



Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative

Meeting Synopsis: 2nd Annual Meeting

The journey of the community-engaged scholar can be a long and winding path. While the mission of virtually every health professional school includes community service, community-engaged scholarship (CES) has been largely unrecognized, undervalued, and misunderstood in the review, promotion and tenure (RPT) process. In an effort to address the disconnect between what community-engaged faculty actually do and how they are recognized and rewarded, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health launched the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative in Fall 2004. A three-year initiative funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, the Collaborative is comprised of nine health professional schools that seek to recognize, reward, and institutionalize CES in their institutions, disciplines and peers nationwide.

In February 2005, campus teams convened for their **first meeting** [link phrase "first-in person meeting" to summary for 2005 meeting]. Meeting goals included creating a shared understanding of the project's goals and objectives, building knowledge about CES, identifying assets and areas of focus, and achieving consensus on project documentation, learning and assessment. **During the Collaborative's 2nd annual meeting in February 2006, teams celebrated achievements made thus far while also reflecting on lessons learned, sharing strategies for "what worked" and "what didn't work," and planning activities for the year ahead.**

Key highlights from the meeting included:

Evaluation: Assessing Progress. Prior to each year's meeting, teams complete an assessment tool specifically designed by the project evaluators to assess the capacity of their school and university for CES and to identify opportunities for action across six different dimensions.¹ When comparing results across the Collaborative from this year's assessment to last year's, scores increased in all six dimensions, indicating that capacity is being built and positive changes are taking place. Team reports on their accomplishments over the past year provided further evidence of positive change:

Aburn University (Pharmacy): Faculty have been promoted based on scholarship that was conducted in their community-based practices.

Case Western Reserve University (Nursing): A dialogue has begun that has identified individuals on campus who are committed to supporting and advocating for CES.

Indiana University (Dentistry): A school-wide Committee on CES was recently formed to provide ongoing support for community engagement and CES, including providing faculty development, guidance around program design, and peer review of draft manuscripts and other scholarly work.

Loma Linda University (Public Health): A process has begun of educating faculty regarding CES and a faculty member has been promoted to full professor based on a public health practice portfolio. Recent grants for community-academic partnerships are providing more faculty opportunities for CES.

University of Cincinnati (Allied Health Sciences): Team members obtained institutional grant funding for a 2-day faculty development colloquium on "adding science to service" that included skill-building workshops on how to build scholarship into service-learning and community service programs.

University of Colorado at Denver (Pharmacy): A university-wide review of RPT policies is underway.

University of Minnesota (Academic Health Center): A university-wide initiative has created a task force on faculty culture and RPT policies that recognize the value and importance of CES.

University of North Carolina (Dentistry): A proposal for revising the RPT policies that reflects CES in a prominent and noteworthy manner is currently being considered by the faculty, with results of the vote expected within weeks of the Collaborative meeting.

Vanderbilt University (School of Medicine): The RPT criteria for clinical faculty were revised to explicitly mention that CES is worthy and legitimate.

Team Meetings, Reflections and Strategic Action Plans. Teams reflected on the successful strategies they have taken and the obstacles they have faced in their effort to change their institutions., Teams continued to use **John Kotter's steps for organizational change** [link this to his article "Leading Change"] as a framework to analyze their work and develop strategic action plans for the upcoming year.

Collaborative Work Group Activities. The Collaborative's three work groups, formed to address priority issues identified at the first meeting, each facilitated a session. Briefly described below, these sessions were designed not only to share outcomes and products, but to stimulate conversation and spark ideas and direction for the year ahead.

Faculty Development (Chair: Lynn Blanchard, University of North Carolina): Members of this work group spearheaded a discussion on the nontraditional career trajectory of many community-engaged scholars, and solicited input from the group regarding the specific characteristics and competencies one must develop as a community-engaged scholar. Feedback is being channeled into two products that this group is developing: (1) a set of competencies for community-engaged scholars, and (2) a faculty development resource guide.

Peer Review (Chair: Cathy Jordan, University of Minnesota): This work group staged a mock review of a real-life community-engaged scholar's tenure dossier. Collaborative members, playing the role of RPT committee members, used draft criteria developed by the work group that included the specific characteristics, skills, and evidence applicable to community-engaged scholars. After the mock review, Collaborative members critiqued the criteria and offered suggestions for improvement. The work group plans to incorporate the comments into a revised model set of criteria that will be discussed, disseminated and adapted for use.

Sustainable Funding (Chair: Marilyn Lotas, Case Western University): One of the main goals of this work group is to develop a repository of case studies that address funding of CES, using a template developed for this purpose. Marilyn Lotas, Karen Yoder (Indiana University), and Elizabeth King (University of Cincinnati) each presented a case study on how they obtained funding for CES. Collaborative members identified new categories for case studies that would be useful, such as NIH grants, institutional funding and state/federal line-item funding. They also solicited ideas for "tip sheets" on funding-related issues, including how to navigate university systems and structures such as the Institutional Review Board and development office. The work group also plans to host teleconferences with funders to discuss their funding priorities and demystify the application and review process.

Disciplinary Meetings: Collaborative members met by discipline to discuss the current state of CES within the context of the discipline and develop specific, measurable actions that could be taken in the next year to create a more supportive climate for CES. Proposed actions included presenting at national professional association conferences, meeting with association leadership and submitting manuscripts to key journals.

Looking Towards Next Year: The Collaborative also adopted a publications/presentations policy and made decisions about important opportunities for dissemination in the year ahead. The 3rd annual meeting of the Collaborative will take place February 21-23, 2007 in Washington DC. Holding the meeting in the nation's capitol will enable the Collaborative to not only assess progress and build knowledge internally, but to learn from related initiatives and to engage national professional associations and other key stakeholders in a dialogue to advance CES.

For more information, please contact Kristine Wong, CCPH Program Director, at 206.543.7954, or kristine@u.washington.edu or visit <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/healthcollab.html>

¹ Gelmon SB, Seifer SD, Kauper-Brown J., Mikkelsen M. (2005) *Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment*. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. [adapted from the Collaborative tool used by the Collaborative] Available at www.ccph.info