop skills.
8. Consider new financial and other support for scholars willing to propose special issues of

disciplinary journals that focus on publicly engaged scholarship.

Awards for publicly engaged scholarship

1. Develop an award for publicly engaged scholarship that clearly distinguishes public engagement from community service and provides the same types of benefits to faculty as awards for research and teaching. This type of award might be endowed and used as a focus of ongoing university philanthropic efforts.
2. Aggressively pursue opportunities to nominate University of Minnesota faculty for national awards related to publicly engaged scholarship.
3. Create prestigious endowed chairs for publicly engaged scholars that confer rewards comparable to those associated with the McKnight Professorships.

Measuring and monitoring public engagement

1. Incorporate questions about public engagement into the University's Pulse Survey, develop measures of public engagement outcomes, and periodically report on trends in indicators and outcomes.
2. Assemble information from engaged department institutes, examples of publicly engaged curricula, and other relevant examples to illustrate strategies for increasing public engagement.
3. Review the vitae and accomplishments of all Regents Professors to determine the extent to which publicly engaged scholarship has been a focus of or incorporated into their careers.
4. Use the recommendations in this report as context for formal evaluations of the Office of Public Engagement and periodically convene a faculty task force or group to update this report, determine progress, assess the University of Minnesota relative to other institutions, and make additional recommendations to strengthen public engagement.

Literature Reviewed

CIC Committee on Engagement (2005). *Engaged scholarship: A resource guide*. Committee on Institutional Cooperation Members Committee (Chief Academic Officers).

Jones, R.F. and J.S. Gold (1998). "Faculty appointment and tenure policies in medical schools: a 1997 status report." *Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*. Vol. 73, Issue 2, p. 212-219.

Sandmann, L.R., Foster-Fishman, P.G., Lloyd J., Rauhe, W., & Rosaen, C. (2000). Managing critical tensions. How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change*, Jan/Feb 45-52.

Sandmann, L.R., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara K. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 47-64.

Weerts, D.J. (2007). Toward an engagement model of institutional advancement at public colleges and universities. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(2), 79-103.

Appendix 1 Charge to the Task Force

Dear [Committee Member]:

The Office for Public Engagement has launched five task forces charged with establishing key policy recommendations that will address several key engagement issues identified in the University's *Ten-Point Plan for Advancing and Institutionalizing Public Engagement* (June 2008).

I cordially invite you to serve as a member of the task force for *Faculty Scholarship, Development and Rewards*. This task force will be co-chaired by Professor Greg Lindsey, Associate Dean, Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs and Associate Professor Cathy Jordan, Director of the Children, Youth and Family Consortium. Your particular background and expertise in public engagement will be invaluable to the work of this task force.

The Faculty Task Force will articulate a set of institutional policies and practices that will enhance faculty members' capacity to participate in engagement initiatives and support their engaged research and teaching. Having this information is vital to securing the full institutionalization of public engagement at the University.

For the Spring 2009 semester, the co-chairs will facilitate six meetings to each of the tasks listed in Table 1. The meetings will be conducted as brainstorming session or focus groups, with an emphasis on identifying barriers that impede faculty engagement and strategies for overcoming the barriers). Following these discussions, the task force will submit to me a summary of its findings, along with a set of actionable recommendations that will help further institutionalize engaged research and teaching at the University of Minnesota. I do not expect that your service on the Task Force will require much time outside the meetings, other than to review draft summaries of minutes and the final report. A part-time graduate student has been assigned to support and assist with the work of the task force.

President Bruininks has reaffirmed the centrality of public engagement to our mission as a land grant institution. Public engagement is integral to our research and teaching mission and it is important that we enhance our engagement even as we face new fiscal challenges.

I would appreciate you contacting Michelle Kuhl at witt0160@umn.edu or 624-1562 to let me know if you will be able to serve on this Task Force. Also, please feel free to contact Michelle or me at afurco@umn.edu if you have any questions about the work of the task force.

I hope you are available to join us for this important work.

Sincerely,

Andrew Furco
Associate Vice President for Public Engagement

Enclosure

Table 1. Draft Work Plan for Task Force on Faculty Scholarship, Development, and Rewards	
Meeting	Topic(s) of Discussion
1. January	Faculty attitudes towards engaged research and teaching. Perspectives on support for and barriers to engaged scholarship.
2. February	Disciplinary perspectives on engaged research and teaching. Role of engaged scholarship in new faculty promotion and tenure guidelines.
3. March	Faculty development needs to advance engaged research and teaching.
4. April	Priorities for investment to advance engaged research and teaching.
5. May	Public engagement at research intensive public universities: how does the U compare?
6. May	Wrap up and complete semester report.

Appendix 2
Members of the Task force

Mac	Baird	Family Practic Department
Kathleen	Call	Div of Hlth Policy and Mgmt
Dave	Demuth	Math, Science, and Technology Dept
Joycelyn	Dorscher	UMD Medicine-Family Med
Megan	Gunnar	Inst Of Child Dev
Jeremy	Hernandez	Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Cathy	Jordan	Children Youth and Family Consortium
Sonja	Kuftinec	Theatre Arts and Dance
Greg	Lindsey	HHH Institute for Public Affairs
Judith	Martin	Geography
Andy	Nelson	HealthPartners Research Foundation
Renee	Sieving	
Fionnuala	Ni Aolain	Law School
Andy	Van de Ven	Strategic Mgmt/Organization
David	Weerts	Educational Policy and Administration

Appendix 3

Models for Faculty Development

Models for faculty development: What does it take to be a community-engaged scholar?

Lynn W. Blanchard, Chris Hanssmann, Ronald P. Strauss, Juan Carlos Belliard, Kathleen Krichbaum, Emily Waters, and Sarena Seifer

(Submitted to *Metropolitan Universities* journal, February 29, 2008

Revised September 21, 2008)

Abstract

Community-engaged scholarship (CES) is gaining legitimacy in higher education. However, challenges of institutionalizing and sustaining it as a core value remain. Significant barriers exist for faculty choosing to incorporate CES into their teaching and research. Faculty development programs are a key mechanism for advancing faculty skills as well as increasing institutional support. This article provides a framework and set of competencies for faculty pursuing CES, and offers examples of existing programs and activities.

Recognition

The authors would like to thank their colleagues in the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, particularly those who participated in the Faculty Development Workgroup, for their contributions to the conceptualization and content of this paper.

Introduction

In 1990, Ernest Boyer started a national discussion regarding scholarship in institutions of higher education with his seminal publication *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Boyer promoted broadening the scope of what is recognized and rewarded in the academy to encompass the tri-partite institutional mission of teaching, research and service, and he proposed accomplishing this through four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application and teaching (Boyer 1990). With the Kellogg Commission *Report on the Future of Public and Land Grant Universities* (2000) promoting the concept of engagement rather than traditional service, the discussion Boyer started has grown in intensity. Most recently, the Carnegie Foundation on the Advancement of Teaching has introduced community engagement to their classification system. However, at the same time the acceptance of engagement is gaining ground, preparing and supporting faculty for it and determining how it fits with the goals of the academy remain a challenge.

Faculty development efforts occur at institutions of higher learning to build and enhance the scholarship of faculty members as it relates to teaching and research. Faculty development programs may offer support or instruction in instructional methods, curriculum development, research, grant writing, and career enhancement. Such programs generally target faculty members on an individual level, and aim to expand their skills in all of the facets of their position: as teachers, as scholars, as professionals, and as people (The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education). There has been significant movement within the field of faculty development to incorporate Boyer's model (Braxton, Luckey and Helland 2002; Fincher et al. 2000; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff 1997).

Health professional schools use a multitude of approaches to faculty development. Faculty members in the health professions may also have clinical responsibilities, and in many cases, must prepare students for patient or client care settings. Due to the unique features of health professional education and its focus

on educating skilled health professionals, some faculty development programs have been crafted to hone faculty skills of those in health professional fields. Nevertheless, health professional faculty members are expected to professionally progress under a conventional academic rubric that includes promotion and tenure guidelines generally developed with a broader university vision.

All faculty development must work well within the established norms of institutional parameters for promotion and tenure. Therefore, whether in health or academic affairs, faculty members who depart from traditional forms of scholarship are likely to find themselves without related faculty development opportunities and may also find themselves at-risk for promotion and tenure.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) is a nonprofit organization that promotes health through equitable and authentic partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions. CCPH has promoted Boyer's model of scholarship as it seeks to promote health through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions and other partnership strategies. The organization aims to foster partnerships between communities and educational institutions that build on each other's strengths and develop their roles as change agents for improving health professions education, civic responsibility and the overall health of communities (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health).

In 2003, CCPH convened a Commission on Community Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions which determined that "a significant gap exists between the promise of health professional schools as engaged institutions and the reality of how faculty members are typically judged and rewarded." (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, p. 2) The Commission issued recommendations on how to close this gap, including that health professional schools should:

- adopt and promote a definition of scholarship that includes and values community-engaged scholarship (CES).
- adopt review, promotion, and tenure policies and procedures that value CES.
- educate the members of review, promotion, and tenure committees about CES and prepare them to understand and apply the review, promotion, and tenure guidelines in the review of community-engaged faculty.
- invest in the recruitment and retention of community- engaged faculty.
- take a leadership role on their university campuses to initiate or further campus-wide support for CES.

In 2004, the US Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) awarded CCPH a 3-year grant for the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative to actualize these recommendations (Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative 2005). The Collaborative is a group of nine health professional schools across the fields of allied health, dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy and public health that aim to build capacity within their institutions and among others in their disciplines for community-based participatory research, service-learning, and other forms of community-engaged scholarship.

Schools in the Collaborative identified review, promotion and tenure issues as major impediments to sustaining and expanding community-engaged scholarship. Each school formed a team of faculty, administrators and community partners to lead the change process. The Collaborative decided to establish three workgroups, each focusing on one facet of institutional support: sustainable funding, peer review processes, and faculty development. This article focuses on the work of the Faculty Development Workgroup within the Collaborative.

What is Community Engaged Scholarship?

A common understanding of terms is fundamental to effective faculty development. “Community” entails a group of people who share a common location, interests, values, work or identity, and who have an association due to common traditions, or political, civic, social, cultural or economic interactions.

“*Community engagement* is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities, through collaboration with these communities (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, p 12).”

“*Scholarship* is teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement that has clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique that is rigorous and peer-reviewed (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, p. 12).”

“*Community-engaged scholarship* (CES) involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community.” It can be interdisciplinary and/or draw on the principles of community-based participatory research. According to the 2005 Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, “it is important to point out that not all community-engaged activities undertaken by faculty are scholarship. For example, if a faculty member devotes time to developing a community-based health program, it may be important work and it may advance the service mission of the institution, but unless it includes the other components that define or represent standards for scholarship (e.g., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, reflective critique, rigor and/or peer review) it would not be considered scholarship (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, p. 11-12).”

Faculty Development Programs in support of Community Engaged Scholarship

Faculty development programs with an emphasis on community engagement can facilitate the development and success of potential community engaged scholars. The choice to pursue CES presents academics with a number of opportunities and challenges. The primary opportunity is the capacity to have an impact on issues of salience in the community and to partner with colleagues within the academy and the community. Bridging the gap between the “ivory tower” and the “real world” is exciting and will potentially attract early innovators who find sustainable and systemic change possible.

The path to doing CES is not easy. For example, the “publish or perish” mentality in tenure-track positions poses difficulty to community-engaged faculty whose work requires a large amount of relationship-building and time before a publication might be possible. In addition, although large scientific funding agencies, including the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, have begun to give credence to community engaged research, securing sustained funding continues to be a challenge. Building a faculty portfolio for promotion and tenure review can be daunting for those focusing on CES, particularly when review committees are not familiar with this form of scholarship (Calleson, Jordan and Seifer 2005).

Faculty development programs can provide support and guidance to interested faculty. These programs take on different forms but share a common commitment to helping faculty fulfill their scholarly potential. In addition to the benefit to these scholars, these programs support academic institutions by linking the common tri-partite mission of teaching, research and service through the concept of CES.

Attitudes in Community Engagement

In a series of meetings, participants in the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative identified a specific set of measurable skills and competencies, and also a more abstract set of attitudes and values for faculty pursuing CES. Because CES takes a different approach than does more traditional scholarship, we believe that there are assumptions that are shared by successful CES scholars. These are less concrete and measurable than skill-based competencies, but are at the foundation of effective CES.

Several institutions and projects have developed “Principles of Engagement” to guide community based or community engaged learning or research (Blumenthal 1996; Israel, Schultz, Parker and Becker 2001; University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine). Each of these refers in some way to collaboration, reciprocity, information and/or power sharing and inclusion of community at all levels of research. These tenets acknowledge several assumptions about community and community-based research:

- The community holds specialized knowledge.
- The community has a unique and valuable vantage point in research.
- Knowledge production involving academics and communities must be shared.

CES is distinct from traditional scholarship in that it necessitates culture-bridging and negotiation around research agendas. It requires flexibility in terms of research methodologies, willingness to share credit and material resources and attention to the potential for advocacy and political action in academic scholarship. Though more difficult to measure than competencies, these attitudes can be demonstrated by community-engaged scholars in and through community feedback and evidence of impact in terms of policy or community infrastructure (Peer Review Workgroup 2007).

Faculty development programs that aim to support community-engaged scholars in their professional development should focus on cultivating concrete skills and contributing to an academic environment that is supportive of CES. However, some academics may be better suited than others to be successful in CES due to attitudes about scholarship and community, as these set the stage for skill and knowledge development.

CES and Faculty Development

CES may begin at any point in one’s academic career and it is possible to foster professional development through the acquisition of knowledge, skills and experience. Gelmon and Agre-Kippenhan (2002) present a case for using an adapted Dreyfus model of skill acquisition in faculty development, ranging from novice to expert (Benner, Tanner and Chesla 1992; Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1996). These levels do not necessarily correlate to one’s academic rank, but rather they provide a framework specific to experience with CES. We have elected to use novice, intermediate and advanced levels for the faculty development framework presented here.

At each developmental stage, a community-engaged scholar is expected to demonstrate a set of competencies. Competencies are linked with skills in each developmental stage and are cumulative. Whether one’s “novice” stage occurs mid-career or in graduate school, each developing community-engaged scholar will likely share similar values and attitudes about community and scholarship, and his/her respective CES skills can be developed along a similar continuum of learning.

Although we have stated the likelihood that those choosing to pursue CES will hold some specific attitudes about the work, we believe that all academics should have at least a working knowledge of CES, and the framework reflects that assumption. Even if it is not a career path they choose to take, any faculty

member may mentor students who have an interest in CES, work in departments with community-engaged colleagues or serve on a review board that considers promotion and tenure for community-engaged scholars. It is vital that they are aware of community-engagement as a legitimate scholarly path.

TABLE 1: General CES Competencies

Value and understand legitimacy and significance of CES concepts and social determinants of health, some experience in research

Comprehend availability of faculty career positions in CES, have some knowledge of CES resources

Have basic knowledge/awareness of:

- definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality
- CES-involved colleagues and campus resources, capability to refer students interested in CES to appropriate faculty and/or resources

Have respect for quality and importance of field

Possess basic ability to evaluate scholarly content of CES projects, particularly if interested in serving on RPT committee

Competencies for Community-Engaged Faculty Members

To support development of community-engaged scholars, it is desirable to have a set of measurable competencies to ascertain progress and development. The Kellogg Community Health Scholars Program has defined a set of skill-based competencies for community-engaged scholars, which we have adapted for use in this framework (Community Health Scholars Program). They begin at “novice” and continue through the “advanced” levels. All competencies are considered cumulative.

Novice	1. Understanding of the concepts of community engagement and community-engaged scholarship (CES), and familiarity with basic literature and history of CES (ie: Boyer, Glassick, etc.).
Novice	2. Understanding of the various contributors to community issues (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental); developing skills and commitment for fostering community and social change.
Novice to Intermediate	3. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of CES in theory and practice, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles • Theoretical frameworks • Models and methods of planning • Implementation and evaluation <i>(For example: community governance, equitable participation at all levels, local relevance of public health problems, dissemination of findings, trust building, benefits to community involved community partnerships, service & learning objectives, fostering critical reflection, meaningful community service activities in response to community-identified concerns)</i>
Intermediate	4. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities.
Intermediate	5. Ability to negotiate across community-academic groups.
Intermediate	6. Ability to write grants expressing CES principles and approaches.
Intermediate	7. Ability to write articles based on CES processes and outcomes for peer-reviewed publications.
Intermediate to Advanced	8. Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty. Recognition by the community.
Intermediate to Advanced	9. Knowledge and successful application of definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality.
Advanced	10. Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policy.
Advanced	11. Ability to balance tasks in academia (e.g., research, teaching, service) posing special challenges to those engaged in CES in order to thrive in an academic environment.
Advanced	12. Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion and/or tenure.
Advanced	13. Knowledge of RPT process and its relationship with CES, ability to serve on RPT committee.

Advanced	14. Ability to mentor student and junior faculty in establishing and building CES-based portfolio.
----------	--

CES Faculty Development Programs

As outlined above in listings of competencies in Table 2, there are a number of skills for individuals interested in pursuing CES to acquire in building their expertise. The means to support the development of those who choose to pursue a career in community-engaged scholarship will inevitably differ from institution to institution. For example, a large land-grant institution, with a specific mission and resources for community outreach, may offer a more expansive faculty development program. A smaller school that may have fewer faculty members engaged in such work may support their professional development through a smaller or less formal means, but may have close relationships with the communities in which they are located, offering unique CES opportunities.

In addition to institutional efforts, professional associations and regional and national organizations may provide interested faculty with opportunities for developing their expertise. The following two tables provide some summary overview of potential faculty development efforts. Table 3 includes learning content, type of guidance and support, incentives and portfolio development. Table 4 follows and outlines structures, goals and methods of faculty development efforts by level and scope.

TABLE 3: Faculty Development Plan by Level of Expertise

This grid displays areas to target in faculty development in community-engaged scholarship at level of expertise. “Novice” is not synonymous with junior faculty, as a faculty member might begin CES (e.g. community-based research and learning, etc.) at any point in his/her career.

	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Learning Content	Information about CES provided to faculty and training offered in community-based learning and research Meet with potential community partners	CES workshop/seminar series Inter- or multi-disciplinary faculty scholar program	Advanced community-based research training seminars

	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Guidance and Support	<p>Introduction to individuals and campus units doing CES for potential collaboration</p> <p>Opportunities to meet and learn from potential community partners</p> <p>Integration of CES into professional development services</p> <p>Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group</p> <p>Informal and formal preceptor/ mentor matched to CES interest initiated. If mid-career, initiate additional or new mentorship relationship</p>	<p>Continued opportunities for planning and learning with community partners and mentors</p> <p>Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group (on-going)</p> <p>Opportunities for community and faculty mentorships continuing through career</p>	<p>Annual orientation to policies with opportunity for input</p> <p>Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group (on-going)</p> <p>Mentor novice and junior faculty, focus on CES (ongoing)</p>
Incentives	<p>Information on resources on CES resources and opportunities</p>	<p>Community-Based Learning and research training development grants and mini-grants</p> <p>Project seed and mini-grants</p> <p>Faculty development credits for CES-related workshops</p>	<p>Support for providing CES leadership and mentorship of interested faculty</p>
Portfolio development	<p>Review of RPT guidelines in regard to CES</p>	<p>Tutorials and workshops specific to CES portfolio</p> <p>Participate in mock portfolio reviews</p>	<p>Mini-sabbatical grants to work on portfolio</p> <p>Conduct mock portfolio reviews</p> <p>Participation in departmental and/or institutional RPT committees</p>

TABLE 4: Faculty Development Resources by Level and Scope

SOURCE	Informal network–based	School-based	University-based	Association and Organizationally based
Structure	Informal	Formal/small-scale	Formal/institutional	Formal, society- or health professional association-based, and/or multi-disciplinary, inter-institutionally-based, either with individual or institutional membership.
Goal	Create informal networks to develop or support individuals as faculty members	Tailor faculty development programs in all dimensions to discipline, school, or program	Provide university-wide faculty development programs in all dimensions to generally enhance skills and personal and professional development	Provide faculty and professional development programs in all dimensions to those with professional membership (and others) in society or association
Methods	<p>Informal (non-organizational) support group, writing group, listserv, etc.</p> <p>Informal faculty development may take place in the form of a writers’ group, a support group, an informal learning community, or a non-organization affiliated listserv.</p>	<p>School/discipline/program-specific workshops, mentoring, grants, career planning assistance, etc.</p> <p>School-based programs are particularly appropriate when faculty development needs are specific to a field, such as teaching skills around patient interaction.</p>	<p>University-wide centers or offices offering seminar series, workshops, mentoring, grants, etc. University-wide faculty development academy-based programs.</p> <p>Many institutions have faculty development centers or grants programs which can offer CES opportunities. In addition, centers for service-learning, community-based participatory research, or community engagement often offer faculty development workshops on these topics.</p>	<p>Association or society-wide training programs, continuing education programs, seminars, workshops, mentoring programs, etc.</p> <p>Formal organization, listserv, member organization (intended for faculty members and faculty developers)</p>

Examples	<p>The UNC School of Public Health holds Conversational Living Rooms in a large open gathering space at the school. Interdisciplinary research ideas are discussed in an informal setting in which faculty members present their research for which they may need collaborators. Posters with background information on each research concept are displayed to allow faculty to mingle and discuss. The concept is to give faculty members, long in advance of submitting a grant, a platform to present their ideas and engage others who might have something important to contribute to the growth of the idea.</p>	<p>The Leadership in Academic Medicine Program (LAMP) at Indiana University School of Medicine is an invitational year-long program that meets monthly for half-days. Sessions include topics such as promotion and tenure guidelines, dossier preparation, career development strategies, mentor-protégé issues, conflict management and negotiation, conducting oral presentations, and writing a scientific paper. Each session ends with “group mentoring.”</p> <p>The Health Disparities Work Group at the University of Minnesota meets throughout the academic year, and, with community-based and funding partners, oversees projects such as “Commercial Tobacco Use in Urban American Indians” and “Native Teen Voices Study.”</p>	<p>The Outreach Scholars Academy (OSA) of the University of New Hampshire and the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program (FES) at UNC-Chapel Hill are campus-wide efforts supporting and engaged faculty from a range of academic disciplines. The OSA is a semester-long program for faculty to learn about best practices in engaged scholarship and move faculty from the perspective of public service to one of engaged scholarship.</p> <p>FESP is a two-year program, with programming and assessment grounded in the faculty competencies (Table 2). A new cohort of scholars is selected annually for the program, which aims to create and sustain a community of engaged scholars from diverse perspectives, promote engaged scholarship across disciplines and strengthen institutional commitment to strong university-community relationships.</p>	<p>Campus Compact joined with Tufts University in 2005 to convene a group of leading scholars in community engagement at research universities. The group has since met several times to discuss ways to promote and expand the engagement movement among research universities, and has produced two reports: <i>New Times Demand New Scholarship</i> (Gibson 2006) and <i>New Times Demand New Scholarship II</i> (Stanton 2007).</p> <p>Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) focuses on promoting health through partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions and other partnership strategies. CCPH also offers a number of online resources including the <i>Community Engaged Scholarship Toolkit</i>, and the <i>Faculty Toolkit for Service Learning in Higher Education</i>.</p>
-----------------	---	--	--	---

Although not all of the above examples are exclusive to CES, all are inclusive of it. In addition to those listed, other resources exist, including fact sheets from the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse and a report from a task force on community engagement convened by the University of California-San

Francisco (*National Service Learning Clearinghouse; UCSF Task Force on Community Partnerships* 2005). Examples of programs may also be found in the representative applications to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for the elective classification in community engagement posted on the Campus Compact web site (<http://www.compact.org/carnegie/applications/>).

In 2007, CCPH received funding for a three-year initiative, Faculty for the Engaged Campus. This national initiative, in partnership with the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, aims to strengthen and support community-engaged career paths in the academy by developing innovative competency-based models of faculty development, facilitating peer review and dissemination of products of community-engaged scholarship, and supporting community-engaged faculty through the promotion and tenure process.

During the first year of the initiative, Faculty for the Engaged Campus issued a call for institutions to participate in a two day charrette¹ to facilitate development of innovative campus-wide mechanisms for preparing and supporting community-engaged faculty. The charrette was designed to bring together teams from 20 diverse US institutions of higher education for an intensive planning experience from which they would leave with action plans to implement faculty development activities on their campuses. Applicants were required to complete an application, designate a team that included at least one senior level faculty member, and have a written letter of support from a senior administrator with campus-wide responsibility (e.g. provost, vice president/chancellor) elaborating on the institutional support of participation in the charrette and the implementation of preparing faculty for CES. One hundred and two institutions responded to the call, representing a range of 4-year colleges and universities, including public and private, small and large, liberal arts and research focused.

Participating teams completed two pre-charrette assignments (an institutional assessment and a SWOT analysis). Using these and the competencies as a framework, charrette organizers developed a structured set of exercises and planning time, so that each team left the event with a draft action plan for their campus. For example, during one exercise, groups of participants were assigned two competencies for which they brainstormed potential faculty development activities.

The competencies can be utilized in other ways as well. The Faculty Engaged Scholars Program at the University of North Carolina is using them as an assessment tool. Before beginning the program, faculty rated themselves individually on each of the competencies, using a six-point scale from minimal to complete mastery. The results were used by program organizers to inform content for the four day-long sessions. Participants will complete the self assessments again at the ends of the first and second years of the program, providing data on the effectiveness of the program as well as on-going areas for additional faculty development.

Discussion

Community-engaged scholarship is an important means of knowledge production, and is a bridge between institutions of higher learning and the communities they serve and/or in which they exist. It also presents particular challenges to faculty members who choose to pursue it as part of their scholarship.

¹ A charrette is an intensely focused multi-day session that uses a collaborative approach to create realistic and achievable designs. Charrettes have mainly been used in architecture, urban planning and community design projects. In our case, we will convene campus teams, project leadership and expert advisors to collaboratively design innovative models of CES faculty development.

In 2005, Campus Compact and Tufts University convened scholars from research universities around the country to discuss their efforts to promote civic engagement. The report from the conference, *New Times Demand New Scholarship*, describes a number of common barriers to engaged scholarship (Gibson 2006):

1. A focus on individual disciplines rather than on public problems or issues
2. An emphasis on abstract theory rather than actionable theory derived from and useful for real world practice
3. Lack of understanding about what scholarship is and how it works
4. Few incentives to reward engaged scholarship
5. Institutions are organized in ways that prohibit engaged scholarship

These barriers offer challenges to faculty development efforts and also insight into potential direction and content for those efforts. Our premise that some level of efforts should be directed toward all faculty as well as the implicit suggestion that faculty development efforts should be inter-disciplinary, speak to several of the above.

A particular and common challenge implicit in the barrier of few incentives is related to review, promotion and tenure within the academy. Because aspects of CES may include non-traditional methods and scholarly products, it may be difficult to assess within existing institutional policies and procedures. Additionally, the practice of community-engaged scholarship is accompanied by the challenges of working with community members. For example, faculty may find that research moves along slowly, or that the agendas of communities must be negotiated over the course of a project. Faculty members can benefit from building their skills in approaching and interacting with communities. Communities, in turn, can benefit from working with faculty members who have built up a set of competencies in CES.

Engagement with communities requires a foundation of identifiable values and a set of specialized skills. It is important to support and cultivate the professional development of community-engaged faculty members, at whatever point in their professional trajectory at which they choose to begin this work. Access to and participation in a variety of faculty development programs will not only support individual faculty members, it will strengthen the value and effectiveness of the work and build networks of faculty throughout and between institutions of higher education. This can lead to policy change that creates a more positive, supportive, and productive environment for community-engaged scholarship.

Although we have stated our strong belief that faculty can “enter” into CES at any point in their careers, the career level of the faculty will have an effect on how they incorporate CES into their scholarship. For instance, tenured and full professors may have more freedom to fully immerse themselves in CES efforts and also have an opportunity to promote the concept more vocally than those who are untenured. Although all faculty should approach CES with academic rigor (and faculty development efforts should support ways to do so), more junior faculty need to do so with the highest level of documentation and attention to the process. They also need to garner the support of senior faculty, chairs, deans and senior administrators to assure they can be successful.

It is also critical to understand that successful CES cannot happen without substantive, meaningful partnerships with the community. As in any true partnership, this requires knowledge and negotiation of each others’ perspectives. Too often, CES is limited by the belief that it rests solely on the institutional partner to understand and adapt to the community. In CES, it is also critical for community partners to understand and be able to negotiate the academic environment. Although this paper does not directly deal with this issue, there is space within the framework presented for opportunities to promote such learning.

Given all this, we believe the faculty competencies and levels of expertise presented in this article provide a specific structure and content for addressing barriers as well as a framework for programmatic faculty development CES activities. In addition, they provide insights into how individual and programmatic progress and effectiveness can be evaluated.

In sum, there are specific ways that faculty development efforts can support both the work of individual faculty and the field in general. There are aspects of community engaged scholarship that are necessary for all faculty to have as well as competencies and skills essential for those choosing to pursue it. Most institutions of higher education are grounded in a civic mission as well as an academic mission. Community engaged scholarship can connect those missions in ways that honor the traditions of each, and we believe effective faculty development will assure that can happen.

References

- Benner, P., C.A. Tanner, and C.A. Chesla., "From Beginner to Expert: Gaining a Differentiated Clinical World in Critical Care Nursing," *Advances in Nursing Science* 14 (3, 1992): 13-28.
- Blumenthal, D.S., "Ethics Issues in Academic-industry Relationships in the Life Sciences: The Continuing Debate," *Academic Medicine* 71 (12, 1996): 1291-1296.
- Boyer, E. L., *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990).
- Braxton, J. M., W. Luckey, and P. Helland, "Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship Through Boyer's Four Domains," *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 29(2, 2002), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Calleson, D. C., C. Jordan, and S.D. Seifer, "The Scholarship of Community Engagement: Is Faculty Work in Communities a True Academic Enterprise?" *Academic Medicine* 80 (4, 2005): 317-321.
- Campus-Community Partnerships for Health, University of Washington. Retrieved February 28, 2008 from the Campus-Community Partnerships for Health Web site: <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/index.html>
- Campus Compact, "Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Applications," retrieved February 28, 2008 from the Campus Compact Web site: <http://www.compact.org/carnegie/applications/>
- Campus Compact, "Civic Engagement at Research Universities," retrieved February 28, 2008 from the Campus Compact Web site: http://www.compact.org/initiatives/research_universities/
- Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, *Linking Scholarship and Communities: Report of the Commission on Community-engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions* (Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2005). Retrieved February 28, 2008 from the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Web site: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Commission%20Report%20FINAL.pdf
- Community Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, "National Collaborative Seeks to Change Academic Culture to Embrace Community Engagement," (Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2005). Retrieved February 28, 2008, from the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Web site: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/FIPSE%20Press%20Release.pdf

- Community Health Scholars Program, "Program Goals and Competencies," retrieved February 28, 2008 from the University of Michigan Community Health Scholars Web site:
<http://www.sph.umich.edu/chsp/program/index.shtml>
- Dreyfus, H.L., and S.E. Dreyfus, "The Relationship of Theory and Practice in the Acquisition of Skill" in P.A. Brenner, C.A. Tanner, C.A. Chelsa, eds, *Expertise in Nursing Practice: Caring, Clinical Judgment, and Ethics* (New York: Springer, 1996): 29-47
- Fincher R., D. Simpson, S. Mennin, G. Rosenfeld, A. Rothman, A. McGrew, P. Hansen, P. Mazemanian, and J. Turnbull, "Scholarship in Teaching: An Imperative for the 21st Century," *Academic Medicine* 75 (9, 2000): 887-894.
- Gelmon, S. and S. Agre-Kippenhan, "A Developmental Framework for Supporting Evolving Faculty Roles for Community Engagement," *Journal of Public Affairs, Supplemental Issue 1* (2002).
- Gibson, C.M., *Report on New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement: A Leadership Agenda* (Tufts University and Campus Compact, 2006).
- Glassick, C. E., M.T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff., *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).
- Indiana University School of Medicine, *Leadership in Academic Medicine Program, LAMP 2007-2008 Brochure*. Retrieved online at
http://medicine.iu.edu/documents/professional%20development/LAMP_brochure_0707.pdf
- Israel, B. A., A. J. Schulz, E.A. Parker, and A. B. Becker, "Community-based Participatory Research: Policy Recommendations for Promoting a Partnership Approach in Health Research," *Education for Health* 14 (2, 2001): 182-197.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, *Renewing the Covenant: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement in a New Age and Different World* (Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges, 2000).
- Macaulay, A.C., L.E. Commanda, N. Gibson, M.L. McCabe., C.M. Robbins, and P.L.Twohig, *Responsible Research with Communities: Participatory Research in Primary Care* (North American Primary Care Research Group, 1998). Retrieved February 28, 2008 from the NAPCRG Web Site: <http://napcrg.org/exec.html>
- National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, "Higher Education Fact Sheets," retrieved February 28, 2008 from the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse Web site:
http://www.servicelearning.org/instant_info/fact_sheets/he_facts/index.php
- Peer Review Workgroup, *Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, "Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Tenure, and Promotion Package."* (Seattle: Campus-Community Partnerships for Health, 2007).
- Stanton, T.K., *New Times Demand New Scholarship II : Research Universities and Civic Engagement – Opportunities and Challenges* (The University of California Los Angeles, and Campus Compact, 2007).

The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD), “What is faculty development?” Retrieved February 28, 2007 from the POD Network Web site:
<http://www.podnetwork.org/development.htm>

University of California San Francisco, Task Force on Community Partnerships, Report of the Executive Vice Chancellor’s Task Force on Community Partnerships (San Francisco, CA: University of California San Francisco, 2005). Retrieved February 28, 2008 from the UCSF Department of Family Medicine Web site http://www.familymedicine.medschool.ucsf.edu/pdf/CPTF_Report.pdf

University of Minnesota School of Public Health, “Health Disparities Work Group Forum,” retrieved February 28, 2008 from the University of Minnesota School of Public Health Web site:
<http://www.sph.umn.edu/cpheo/healthdisparities/home.html>

University of New Hampshire, “Outreach Scholars,” retrieved February 28, 2007 from the University of New Hampshire Web site: <http://www.unh.edu/outreach/champions.html>

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Public Health, “Conversational Living Rooms,” retrieved February 28, 2007 from the UNC School of Public Health Web site:
http://www.sph.unc.edu/research/conversational_living_rooms_423_1957.html

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carolina Center for Public Service, “Faculty Engaged Scholars Program,” retrieved February 28, 2007 from the Carolina Center for Public Service Web site: <http://www.unc.edu/cps/faculty-engaged-scholars.php>

University of Washington, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, “Community-based Research Principles,” retrieved February 28, 2008 from the University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine Web site:
<http://sphcm.washington.edu/research/community.asp>

Author Information

Lynn W. Blanchard, MPH, PhD, is the Director of the Carolina Center for Public Service at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Clinical Associate Professor in the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education at the UNC School of Public Health.

Contact information:

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Carolina Center for Public Service
CB# 3142
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3142
Email: blanchard@unc.edu
Telephone: 919-843-7568

Chris Hanssmann, MPH, is a graduate of the School of Public Health at the University of Washington, where he worked with an experienced faculty practitioner of CBPR to conduct thesis research using this approach. He is currently working as a Clinical Research Associate in Seattle.

Contact information:

Email: ch6@myuw.net
(does not want to list current work affiliation)

Ronald P. Strauss, PhD, DMD is the Executive Associate Provost and a Distinguished Professor and Chair in the School of Dentistry (Department of Dental Ecology) and Professor in the Department of Social Medicine at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Contact information:

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Office of the Provost
CB# 3000
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7450
Email: ron_strauss@unc.edu
Telephone: 919-962-4510

Juan Carlos Belliard, PhD, MPH, is an Assistant Professor in the Departments of Global Health and Environmental & Occupational Health at the School of Public Health at Loma Linda University.

Contact information:

Loma Linda University
School of Public Health
Nichol Hall Room 1302
Loma Linda, CA 92350
Email: jbelliard@sph.llu.edu
Telephone: 909-558-4902 ext. 44902

Kathleen Krichbaum, PhD, RN, is an Associate Professor in the School of Nursing at University of Minnesota, and is Interim Associate Dean for Academic Programs

Contact Information:

University of Minnesota
School of Nursing
5-160 Weaver-Densford Hall
308 Harvard Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
E-mail: krich001@umn.edu
Telephone: 612-624-2489

Emily Waters, MPH, is a graduate of the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education at the UNC School of Public Health, and served as graduate assistant at the Carolina Center for Public Service.

Contact Information:

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Carolina Center for Public Service
CB 3142
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3142
Email: wmemily@email.unc.edu

Sarena Seifer, MD, MS, is the founding executive director of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. She holds a faculty appointment in the School of Public Health and Community Medicine at the University of Washington and is a Senior Fellow of the Center for the Health Professions at the University of California at San Francisco.

Contact Information:

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health

University District Building

1107 NE 45th Street, Suite 345

Box: 354809

Seattle, WA 98195-4809

Email: sarena@u.washington.edu

Telephone: 206-616-4305

Competencies in Community-Engaged Scholarship

Excerpts from: Blanchard, Hanssmann, Strauss, Belliard, Krichbaum, Waters and Seifer. (under review)
Faculty Development Models for Community Engaged Scholarship
(Please do not cite without permission.)

What is Community Engaged Scholarship?

A common understanding of terms is fundamental to effective faculty development. **Community** entails a group of people who share a common location, interests, values, work or identity, and who have an association due to common traditions, or political, civic, social, cultural or economic interactions.

“Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities, through collaboration with these communities (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005, p 12).”

“Scholarship is teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement that has clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique that is rigorous and peer-reviewed (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005, p. 12).”

“Community-engaged scholarship (CES) involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community.” It can be interdisciplinary and/or draw on the principles of community-based participatory research. According to the 2005 Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, “it is important to point out that not all community-engaged activities undertaken by faculty are scholarship. For example, if a faculty member devotes time to developing a community-based health program, it may be important work and it may advance the service mission of the institution, but unless it includes the other components that define or represent standards for scholarship (e.g., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, reflective critique, rigor and/or peer review) it would not be considered scholarship.” (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005, p. 11-12)

TABLE 1: General CES Competencies

Value and understand legitimacy and significance of CES concepts and social determinants of health, some experience in research

Comprehend availability of faculty career positions in CES, have some knowledge of CES resources

Have basic knowledge/awareness of:

definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality

CES-involved colleagues and campus resources, capability to refer students interested in CES to appropriate faculty and/or resources

Have respect for quality and importance of field

Possess basic ability to evaluate scholarly content of CES projects, particularly if interested in serving on RPT committee

Novice	15. Understanding of the concepts of community engagement and community-engaged scholarship (CES), and familiarity with basic literature and history of CES (ie: Boyer, Glassick, etc.).
Novice	16. Understanding of social determinants of health (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental); developing skills and commitment for fostering community and social change.
Novice to Intermediate	17. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of CES in theory and practice, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles • Theoretical frameworks • Models and methods of planning • Implementation and evaluation <p>(For example: community governance, equitable participation at all levels, local relevance of public health problems, dissemination of findings, trust building, benefits to community involved community partnerships, service & learning objectives, fostering critical reflection, meaningful community service activities in response to community-identified concerns)</p>
Intermediate	18. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities.
Intermediate	19. Ability to negotiate across community-academic groups.
Intermediate	20. Ability to write grants expressing CES principles and approaches.
Intermediate	21. Ability to write articles based on CES processes and outcomes for peer-reviewed publications.
Intermediate to Advanced	22. Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty. Recognition by the community.
Intermediate to Advanced	23. Knowledge and successful application of definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality.
Advanced	24. Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policy.
Advanced	25. Ability to balance tasks in academia (e.g., research, teaching, service) posing special challenges to those engaged in CES in order to thrive in an academic environment.
Advanced	26. Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion and/or tenure.
Advanced	27. Knowledge of RPT process and its relationship with CES, ability to serve on RPT committee.
Advanced	28. Ability to mentor student and junior faculty in establishing and building CES-based portfolio.

TABLE 3: Faculty Development Plan by Level of Expertise

This grid displays areas to target in faculty development in community-engaged scholarship at level of expertise. “Novice” is not synonymous with junior faculty, as a faculty member might begin CES (e.g. community-based research and learning, etc.) at any point in his/her career.

	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Learning Content	<p>Information about CES provided to faculty and training offered in community-based learning and research</p> <p>Meet with potential community partners</p>	<p>CES workshop/seminar series</p> <p>Inter- or multi-disciplinary faculty scholar program</p>	<p>Advanced community-based research training seminars</p>
Guidance and Support	<p>Introduction to individuals and campus units doing CES for potential collaboration</p> <p>Opportunities to meet and learn from potential community partners</p> <p>Integration of CES into professional development services</p> <p>Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group</p> <p>Informal and formal preceptor/mentor matched to CES interest initiated. If mid-career, initiate additional or new mentorship relationship</p>	<p>Continued opportunities for planning and learning with community partners and mentors</p> <p>Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group (on-going)</p> <p>Opportunities for community and faculty mentorships continuing through career</p>	<p>Annual orientation to policies with opportunity for input</p> <p>Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group (on-going)</p> <p>Mentor novice and junior faculty, focus on CES (ongoing)</p>
Incentives	<p>Information on resources on CES resources and opportunities</p>	<p>Community-Based Learning and research training development grants and mini-grants</p> <p>Project seed and mini-grants</p> <p>Faculty development credits for CES-related workshops</p>	<p>Support for providing CES leadership and mentorship of interested faculty</p>
Portfolio development	<p>Review of RPT guidelines in regard to CES</p>	<p>Tutorials and workshops specific to CES portfolio</p> <p>Participate in mock portfolio reviews</p>	<p>Mini-sabbatical grants to work on portfolio</p> <p>Conduct mock portfolio reviews</p> <p>Participation in departmental and/or institutional RPT committees</p>

TABLE 4: Faculty Development Resources by Level and Scope

SOURCE	Informal network-based	School-based	University-based	Association and Organizationally based
Structure	Informal	Formal/small-scale	Formal/institutional	Formal, society- or health professional association-based, and/or multi-disciplinary, inter-institutionally-based, either with individual or institutional membership.
Goal	Create informal networks to develop or support individuals as faculty members	Tailor faculty development programs in all dimensions to discipline, school, or program	Provide university-wide faculty development programs to generally enhance skills and personal and professional development	Provide faculty and professional development programs in all dimensions to those with professional membership (and others) in society or association
Methods	Informal (non-organizational) support group, writing group, listserv, etc.	School/discipline/ program-specific workshops, mentoring, grants, career planning assistance, etc.	University-wide centers or offices offering seminar series, workshops, mentoring, grants, etc. University-wide faculty development academy-based programs.	Association or society-wide training programs, continuing education programs, seminars, workshops, mentoring programs, etc. Formal organization, listserv, member organization (intended for faculty members and faculty developers)

School	Website	Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement	Awards and Grants
University of Illinois	http://engagement.illinois.edu/	Curricular Engagement & Outreach and Partnerships	Campus Award for Excellence in Public Engagement- recognizes faculty, staff, and students for public engagement; \$1500 cash reward and \$1500 permanent salary increase for staff and faculty; \$1500 cash reward for students; http://engagement.illinois.edu/PDF/CAEPE_IndividualTeamGuidelines.pdf
Indiana University	http://www.indiana.edu/~uconnect/ http://www.indiana.edu/~copsl/	not classified	-Service Learning Faculty Fellows- 6 faculty chosen to be a part of a collaboration on service-learning efforts; each receives \$1000 research grant
Iowa University	http://www.uiowa.edu/~cep/	not classified	
Michigan*	http://www.state.outreach.umich.edu http://ginsberg.umich.edu/ http://www.umich.edu/~govrel/community_guide/index.html	Curricular Engagement & Outreach and Partnerships	
Michigan State	http://outreach.msu.edu/default.asp	not classified	
University of Minnesota	http://www.engagement.umn.edu/index.html http://blog.lib.umn.edu/acadweb/engagingu/	not classified	-Engaged Departments Grant- up to \$10,000 to five departments to implement public engagement in research and teaching activities -Outstanding Community Service Awards
Northwestern	http://www.northwestern.edu/newscenter/stories/2008/12/civicengage.html	not classified	
Ohio State	http://outreach.osu.edu/ http://communityconnection.osu.edu/homepage.html	Curricular Engagement & Outreach and Partnerships	-Excellence in Engagement Grants: Up to \$100,000 for proposals to establish engagement initiatives -Service Learning Initiative Grants: \$3,000 for development of courses that serve community goals - OSU Extension Grants- \$10,000-\$25,000 for engagement initiatives involving cross-department partnerships http://outreach.osu.edu/
Penn State	http://www.outreach.psu.edu/	not classified	
Purdue	http://www.purdue.edu/engagement/	Curricular Engagement & Outreach and Partnerships	**Funding Opportunities" portion of website under construction
Wisconsin	http://www.wisc.edu/outreach/ http://www.wisconsinidea.wisc.edu/	Curricular Engagement & Outreach and Partnerships	-Wisconsin Idea Endowment- competitive grant program for faculty, staff, and students with proposals for engaged research -Wisconsin Idea Undergraduate Fellowships- \$1000-\$5000 for students or student groups working on a project that addresses a community need; \$1000 for faculty supporting the project http://www.morgridge.wisc.edu/students/wif.html
University of Washington	http://depts.washington.edu/uwcp/	not classified	
University of California-Berkeley*	http://teaching.berkeley.edu/civic.html http://calinthecommunity.berkeley.edu http://students.berkeley.edu/osl/calcorps.asp http://www.berkeley.edu/pubserv/	not classified	

*No formal Office of Public Engagement

School	Faculty Workshops and Training	Office of Engagement Website Functions	Task Forces/Complementary Organizations With Faculty Role	notes
University of Illinois		-links to opprotunities for scholarships and grants -links to schoool organizations performing engagement activies	Task Force on Civic Commitment in the 21st Century; Senate Committee on Public Engagement; http://engagement.illinois.edu/institutional_commitment.html	-informative, comprehensive, "one-stop" website
Indiana University		-links to scholarship/grant opportunities -links to engagement related resources		
Iowa University		- links and information for volunteering -engagement-related web-links	-Civic Engagement Coordinating Council http://www.uiowa.edu/~cep/cecc.shtml	-Strategic Plan for Engagement -sponsors service service events and trips
Michigan*				
Michigan State				
University of Minnesota		-list opportunities for engagement-based grants and awards -list campus centers performing engaged research -engagement-related web links - <u>blog of engagement related activites at U and elsewhere</u>		
Northwestern		under construction		
Ohio State	activites http://outreach.osu.edu/workshop_resources.php#assessment1	- list engagement grant opportunities (both internal and external) -online workshops for professional development -list of publications for engagement research -provides links to upcoming conferences on engagement		-comprehensive website listing grant opportunities http://outreachgrants.osu.edu/ -exploring potential use of virtual learning for engagement/outreach efforts
Penn State				
Purdue		-links to resources for engagement activities	-Engagement Council http://www.purdue.edu/engagement/council.shtml -Associate Deans Council	- 3 offices of engagement (campus, Indianapolis, and Northeast Indiana) -large engagement staff (Vice Provost, 4 Associate Vice Provosts)
Wisconsin	-Wisconsin Idea Seminar- bus tour for 40 faculty members to demonstrate economic, political, and social realities in the state http://info.gradsch.wisc.edu/wis/	-links to engagement-related resources and departments -links to grant/scholarship opportunities		-mission of engagement well-branded as "Wisconsin Idea"
University of Washington				
University of California-Berkeley*				

*No formal Office of Public Engagement