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Abstract

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill undertook faculty development activities to increase awareness of community-engaged scholarship through campus dialogue and by assisting faculty members in acquiring skills for community-engaged scholarship. This article presents a case report describing activities and their impact. The activities informed campus-wide initiatives on promotion and tenure as well as the development of the university’s new academic plan. Two lessons learned from the university’s community-engaged scholarship faculty development activities include (1) incorporating these activities into existing campus programs helps institutionalize them, and (2) implementing these activities within broader institution-wide initiatives helps those initiatives and provides a wider forum for promoting community-engaged scholarship.

Introduction

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) has a long tradition of service to the state of North Carolina. The University of North Carolina’s public service mission was articulated almost 100 years ago under the leadership of President Edward Kidder Graham. In 1914, he declared that university public service is “the radiating power of a new passion,” which goes far beyond “thinly stretching out its resources” to the state. North Carolina was recovering from the Civil War, and the university embraced “the state and all its practical problems” as a legitimate field of study and service (Graham, 1919, pp. 14–15). For many years, the University of North Carolina’s slogan was “Write to the University When You Need Help” (Wilson, 1976, p. 136), and the university “thought of itself as a telephone central which connected those interested in being served with those who could provide the service” (Wilson, 1957, p. 210). This passion for service influenced the work of leaders Frank Porter Graham, Bill Friday, and Howard Odum as well as generations of faculty members who applied their considerable talents to solving public problems. The University of North Carolina’s commitment to improving North Carolina has become a defining characteristic, and it has created a special bond with the people in the state.
The tradition of service for the common good in this non-landgrant flagship university has evolved into a commitment to deeper engagement that involves mutually beneficial partnerships between the university and communities in North Carolina and beyond. Partnerships between the University of North Carolina and communities have fueled impressive scholarship, economic development and entrepreneurship.

This article is a case study of how the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill deliberately undertook activities to promote engaged scholarship through faculty development and other campus-wide efforts.

**Setting the Context**

Over the last decade, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has moved to strengthen its commitment to addressing practical problems facing society. The influential report of the Kellogg Commission, *Returning to Our Roots—The Engaged Institution*, encouraged universities to “become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined” (1999, p. 9). Former Chancellor James Moeser (2000–2008), who helped create the Kellogg report while chancellor at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln, led the University of North Carolina to become an “engaged” university in keeping with the Kellogg report to “envision partnerships [as] two-way streets defined by mutual respect among the partners for what each brings to the table” (1999, p.13). In an address at the 10th anniversary celebration of the William and Ida Friday Center for Continuing Education, Chancellor Moeser (2001) echoed earlier generations of campus leaders, stating, “Service and engagement must be an integral part of a university’s life, not something we practice if we have extra time or if the mood strikes us or if our schedule permits or if it happens to be convenient. We must consider it an obligation and a responsibility, something that we owe society.”

Established in 1999 from one of the recommendations of the Chancellor’s Intellectual Climate Task Force, the Carolina Center for Public Service (CCPS) is a pan-university center administratively located in the Office of the Provost. The Center’s mission is to engage and support the faculty, students and staff of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in meeting the needs of North Carolina and beyond. The Center strengthens the University’s public service commitment by promoting scholarship and service that are
responsive to the concerns of the state and contribute to the common good. (Carolina Center for Public Service website, 2011)

The center is home to several campus programs promoting engaged scholarship and service—connecting the university’s tripartite mission of teaching, research and service. These programs include the Assisting People in Planning Learning Experience in Service (APPLES) Service-Learning Program, a student-initiated, student-led and student-funded organization established in 1990. APPLES, working with faculty members from across campus, now supports more than 100 service-learning courses annually, and its activities include an annual Course Development Institute for Service-Learning for faculty members and graduate instructors.

In 2003, the university adopted its first 5-year academic plan, with six academic priorities, including several directly related to engagement (specifically, priorities B and E):

B. Further integrate interdisciplinary research, education and public service.

E. Enhance public engagement. (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2003)

In 2004, five faculty members and administrators from the UNC School of Dentistry and the Office of the Provost represented the university in the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH). This 3-year initiative was focused on increasing rewards and incentives for faculty pursuing community-engaged scholarship (Seifer, Wong, Gelmon, & Lederer, 2009). During the time UNC participated, members of the School of Dentistry revised the school’s guidelines for promotion and tenure to encompass community-engaged scholarship, and team members helped author an article regarding competencies for community-engaged scholarship for faculty development (Blanchard et al., 2009).

The commitment of academic leaders, supportive organizational structures and inclusive promotion and tenure policies have been identified as key to institutionalizing support, recognition and reward for community-engaged scholarship (Bringle, Hatcher, & Holland, 2007; Holland, 1997; Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & O’Meara, 2008).
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Activities to Support Community-Engaged Scholarship

Concurrent with participation in the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative from 2004 through 2007, the Carolina Center for Public Service was developing programmatic activities to support and further community-engaged scholarship across the campus. The first Campus Dialogue on Engagement was held in 2007 to gather faculty input for a new community-engaged scholarship faculty development program. That input was incorporated into the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program, which identified the first class of scholars through a competitive process in fall 2007 to begin the program in January 2008.

As a result of involvement in the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, UNC was asked to partner with Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and the University of Minnesota in the development of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative, which is described in more detail elsewhere in this issue of the Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement (Seifer, Blanchard, Jordan, Gelmon & McGinley 2012). Both the timing of the initiative and the focus on community-engaged scholarship faculty development were ideal for helping inform and further UNC’s campus efforts.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill hosted and participated in the Community-Engaged Scholarship Faculty Development Charrette for the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative in May 2008, described elsewhere in this issue (Gelmon, Blanchard, Ryan, & Seifer, 2012). UNC also submitted a proposal for a 2-year Faculty for the Engaged Campus grant to implement the team’s action plan developed at the charrette.

A timeline of the campus activities and programs discussed in this article is presented in Table 1.
In 2008, concurrent with the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative, UNC established the Center for Faculty Excellence, which built on and expanded the work of the former Center for Teaching and Learning. The mission of the Center for Faculty Excellence is “to provide holistic support to faculty across the entire spectrum of professional development: instruction, research, and leadership skills” (UNC Center for Faculty Excellence, 2011).

The timing of the Community-Engaged Scholarship Faculty Development Charrette provided an opportunity to collaborate on faculty development efforts in new and important ways. The UNC team that participated in the charrette included:

- the faculty director for the Center for Faculty Excellence;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Carolina Center for Public Service established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>First campus academic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2007</td>
<td>CCPH Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2010</td>
<td>Faculty for the Engaged Campus Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: Planning for Faculty Engaged Scholars Program (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Selection of inaugural class of Faculty Engaged Scholars (October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Faculty Engaged Scholars Class I begins program (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: “UNC Tomorrow” (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Academic Plan 2011: Reach Carolina presented to Board of Trustees (March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Faculty for the Engaged Campus action planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: “Rewards and Incentives for Engaged Scholarship” (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Faculty Engaged Scholars Class II begins program (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies report issued (April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: “The Academic Plan” (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Faculty Engaged Scholars Class III begins program (August)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: “Responding to Hard Times” (January)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the director of the University of North Carolina Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention (also a senior faculty member at the Gillings School of Global Public Health, who is now co-chair of the Academic Plan Steering Committee);

the department chair/professor from the University of North Carolina School of Dentistry (who also serves as faculty director of the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program, and who is now Executive Associate Provost); and

an associate professor from the Department of Communication Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences (who was also a participant in the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program).

The director of the Carolina Center for Public Service and a community partner with extensive experience in community-based participatory research, who also serves as the community course director of the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program, served as facilitators for the charrette.

Like the other 19 campus teams attending, the UNC team created an action plan at the charrette. Team members identified overall goals to advance community-engaged scholarship at the university. Each goal included a faculty development objective.

Goal 1: Enhance the appreciation and value the institution places on engaged scholarship.

*Faculty development objective:* Increase faculty awareness of engaged scholarship through campus dialogue focused on engaged scholarship.

Goal 2: Promote and tenure faculty at the University of North Carolina by including engaged scholarship as part of the criteria.

*Faculty development objective:* Assist faculty in acquiring skills to achieve promotion and tenure within current tenure system as well as advocate for systemic change.

Goal 3: Ensure that communities benefit in enduring ways from engaged scholarship and research originating at the University of North Carolina.

*Faculty development objective:* Incorporate community representation and perspective in all faculty development efforts around engaged scholarship.
To implement the action plan, the campus team built on existing partnerships and programs. They hoped that this approach would increase the likelihood of institutionalization and would be a more efficient use of campus resources.

Consistent with its mission to support faculty, students and staff in addressing the needs of the state and beyond through engaged scholarship and service, the Carolina Center for Public Service oversaw the implementation of the team’s action plan. Specifically, the three objectives were addressed through two existing endeavors: (1) an annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement, and (2) the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program.

“The . . . campus team built on existing partnerships and programs. They hoped that this approach would increase the likelihood of institutionalization and would be a more efficient use of campus resources.”

The University of North Carolina’s Campus Dialogues on Engagement

The Carolina Center for Public Service held two half-day Campus Dialogues on Engagement during the Faculty for the Engaged Campus grant period. In 2009 the dialogue topic was “Rewards and Incentives for Engaged Scholarship,” and in 2010, it was “The Academic Plan.” A campus-wide announcement went out for each dialogue. The dialogues included structured breakout discussions addressing questions relevant to the respective topics, which were introduced by senior campus administrators and faculty member presentations. The questions addressed in each of the dialogues are presented in Table 2.

A written summary of the discussions was completed for each dialogue event. The 2009 Dialogue summary was given to the campus Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices. The 2010 Dialogue summary was shared with Academic Plan Steering Committee members.

The Campus Dialogues on Engagement were planned to help inform campus efforts for which engagement and engaged scholarship were particularly relevant. The university’s administration was appreciative of the dialogues, as they provided a mechanism for faculty members, staff, students and community representatives to provide input and share perspectives.
The University of North Carolina’s Faculty Engaged Scholars Program

In 2007, the Carolina Center for Public Service established the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program, a two-year, competency-based program with the following goals:

- Recognize and reward faculty members involved in community-engaged scholarship.
- Create and sustain a community of engaged scholars from diverse perspectives.
- Promote the scholarship of engagement at Carolina across disciplines.
- Continue to build Carolina as an institution committed to and demonstrating strong university-community relationships. *(Carolina Center for Public Service website, 2011)*

The program, in its third year at the time of this article, is led by a senior faculty member and a community partner member with more than 15 years’ experience in working with faculty on community-engaged scholarship endeavors.
Selection of program participants.

Faculty participants are selected through a competitive process. Applicants complete statements of interest that include how their scholarship is (has been or has the potential to be) responsive to community need, what they hope to gain from participating in the program, and how they might use the monetary stipend ($5,000–$7,500/year). Each application must include a support letter from the faculty member’s department chair or dean. A committee of faculty and community representatives reviews the applications and selects each class of scholars.

Pre-program self-assessment activity.

Before beginning participation in the program, each scholar completes a self-assessment based on the 14 competencies for community-engaged scholarship from Blanchard et al. (2009). The competencies were conceptualized along a developmental path of novice to intermediate to advanced. Table 3 contains examples of the competencies by level, and Table 6 lists all 14 competencies for community-engaged scholarship.

Table 3. Examples of Level of Community-Engaged Scholarship Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Understanding of the concepts of community engagement and community-engaged scholarship, and familiarity with basic literature and history of community-engaged scholarship (i.e., Boyer, 1990, and Glassick, Huber, &amp; Maeroff, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice to Intermediate</td>
<td>Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of community-engaged scholarship in theory and practice, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Theoretical frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Models and methods of planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate to Advanced</td>
<td>Knowledge and successful application of definition of community-engaged scholarship, community-engaged scholarship benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion, and/or tenure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scholars rated themselves for each competency on a six-point scale: (1) none to minimal, (2) basic, (3) intermediate, (4) proficient, (5) advanced, and (6) complete mastery. In addition,
they articulated the things they hoped to learn in the program by ranking the top three competencies they would like to see addressed in the program’s sessions. The participants were asked to complete the self-assessments at the end of each of their two years of program participation. In addition, they rated their accomplishments on the eight items shown in Table 4, and responded to open-ended questions regarding their participation in the program.

Table 4. Scholar Self-Assessments of Progress During Program Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following have you accomplished since entering the program?</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>In part</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My scholarship is more seamlessly integrated into my work with the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have secured new funding to support my engaged scholarship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My professional career has advanced and/or been enriched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have established a strong working partnership with at least one UNC faculty member with whom I did not previously interact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have enriched and deepened my community partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have contributed to UNC’s capacity to address the state’s priority problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have catalyzed other faculty to become more engaged through their scholarship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have contributed to the standing and appreciation of engaged scholarship within the academy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before completing any of the assessments, scholars consented to participating in the assessments as required by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s Institutional Review Board.

**Program activities in Year 1 of a cohort.**

In Year 1 of the program, participants attend a two-day orientation, four half-day sessions, and a symposium. The curriculum covers background and current developments in the work of engaged scholarship at the global, national, state and local levels. The curriculum is interactive and experiential, involving field visits, exposure to a number of ongoing projects, and discussions with community members and faculty partners. Sessions address such topics as funding and dissemination of engaged scholarship, navigating disciplinary expectations while addressing community
needs and partnering with local communities in North Carolina and beyond.

During the first year, the participants apply what they are learning in a series of experiential sessions to their own work in partnership with the community. (Note: Community can be defined broadly to include grassroots, nonprofit and business organizations; educational and governmental agencies; and neighborhoods or individuals with a common interest or identity.)

---

“The curriculum is interactive and experiential, involving field visits, exposure to a number of ongoing projects, and discussions with community members and faculty partners.”

---

**Program activities in Year 2 of a cohort.**

In the second year, the curriculum focuses on the work of the participants who form a learning community, with each producing a scholarly project, or a product of disciplined inquiry (this can be a new project or an expansion of ongoing engaged scholarship).

**Insights Regarding the University of North Carolina’s Community-Engaged Scholarship Faculty Development Activities**

In this section, the authors describe the impact that the Campus Dialogues on Engagement and the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program have had on the university community.

**Campus Dialogues on Engagement: Impact**

The 2009 Campus Dialogue on Engagement, “Rewards and Incentives for Engaged Scholarship,” provided a number of insights that were shared with the campus Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices. In response to the question regarding motivation, although a few dialogue participants reported that they did engaged work because it was their job or the research they were involved with necessitated this approach, most described other sources of motivation. Some felt a moral obligation to do it; others said that it gave them personal satisfaction, or that the work enriched their teaching and their perspective on things. Others suggested that engaged work restored balance in their professional lives or offered new challenges. Still others reported they do this work simply “because it is fun!”
Faculty participants in the 2009 dialogue had ideas about what should be rewarded in the promotion and tenure process. Their suggestions included broadening the definition of a *publication* to include other types of scholarly work, which have the potential to reach a broader audience (e.g., legislative testimonies; op-ed articles; critical reviews of state task force, commission, or fiscal research; textbooks; curricula). The translation of research that makes it more accessible to the public was considered important.

Dialogue participants proposed ideas to facilitate engaged scholarship, including enhancing interaction among departments, expanding communication between the campus and the community, and increasing the number of training opportunities for faculty, staff and students. They cited several existing campus programs as important in this regard, including the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program and the APPLES Service-Learning Program. Participants suggested that the university could expand support for community-engaged scholarship efforts through campus centers and institutes, grant programs, networking and support from external funding sources.

Participants identified a variety of issues and made suggestions for the Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices to consider, especially regarding the importance of clarity of definitions of engagement, engaged scholarship and service. They noted the need to expand what is offered while recognizing existing exemplary efforts, and that progress was needed not only at the overall institutional level, but within specific departments and disciplines as well. They expressed an understanding that there are many challenges to revising promotion and tenure policies, including deep skepticism about whether engaged scholarship is in fact “scholarly,” and that as promotion and tenure are rooted in disciplines, one-size guidelines do not fit all disciplines. As a result, they encouraged the task force to consider how to use disciplinary lenses to think about the ways engaged scholarship can be manifested in each discipline.

The 2010 Campus Dialogue on Engagement, “The Academic Plan,” was structured to provide information to the steering
committee that was being convened to develop the new Academic Plan. The co-chairs of that effort helped plan the dialogue and attended the event. The dialogue summary provided six key points to be considered for the Academic Plan.

1. The University of North Carolina should reaffirm the centrality of engagement to the university’s mission.

2. The university needs to involve community members in discussions, planning, evaluation and all aspects of the engagement process.

3. There is a need for inclusion of students (specifically graduate students) and community connections.

4. Engagement and engaged scholarship should be recognized through the promotion and tenure process.

5. The campus should define how to support faculty, students and staff who want to do engagement work.

6. The university needs to share what it is doing in engagement across disciplines—perhaps using a web-based portal, journal or database that faculty, staff and students could all post to.

The 2011 Campus Dialogue on Engagement, “Responding to Hard Times,” was held after the end of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus grant. A full draft of the Academic Plan served as the basis for the dialogue. Several members of the Academic Plan Steering Committee were among the 81 participants, including the chair of the Engagement Subcommittee. Ten schools and 13 departments from the College of Arts and Sciences were represented. Breakout discussions focused on three areas in regard to the engagement section of the plan:

1. In general, do you see the engagement section of the Academic Plan as strengthening and advancing engagement and engaged scholarship at the University of North Carolina? What are one or two of the key recommendations or areas that are particularly important?

2. Will you support endorsement of this section of the draft plan (in general concept) by the participants in the 2011 Campus Dialogue on Engagement?

3. The draft Academic Plan proposes an “Idea Fair,” in which the campus would focus on some common
themes over an extended period. This is an idea that has been suggested at prior Dialogues, and could happen whether or not it is included in the final Academic Plan.

In the full discussion that followed the breakouts, the following were the key points shared by the breakout groups (and shared, along with a fuller summary, with the Academic Plan Steering Committee):

1. Focus engagement on communities in need versus aspiring communities.
2. What will the university do to operationalize engaged scholarship, particularly with respect to promotion and tenure? Include the plan in the overall Academic Plan.
3. No more helicopter research projects with community as labs.
4. Emphasize the integration of research, teaching and service rather than as a separate add-on.
5. Students need to learn the ethics of engagement.
6. Convene people across campus more frequently to share research and talk about pressing issues.
7. The Idea Fair needs to be ongoing, like the Summer Reading Program does after the summer. Tailor ongoing work to feed into an overall theme. Engage the community in this process.
8. Identify the big themes collaboratively. Focus multiple efforts going on across campus.
9. Need a better way to publicize or disseminate what is going on. Expand the Dialogue!

The Faculty Engaged Scholars Program

To date, three classes of eight scholars each have participated in the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program. The 24 participants were competitively selected from among 47 applicants from 10 of 13 schools, and more than 20 departments. The selected scholars represent eight schools and 12 departments (see Table 5). In this section the authors provide insights from the pre- and post-program assessment activities.
When the competency self-assessments were combined for all participants selected to date ($N = 24$), patterns emerged regarding how the participating faculty members felt about their competencies for practicing community-engaged scholarship. None of the participants felt that they had completely mastered any of the competencies. Fourteen felt proficient or advanced in their “ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities,” with one rating none to minimal proficiency and three stating they had basic proficiency. Eleven rated themselves proficient or advanced in their “ability to negotiate across community-academic groups,” while one rated minimal and seven as basic. Ten rated themselves proficient or advanced in their “understanding of the various contributors to community issues” with three stating they had no to minimal proficiency and seven had basic.

The faculty participants most consistently rated themselves as having no or minimal mastery for the competencies for community-engaged scholarship listed below.
• “Understanding of policy implications . . .” \( (N = 13) \)
• “Knowledge of review, promotion, and tenure process . . .” \( (N = 13) \)
• Ability to write grants expressing community-engaged scholarship principles and approaches” \( (N = 12) \)
• “Knowledge and successful application of definition . . ., benchmarks . . ., and measures of quality” \( (N = 12) \)

A full list of the competencies and summary of faculty rankings are contained in Table 6.
Table 6. Faculty Engaged Scholars: Summary of Initial Community-Based Scholarship Competency Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>None to minimal</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding the concepts of community engaged scholarship, and familiarity with basic literature and history of community-engaged scholarship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understanding of the various contributors to community issues (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental); developing skills commitment for fostering community and social change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of community-engaged scholarship in theory and practice, including: Principles, Theoretical frameworks, Models and methods of planning, and implementation and evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to negotiate across community-academic group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ability to write grants expressing community-engaged scholarship principles and approaches</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ability to write articles based on community-engaged scholarship processes an outcomes for peer-reviewed publications</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Knowledge and successful application of definition of community-engaged scholarship, community-engaged scholarship benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ability to balance tasks in academia (e.g., research, teaching, service) posing special challenges to those engaged in community engaged scholarship in order to thrive in an academic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion, and/or tenure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Knowledge of review, promotion, and tenure process and its relationship with community engaged scholarship, ability to serve on review, promotion, and tenure committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ability to mentor student and junior faculty in establishing and building community-engaged scholarship-based portfolio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results specific to Cohort 1.

At this writing, only one cohort has completed the two-year program. In that first cohort, six participants reported increased competency in most, but not all, of the items. In the first cohort’s qualitative responses they reported having acquired ideas about how to better structure campus-community partnerships and an increase their interdisciplinary relationships. They also noted the benefits of having a community member as a co-program director, including the consistent community voice present at all their sessions.

Grant proposals submitted.

At least six grant proposals were submitted by participants in Cohort 1. Several noted that their participation had suggested how to expand grant proposals to include components of community-engaged scholarship. One respondent’s comment illustrates.

I now have ideas about expanding academic grants (and, in fact, have submitted one) to include engaged scholarship components that will ultimately improve my academic research as well as “give back” to the community hosting the research.

Two of Cohort 1’s participants collaborated on a grant proposal for a partnership among UNC graduate students in City and Regional Planning, undergraduates in the School of Journalism and Mass Communication and students at North Carolina Central University. The funded project is focused on urban youth in an underserved area who are now producing a print and online newspaper for their neighborhood. One of the collaborators elaborates on the impact of the program and the funded project:

If it weren’t for FESP [Faculty Engaged Scholars Program], I never would have gotten the inspiration to launch the Northeast Central Durham Community Newspaper Project, which, as of this writing, has pretty much taken over my life—in a good way. . . . The project has completely altered for the better the nature of my Community Journalism class, where we now are knee-deep in making connections happen. . . .
Suggestions for program enhancements.

Participants in Cohort 1 suggested two ways to enhance the program: (1) provide scheduled time to interact informally with other participants to learn about each other’s work, and (2) include more didactic sessions with discussion of the recommended readings.

The Evolution of Institutional Support for Community-Engaged Scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The community-engaged scholarship faculty development activities described in this article occurred during a dynamic time for the university. Since 2008, when the programs were initiated, the chancellor and the provost positions have new occupants, and severe budgetary cuts have been felt throughout the campus. Still, the university’s commitment remains strong, as evidenced by Academic Plan 2011: Reach Carolina:

Because the University exists to serve not only its students but also the state, nation, and the world, Reach Carolina embraces enthusiastically a comprehensive approach to engagement that will recognize, stimulate, and reward excellence in teaching and research on the part of all members of the campus community. (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2011, p. 4)

Promotion and Tenure Policies

In May 2009, the University of North Carolina Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices released their report, in which engagement and community-engaged scholarship were prominently featured. It appears that the summaries from the 2009 and 2010 Campus Dialogues on Engagement and the campus impact of the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program may have had some influence on the task force’s report in that it adopts several definitions for use on the campus (see Table 7).
The meaning of faculty engagement:

- scholarly, creative, or pedagogical activities for public good
- directed toward persons/groups outside the university
- research, teaching, and/or service as collaborative interactions that respond to short- and long-term societal needs
- serves people through a continuum of academically informed activities
- varies among disciplines
- 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. (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009)

### The University of North Carolina’s Academic Plan

*Academic Plan 2011: Reach Carolina* was presented to the Board of Trustees in March 2011. The six themes listed below indicate that engagement and engaged scholarship will continue to be critical to addressing the stated priorities.

1. Work as an integrated university to attract, challenge, and inspire students through transformative academic experiences
2. Faculty prominence, composition, recruitment, development, retention and scholarship
3. Interdisciplinarity in teaching, research, and public engagement
4. Equity and inclusion at Carolina
5. Engaged scholars and scholarship
6. Extend Carolina’s global presence in teaching, research, and public service

(University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2011 pp. 2–3)

### Future of the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program

The Faculty Engaged Scholars Program continues to evolve under the administration and funding from the Carolina Center for Public Service. Continuing budget cuts resulting in loss of positions at the center, as well as the need to raise private money to

---

**Table 7. Definitions Included in the University of North Carolina Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The meaning of faculty engagement:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- scholarly, creative, or pedagogical activities for public good
- directed toward persons/groups outside the university
- research, teaching, and/or service as collaborative interactions that respond to short- and long-term societal needs
- serves people through a continuum of academically informed activities
- varies among disciplines
- 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. (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009)
support these positions, present growing challenges, but there is strong commitment to do all that is possible to ensure that the program continues. Necessary changes include reducing the amount of faculty stipend and selecting classes every two years rather than annually. The latter decision makes for easier administration of the program, as it is a two-year program and running one class at a time is more realistic for those involved as course directors and administrators.

The competencies for community-engaged scholarship provide a flexible structure for the program. Each cohort identifies the competencies on which they would most like to focus. An important note, however, is that the responses from the survey show that the developmental levels of the competencies for community-engaged scholarship did not hold up in terms of where faculty participants assessed themselves. Thus, while the idea of an orderly progression of competency development is appealing, and may be helpful in initial conceptualization and planning of programs, it is less useful in relation to where faculty members may identify areas of most need in relation to their own development. In short, the attainment of the competencies for community-engaged scholarship is not a linear progression as the authors had first thought. As a result, the authors have removed the labels (novice, intermediate, and advanced) from the competency materials. Also, in response to participant suggestions, a list of readings and resources organized around the competencies for community-engaged scholarship has been developed (see Appendix A).

Conclusion

Two lessons learned from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s participation in the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative may be helpful to the reader. First, the decision to enhance existing community-engaged scholarship faculty development efforts, rather than create new ones, has proven to be a wise one for the university. Identifying resources to continue community-engaged scholarship faculty development activities is an ongoing challenge in today’s budget climate. Because some of the programs were already established, however, there is more institutional commitment to support them than if they were less institutionalized.

Second, it has proven significant to implement the community-engaged scholarship faculty development activities within broader institution-wide initiatives. Supporting and informing more comprehensive campus efforts has been effective, and has provided a
wider forum for promoting community-engaged scholarship. As a result of the activities and other interest across campus, there are two campus-wide monthly seminars under way that provide networking and professional development for faculty, staff, students and community partners. Each series is planned through the collaboration of multiple units on campus. The Carolina Center for Public Service has convened a group of committed campus units informally called the Campus Consortium on Engaged Scholarship to work toward more coordinated and collaborative efforts.

This work supports the overall mission of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which is underscored in Academic Plan 2011: Reach Carolina, and is eloquently stated in the last line of the University of North Carolina’s mission statement:

> With lux, libertas—light and liberty—as its founding principles, the University has charted a bold course of leading change to improve society and to help solve the world’s greatest problems. (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2011, p. 5)
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### Competency

1. Understanding of the concepts of community engagement and community-engaged scholarship (CES), and familiarity with basic literature and history of CES (Boyer, Glassick, etc.).

### Bibliography/Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles or Chapters:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Resources:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Understanding of the various contributors to community issues (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental); developing skills and commitment for fostering community and social change.

**Articles or Chapters:**

**Other Resources:**
- [www.unnaturalcauses.org](http://www.unnaturalcauses.org)

3. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of CES in theory and practice, including:
   - Principles
   - Theoretical frameworks
   - Models and methods of planning
   - Implementation and evaluation

(For example: community governance, equitable participation at all levels, local relevance of public health problems, dissemination of findings, trust building, benefits to community involved, community partnerships, service & learning objectives, fostering critical reflection, meaningful)

**Articles or Chapters:**

**Books:**
|---|---|

**Other Resources:**


**Service Learning Resources:**

- Campus Compact. Service learning resource list. (Available at [http://www.compact.org/resources-for-faculty/](http://www.compact.org/resources-for-faculty/))
Variety of other service learning toolkits:
http://www.servicelearning.org/instant_info/tool_kits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articles or Chapters:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Resources:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Ability to negotiate across community-academic groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articles or Chapters:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Engaged Scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Other Resources:


- Sandman, L. PowerPoint presentation: Outreach scholarship partnerships and projects (a presentation for UNH Outreach Scholars Academy Presentation).

| 7. Ability to write articles based on CES processes and outcomes for peer-reviewed publications. | Resources:


- CES4Health.info (a mechanism for the rigorous peer review of and broad online dissemination of nontraditional products of CES)

- Lists of journals that publish CES


  - [http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/links.html#Journals](http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/links.html#Journals)

| 8. Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty. Recognition by the community. | Articles or Chapters:


- Books:

  - Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J. (1997). *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community’s assets*. ACTA Publications.

- Other Resources:

| Knowledge and successful application of definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality. | Articles or Chapters:  
Books or Journals:  
Other Resources:  
| Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policy. | Articles or Chapters:  
Books:  
Other Resources:  
| 11. Ability to balance tasks in academia (e.g., research, teaching, service) posing special challenges to those engaged in CES in order to thrive in an academic environment. | Articles or Chapters:  
Sandman, L. Placing scholarly engagement “on the desk” (Available in the TRUCEN Toolkit)  
Other Resources:  
|---|---|
| 12. Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion, and/or tenure. | Articles or Chapters:  
Jordan, C. Practical tools for overcoming the challenges of advancing your career as a community-engaged scholar. (TRUCEN toolkit).  
Books:  
Other Resources:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge of RPT process and its relationship with CES, ability to serve on RPT committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>See Competency #12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ability to mentor student and junior faculty in establishing and building CES-based portfolio.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Thomas, R. Exemplary junior faculty mentoring programs. (Available at <a href="http://www.yale.edu/wff/pdf/ExemplaryJunior%20Faculty%20MentoringPrograms.pdf">http://www.yale.edu/wff/pdf/ExemplaryJunior%20Faculty%20MentoringPrograms.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>