

Engaged Scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Campus Integration and Faculty Development

Lynn W. Blanchard, Ronald P. Strauss, and Lucille Webb

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-land-grant 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.

Table 1. Community-Engaged Scholarship at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Chronology of Events and Programs

Date	Event/Program
1999	Carolina Center for Public Service established
2003	First campus academic plan
2004-2007	CCPH Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative
2007-2010	Faculty for the Engaged Campus Initiative
2007	Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: Planning for Faculty Engaged Scholars Program (January) Selection of inaugural class of Faculty Engaged Scholars (October)
2008	Faculty Engaged Scholars Class I begins program (January) Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: "UNC Tomorrow" (January) Faculty for the Engaged Campus Community-Engaged Scholarship Faculty Development Charrette (May)
2009-2010	Faculty for the Engaged Campus action planning grant
2009	Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: "Rewards and Incentives for Engaged Scholarship" (January) Faculty Engaged Scholars Class II begins program (January) UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies report issued (April)
2010	Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: "The Academic Plan" (January) Faculty Engaged Scholars Class III begins program (August)
2011	Annual Campus Dialogue on Engagement: "Responding to Hard Times" (January) Academic Plan 2011: Reach Carolina presented to Board of Trustees (March)

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;

- 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.

“[T]he . . . 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.

Table 2. Discussion Questions from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Annual Campus Dialogues on Engagement

2009: Incentives for Engaged Scholarship	2010: The Academic Plan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What motivates you to do the work of engaged scholarship? 2. What kinds of things should be rewarded that are not now? Please give some specific examples. 3. What kinds of things can we do at the University of North Carolina to facilitate engaged scholarship? Are there best practices, examples, or experiences we can learn from others? 4. What issues should the Promotion and Tenure Task Force consider? 5. What kinds of things can you do to help promote engaged scholarship? 6. From your discussions (particularly of items 3 and 5), choose two critical actions to share in the closing session. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is academic about engagement? 2. What are some exemplars of engagement and engaged scholarship from across campus? 3. What are some commonalities across the examples shared? 4. What components should be included in our academic plan that can help define the University of North Carolina's engagement? 5. Pick two (and only two) key points from your discussion to share with the larger group.

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

Level	Competency
Novice	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, & Maeroff, 1997)
Novice to Intermediate	Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of community-engaged scholarship in theory and practice, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles • Theoretical frameworks • Models and methods of planning • Implementation and evaluation
Intermediate	Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities.
Intermediate to Advanced	Knowledge and successful application of definition of community-engaged scholarship, community-engaged scholarship benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality
Advanced	Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion, and/or tenure

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

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

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 grass-roots, 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

“Dialogue participants . . . encouraged the task force to consider how to use disciplinary lenses to think about the ways engaged scholarship can be manifested in each discipline.”

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.

Table 5. Participants in the Faculty Engaged Scholars Program: Schools, Departments, and Faculty Rank by Cohort

	Cohort 1: Class I N = 8 2008-2009 (Calendar Years)	Cohort 2: Class II N = 8 2009-2010 (Calendar Years)	Cohort 3: Class III N = 8 2011-2012 (Academic Years)
Schools	College of Arts & Sciences (4) Journalism Medicine & Public Health Social Work (2)	College of Arts & Sciences (2) Education Government Medicine (2) Nursing Social Work	College of Arts & Sciences (5) Education Medicine (2)
Departments	Anthropology City & Regional Planning Communication Studies Computer Science Social Medicine	Anthropology Allied Health Political Science Social Medicine	Allied Health Biomedical Engineering Communication Studies Dramatic Art History Psychology Religious Studies
Faculty Rank	Professor (2) Associate Professor (4) Assistant Professor (1) Lecturer (1)	Professor (2) Clinical Professor (1) Associate Professor (2) Assistant Professor (2) Research Assistant Professor (1)	Professor (3) Associate Professor (1) Assistant Professor (2) Research Associate Professor (1) Research Assistant Professor (1)

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

Competency	Ranking				
	None to minimal	Basic	Intermediate	Proficient	Advanced
1. Understanding the concepts of community engaged scholarship, and familiarity with basic literature and history of community-engaged scholarship	7	11	2	2	1
2. Understanding of the various contributors to community issues (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental); developing skills commitment for fostering community and social change	3	4	6	7	3
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	7	8	6	0	0
4. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities	1	2	6	5	9
5. Ability to negotiate across community-academic group	1	7	5	6	5
6. Ability to write grants expressing community-engaged scholarship principles and approaches	12	3	6	1	1
7. Ability to write articles based on community-engaged scholarship processes and outcomes for peer-reviewed publications	10	2	8	1	2
8. Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty	2	11	3	3	4
9. Knowledge and successful application of definition of community-engaged scholarship, community-engaged scholarship benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality	12	9	2	0	0
10. Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policies	13	5	4	0	1
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	1	8	6	7	1
12. Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion, and/or tenure	3	6	10	3	1
13. Knowledge of review, promotion, and tenure process and its relationship with community engaged scholarship, ability to serve on review, promotion, and tenure committee	13	4	5	1	0
14. Ability to mentor student and junior faculty in establishing and building community-engaged scholarship-based portfolio	6	6	9	1	1

Results specific to Cohort I.

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).

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

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

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)

Acknowledgments

This article was supported, in part, by the Faculty for the Engaged Campus (FEC), a national initiative of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) in partnership with the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which aimed to strengthen community-engaged career paths in the academy by developing innovative competency-based models of faculty development, facilitating peer review and dissemination of products of community-engaged scholarship, and supporting community-engaged faculty through the promotion and tenure process. Faculty for the Engaged Campus was funded by a comprehensive program grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) in the U.S. Department of Education.

The authors also thank the participants in the university's Faculty Engaged Scholars Program, and those who attended the Campus Dialogues on Engagement, all of whom contributed to furthering the work of community-engaged scholarship at the university. Special thanks go to the university's community partner members who have been teachers and co-learners in these efforts.

References

- Blanchard, L. W., Hanssmann, C., Strauss, R. P., Belliard, J., Krichbaum, C., Waters, E., & Seifer, S. (2009). Models for faculty development: What does it take to be a community-engaged scholar? *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(2), 47–65.

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Holland, B. (2007). Conceptualizing civic engagement: Orchestrating change at a metropolitan university. *Metropolitan Universities*, 18(3), 57–74.
- Gelmon, S., Blanchard, L., Ryan, K., & Seifer, S.D. (2012). Building Capacity for Community-Engaged Scholarship: Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs in the Faculty for the Engaged Campus Initiative. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 21-46.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Graham, E. K. (1919). *Education and citizenship and other papers*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key institutional factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning* 4(1), 30–41.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Mooser, James. (2001, March 27). *Public service or lip service? Outreach at a major research university*. Address at 10th Anniversary of the Friday Center, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Sandmann, L., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara, K. (2008). Creating academic homes: An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 47–63.
- Seifer, S.D., Blanchard, L.W., Jordan, C., Gelmon, S., and McGinley, P. Faculty for the Engaged Campus: Advancing Community-Engaged Careers in the Academy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 16(1), 5-20.
- Seifer, S. D., Wong, K., Gelmon, S. B., & Lederer, L. (2009). The Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: A national change initiative focused on faculty roles and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(2), 5–21.
- Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices. (2009). *Report of the UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices*. Retrieved December 6, 2010, from <http://provost.unc.edu/policies/>
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2003). *Academic plan*. Retrieved December 6, 2010, from <http://provost.unc.edu/academicplan/academicplan>
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2011). *Academic Plan 2011: Reach Carolina*. Retrieved April 18, 2011, from <http://provost.unc.edu/academicplan/draft-academic-plan-2011>
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2011) Carolina Center for Public Service mission. Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/ccps/index.php>
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2011) Carolina Center for Public Service Faculty Engaged Scholars program. Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/ccps/faculty-engaged-scholars-index.php>

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Center for Faculty Excellence. (2011). The CFE's mission. Retrieved from <http://cfe.unc.edu/about/index.html>

Wilson, Louis R. (1957). *The University of North Carolina, 1900–1930—the making of a modern university*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Wilson, Louis R. (1976). *Louis Round Wilson's historical sketches*. Durham, NC: Moore Publishing Company.

About the Authors

Lynn W. Blanchard is the director of the Carolina Center for Public Service and a clinical associate professor at the Gillings School of Global Public Health at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her research interests include focus on the role of higher education in meeting community need, including evaluation of student and faculty programs emphasizing engaged scholarship. Blanchard earned her bachelor's degree in Education from East Carolina University, and her master's degree and Ph.D. in Health Behavior and Health Education from the Gillings School of Global Public Health.

Ronald P. Strauss is the executive associate provost and chief international officer at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He uses research to actively help investigators communicate research results to the community and improve the enrollment and retention of minority participants and women. Specific interests include relevant community and clinical studies involving persons with HIV/AIDS and members of racial and ethnic minorities as research participants and community advisors. Strauss earned his bachelor's degree in Biology, and his master's degree and Ph.D. in Sociology, all from the University of Pennsylvania

Lucille Webb is the founder and former president of Strengthening the Black Family, Inc. She has extensive experience and interest in community-based participatory research in regard to health, with an emphasis on underserved communities. Webb earned her bachelor's degree in Education from North Carolina A&T State University and her master's degree in Education from the University of New York at Oneonta.

Appendix

Competency	Bibliography/Resources
<p>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.).</p>	<p>Articles or Chapters:</p> <p>Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. <i>Journal of Public Service and Outreach</i>, 1(1), 1–20. (Available in the “Resources Organized by Competency” folder and at http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/05/boyer-1996.pdf)</p> <p>Sandmann, L. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996–2006. <i>Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement</i>, 12(1), 91–104.</p> <p>Books:</p> <p>Boyer, E. (1990). <i>Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate</i>. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.</p> <p>Glassick, C. E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). <i>Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Other Resources:</p> <p>Stanton, T., & Howard, J. (2009). <i>Research university engaged scholarship toolkit</i>. Boston, MA: Campus Compact. (Available at: http://www.compact.org/initiatives/civic-engagement-at-research-universities/truceen-overview/)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section A: About engaged scholarship—http://www.compact.org/initiatives/civic-engagement-at-research-universities/truceen-section-a/ <p>Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Introduction to Community Engaged Scholarship. (Available online at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/scholarship.html)</p> <p>Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. (2005). Linking scholarship and communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (Available at http://www.cceph.info/)</p> <p>Howard, J. (2007). PowerPoint slide of a Venn diagram that reflects the three essential components of engaged scholarship: Involves the community, benefits the community, and advances the faculty member’s scholarship. University of Michigan. (Available at http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/engaged-scholarship-venn-diagram.pdf)</p> <p>Howard, J. (2007). PowerPoint slide: Distinguishing engaged scholarship from faculty volunteering and professional service. University of Michigan. (Available at http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/distinguishing-engaged-scholarship-from-other-forms-of-faculty-involvement-in-the-community.pdf)</p> <p>Howard, J. (2007) PowerPoint slide: Is it engaged scholarship? An exploratory assessment heuristic to assist campuses in determining whether or not a community-engaged project qualifies as engaged scholarship. University of Michigan. (Available in the “Resources Organized by Competency” folder and at http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/is-it-engaged-</p>

	scholarship-3-ps-assessment1.pdf
<p>2. Understanding of the various contributors to community issues (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental); developing skills and commitment for fostering community and social change.</p>	<p>Articles or Chapters:</p> <p>Ayala, G. X., Maty, S. C., Cravey, A. J., & Webb, L. H. (2005). Mapping social and environmental influences on health: A community perspective. In B. Israel, E. Eng, A. Schulz, & E. Parker, <i>Methods in community-based participatory research for health</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Gonzalez, C. F. (2008). Personal and ecological contexts for understanding the health of immigrants. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 98(11): 1933.</p> <p>Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. <i>Lancet</i>, 365, 1099-1104.</p> <p>Wilensky, G., & Satcher, D. (2009). Don't forget about the social determinants of health. <i>Health Affairs</i>, 28, w194-w198.</p> <p>Other Resources:</p> <p>www.unhcr.org</p>
<p>3. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of CES in theory and practice, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles • Theoretical frameworks • Models and methods of planning • Implementation and evaluation <p>(For example: community governance, equitable participation at all levels, local relevance of public health problems, dissemination of findings, trust building, benefits to community involved, community partnerships, service & learning objectives, fostering critical reflection, meaningful</p>	<p>Articles or Chapters:</p> <p>Holland, D., Eng, G., Powell, D., & Drew, G. (2008). Models of engaged scholarship: An interdisciplinary group's examination of choices, actions, methods, and strategies for engaged scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Are researchers prepared? <i>Circulation</i>, 119, 2633-2642.</p> <p>Horowitz, C. R., Robinson, M., & Seifer, S. (2009). Community-based participatory research, from the margin to the mainstream: Are researchers prepared? <i>Circulation</i>, 119, 2633-2642.</p> <p>Israel, B., Schulz, A., Parker, E., & Becker, A. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. <i>Annual Review of Public Health</i>, 19, 173-202 (9 principles).</p> <p>O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service learning is . . . How faculty explain their practice. <i>Michigan Service Learning Journal</i>.</p> <p>O'Meara, K. (2009, in press). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In John Saltmarsh and Matt Hartley (Eds.), <i>To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education</i>. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.</p> <p>Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., et al. (2004). <i>Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence</i> (Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99, AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.</p> <p>Books:</p> <p>Israel, B., Eng, E., Schulz, A., & Parker, E. (2005). <i>Methods in community based participatory research for health</i>. San Francisco,</p>

community service activities in response to community-identified concerns)	<p>CA.: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Van de Ven, A. (2007). <i>Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research</i>. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.</p> <p><u>Other Resources:</u></p> <p>Blanchard, L. (2010). PowerPoint presentation: <i>Community engaged scholarship—it's not rocket science</i>. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Principles of good community-campus partnerships. (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ceph/principles.html#principles)</p> <p>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Public Health Practice Program Office. (1997). <i>Principles of community engagement</i>. Atlanta, GA: Author. (Available at http://www.cdc.gov/phppo/hce/part2.htm)</p> <p>NIH Director's Council of Public Representatives. Community engagement framework and definitions. (Available at http://copr.nih.gov/reports.asp)</p> <p>Sandmann, L. (2008). PowerPoint presentation: <i>Engaged scholarship in context: Approaches and issues</i>.</p> <p>Stanton, T., & Howard, J. (2009). <i>Research university engaged scholarship toolkit</i>. Boston, MA: Campus Compact. (Available at http://www.compact.org/initiatives/civic-engagement-at-research-universities/museen-overview/)</p> <p>The Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group. (2006). <i>Developing and sustaining community-based participatory research partnerships: A skill-building curriculum</i>. (Available at http://www.ebprecurriculum.info)</p> <p>UNC-Greensboro. (2010). <i>Terms, definitions, and resources for community engaged scholarship in business and finance</i>. <u>Service Learning Resources:</u></p> <p>Campus Compact. Service learning resource list. (Available at http://www.compact.org/resources-for-faculty/)</p> <p>North Carolina Campus Compact. <i>Partnerships—A Journal of Service Learning and Civic Engagement</i>. (Available at: http://www.partnershipsjournal.org/index.php/part)</p> <p>Seifer, S. (2005). <i>The evidence base for service-learning in higher education</i>. Santa Cruz, CA: National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. (Available at: http://www.servicelearning.org/instant_info/fact_sheets/he_facts/evidence/)</p> <p>Seifer, S. D., & Connors, K. Eds. (2007). Community Campus Partnerships for Health. Faculty toolkit for service-learning in higher education. Scotts Valley, CA: National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Faculty%20Toolkit%20for%20Service%20Learning.pdf)</p> <p>Special Issue: Future Directions for Service Learning in Higher Education. <i>International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education</i>, 18(1). (Available at http://www.ijtel.org/ijthe/past2.cfm?v=18&f=1)</p>
--	--

	<p>Variety of other service learning toolkits: http://www.servicelearning.org/instant_info/tool_kits</p>
<p>4. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities.</p>	<p>Articles or Chapters:</p> <p>Bringle, R., Clayton, P., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. <i>Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning and Civic Engagement</i>, 1(1).</p> <p>Christopher, S., Watts, V., McCormick, A., & Young, S. (2008). Building and maintaining trust in a community-based participatory research partnership. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 98(8), 1398–1406.</p> <p>Wallerstein, M., Duran, B., Minkler, M., & Foley, K. (2005). Developing and maintaining partnerships with communities. Chapter 2 in B. A. Israel, E. Eng, A. J. Schultz, & E. A. Parker (Eds.), <i>Methods in community-based participatory research for health</i> (pp. 31–51). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Books:</p> <p>Minkler, M. (Ed.). (2005). <i>Community organizing and community building for health</i>. Rutgers University Press.</p> <p>Other Resources:</p> <p>Alameda County Health Department. Resources on undoing racism. (Available at http://www.acphd.org/healthequity/training/documents/UndoingRacismResources.pdf)</p> <p>Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (2007). <i>Achieving the promise of authentic community-higher education partnerships: Community partners speak out</i>. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CPSReport_final_11.08.pdf)</p> <p>The Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) Consortium's Community Engagement Key Function Committee and the CTSA Community Engagement Workshop Planning Committee. (2007). <i>Researchers and their communities: The challenges of meaningful engagement</i>.</p> <p>The Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group. (2006). <i>Developing and sustaining community-based participatory research partnerships: A skill-building curriculum</i>. (Available at www.chpcu.rutgers.edu)</p> <p>Articles or Chapters:</p> <p>Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: The terms of engagement. <i>Journal of Social Issues</i>, 58(3).</p> <p>Brown, D. (2001). Pulling it all together: A method for developing service-learning and community partnerships based in critical pedagogy. (Available at http://national.serviceresources.org/files/legacy/filemanager/download/720/brown.pdf) and in the "Resources Organized by Competency" folder)</p> <p>Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Principles of Good Campus Community Partnerships (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/principles.html)</p>
<p>5. Ability to negotiate across community-academic groups.</p>	<p>Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Principles of Good Campus Community Partnerships (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/principles.html)</p>

	<p>Gust, S., & Jordan, C. (2006). The community impact statement: A pre-nuptial agreement for community-campus partnerships. <i>Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17</i>(2), 155-169. (Available at http://www.campact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/gust-jordan.pdf)</p> <p>Ferman, B., & Hill, T. (2002). The challenges of agenda conflict in higher-education-community research partnerships: Views from the community side. <i>Journal of Urban Affairs, 24</i>(2).</p> <p><u>Other Resources:</u></p> <p>New York Academy of Medicine. <i>The partnership self-assessment tool</i>. (Available at: http://www.partnershiptool.net/)</p> <p>Sandman, L. PowerPoint presentation: <i>Outreach scholarship partnerships and projects</i> (a presentation for UNH Outreach Scholars Academy Presentation).</p>
6. Ability to write grants expressing CES principles and approaches.	<p><u>Resources:</u></p> <p>Seifor, S. (2005). <i>Tips and strategies for developing strong community-based participatory research proposals</i>. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ceph/pdf_files/cbpr-review1.pdf)</p> <p>National Institutes of Health. Community engagement framework for peer review guidance. (Available at http://copr.nih.gov/reports/Peer_Review_Framework_508c.pdf)</p>
7. Ability to write articles based on CES processes and outcomes for peer-reviewed publications.	<p><u>Resources:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CES4Health.info (a mechanism for the rigorous peer review of and broad online dissemination of nontraditional products of CES) <p>Lists of journals that publish CES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ http://studentaffairs.unsg.edu/cehr/journals-that-publish-community-engaged-scholarship/ ▪ http://depts.washington.edu/ceph/links.htm#Journals <p><u>Articles or Chapters:</u></p>
8. Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty. Recognition by the community.	<p>Chaskin, R. (2001). Building community capacity: A definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. <i>Urban Affairs Review, 36</i> (3).</p> <p><u>Books:</u></p> <p>Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J. (1997). <i>Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets</i>. ACTA Publications.</p> <p><u>Other Resources:</u></p> <p>Public Health Agency of Canada. <i>Community capacity building tool: A tool for planning, building and reflecting on community capacity in community based health projects</i>. (Available at http://www.pbacc-aspc.gc.ca/canadatregions/ab-nwl-info/documents/CGBT_English_web_000.pdf)</p>

<p>9. Knowledge and successful application of definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality.</p>	<p>Articles or Chapters: Ahmed, S., and Palermo, A. (2010). Community engagement in research: Frameworks for education and peer review. <i>American Journal of Public Health, 100</i>, 1380-1387.</p> <p>Books or Journals: The Community-Engaged Scholarship Collaborative. (2009). <i>Metropolitan Universities, 20(2)</i>.</p> <p>Other Resources: Jordan, C. (Ed.) (2007). <i>Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion & tenure package</i>. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CES_RPT_Package.pdf)</p> <p>Articles or Chapters: Izumi, B., Schulz, A., Israel, B., Reyes, A., et al. (2010). The one-pager: A practical policy advocacy tool for translating community-based participatory research into action. <i>Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 4(2)</i>, Summer 2010, pp. 141-147. The Johns Hopkins University Press.</p> <p>Minkler, M. (2010). Linking science and policy through community-based participatory research to study and address health disparities. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>.</p> <p>Petersen, D., Minkler, M., Vasquez-Breckwich, V., Baden, A. (2006). Community-based participatory research as a tool for policy change: A case study of the Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative. <i>Review of Policy Research, 23(2)</i>, 339.</p> <p>Vásquez-Brechwich, V., Minkler, M., & Shepard, P. (2006). Promoting environmental health policy through community based participatory research: A case study from Harlem, New York. <i>Journal of Urban Health</i>.</p> <p>Books: Lasker, R., & Guitry, J. (2009). <i>Engaging the community in decision making: Case studies tracking participation, voice and influence</i>. McFarland & Company, Inc.</p> <p>Other Resources: Minkler, M., Vásquez, B., Chang, C., & Miller, J. (2008). <i>Promoting healthy public policy through community-based participatory research: 10 case studies</i>. Oakland, CA: Policy Link (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CBPR_final.pdf)</p> <p>Guthrie, K., Louie, J., & Foster, C. (2006). The challenge of assessing policy and advocacy activities: Part II—moving from theory to practice. Los Angeles, CA: The California Endowment. (Available at http://www.calendow.org/uploadedFiles/challenge_assessing_policy_advocacy2.pdf)</p> <p>Ritas, C. (2003). <i>Speaking truth, creating power: A guide to policy work for community-based participatory research practitioners</i>. Hunter College Center on AIDS, Drugs, and Community Health For Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH). (Available at: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/ritas.pdf)</p>
<p>10. Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policy.</p>	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Articles or Chapters: Morahan, P., & Fleetwood, J. (2008). The double helix of activity and scholarship: Building a medical education career with limited resources. <i>Medical Education, 42</i>, 34-44. Sandman, L. Placing scholarly engagement "on the desk" (Available in the TRUCEN Toolkit) Other Resources: Salmirash, M. (2010). PowerPoint presentation: <i>Community engaged scholarship, teaching and learning</i>. Articles or Chapters: Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. D. (2005). The scholarship of community engagement: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? <i>Academic Medicine, 80</i>(4), 317-321. Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (1999). <i>Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach</i>. American Association for Higher Education. Jordan, C. Practical tools for overcoming the challenges of advancing your career as a community-engaged scholar. (TRUCEN toolkit) Books: O'Meara, K., & Edgerton, R. (Eds.). (2005). <i>Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Macroff, G. (1997). <i>Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Other Resources: Jordan, C. (Ed.). Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion & tenure package. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CES_RPT_Package.pdf) Calleson, D., Kauper-Brown, J., & Seifer, S. (2005). <i>Community-engaged scholarship toolkit</i>. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (Available at http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info) Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. (2008). <i>Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university: A resource on promotion and tenure in the arts, humanities, and design</i>. (Available at http://www.imagineamerica.org/TI/TI1_Final.pdf) Sandmann, L. (2008). PowerPoint: <i>Scholarship of engagement: Making the case for promotion</i>.</p>
<p>12. Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion, and/or tenure.</p>	<p>Articles or Chapters: Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. D. (2005). The scholarship of community engagement: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? <i>Academic Medicine, 80</i>(4), 317-321. Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (1999). <i>Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach</i>. American Association for Higher Education. Jordan, C. Practical tools for overcoming the challenges of advancing your career as a community-engaged scholar. (TRUCEN toolkit) Books: O'Meara, K., & Edgerton, R. (Eds.). (2005). <i>Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Macroff, G. (1997). <i>Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Other Resources: Jordan, C. (Ed.). Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion & tenure package. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (Available at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CES_RPT_Package.pdf) Calleson, D., Kauper-Brown, J., & Seifer, S. (2005). <i>Community-engaged scholarship toolkit</i>. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (Available at http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info) Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. (2008). <i>Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university: A resource on promotion and tenure in the arts, humanities, and design</i>. (Available at http://www.imagineamerica.org/TI/TI1_Final.pdf) Sandmann, L. (2008). PowerPoint: <i>Scholarship of engagement: Making the case for promotion</i>.</p>

	<p>Stanton, T., & Howard, J. (2009). <i>Research university engaged scholarship toolkit</i>. Boston, MA: Campus Compact. (http://www.compact.org/initiatives/civic-engagement-at-research-universities/trucon-overview/)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section B: Engaged scholarship and review, promotion and tenure—145 ▪ http://www.compact.org/initiatives/civic-engagement-at-research-universities/trucon-section-b/ <p>Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (web links and references). The Office of Leadership and Service Learning, UNC Greensboro. (Available at http://studentaffairs.uncg.edu/cbr/promotionandtenure/)</p> <p><u>Links relevant to UNC Chapel Hill:</u></p> <p>Report of the UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices. (2009). (Available at http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccount/reports/index.shtml)</p> <p><i>See Competency #12</i></p>
<p>13. Knowledge of RPT process and its relationship with CES; ability to serve on RPT committee.</p>	
<p>14. Ability to mentor student and junior faculty in establishing and building CES-based portfolio.</p>	<p>Thomas, R. Exemplary junior faculty mentoring programs. (Available at http://www.yale.edu/wff/pdf/ExemplaryJunior%20Faculty%20MentoringPrograms.pdf)</p>