Memorandum of Understanding
Review of Community-Engaged Scholarship and Creative Activity

This Memorandum of Understanding outlines the terms of an engaged scholar review for a faculty candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure at the University of Minnesota.

Purpose
The purpose of the engaged scholar review is to provide an internal review of the scholarly portfolio of community-engaged scholars who are submitting their dossiers for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. These reviews are meant to provide an analysis of the quality and impact of engaged scholarship, either in the specific areas of research or teaching or more broadly.

Process
January 23  Information session for prospective candidates
February 27  Orientation provided to candidates about review criteria and processes
April 1    MOU agreement signed by candidate and unit head. Candidate notifies Office for Public Engagement of intention to seek review
June 1    Appropriate 7.12, narrative statements, curriculum vitae, and evidence of engaged research and teaching submitted to review committee; letters from community partners may also be provided if the candidate chooses to do so
August 15 Unit leader receives letter from review committee to include in dossier with other supplemental reviews
Ongoing Members of the review committee are available to meet with unit-level or college-level promotion and tenure committees

The engaged scholar review will take into consideration engagement criteria as they relate to criteria outlined in the unit’s 7.12 statement.

The criteria for high-quality engaged scholarship include the candidate's demonstration of:
- Clear Academic and Community Change Goals
- Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community
- Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement
- Significant Results: Impact on the Scholarly Discipline/Field and the Community
- Effective Presentation and Communication to Academic and Community Audiences
- Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement
- Leadership and Personal Contribution
- Consistently Ethical Behavior: Socially Responsible Conduct of Research and Teaching

For each of these criteria is a set of specific standards, indicators, and expectations that will guide the reviewers’ assessment of the dossier. These criteria and the respective expectations are based on engaged scholarship standards developed by the National Review Board (NRB) for the Scholarship of Engagement, which developed its assessment criteria from the pioneering sourcebook, Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on Faculty Evaluation (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997). These national standards were further refined by our internal Review Committee based on their expertise as engaged scholars and their knowledge of scholarship expectations at the University of Minnesota. Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek mentoring from members of the review committee who are not on their panel regarding these criteria.

The members of the Review Committee are senior, tenured community-engaged scholars at the University of Minnesota from a broad range of disciplines. Based on the focus of the faculty
candidate’s scholarship and community-engaged work, three members of the Review Committee will be appointed to serve as reviewers. At least one member with a discipline or field of study in an area related to the candidate’s. No member of the review panel will be from the candidate’s department nor will a member serve at any subsequent levels of review. This three-person review committee will identify the community-engaged scholarly components of the faculty candidate’s dossier, and will review those components using the review criteria. The appointed committee will produce a summary letter that presents these senior scholars’ assessment of the quality and impact of the faculty candidate’s community-engaged scholarship.

It is important to note that the reviewers will assess only the quality and impact of the candidate’s engaged scholarship; reviewers will not assess the candidate’s level of prominence in his/her discipline or other aspects of the dossier unrelated to the candidate’s community-engaged research, teaching, and/or outreach. In addition, the reviewers will align the focus and presentation of their review to the 7.12 guidelines and expectations that guide the faculty candidate’s promotion and/or tenure process. The Engaged Scholarship Review Committee will adhere to the same standards of confidentiality that govern other aspects of the promotion and review process. **IMPORTANT**: Once this MOU is signed and submitted, the candidate has the right to withdraw their request for a review up until the time the dossier is submitted to the Review Committee. Once the candidate submits the dossier materials for consideration, the review request cannot be withdrawn and the review will be completed.

By signing this MOU on this date: ____________________:

1. We agree to have the Engaged Scholarship Review Committee conduct a review of _________’s [research, teaching, sum of engaged scholarship] and provide to the unit leader [___________________] a written report of that review.

2. We understand that this request may be withdrawn by the candidate in writing (to avp-ope@umn.edu) at any time prior to the submission of the candidate’s dossier to the Review Committee.

3. We understand that once the dossier is submitted to the Review Committee, this review request cannot be withdrawn and that the review will be completed.

4. We agree that, once completed, the Review Committee’s report will be added to the candidate’s dossier and will be included with the materials that are submitted for the candidate’s department, college, and provostial reviews.

_______________________  ______________________________
NAME OF Faculty Candidate  NAME OF Unit Leader

**Received and Recorded**

___________________________________________
Date  Andrew Furco, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement