

2016 PROVOST'S TASK FORCE ON ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP IN PROMOTION AND TENURE

9/20/2016

Final Report

Task Force Members:

Harriet Able (Education)

Lynn White Blanchard (Carolina Center for Public Service and Public Health)

Giselle M. Corbie-Smith (Medicine)

Barbara G. Friedman (Media and Journalism)

Eric L. Muller (Law)

Terry Ellen Rhodes (Fine Arts and Humanities, College of Arts and Sciences)

2016 Provost's Task Force on Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure

FINAL REPORT

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive summary	2
Introduction and history	3
Task Force charge	3
Task Force process	4
Review of 2009 Task Force report and recommendations	4
Relevant issues	5
Qualities of scholarship	6
Disciplinary, departmental and school variation	10
Reporting of engaged scholarship/research	10
Integration and connections	11
Report recommendations	11
Appendices	
A: Excerpt of 2009 Task Force Report	14
B: Terms and Definitions	16
C: Examples of Products of Engaged Scholarship (in development)	17
D: Discussion Guide for Departments and Schools	18

Executive Summary

In response to concerns expressed by the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee at UNC-Chapel Hill about difficulties in understanding and evaluating engaged scholarship during their review processes, Provost James Dean appointed the Task Force on Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure (Task Force). He charged the Task Force with reviewing issues associated with engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure and providing recommendations regarding the assessment of quality as well as suggesting training materials and approaches for faculty.

The six members of the Task Force included faculty with experience at school- and university-level review committees. In a series of meetings during fall 2015, the Task Force reviewed issues expressed by the campus APT Committee, all campus guidelines, and literature regarding promotion and tenure as related to engaged scholarship. The 2009 report of the UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices and interviews with campuses undergoing or that have undergone similar processes provided key information and insights for the committee's discussions.

The Task Force identified a number of areas that likely contribute to issues in assessing the quality of engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure. These include:

- confusion and overlap with other foci of 2009 report, specifically interdisciplinarity and new products of scholarship
- the collaborative nature of engaged scholarship
- differentiation of engaged scholarship from engaged teaching and engaged activities (service)
- challenges of peer review and documentation of impact
- discipline, departmental, and/or school variation

The six recommendations of the Task Force address these issues and will require work at the campus, school, department, and individual faculty-member levels:

- a. Provide more accessible information and resources regarding promotion and tenure on relevant <http://www.unc.edu/> webpages.
- b. Provide a suggested list of specific qualities of scholarship (both traditional and engaged) as part of the resources for promotion and tenure.
- c. Establish explicitly stated standards and examples of engaged scholarship at the disciplinary, departmental, and/or school level, including peer review and documentation of impact.
- d. Provide guidelines on presentation of engaged scholarship in CVs and portfolios. Modify current CV template as needed.
- e. Provide professional development for faculty pursuing engaged scholarship.
- f. Provide information and training as needed for department chairs and members of departmental, school, and campus promotion and tenure committees.

Introduction and History

As the first public university, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has a long and proud history of service, with engagement as a core component of the University's mission. In 1998 the Chancellor's Intellectual Climate Task Force recommended the creation of a pan-university entity to support the University's public service and engagement, and in 1999 established the Carolina Center for Public Service.

Concomitant with the Center's establishment, a growing national movement was fueled by an influential report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. *Returning to Our Roots—The Engaged Institution*¹ encouraged universities to “become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined.” Former Chancellor James Moeser helped create the report and led Carolina to become an “engaged” university, going beyond traditional public service to “envision partnerships as two-way streets defined by mutual respect among the partners for what each brings to the table.”²

A decade later, in 2009, the UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices examined key issues and made recommendations in the areas of 1) engagement and engaged scholarship, 2) interdisciplinarity, 3) new products of scholarship, and 4) mentoring. Recommendations for faculty engagement included aspects of how to incorporate and evaluate scholarship and activities in future appointment, tenure, and promotion reviews.

In 2011, Provost Bruce Carney sent a letter to deans, and department chairs requesting incorporation of the 2009 Task Force recommendations, including engaged scholarship in all campus promotion and tenure policies. These revisions were completed in 2013 and reviewed and approved in 2014.

In 2015, UNC-Chapel Hill received continuing classification as a community-engaged institution from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (the original classification was received in 2006). The progress made towards recognition of engaged scholarship in the promotion and tenure process was a key aspect of the campus' application.

Task Force Charge

During spring 2015 the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee at UNC-Chapel Hill expressed concerns about the continued difficulties in understanding and evaluating engaged scholarship during their review processes. In a memo to Provost James Dean, they expressed the need for (1) clarity regarding products of engaged scholarship and (2) standards for systematically evaluating the quality of engaged scholarship when present as a major component in the dossier. In response, Provost Dean appointed the Task Force on Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure (Task Force), and charged the

¹ Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution* (Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1999), vii.

² James Moeser, “Public Service or Lip Service? Outreach at a Major University” (address, tenth anniversary of the William and Ida Friday Center for Continuing Education, Chapel Hill, NC, March 27, 2001).

Task Force with the following objectives:

1. Review issues associated with engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure at UNC-Chapel Hill,
2. Provide recommendations for the conduct of quality assessment of engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure,
3. Offer templates for how to present and document engaged scholarship on CV and in the dossier,
4. Suggest training materials and approaches (workshops, guidance documents for schools, etc.) for faculty coming forward with engaged scholarship, and
5. Provide recommendations and briefing to the Provost for use in communication to deans and department chairs

Task Force Process

The Task Force consisted of six faculty members, chaired by Dr. Lynn White Blanchard, who began meeting in August 2015. Task Force members included faculty with experience at school- and university-level review committees. The Task Force met four times and completed the following during and between meetings:

- Discussion of issues expressed by the campus P&T Committee with regard to evaluation of engaged scholarship;
- Review of all campus APT guidelines and documentation of how they have incorporated engaged activities and engaged scholarship;
- Literature review of engaged scholarship as related to promotion and tenure;
- Review of campus's 2009 report of the UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures as well as reports, promotion and tenure policies, and procedures at other institutions as related to engaged scholarship;
- Interviews/meetings with experts in the field of higher education and engaged scholarship, including representatives of Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, University of Maryland, and Iowa State University (all of which are undergoing or have completed similar processes);
- Discussion of findings and how they might relate to and help inform procedures at UNC-Chapel Hill; and
- Determination of key resources and recommendations for their use.

Review of 2009 Task Force Report and Recommendations

Faculty engagement, including engaged scholarship, was one focus of the 2009 UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures (along with new forms of scholarship and communication and interdisciplinarity). Specifically, that report states that faculty engagement is a core component of the University's mission and is consistent with a national trend at peer institutions and that it

may take the form of teaching, research, and/or service. It also defines the terms “engaged scholarship” and “engaged activities.” (See Table 1. Additional details of the 2009 report can be found in Appendix A.)

TABLE 1: Definitions of engaged scholarship and engaged activities from 2009 report:

- *Engaged scholarship:* Scholarly efforts to expand multifaceted intellectual endeavor with a commitment to public practices and public consequences.
- *Engaged activities:* Artistic, critical, scientific, and humanistic work that influences, enriches, and improves the lives of people in the community.

The current task force used that report as a basis for definition and direction. Importantly, our charge relates to engaged scholarship, rather than engaged teaching and service, so that is the focus of this report. Defining characteristics of engaged scholarship based on the 2009 report are found in Table 2.

TABLE 2: Defining characteristics of engaged scholarship from 2009 report:

- * Scholarly, creative, or pedagogical activities for the public good
- * Directed toward persons and groups outside UNC-Chapel Hill
- * Collaborative interactions responding to short- and long-term societal needs
- * Planned and carried out in collaboration with community partners*
- * Intellectual endeavor with commitment to public practices and consequences

In providing some guidelines for evaluating faculty engagement for promotion and tenure, the report recognizes that the work will take different forms depending on the discipline, department, and school, and reiterates that “As a research-intensive university, UNC-Chapel Hill will continue to require original scholarly research as a key criterion for tenure and promotion in rank.” (pg. 6). The report goes on to state that as with other forms of scholarship, “each school, department, and discipline should determine the criteria for evaluating the excellence of engaged scholarship.”

- * The degree of active involvement of community partners in the creation and implementation of engaged scholarship will vary depending on the specifics of a particular project, as well as the discipline. For example, while a faculty member and community partner(s) may fully collaborate at every stage of a project, the faculty member may also invite community partners to serve on an advisory board to a project addressing an issue of common interest that has been conceptualized and/or funded. Another example is the creation of a product that is responsive to a stated community need or request such as a book or manual.

Relevant Issues

In reviewing the 2009 report and the concerns expressed by the APT committee in their draft memo to the Provost, the Task Force identified several issues of relevance to understanding and review of engaged scholarship.

A. Confusion and overlap with other foci of 2009 report

The 2009 report and the subsequent charge from the Provost in 2011 for policy revisions included interdisciplinarity, new products of scholarship, and mentoring as well as engagement and engaged scholarship. In some general examples of submissions considered by the APT committee, it appears there may be confusion among these three foci. Engaged scholarship often includes working across disciplines and the development of new products of scholarship, but there are many instances of interdisciplinarity and new products that are not engaged scholarship and should not be considered as such.

B. Collaborative nature of engaged scholarship

One key aspect of engaged scholarship is that it is conducted in partnership with those outside the academy. This collaboration includes mutual goal setting and reciprocity and should be documented.

C. Differentiation of engaged scholarship from engaged teaching and engaged activities (service)

The 2009 report underscores that engagement may relate to teaching, research, and/or service. Faculty partnerships may result in related work that can be documented in each of those categories, and should be reported in the appropriate section (or sections) of a portfolio. There is particular confusion about what constitutes engaged scholarship and how it differs from engaged activities (service). To qualify as engaged scholarship, work must result in a product that can be reviewed in relation to accepted qualities of scholarship.

D. Challenges of peer review and documentation of impact

Peer review and documentation of impact of engaged scholarship may be challenging, but are still critical to assessing its quality. Ways to accomplish this will differ from traditional scholarship, and should be documented and explained.

Qualities of Scholarship

Traditional scholarship, regardless of the form in which it is presented, generally reflects professional and academic expertise, is reviewed by peers external to the institution, and is disseminated to appropriate audiences. More specifically, traditional scholarship is intended to have a solid theoretical basis and apply appropriate investigative methods in order to break new ground and answer significant questions in the discipline.

Our review of both the 2009 report and other campuses' efforts repeatedly spoke to criteria for assessing the quality of scholarship (both traditional and engaged). Of the variety of resources we reviewed, the six criteria proposed by Glassick and his colleagues (1997) were the most widely used. These criteria ask whether the scholarship and product emerged from:

- Clear goals
- Adequate preparation
- Appropriate methods
- Significant results
- Effective presentation
- Reflective critique

Others include criteria similar to Glassick as well as additional criteria including originality and innovation (Lynton, 1995), peer review (Diamond, 2002), and ethical behavior (Jordan, 2007).

Andrew Furco, associate vice president for public engagement and associate professor of organizational leadership, policy, and development at the University of Minnesota, has developed comparisons of traditional and engaged scholarship in relationship to defining and assessing engaged scholarship that are particularly helpful and are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 3: Traditional and Engaged Scholarship

TRADITIONAL SCHOLARSHIP	ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP
Breaks new ground in the discipline	Breaks new ground in the discipline <u>and</u> has direct application to broader public issues
Answers significant questions in the discipline	Answers significant questions in the discipline <u>which have relevance to public or community issues</u>
Is reviewed and validated by qualified peers in the discipline	Is reviewed and validated by qualified peers in the discipline <u>and</u> by members of the community
Is based on solid theoretical basis	Is based on solid theoretical <u>and</u> practical bases
Applies appropriate investigative methods	Applies appropriate investigative methods
Is disseminated to appropriate audiences	Is disseminated to appropriate academic <u>and</u> community audiences
Makes significant advances in knowledge and understanding of the discipline	<p>Makes significant advances in knowledge and understanding of the discipline <u>and</u> public social issues</p> <p>Applies the knowledge to address issues in the community</p>

(Furco, 2008)

TABLE 4: Traditional and Engaged Scholarship: Assessment Criteria and Guiding Questions

TRADITIONAL SCHOLARSHIP	ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP
Clear Goals	Clear Goals
<p>1. Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly?</p> <p>2. Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?</p> <p>3. Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?</p>	<p>1. Does the scholar state the basic purpose of the work <u>and its value for the public good?</u></p> <p>2. Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?</p> <p>3. Does the scholar identify intellectual and significant questions in the discipline <u>and in the community?</u></p> <p><u>Is there an "academic fit" with the scholar's role, departmental and university mission?</u></p>
Adequate Preparation	Adequate Preparation
<p>4. Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field?</p> <p>5. Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work?</p> <p>6. Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?</p>	<p>4. Does the scholar show an understanding of relevant existing scholarship?</p> <p>5. Does the scholar bring the necessary skills <u>to the collaboration?</u></p> <p>6. Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary <u>to support the collaboration</u> and move the project forward?</p>
Appropriate Methods	Appropriate Methods
<p>7. Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals?</p> <p>8. Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?</p> <p>9. Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?</p>	<p>7. Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions, <u>and context of the work?</u></p> <p>8. Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?</p> <p>9. Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?</p> <p>Does the scholar describe the rationale for election of methods <u>in relation to context and issue?</u></p>

TABLE 4 con’t.: Traditional and Engaged Scholarship: Assessment Criteria and Guiding Questions

TRADITIONAL SCHOLARSHIP	ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP
Significant Results	Significant Results
<p>10. Does the scholar achieve the goals?</p> <p>11. Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the field?</p> <p>12. Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration?</p>	<p>10. Does the scholar achieve the goals?</p> <p>11. Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the discipline and to the community?</p> <p><i>Does the scholar’s work achieve impact or change? Are those outcomes evaluated and by whom?</i></p> <p><i>Does the scholar’s work make a contribution consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time?</i></p>
Effective Presentation	Communication/Dissemination
<p>13. Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work?</p> <p>14. Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences?</p> <p>15. Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?</p>	<p>13. Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present the work?</p> <p>14. Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to the intended audiences?</p> <p>15. Does the scholar present information with clarity and integrity?</p> <p><i>Does the scholar communicate/disseminate to appropriate academic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the university?</i></p>
Reflective Critique	Reflective Critique
<p>16. Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work?</p> <p>17. Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique?</p> <p>18. Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?</p>	<p>16. Does the scholar critically evaluate the work?</p> <p>17. Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique?</p> <p>18. Does the scholar use evaluation to learn from the work and to direct future work?</p> <p><i>What are sources of evidence inform the critique?</i></p>

(Furco, 2015)

Disciplinary, Departmental, and School Variation

Traditional scholarship is well established in terms of what counts toward promotion and tenure and how that is measured. However, there is wide variation depending on the discipline, department, and/or school. Although peer review is a constant, how impact and quality are assessed may be in the form of journal articles, books, performances or other products, with specifics defined by the faculty of the department, and/or school. These products are widely and well accepted as proxies for quality of the scholarship.

Engaged scholarship does not have the established history or tradition with regard to accepted evidence of quality, and by its nature lends itself to a wider range of possible proxies. As noted in the 2009 Task Force Report and underscored in our review of the literature and other campus policies and practices, it is incumbent on departments and schools to provide specifics as to what is expected of faculty members doing engaged scholarship in their discipline.

Reporting of Engaged Scholarship/Research

Faculty engagement may be related to one's teaching, research and/or service, and as recommended in the 2009 Task Force Report, faculty members should report their efforts in the appropriate sections and statements of their portfolios/packages. This report focuses on engaged scholarship/research. For reference, definitions related to engaged teaching and service are contained in Appendix B that may be useful in determining the best placement of engaged efforts in a portfolio.

Engaged Scholarship/Research

Engaged scholarship/research broadly involves the process of contextualizing work to address problems in the real world and to develop knowledge for a particular setting. Faculty members work toward advancing knowledge while simultaneously partnering with external entities to address problems—so that both the external partners and the researcher benefit.

When conducting engaged research, researchers must consider the significance, context, knowledge application, and external and internal impacts of their work in relation to the community.

Terms may differ from one discipline to another and/or may include different approaches. These include, but are not limited to: participatory research, action research, public scholarship, and community-based participatory research.

As with traditional research, engaged research results in products that may/can be reviewed for quality and impact. Although these products may include articles in peer-reviewed journals, they may also include innovative products (e.g., curricula, videos, policies, and websites) that result in benefits outside of the academic arena.

Although new/non-traditional/innovative products of scholarship may be the result of engaged scholarship, they do not qualify as engaged products only by virtue of being non-traditional. They must meet the basic criteria for engagement, and include collaboration with community partners.

Engaged scholarship that has been published in books and peer-reviewed publications should be reported along with traditional scholarship publications. Products that are not traditional publications should be noted in a separate section of the curriculum vitae and noted as "Products of Engaged Research."

Given the nature of engaged work, faculty members should provide a narrative and context for their scholarship at a level of detail that may not be necessary for traditional scholarship. This documentation (within the CV or accompanying research statement) should provide evidence of how the work embodies the qualities of engaged scholarship (e.g., clear goals, appropriate methods, and impact as seen in Table 4).

Integration and Connections

Engagement may also provide important connections among teaching, research, and service. As noted, those should be documented in a CV in the appropriate sections. However, the interconnectedness with other aspects of a faculty member's work should also be explicitly stated, most appropriately in the narrative portions of the portfolio.

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Addressing issues identified regarding engaged scholarship as related to promotion and tenure requires work at the campus, school, department, and individual faculty-member levels. The following recommendations serve to inform efforts to present and assess the products of engaged scholarship, and in so doing may also enhance the overall promotion and tenure process.

1. **Provide more accessible information and resources regarding promotion and tenure on relevant [unc.edu](http://www.unc.edu) webpages.**

Suggested action and responsibility:

The campus policies and guidelines are currently linked on the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost's website under Policies, Procedures, and Reports (<http://provost.unc.edu/policies/>), but are not easily located. The link to this document and to additional resources and information regarding promotion and tenure in general, and as related to engaged scholarship. The Center for Faculty Excellence should create a dedicated webpage that can be accessed from their website, the University's Faculty and Staff Resource page (<http://www.unc.edu/faculty-staff/>), and the Provost's website.

- 2. Provide a suggested list of specific qualities of scholarship (both traditional and engaged) as part of the resources for promotion and tenure to help guide faculty members in the planning, implementation, and presentation of engaged scholarship and to assist promotion and tenure committees in their assessment of that scholarship.**

Suggested action and responsibility:

Include Glassick's six criteria (1997) and Furco's table of guiding questions (pgs. 8-9) on the general webpage for promotion and tenure created by the Center for Faculty Excellence.

- 3. Establish explicitly stated standards and examples of engaged scholarship at the disciplinary, departmental, and/or school level, including peer review and documentation of impact.**

Suggested action and responsibility:

Hold a series of sessions (campus-wide, school-, and/or department-based) to discuss standards and examples using discussion guide (draft in Appendix C). These can be facilitated by the Carolina Center for Public Service and the Center for Faculty Excellence and should include discussion of appropriate proxies for traditional peer review and documentation of impact. Results of these sessions should be synthesized and included with other online resources.

- 4. Provide guidelines on presentation of engaged scholarship in CVs and portfolios. Modify current CV template as needed.**

Suggested action and responsibility:

Using information gained through this Task Force process, develop a packet of guidelines for presentation of engaged scholarship that can be provided on the website and included in faculty development trainings and workshops. The Carolina Center for Public Service should coordinate development of the information with input from Task Force members and representatives of the APT committee.

- 5. Provide professional development for faculty pursuing engaged scholarship.**

Suggested action and responsibility:

The Carolina Center for Public Service should collaborate with campus partners including the Center for Faculty Excellence and the Institute of Arts and Humanities to establish professional development opportunities, including online and in-person training and information regarding planning, conducting, and documenting engaged scholarship. Training materials to be developed should include examples of materials from successful portfolios.

- 6. Provide information and training as needed for department chairs and members of departmental, school, and campus promotion and tenure committees.**

Suggested action and responsibility:

Develop online information specific to the assessment and review of engaged scholarship for promotion and tenure, and offer an annual in-person workshop offered through the Office of the Provost by the Carolina Center for Public Service and/or the Center for Faculty Excellence.

APPENDIX A

2009 UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices Report Excerpt (pages 6-8)

DEFINE, VALUE, AND EVALUATE FACULTY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE PUBLIC

Recommendation: The University's personnel reviews should include consideration of the faculty member's interactions and engagements with communities outside the traditional scholarly community.

Engagement is a core component of the University's mission. Such engagement has become important for the professional work of faculty in most units of the University, and exemplifies part of our commitment to the principles of the UNC Tomorrow initiative. Faculty engagement is also consistent with a national trend at peer institutions in higher education.

The meaning of faculty engagement

Faculty "engagement" refers to scholarly, creative, or pedagogical activities for the public good, directed toward persons and groups outside the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Such activities (in the form of research, teaching, and/or service) develop as collaborative interactions that respond to short- and long-term societal needs. Engagement serves people in our state, nation, or the wider world through a continuum of academically informed activities. Although the spectrum of engaged scholarship and activities varies among disciplines, "engagement" is planned and carried out by University and community partners, and includes:

- *Engaged scholarship:* Scholarly efforts to expand multifaceted intellectual endeavor with a commitment to public practices and public consequences.
- *Engaged activities:* Artistic, critical, scientific, and humanistic work that influences, enriches, and improves the lives of people in the community.

Guidelines for evaluating faculty engagement in tenure and promotion reviews Engagement will inevitably take different forms in the various schools, divisions, and departments of the University. As a research-intensive university, UNC-Chapel Hill will continue to require original scholarly research as a key criterion for tenure and promotion in rank. Faculty engagement can take the form of "engaged scholarship" and other "engaged activities."

- To satisfy the criterion for scholarly research, "engaged scholarship" must meet a rigorous standard such as external funding, peer-reviewed publications and evaluations. As is the current practice for other kinds of scholarship, each school, department, and discipline should determine the criteria for evaluating the excellence of engaged scholarship.
- To define the criterion for "engaged activities," each school, department, and discipline should develop its own descriptions and examples of academically informed activities that constitute faculty engagement (for example, but not limited to: APPLES courses, outreach to public schools and adult audiences re: North Carolina history, health, and other academically informed topics).

In establishing these criteria, each unit should refer to the “The meaning of faculty engagement” paragraph above. The Center for Public Service is also available to work with schools and departments in developing guidelines and criteria for engagement. See: <http://www.unc.edu/pse/our-office-cps.php>; <http://www.unc.edu/cps/learn-more-about-engagement.php>.

Engagement should be recognized as a significant component of a faculty member’s professional achievements. Engagement may play a more prominent role at different phases of a faculty member’s career, and it should be supported at any phase if it is consistent with a unit’s practices and priorities. However, faculty whose work does not include engaged activities should not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on those grounds unless such activities are part of the clearly articulated core mission of the hiring unit.

Guidelines for reporting faculty engagement

- Engagement may be embedded in one or more aspects of a faculty member’s work— research, teaching, and service. Faculty should be asked to describe their “engaged scholarship” and “engaged activities” in their promotion/tenure statements about research, teaching, and service.
- “Engaged scholarship” and “engaged activities” should be included as categories within the dossiers faculty prepare for personnel reviews, similar to traditional categories such as “scholarly publications,” “course syllabi,” and “teaching evaluations.” Descriptions of engaged activities must be demonstrated with specific examples and should be evaluated with the usual attention to significance and influence in a professional field.
- In addition to the categories of Research, Teaching, and Service, the Provost’s document, “Dossier: Format for Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty Review,” should provide the department chair with the opportunity to assess the faculty member’s engagement as a fourth category of their academic work; the section that provides guidelines for the formatting of *faculty CVs* should designate a section of the CV for listing engaged faculty work that does not fit in already-established categories.

Recommendation: The “service category” in the Provost’s current guidelines for tenure and promotion should be revised. This kind of service typically differs from “engaged activities” with communities outside the academic world, although there can be some overlap. Categories that might be included:

- Service on departmental, school, and university committees;
- Service in professional scholarly organizations;
- Service for scholarly journals and presses;
- Service for international/national scholarly associations;
- Service provided in clinical or consultative settings

Recommendation: A survey should be conducted of faculty to determine the nature and extent of ongoing engaged scholarship and engaged activities at the UNC-Chapel Hill.

Full report: <http://provost.unc.edu/files/2012/10/Taskforce-on-Future-Promotion-and-Tenure-Policies-and-Practices-FINAL-REPORT-5-8-09.pdf>)

APPENDIX B

Terms and Definitions

Community-Engaged Teaching

Community engaged teaching connects the concepts in the classroom to civic engagement and service experiences in the community. Often referred to as service-learning, it is a pedagogy in which a faculty member builds a community-based learning experience (service or research) into the syllabus, planned with a community partner and meeting a stated community need, and students provide structured reflections connecting the community experience to course learning goals.

Community-Engaged Service

Community engaged service is service beyond the university (e.g., department and college committees), the profession (e.g., peer review, academic organizations), and the community (e.g., volunteering at a social service, good citizenship). It is service to the public that includes the extension and application of the faculty member's expert knowledge. For example, this could be a professor of education providing support for a community's literacy coalition or a professor of urban planning advising a municipality in the design of new roadways and pedestrian areas.

Engaged Research (also referred to in this report as engaged scholarship)

Engaged research broadly involves the process of contextualizing work to address problems in the real world and to develop knowledge for a particular setting. Faculty members work toward advancing knowledge while simultaneously partnering with external entities to address problems—so that both the external partners and the researcher benefit.

When conducting engaged research, researchers must consider the significance, context, knowledge application, and external and internal impacts of their work in relation to the community.

Terms may differ from one discipline to another and/or may include different approaches. These include, but are not limited to: participatory research, action research, public scholarship, and community-based participatory research.

The definition of the scholarship of engagement used by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education speaks to its quality of interconnectedness:

“The scholarship of engagement (also known as outreach scholarship, public scholarship, scholarship for the common good, community-based scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship) represents an integrated view of the faculty role in which teaching, research, and service overlap and are mutually reinforcing, is characterized by scholarly work tied to a faculty member's expertise, is of benefit to the external community, is visible and shared with community stakeholders, and reflects the mission of the institution.”

APPENDIX C

Discussion Guide for Departments and Schools

1. Faculty members collaborate with a variety of communities/publics.

Engaged faculty members partner with different kinds of communities. For example, some communities are defined by geography (such as neighborhoods or cities), circumstance (such as surviving a disaster, belonging to the same school district), identity (such as gender, ethnicity/race), kin (such as families and family systems), affiliation (such as political party or interest group), faith (such as members of a specific religion), or profession (such as practicing professionals in a field, entrepreneurs, or specific types of businesses)—to name a few.

- What publics and communities are natural partners with which the faculty in your discipline, department, or school already do or might collaborate?

2. Faculty members collaborate with communities on different types of activities.

Faculty may partner with communities through research (such as applied research or community-based research), teaching and learning (such as service-learning or noncredit instruction), service (such as technical assistance, expert testimony), or economic-development activities (such as patents, licenses, or new business ventures).

- What are the common types of scholarly engagement activities in your discipline, department, and school?
- What differentiates engaged scholarship from engaged teaching and engaged service?

3. Faculty members pursuing engaged scholarship collaborate with communities in a variety of ways.

Sometimes faculty scholarship may be described as highly engaged—with community partners collaborating at all stages of the scholarship—and other times faculty scholarship may be responsive to their community but engaged in a more limited way. This range in the degree of engagement reflects elasticity in collaboration—with faculty members making appropriate choices given the community, the context, the research problem, etc.

- What are ways faculty members in your discipline and/or department are involved with community partners?
- How are scholarly efforts in your discipline, department or school responsive to community?

4. The language associated with engaged scholarship varies by discipline.

The ways of describing scholarly engagement are wide-ranging, including translational research, public scholarship, community based participatory research, action or applied research, etc.

- What are ways engaged scholarship is described in your discipline, department, or school?
- What words does your discipline, department, or school commonly use to refer to scholarly engagement?

5. Scholarly engagement generates a range of scholarly and public products or artifacts.

The evidence of engaged scholarship takes the form of peer-reviewed journal articles and conference presentations, as well as other forms of scholarly work products (e.g. technical bulletins, evaluation reports, public performances, curricula, videos, policies, websites).

- What are acceptable forms of evidence of scholarly engagement in your unit?
- What are current innovative products of scholarship in your field and are they engaged?
- What constitutes peer review of these products?

6. Engaged scholarship meets scholarly standards.

It is informed by theory and evidence-based practice and, in turn, is the source of new knowledge and practice. The merit of engaged scholarship should be evaluated by stated standards of rigor and quality, just as other forms of scholarship are judged in the academy.

- What are indicators of quality in your field?
- What counts as scholarly engagement in your discipline, department, and school?
- What criteria do you use to judge its quality?
- What are the processes or standards for evaluating this quality in your field?
- How does your field evaluate interdisciplinary engagement?

This guide is partially adapted from Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer
University Outreach and Engagement
Michigan State University
September 2011