Chapter 12

PREPARING FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

This chapter is for faculty on the tenure track who will be reviewed for promotion and tenure as well as adjunct instructors on contract who undergo periodic performance reviews, including those teaching at community colleges. This is a critically important process that ensures quality scholarship within the academy. We begin with the good news. Nearly 75% of faculty on the tenure track are awarded tenure (Chait, 2002; O'Meara, 2010). Now the not-so-good news. Most nontenured faculty feel the promotion and tenure review process is "ambiguous and difficult to navigate in terms of standards and expectations" (O'Meara, 2010, p. 275). A recent study of 410 full-time pretenured and tenured faculty at 3 universities in the northeastern part of the United States reported that respondents generally found a lack of clarity in promotion and tenure criteria (Prottas, Shea-Van Fossen, Cleaver, & Andreassi, 2017).

To complicate things further, the review process varies widely from one institution to another. Some institutions are highly centralized with a single promotion and tenure process. Others are very decentralized, and every academic department on campus has its own criteria and procedures. Some criteria provide useful descriptions and benchmarks of performance expectations. Others can be vague, which presents challenges for the instructor who is trying to meet those performance expectations. Therefore, it is incumbent on you to be aware of the process as well as the cultural and political factors that shape this exercise at your institution. The promotion

and tenure process continues to be a challenge, especially for engaged faculty (Bialek, 2000; Gelmon & Agre-Kippenhan, 2002; Huber, 2002; Nyden, 2003; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Seifer, Wong, Gelmon, & Lederer, 2009; Welch, 2016), as many promotion and tenure systems do not reflect institutional priorities nor the changes in the dynamic nature of what constitutes scholarship or the aspirations of the new engaged professoriate (O'Meara et al., 2015).

One reason for these challenges is that review committees at any type of institution of higher education don't fully understand what CES is, and they tend to focus on the location of the work in the community as a form of service rather than as a scholarly activity. Another factor is that CES does not readily align with traditional standards for evaluating the quality and productivity of scholarship. Consequently, there is no accepted method of peer-reviewing the various dissemination methods that are common in CES, as described previously in chapter 11 (Hafler & Lovejoy, 2000; Popovich & Abel, 2002). Swipe your smartphone or tablet over the QR code in Figure 12.1 to hear KerryAnn O'Meara discuss some of the challenges associated with promotion and tenure review for engaged scholars. Jot down your thoughts, reactions, and questions that arise from watching the video in the space provided in Tool Kit 12.1.

Figure 12.1 Video of KerryAnn O'Meara discussing promotion and tenure challenges for engaged scholarship.

Note. Scan the QR code to access https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2y9hE9xe9Qc

> Tool Kit 12.1—Refer to Exercise 12.1 in your workbook. Record your thoughts, reactions, and questions that arise from watching the video clip regarding some of the challenges associated with the review process for engaged scholars.

The Community-Campus Partnership for Health (CCPH) established a working group to examine issues pertaining to promotion and tenure review in the context of engaged scholarship and to develop mechanisms to fairly and accurately review scholarly performance (Jordan et al., 2009). The

working group reported that (a) promotion and tenure criteria generally did not have clear language to describe community engagement nor did they have key competencies that could be used by a review committee, (b) existing definitions did not adequately characterize the purpose or spirit of community engagement as a valid form of scholarship, and (c) the review process lacked adequate tools and standards to assess engaged scholarship. As a result, the working group developed a resource package for assessing engaged scholarship (described further on p. 169, this volume).

O'Meara and colleagues (2015) argue that "the promotion and tenure process reflects institutional values, aspirations, privileges, and power structures" (p. 52). At the same time, Diamond (1995) stated that

> the promotion and tenure review has basically three components: 1) the documentation that the candidate provides, 2) the materials that the committee collects, and 3) the process by which the committee reviews these materials and conducts its deliberations. A well-prepared faculty member can go a long way in making his or her "case" by providing strong context and solid documentation for the committee to consider. (p. 14)

As such, it is in your best interest to proactively prepare for the review process as well as articulate what it means to be an engaged scholar (see Tool Kit 12.2).

> Tool Kit 12.2—Refer to Exercise 12.2 in your workbook. Obtain a copy of the promotion and tenure criteria and procedures and/or the evaluation rubric for non-tenure-track instructors that will be used for your review. Examine the nature of the expectations and benchmarks for assessing faculty.

The key to a successful performance review is to clearly articulate the rigor of engaged teaching and scholarship (O'Meara, 2010).

Frameworks for Assessing Engaged Scholarship

We present here three models that frame CES as well as provide suggested standards to assess the quality of the work. An engaged scholar may wish to use one of these as a framework to describe their engaged work. Likewise, an engaged scholar may consider offering it to their review committee as a tool to help them assess the quality of the engaged work that may be unfamiliar to them. However, it is critically important to also follow and address existing review criteria.

Standards for Assessing Engaged Scholarship

Boyer's (1990) landmark report *Scholarship Reconsidered* examined a full range of scholarly activity within the academy that moved beyond the traditional paradigm of research. Boyer characterized scholarship of engagement as that which manifests itself through scholarly activity beyond the campus to address social issues in the community. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching proposed establishing criteria to help assess this new type of scholarship. As a result, Glassick and colleagues (1997) developed assessment criteria for engaged scholarship consisting of the following standards: (a) clear goals, (b) adequate preparation, (c) appropriate methodology, (d) outstanding results, (e) effective communication, and (f) reflective critique of the work. As discussed earlier in chapter 1 (p. 27, this volume) and later in this chapter, these standards have been slightly modified and expanded by two more standards to be more inclusive of the community and are presented in Figure 12.2.

Figure 12.2 Assessment standards for engaged scholarship.

1. Clearly articulated academic and community goals.
2. Adequate preparation in disciplinary content area and grounding in engaged public scholarship.
3. Appropriate methods that reflect and include rigor and tenets of community engagement.
4. Significant results that impact the field and the community.
5. Effective presentation and dissemination to both scholarly and community audiences.
6. Reflective critique to identify and articulate insight to improve scholarship and community engagement.
7. Demonstration and promotion of leadership and scholarly contributions coupled with agency and parity by all participants and stakeholders.
8. Consistent ethical behavior coupled with cultural competence and socially responsible conduct.

CES Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package

In 2005 the CCPH convened a working group known as the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, composed of engaged scholars representing various health fields at several universities from across the country (Seifer et al., 2009).The group identified a number of

issues related to promotion and tenure review and created a very useful and comprehensive online "package" to assist faculty in preparing their review portfolio (Jordan, 2007). The package incorporates a slightly modified version of the standards developed by Glassick and colleagues (1997), consisting of eight standards that were presented in the "Honing Your Craft" section of chapter 1 of this book as a framework for becoming an engaged scholar. Examples of how to address and articulate each of the standards in a professional statement using a table of accomplishments are provided in sample materials (see Appendix 12A).

The CCPH online package also provides a step-by-step guide to creating a narrative for the professional statement in the review portfolio that begins by defining *community engagement* and *engaged scholarship* and a list of materials to include in the review portfolio, such as (a) a career statement, (b) a curriculum vitae, (c) a statement of assigned responsibilities, (d) a teaching portfolio, (e) letters of support and appreciation from community partners and community leaders, (f) media reports, and (g) a list of peer-reviewed publications and presentations. Likewise, the preparation materials include extensive tables that describe enhancement of scientific rigor in research and community-engaged teaching. Each table is composed of (a) a list and description of incremental steps of the research and curriculum development activities, (b) examples of benefits of the community-engaged methods, and (c) examples of documenting evidence of impact and outcomes. The full package can be accessed from the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative website (https://www.ccphealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CES_RPT_Package.pdf). A truncated example consisting of excerpts from the comprehensive package is provided in Appendix 12B.

Points of Distinction

Grounded in its long history of outreach as a land-grant institution, Michigan State University developed a framework to assess community outreach consisting of four domains known as *Points of Distinction* (Michigan State University, 2009), which may also be appropriate in the context of CES. The domains include (a) significance, (b) context, (c) scholarship, and (d) impact. The document provides an assessment matrix made up of the following features characterizing and describing excellence in each of the four domains: (a) components, (b) sample assessment questions, (c) examples of qualitative indicators, and (d) examples of quantitative indicators. The matrix provides a comprehensive list of

indicators, far too extensive to describe here. As with the other examples assessment standards presented previously, engaged scholars may choo to use this matrix to frame their engaged scholarship and/or provide t matrix to their promotion and tenure review committee to assist them assessing engaged scholarship that may be unfamiliar to them. Given t volume of indicators incorporated in the matrix, a truncated example presented in Appendix 12C. Readers may visit https://engage.msu.ed upload/documents-reports/pod_2009ed.pdf to access the full document

Preparing Your Professional Statement as an Engaged Scholar

Many institutions, including community colleges, require faculty to pr vide a professional statement in their review portfolio. This provides background and rationale for the focus of their work. It is here that o must clearly define and describe *engaged scholarship*. This, however, can daunting given that review committees are generally unfamiliar with CE (Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005). As such, you must advocate for yourse and clearly articulate the public purpose and theoretical foundations your work as an engaged scholar. Using your workbook as a guide, yo will be invited, beginning with Tool Kit 12.3, to identify and incorporat language from earlier chapters to define CES as well as present a theoret cal framework that informs your engaged teaching and scholarship yo previously identified in earlier Tool Kit exercises.

> Tool Kit 12.3—Refer to Exercise 12.3 in your workbook to begin to incrementally draft a professional statement that can be included in your review portfolio. As a preface, prepare your professional statement by reviewing and including narrative from your institutional mission that reflects engaged teaching and learning.

Defining *CES*

It is safe to assume that members of the review community will b unfamiliar with the concept of CES. It is likely they will have preconceive notions of what it is and what it is not. Therefore, it is essential to provid a definition and description early in your statement. Using Tool Kit 12.4 you should peruse and review the first chapters of this book and Tool Ki

passages to identify narratives that you feel would serve you and resonate with the culture of your campus.

> Tool Kit 12.4—Refer to Exercise 12.4 in your workbook. This exercise will provide additional definitions of *engaged scholarship*. Using these definitions provided throughout this chapter and book, begin drafting a narrative that introduces and describes CES that you can incorporate into your professional statement.

Academic Trilogy

Tenure-track faculty are evaluated on their performance and productivity in a triadic structure of activities that includes research and scholarship, teaching, and service. The evaluation process should determine the degree and impact of (a) developing and disseminating new knowledge, (b) peer review, and (c) effective communication (Register & King, 2017).

Research and Scholarship

Publication of one's research or creative work is the key to obtaining tenure (Miller & Harris, 2009). As discussed in chapter 11 at great length, you should consider ways to write articles for peer-reviewed journals and/or make presentations at refereed professional conferences that disseminate new knowledge about what transpired through your engaged teaching. Publications and presentations about your engaged teaching reflect an integrated approach of engaged scholarship as well as showcase excellence in your teaching.

In addition to reporting at traditional dissemination venues, and as discussed in chapter 11, present and describe other forms of engaged products derived from your work. Products include policy briefs, reports, products, and programs grounded in theory and incorporating sound methodology for their creation and implementation. Likewise, be sure to articulate the impact or outcomes of each of the products. This may include adoption by community partners, media reports, or letters from representatives of community partners documenting the impact of your scholarly efforts. The frameworks presented earlier in the chapter may serve as useful models on how to articulate this in narrative form as well as in summary tables.

Teaching

The review process is also looking for evidence of excellence in teaching. There are two essential challenges associated with this task. The first is the limited and somewhat myopic evaluation methods that have traditionally been used to evaluate teaching excellence. Historically, evaluating teaching has been limited to the following methods: (a) student evaluation ratings, (b) peer review of teaching, and (c) self-report (De Courcy, 2015; Paulsen, 2002). The difficulty with the first two approaches is the assumption that both students and faculty are able to identify and articulate what constitutes excellence in this context as opposed to articulating teaching methods they like or prefer. A related difficulty is characterizing excellence for review committees (De Courcy, 2015; Fitzmaurice, 2010), which leads to the second challenge: many promotion and tenure criteria or adjunct instructor review procedures do not clearly characterize what constitutes excellence and those characteristics vary across departments and disciplines. Furthermore, there is no "one size fits all" definition for *teaching excellence* (Pratt, 2002, p. 9).

However, some institutional policies and procedures do, in fact, articulate what constitutes excellence in teaching. When this is the case, you must carefully address each of those defining characteristics with examples from your course. For example, Concordia College, a faith-based liberal arts college in Moorhead, Minnesota, devotes more than an entire page in its faculty handbook to articulate and describe teaching effectiveness and explicitly includes examples of engaged pedagogy such as service-learning (Concordia College, 2018):

> Teaching Performance—Faculty teaching is not limited to the classroom. Teaching occurs in the laboratory, the studio, the rehearsal hall and on study abroad experiences. It occurs one-on-one in research, independent study, cooperative education, internships and practica. Teaching also includes the coaching of athletic or speech and debate teams, theater productions, media productions, or musical ensemble groups. Teaching performance includes an array of activities related to the interaction of faculty and students in the teaching-learning process:
>
> 1. Knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter;
> 2. Thorough course preparation, including statements of goals and objectives;
> 3. Course organization, including written syllabi and careful preparation for daily classroom activities;

4. Appropriate assignments and prompt evaluation and return of student work;
5. Interest in and availability to students;
6. Encouragement of critical thinking, effective communication and problem-solving skills through active student learning such as discussion, service-learning, group projects, etc.; and
7. Familiarity with, and use of, a variety of teaching techniques appropriate to the classroom audience.

This particular example essentially outlines a narrative for the instructor to describe their engaged teaching by providing a brief statement for each of the seven benchmarks. Likewise, these benchmarks include key engaged pedagogical components such as instructional objectives, critical thinking, effective communication, and problem-solving, all of which are embedded within community-based engaged courses. Consider incorporating some of these characteristics into your professional statement if your departmental or institutional criteria of teaching excellence appear ambiguous.

When the criteria for teaching are nebulous, you must proactively take it on yourself to provide evidence that your engaged teaching does, in fact, embody best practice to connote academic excellence. Therefore, you are encouraged to frame your teaching in a review process that reflects academic excellence in at least six ways. First, as examined in chapter 1, describe engaged pedagogy. Consider including the characterization of engaged pedagogy provided by Colby and colleagues (2003) in chapter 2 as (a) active learning, (b) learning as social process, (c) knowledge shaped by contexts, (d) reflective practice, and (e) an ability to represent an idea in more than one modality. Second, provide a theoretical foundation that grounds your teaching and course. You'll recall that a number of theoretical frameworks were presented in chapter 2. Such a discussion readily reveals and incorporates scholarly attention to academic excellence that is often included as part of the criteria in evaluating an instructor's teaching. Tool Kit 12.5 will help you begin this process.

> Tool Kit 12.5—Review Tool Kit 2.2 from chapter 2 to identify and select a theoretical framework to include in your professional statement. Spend time either by yourself or with your colleagues or center director drafting a narrative of that theoretical framework.

Third, enumerate the objectives of the course. This includes both the instructional goals for students and the goals for the community partner as a means of documenting impact the course had on both students and the community.

Fourth, explain the course preparation of establishing community partnerships as well as assignments, activities, and products you have incorporated. Describe whether you are participating in a learning community to prepare you to develop and teach your engaged course. Include the number of hours you committed to individual and group study. Share when, where, and how often you met with your community partner(s) in developing objectives, assignments, and partnerships. Your course description also includes a list of readings as well as the engaged activities conducted in the community that were designed to achieve the course objectives. Be sure to provide a brief definition and theoretical basis of *reflection* as well as how it was conducted throughout the course. With students' permission, consider providing anonymous reflection passages from students' written reflection entries to illustrate and highlight features of the engaged experience.

Fifth, report the impact of the course. You will recall that chapter 10 explored various ways to assess the impact of engaged courses based on instructional objectives and objectives of community partners. Briefly describe how you assessed achieving those goals and the results. This may include students' pre/post scores on various cognitive or attitudinal measures, reflection statements, and the production and adoption of a tangible product by a community partner. Such an approach provides more evidence of effective teaching than merely sharing course evaluations that often serve as the only vehicle for assessing teaching.

Finally, include the results from community partner summative evaluations. This provides social validation that you and your students effectively applied important knowledge and skills as well as documents cultural competency and effective partnership attributes as described in chapters 3 and 4. Social validity is commonly used in educational and therapeutic contexts in which practitioners in authentic settings (e.g., classrooms, clinics) assess and attest to the effectiveness of a theoretically based approach or program that has been developed and implemented (Baer & Schwartz, 1991; Schwartz & Baer, 1991; Welch et al., 2005). This validation process in real-life settings also serves as a bridge to discussing your service record. That said, you must also remember to clearly articulate that the engagement activities of your course are a form of pedagogy designed to meet instructional objectives. *Therefore, it is imperative that*

you address and describe your course in the context of teaching rather than service in your professional statement. Use Tool Kit 12.6 to begin drafting a description of your engaged course.

> Tool Kit 12.6—Refer to Exercise 12.6 in your workbook. Begin to draft a description of your engaged course. Use the OPERA (objectives, partnerships, engagement, reflection, assessment) rubric as an outline. Be sure to articulate and demonstrate how the course and the engaged activities demonstrate teaching excellence either by addressing specific benchmarks or criteria your institution stipulates or by using the basic framework of excellence presented in this chapter.

Service

Traditionally, service within the academic trilogy has fallen under two, or sometimes three, formats (Welch, 2010b). The first is governance by serving on various committees at the departmental, college, or institutional level. This often includes curriculum or admissions committees as well as institutional task forces. The second form of service is as a citizen in your discipline by serving as a reviewer on the editorial review board of a scholarly journal or the governing body of a professional association. You will want to list these on your curriculum vitae. A third, and somewhat less common, form of service that may be recognized at some institutions is service to the community. In this context, some institutions recognize and reward faculty who serve as consultants or members of local boards or organizations within the city or region that hosts the institution. Eby (2010) points out that this type of outreach to the community is common in faith-based institutions. So even if your department or institution does not necessarily include service to the community under the traditional academic umbrella for this aspect of the academic trilogy, you can demonstrate how you have effectively integrated the triadic academic roles and responsibilities as an engaged scholar.

It is important, however, to anecdotally acknowledge the proverbial 300-pound gorilla in the room by noting that service is sometimes viewed as less significant than research and teaching during the review process (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Holland, 1999). In Tool Kit 12.7, you are encouraged to consult with a trusted colleague to assess your institution's cultural perception of the value under service. As such, engaged faculty should not exclusively or solely frame their engaged teaching and scholarship under the service category, as the engaged dimension of this work.

> Tool Kit 12.7—Refer to Exercise 12.7 in your workbook. Identify a trusted colleague and invite them to lunch or coffee. Ask them about and discuss the cultural and political aspects of the review process. Inquire how service within the academic trilogy is viewed. If they have taught engaged courses, ask to see their promotion and tenure portfolio and how they articulated this work. Share and discuss this with your learning community and/or center director.

Putting It All Together

You are now ready to put together each of the points from this chapter to generate your portfolio. Table 12.4 provides a suggested list and sequence

TABLE 12.4
Suggested List and Sequence for a Review Portfolio

Component	*Description*
Personal and Professional Statement	Your narrative provides an overview of your research, teaching, and service record that reflects tenets of CES. This includes definitions of *CES*. The section on teaching should include a theoretical framework that informs your courses.
Curriculum Vitae	A formal list of your research, teaching, and service activities. This includes lists of publications and presentations under research. Some departments and institutions require instructors to follow a specific outline and format.
Teaching Portfolio	This section may include a description of your courses. This includes a compilation of your course syllabi and course evaluation ratings. Many departments consider serving as an academic adviser and/or a chair of graduate committees a form of teaching. Refer to the theoretical framework articulated in your introductory personal and professional statement.
Letters of Support and Appreciation From Community Partners	Consider soliciting and including letters of support from community partners. These should include the impact of your engaged scholarship.
Media Reports	Consider including any press releases, articles, or reports from local, regional, or national media outlets.
Copies of Peer-Reviewed Articles	Provide hard copies of your peer-reviewed articles.

of components to include in your personal statement and portfolio. Keep in mind your department and institution may have a very formal and official format to use. If this is the case, consider how to incorporate important concepts presented in this chapter and accompanying Tool Kit exercises into that framework. You are also encouraged to refer to the website sources cited in this chapter. Additionally, the Campus Compact website provides useful information on how to prepare for your performance review (https://compact.org/resource-posts/trucen-section-b/). Discuss and share your draft statement and portfolio with your learning community, a mentor, and your center director or campus coordinator of community engagement for input and feedback.

Honing Your Craft

As an engaged scholar, you must approach the promotion and tenure review process professionally and philosophically, and, until there is substantial policy and cultural change within the institution, engaged scholars must also approach this process pragmatically. Later, in chapter 14, we explore ways to advance policy change regarding promotion and tenure at the institutional level, incorporating strategies articulated by O'Meara and colleagues (2015). That discussion will be at a larger, macro-level context. For now, the context in which you find yourself is and can be very challenging, but not inherently impossible. You must be strategic in this process. *Let us be frank: Creating educational experiences that address social challenges and promote capacity building in the community alone will not get you tenure.* You must effectively integrate research, teaching, and service in ways that impact multiple stakeholders: students, your discipline, your institution, and the community at large, as depicted in Figure 1.2 in chapter 1. In Tool Kir 12.8 you can identify scholarly activities and determine which of the four types of scholarship described by Boyer each reflects. Then, you can literally plot the scholarly activity on a map that displays the domain and context. This allows you an opportunity to visually identify and plot your engaged scholarship. Use Tool Kit 12.8 to help with this process.

> Tool Kit 12.8—Refer to Exercise 12.8 in your workbook. Look at the example illustrating how to document the dissemination of engaged scholarship and then draft your own dissemination statement.

Liese (2009) tells his compelling story of how he identified himself as an engaged scholar during his promotion and tenure review process at a large public research university. Wisely, he had to literally educate his peers as to what engaged scholarship was and was not. Likewise, although not part of the official review criteria, he framed his work around the benchmarks and standards of engaged scholarship as depicted by Glassick and colleagues (1997), which he learned about as part of a faculty learning community (Welch, 2002), in tandem with the departmental and institutional standards. As a result, he was awarded tenure. We have provided a link to a video in which Liese discusses this process in the first 20 minutes of a panel discussion. We invite you to scan your smartphone or tablet over the QR code in Figure 12.3 to hear him tell his story. We also encourage you to listen to the entire panel discussion about the evolving promotion and tenure challenges at a public research institution when time allows. With this new insight in mind, we invite you to hone your craft as an engaged scholar—use these standards as benchmarks to guide and inform your work as well as possibly frame your work in your professional statement in your review portfolio in Tool Kit 12.9.

Figure 12.3 Video of a panel discussion with Hank Liese discussing how to articulate engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure review.

Note. Scan the QR code to access https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HJk129Niu4

> Tool Kit 12.9—Honing Your Craft—Refer to Tool Kit Exercise 12.9 in your workbook. Use the standards of evaluation for engaged scholarship developed by Glassick and colleagues (1997) to draft a personal statement that describes you as an engaged scholar.

Example Of Table Of Accomplishments as Defined by The Characteristics of Quality CES

Characteristics	*Supporting Evidence*
1. Clear Goals	See career goals under the narrative heading "Focus of Scholarship and History" and project goals stated for *Comunidades de la Salud* and Promoting the Occupational Health of Indigenous Farmworkers in my narrative statement and under "Grants" in my CV.
2. Adequate Preparation	See descriptions of my investment in building community relationships, described under "Research" in my narrative statement. Also relevant is my W.K. Kellogg postdoctoral fellowship, which prepared me to undertake partnership work with rural communities and to mentor students in this work. Literature reviews and other background research on community-based research (CBR) and substantive topics conducted during preparation of book chapters and articles have allowed me to maintain and grow my foundation of knowledge in collaborative research methods as well as public health issues such as asthma, air quality, pesticides and other toxins, and other environmental health concerns; community planning; environmental justice; and disaster preparedness.
3. Appropriate Methods: Enhancing Rigor Through Community Engagement	See "Promoting the Occupational Health of Indigenous Farmworkers" in my narrative statement for an example of how the community-based public research (CPBR) model strengthened the research design.
4. Significant Results/Impact	See narrative statement for *Comunidades de la Salud* findings of improved health and decreased depression as well as increased civic participation. See letters from community partners concerning community empowerment.
5. Effective Presentation/ Dissemination	I have disseminated my work through high-quality peer-reviewed journals and peer-reviewed and invited presentations at national conferences and in graduate courses. I have given equal attention to dissemination of findings and systemic and policy implications at local workshops and community meetings. Coauthoring papers and copresenting with community research partners have been particularly effective modes of dissemination for both professional and public audiences.

Characteristics	*Supporting Evidence*
6. Reflective Critique	I have written many articles and presentations about the CBPR model, using my work with communities of color as an illustration. Undertaking these pieces of work allows me to reflect on what worked and didn't work in the projects, consider the feedback provided by community members, and offer my students and audiences suggestions for improving on the model. My willingness to alter the recruitment design of "Promoting the Occupational Health of Indigenous Farmworkers" illustrates my ability to reflect and change my plan based on feedback from the community.
7. Leadership and Personal Contribution	My leadership potential was recognized during my training years—I have held training positions of prestige including my National Institute of Health (NIH) predoctoral training fellowship and my W.K. Kellogg postdoctoral fellowship. I serve as the principal investigator (PI) on a number of grants and projects and I have demonstrated my ability to manage a large, complex project and sizable budget. At the university level, I serve on a number of committees including faculty senate, curriculum committee, search committees, and so on. At the national level, I serve on a number of workgroups, boards of directors, and advisory boards. I have served as a reviewer for journals and Centers for Disease Control and NIH grants. I have won several awards, including two since joining the faculty at UMA.
8. Consistently Ethical Behavior	Letters from community partners document my consistently ethical behavior, trustworthiness, and integrity. I have also studied and demonstrated my understanding of ethics (e.g., my book chapter "Methodological and Ethical Considerations of Community-Driven Environmental Justice Research.")

Note. Adapted from Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package, by C. Jordan (Ed.), *The Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative 20*(2), 66–86, 2009. Used with permission.

Truncated Examples of the Enhancement of Scientific Rigor in Research and Curriculum Development Through Community Engagement

Research Phase	*Benefits of Community Engagement*	*Evidence*
Identify Key Issues and Research Questions	With behavioral and community health issues, it can be difficult to identify the research question. Community involvement can help define the research question or confirm its validity. When community members feel involved and perceive equity in power and decision-making, they are invested in seeing the right questions be addressed.	Ways to document the activity in dossier: Include statements in personal narrative about situations in which community input helped define or changed the research question. Include statement in personal narrative that illustrates how relevance was improved as opposed to similar types of work conducted in alternative settings. Explain in personal narrative why your research questions can be addressed with greater validity than in alternative research settings—include findings obtained from alternative settings (if available and relevant).
Study Design and Methodology	Deeper understanding of a community's unique circumstances can result in a more accurate conceptual framework and understanding of important independent, moderating, and dependent variables. Community input can help create a design and methods that are most acceptable to the community, most valid given the unique circumstances of the community, and most culturally appropriate and respectful.	Ways to document the activity in dossier: Include statements in personal narrative describing the involvement of community partners in development of research design and how their participation contributed to improved research design and methods. Document in personal narrative situations in which better understanding of the community resulted in a more refined conceptual framework. Meeting rosters and minutes that document community participation in discussions about proposal. Highlight community coprincipal investigators on grants listed in CV.
Design of Measurement Instruments and Data Collection	Community input fosters development of more culturally appropriate measurement instruments, making projects more effective and efficient and data collection more accurate. Using local staff to administer surveys and conduct interviews and as survey helpers fluent in the languages of the target group increases authenticity of responses and accuracy of data collected. Mutual trust enhances both the quantity and the quality of data collected. Increased opportunity for field-testing instruments improves reliability.	Ways to document the activity in dossier: Within the personal narrative discuss how community participation increased cultural appropriateness, validity, and reliability of instruments that were developed. How were instruments improved as a result of community input? Within personal narrative include statements from community participants about their perceptions of cultural responsiveness, their willingness to share personal information, and so on.
Translation of Findings Into Recommendations for Policy Change or Intervention, Design of Intervention Based on Recommendations	Community members can provide information about what will work, what is culturally appropriate. Increased appropriateness of interventions can result in more positive/successful application. Productive and ongoing partnerships between researchers and community members increase the likelihood that research findings will be incorporated into ongoing community programs, providing the greatest possible benefit to the community from research. Community members are more effective advocates for public policy change.	Ways to document the activity in dossier: Describe through personal narrative, annotations in your CV, acknowledgment sections, and so on, how members in the community were involved in interpretation of findings and their application to community problems/issues being investigated. Within the personal narrative cite policy changes or program development resulting from the research. If the community exhibits signs of empowerment/ increased civic engagement (e.g., community problem-solving, volunteerism).

(*Continues*)

APPENDIX 12B (*Continued*)

Research Phase	*Benefits of Community Engagement*	*Evidence*
Dissemination	Community involvement provides opportunity for broader relevance and impact beyond academic arena. Community environment more accurately depicted in publications and presentations.	Ways to document the activity in dossier: Highlight community coauthors or copresenters in CV. Include examples of community dissemination products such as newspaper articles. Discuss in personal narrative evidence of reach or impact on the community. In the personal narrative discuss how dissemination through nonacademic channels has contributed to application of the findings obtained to the betterment of the communities involved. Note newspaper articles. Discuss in personal narrative evidence of reach or impact on the community, if known.
Ethics	Greater ethical credibility for research because it works *with* people to address their health concerns versus experimenting *on* them.	Ways to document the activity in dossier: Include community letters that speak to the integrity of the researcher, the ethical conduct of the research, and so on.

Curriculum Development	*Benefits of Community Engagement*	*Evidence*	*Ways to Document the Activity*
Identifying Theoretical Framing and Practical Integration for Curriculum Development	Faculty and community partners working on connecting course content with service-related activities can ensure reciprocity of benefit and deepening of the learning experience.	Activities that would create benefit: Conduct focus/training sessions with community partners to share course content, objectives, and outcomes.	Name a community partner teaching advisory committee. Report this committee formulation. Keep log of joint planning meetings with outcomes reported.
Curriculum Development and Potential Funding Support	Cultural, community-specific, socioeconomic questions/ information that might inform students regarding theoretical underpinnings of course content can be provided by community partners for information that may be unknown to the teacher.	Activities that would create benefit: Include community members on curriculum development committees and engage them in specific course planning.	Meeting rosters and minutes that document community participation.
Implementation: Teaching of the Course	Final syllabus and class schedule Identification of community-based learning activities Identification of theoretical-applied learning procedures	Activities that would create benefit: Work with community partner(s) to connect course content and theoretical underpinning with community-base learning.	Present syllabus, reading lists, and all course support materials.

(*Continues*)

APPENDIX 12B (*Continued*)

Curriculum Development	*Benefits of Community Engagement*	*Evidence*	*Ways to Document the Activity*
Outcomes: Student Learning	Course products created by the students (e.g., reflection journals, course assignments, exams). Community partner field assessment.	Activities that would create benefit: Community partner assessment through field observation over the course of the semester.	Meeting report of assessment of professor/community partner observations of student overall learning outcomes
Teaching Effectiveness	Course evaluations by students. Class observation by peer faculty. Class observation by community partner.	Activities that would create benefit: Community partner could give clear feedback on teaching effectiveness as observed in an appropriate teaching lesson that relates to community engagement assignment.	Report of student evaluation scores. Community partner assessment report. Peer faculty observation report.

Note. Adapted excerpts from Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion, and Tenure Package, by C. Jordan (Ed.), *The Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative 20*(2), 66–86, 2009. Used with permission.

APPENDIX 12C

Truncated Example of Points of Distinction Matrix for Planning and Evaluating Quality Outreach and Public Scholarship

Dimension	*Components*	*Sample Questions*	*Examples of Qualitative Indicators*	*Examples of Quantitative Indicators*
Significance	Importance of issue and opportunity to be addressed	How serious are the issues to the scholarly community, specific stakeholders, and the public?	Documentation of issues and opportunities based on concrete information Magnitude of the issue	Indicators of demand or need Number of citations and issues addressed in the literature Calculations of opportunity costs in terms of resources
Context	Consistency with university and unit values and stakeholder interests	To what extent is the project consistent with the university's or unit's mission? To what extent is the project a high priority among external stakeholders?	Comparison with explicit mission statement and goals Evidence of ability to work sensitively with external audiences and key groups	Number of contracts and planning meetings of stakeholders Resources and methods used to promote program Profile and demographics of audience and participants

(*Continues*)

APPENDIX 12C (*Continued*)

Dimension	*Components*	*Sample Questions*	*Examples of Qualitative Indicators*	*Examples of Quantitative Indicators*
Scholarship	Knowledge resources	To what extent is the project shaped by knowledge that is up-to-date, cross-disciplinary, and appropriate to the issue? Is knowledge in the community or among the stakeholders utilized?	Annotated narrative showing what sources of knowledge are used Quality and fit of the citations, outside experts, or consultants Assessment of experience and accomplishments of major project participants external to the university	Number of cross-disciplinary resources utilized Number of years in positions Dates of citations Number of experts cited and participating
Impact	Impact on issues, institutions, and individuals	To what extent were the project goals and objectives met? Did the products or deliverables meet the planning expectations?	Description of impacts Documentation such as program evaluations, surveys, testimonials, and media coverage Result of changes in policy and/or change in practice	Changes from benchmark or baseline measurements Number of appropriate products generated for practitioners and the public Number of products, contracts, patents, and copyrights generated

Note. Adapted from *Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning and Evaluating Quality Outreach,* University Outreach and Engagement, Kellogg Center, 2009. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University. Used with permission.

Chapter 13

MENTORING AND COACHING COLLEAGUES

In the context of learning any craft, novices or apprentices generally benefit from having a skilled teacher who can accompany them on their journey as they hone their craft by artfully using tools and skills to create something that has elegance over mere function. However, within higher education we are typically ensconced in a siloed setting and an autonomous culture in which opportunities for continued collaborative professional development with a colleague or group of colleagues are rare. In fact, we traditionally approach teaching and learning as a private, almost secretive, activity. As Parker Palmer (1998) suggested, "Unlike many professions, teaching is always done at the dangerous intersection of personal and public life" (p. 17). He goes on, however, to say,

> When we walk into our workplace, the classroom, we close the door on our colleagues. When we emerge, we rarely talk about what happened or what needs to happen next, for we have no shared experience to talk about. Then, instead of calling this the isolationism it is and trying to overcome it, we claim it as a virtue called academic freedom: my classroom is my castle, and the sovereigns of other fiefdoms are not welcome here. (p. 142)

It is, indeed, countercultural within higher education to offer or request assistance and advice when it comes to our teaching because the cultural norm and assumption of obtaining "terminal degrees" suggests

Campus Compact is a national coalition of colleges and universities committed to the public purposes of higher education. Campus Compact publications focus on practical strategies for campuses to put civic education and community engagement into action. Please visit http://compact.org for more information.

Campus Compact

The Craft of Community-Engaged Teaching and Learning

A Guide for Faculty Development

MARSHALL WELCH AND
STAR PLAXTON-MOORE

Campus Compact
2019
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETS
Distributed by Stylus Publishing, LLC.