

Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative Self Assessment Summary 2006

Five documents are attached for your review. The first is the Self Assessment Map 2006, which summarizes the results of both the team and provost representative assessments completed in the past two months. The second document is the Self Assessment Raw Scores Comparison Year 1-Year 2. The scores in the top half of this table are the assessments of the school by the team and the provost representative, and the scores in the bottom half are the assessments of the university. The third document presents a summary graph for each of the six dimensions comparing the team's Self Assessment for Year 1 and Year 2. The fourth document presents a summary graph of the average scores for all schools in the Collaborative for Year 1 and Year 2. The final document compares the team scores for Year 1 and Year 2 by dimension and includes six graphs.

The narrative below gives the detailed definitions for each level of each dimension.

Dimension I: Definition and Application of Community Engagement

1.1 Definition of Community Engagement

Level One

There is no definition for community engagement, and the term is used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based activities.

Level Two

There is a definition for community engagement, but the term is used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based activities and is poorly understood.

Level Three

There is a formal definition for community engagement, but it is not universally accepted, used or understood.

Level Four

There is a formal, consistently used and understood definition for community engagement.

1.2 Promotion of Community Engagement through the Mission

Level One

Reference to the concept of community engagement is not included in the institution's mission.

Level Two

Although referred to in the institution's mission, community engagement is not openly valued or explicitly promoted by leaders.

Level Three

The community engagement aspect of the institution's mission is openly valued but is not explicitly used or promoted by leaders.

Level Four

The community engagement aspect of the institution's mission is openly valued and is explicitly used and promoted by leaders.

1.3 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Education

Level One

Community-based learning is not acknowledged as important to the education of students and is not incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.

Level Two

Community-based learning is infrequently acknowledged as important to the education of students and is not incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.

Level Three

Community-based learning is frequently acknowledged as important to the education of students and is incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.

Level Four

Community-based learning is acknowledged and valued as essential to the education of students and is incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.

1.4 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Research

Level One

Community-based research is not acknowledged as an essential component of the institution's involvement in research.

Level Two

Community-based research is infrequently acknowledged as an essential component of the institution's research activities.

Level Three

Community-based research is frequently acknowledged as an essential component of the institution's involvement in research.

Level Four

Community-based research is acknowledged and valued as an essential component of the institution's involvement in research.

1.5 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Service

Level One

Community service is not acknowledged as an essential component of service or practice.

Level Two

Community service is infrequently acknowledged as an essential component of service or practice.

Level Three

Community service is frequently acknowledged as an essential component of service or practice.

Level Four

Community service is acknowledged and valued as an essential component of service or practice.

1.6 Strategic Planning for Community Engagement

Level One

There is no official strategic plan for advancing the institution's community engagement.

Level Two

Although certain short-range and long-range goals for the institution's community engagement have been defined, these goals have not been formalized into an official strategic plan that will guide the implementation of these goals.

Level Three

There is an official strategic plan for advancing the institution's community engagement, which includes short-range and long-range institutionalization goals, but implementation of these goals has not been successful.

Level Four

There is an official strategic plan for advancing the institution's community engagement, which includes short-range and long-range institutionalization goals that have been implemented successfully.

1.7 Alignment of Community Engagement with Strategic Goals and Initiatives

Level One

Community engagement stands alone and is not tied to other important, high profile efforts on campus (such as recruiting and retaining minority students, improving teaching effectiveness, establishing community partnerships, conducting community-based research, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, etc.).

Level Two

Community engagement is tied loosely or informally to other important, high profile efforts on campus (such as recruiting and retaining minority students, improving teaching effectiveness, establishing community partnerships, conducting community-based research, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, etc.).

Level Three

Community engagement is tied formally and purposefully to other important, high profile efforts on campus (such as recruiting and retaining minority students, improving teaching effectiveness, establishing community partnerships, conducting community-based research, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, etc.).

Level Four

Community engagement is named as a high profile effort on campus along with other efforts (such as recruiting and retaining minority students, improving teaching effectiveness, establishing community partnerships, conducting community-based research, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, etc.).

1.8 Applications of Community Engagement

Level One

Few, if any, community engagement activities include all of these components: community partnerships, student and/or faculty orientation, responsiveness to community needs, community capacity building.

Level Two

A minority of community engagement activities include all of these components: community partnerships, student and/or faculty orientation, responsiveness to community needs, community capacity building.

Level Three

A majority of community engagement activities include all of these components: community partnerships, student and/or faculty orientation, responsiveness to community needs, community capacity building.

Level Four

Almost all community engagement activities include all of these components: community partnerships, student and/or faculty orientation, responsiveness to community needs, community capacity building.

Dimension II: Faculty Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement

2.1 Faculty Awareness of Community Engagement

Level One

Very few faculty members know what community engagement is or how it can be integrated into teaching, research or service.

Level Two

Some faculty members know what community engagement is and understand how it can be integrated into teaching, research or service.

Level Three

A substantial number of faculty members know what community engagement is and can articulate how it can be integrated into teaching, research or service.

Level Four

Most faculty members know what community engagement is and can articulate how it can be integrated into teaching, research or service.

2.2 Faculty Involvement In and Support for Community Engagement

Level One

Very few faculty members are supporters or advocates of community engagement. Few support the integration of community engagement into the institution's mission or into their own professional work.

Level Two

While some faculty members are supportive of community engagement, few of them are advocates for integrating it into the institution's mission and/or their own professional work. Only a few key faculty members actively participate in community engaged teaching, research or service activities.

Level Three

A substantial number of influential faculty members participate in community-engaged teaching, research or service activities and support the integration of community engagement both into the institution's mission and the faculty members' individual professional work.

Level Four

Most faculty members participate in community-engaged teaching, research or service activities and support the integration of community engagement into both the institution's mission and the faculty members' individual professional work.

2.3 Faculty Leadership in Community Engagement

Level One

None of the most influential faculty members serve as leaders for advancing community engagement.

Level Two

There are one or two influential faculty members who provide leadership to the community engagement effort.

Level Three

Some influential faculty members provide leadership to the community engagement effort.

Level Four

A highly respected, influential group of faculty members serve as the community engagement leaders and/or advocates.

2.4 Community-Engaged Faculty as Institutional Leaders

Level One

No community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.

Level Two

A few community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.

Level Three

Several community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.

Level Four

Most of the community-engaged faculty are involved as leaders in influential institutional roles such as review, tenure and promotion committees, faculty governance and curriculum committees.

2.5 Institutional Support for Faculty Development

Level One

The institution does not provide faculty with campus-based opportunities to become familiar with methods and practices related to community-engaged teaching, research or service. Mechanisms have not been developed to help faculty mentor and support each other in community-engaged work.

Level Two

The institution infrequently provides faculty with campus-based opportunities to become familiar with methods and practices related to community-engaged teaching, research or service. Mechanisms have not been developed to help faculty mentor and support each other in community-engaged work.

Level Three

The institution frequently provides faculty with campus-based opportunities to become familiar with methods and practices related to community-engaged teaching, research or service. Mechanisms have been developed to help faculty mentor and support each other in community-engaged work.

Level Four

The institution regularly provides faculty with campus-based opportunities to become familiar with methods and practices related to community-engaged teaching, research or service. Mechanisms are consistently in place to help faculty mentor and support each other in community-engaged work.

2.6 Faculty Development and Incentives for Community Engagement

Level One

In general, faculty members are not encouraged to participate in community engagement; few if any incentives are provided to pursue community engagement (e.g., curriculum development mini-grants, support to attend conferences, faculty development).

Level Two

Although faculty members are not explicitly encouraged to participate in community engagement, some faculty have used institutional incentives (e.g., curriculum development mini-grants, support to attend conferences, faculty development) to pursue community engagement.

Level Three

Faculty members are encouraged to pursue community engagement through modest availability of various incentives put in place for that purpose (e.g., curriculum development mini-grants, support to attend conferences, faculty development).

Level Four

Faculty are strongly encouraged to pursue community engagement through widespread availability of various incentives put in place for that purpose (e.g., curriculum development mini-grants, support to attend conferences, faculty development).

Dimension III: Student Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement

3.1 Student Awareness of Community Engagement

Level One

There are very few mechanisms for informing students about opportunities for their own community engagement, such as community-based courses, research assistantships or volunteer positions (e.g., specific mention in the course schedule, job postings, websites, student organizations).

Level Two

There are sporadic and inconsistent mechanisms for informing students about opportunities for their own community engagement, such as community-based courses, research assistantships or volunteer positions (e.g., specific mention in the course schedule, job postings, websites, student organizations).

Level Three

There are some coordinated mechanisms for informing students about opportunities for their own community engagement such as community-based courses, research assistantships or volunteer positions (e.g., specific mention in the course schedule, job postings, websites, student organizations).

Level Four

There are explicit and consistent mechanisms for informing students about opportunities for their own community engagement, such as community-based courses, research assistantships or volunteer positions (e.g., specific mention in the course schedule, job postings, websites, student organizations).

3.2 Student Involvement in Community Engagement Activities

Level One

Students are never or rarely involved in community engagement activities.

Level Two

Students are occasionally involved in community engagement activities.

Level Three

Students are regularly involved in community engagement activities.

Level Four

Students are not only regularly involved in community engagement activities, but they frequently serve in leadership roles to recruit even more student involvement.

3.3 Student Incentives and Rewards

Level One

There are no formal or informal mechanisms that encourage students to participate in community engagement activities or reward them for their participation (e.g., community engagement notation on transcripts, graduation requirement, scholarships, awards, stories in campus newspaper, certificates of achievement).

Level Two

There are few formal mechanisms that encourage students to participate in community engagement or reward them for their participation in community engagement (e.g., community engagement notation on transcripts, graduation requirement, scholarships, awards). There are few informal mechanisms (e.g., stories in the campus newspaper, verbal encouragement).

Level Three

There are some formal mechanisms that encourage students to participate in community engagement or reward them for their participation in community engagement (e.g., community engagement notation on transcripts, graduation requirement, scholarships, awards). There are some informal mechanisms (e.g., stories in the campus newspaper, verbal encouragement).

Level Four

There are many formal mechanisms in place that encourage students to participate in community engagement or reward them for their participation in community engagement (e.g., community engagement notation on transcripts, graduation requirement, scholarships, annual awards). There are many informal mechanisms (e.g., stories in the campus newspaper, verbal encouragement).

Dimension IV: Community Support for and Involvement in Institutional Community Engagement

4.1 Community Recognition as "Engaged Campus"

Level One

Local community leaders do not describe the institution as an important and reliable partner in addressing community concerns.

Level Two

Local community leaders describe the institution as an occasional partner in addressing community concerns.

Level Three

Local community leaders describe the institution as an important and reliable partner in addressing community concerns.

Level Four

Local community leaders regularly describe the institution as an essential partner in addressing community concerns.

4.2 Nature and Extent of Community-Institutional Partnerships

Level One

There is little or no understanding between the institution and community partners regarding each other's needs, timelines, goals, resources and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities. Relationships change frequently, and lapse during school breaks.

Level Two

There is some understanding between the institution and community partners regarding each other's needs, timelines, goals, resources and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities. There is some continuity of relationships.

Level Three

There is substantial understanding between the institution and community partners regarding each other's needs, timelines, goals, resources and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities. Many relationships exist from year to year.

Level Four

There is extensive understanding between the institution and community partners regarding each other's needs, timelines, goals, resources and capacity for developing and implementing community engagement activities. Relationships are well-established and sustained over time.

4.3 Community Access of Institutional Resources

Level One

Community agencies rarely access students and/or faculty as resources for their work through course-based projects, community-based research, service or other activities.

Level Two

Community agencies occasionally access students and/or faculty as resources for their work through course-based projects, community-based research, service or other activities.

Level Three

Community agencies frequently access students and/or faculty as resources for their work through course-based projects, community-based research, service or other activities.

Level Four

Community agencies consistently access students and/or faculty as resources for their work through course-based projects, community-based research, service or other activities.

4.4 Community Partner Voice and Leadership in the Institution

Level One

Few opportunities exist for community partners to assume leadership roles in institutional activities (e.g., serve on advisory committees, facilitate student reflection, give on-campus lectures, collaborate on research). Community partners are not invited or encouraged to express their needs, goals, resources and capacity.

Level Two

There are a limited number of opportunities for community partners to assume leadership roles in institutional activities (e.g., serve on advisory committees, facilitate student reflection, give on-campus lectures, collaborate on research). Community partners are rarely invited or encouraged to express their needs, goals, resources and capacity.

Level Three

There are some opportunities for community partners to assume leadership roles in community engagement (e.g., serve on advisory committees, facilitate student reflection, give on-campus lectures, collaborate on research). Community partners are occasionally invited or encouraged to express their needs, goals, resources and capacity.

Level Four

There are regular opportunities for community partners to assume leadership roles in institutional activities (e.g., serve on advisory committees, facilitate student reflection, give on-campus lectures, collaborate on research). Community partners are routinely invited or encouraged to express their needs, goals, resources and capacity.

4.5 Community Partner Incentives

Level One

No incentives are provided for community partners to become involved in the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., adjunct faculty status, compensation for participation in research or teaching, continuing education credits, access to institutional resources).

Level Two

Few incentives are provided for community partners to become involved in the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., adjunct faculty status, compensation for participation in research or teaching, continuing education credits, access to institutional resources).

Level Three

Although community partners are provided incentives to become involved in the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., adjunct faculty status, compensation for participation in research or teaching, continuing education credits, access to institutional resources), these are not consistently offered.

Level Four

Community partners are consistently provided a variety of incentives to become involved in the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., adjunct faculty status, compensation for participation in research or teaching, continuing education credits, access to institutional resources).

4.6 Community Partner Recognition

Level One

No mechanisms are in place to recognize community partner contributions to the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., recognition event, certificates of appreciation, mini-grants, compensation, awards).

Level Two

Few mechanisms are in place to recognize community partner contributions to the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., recognition event, certificates of appreciation, mini-grants, compensation, awards).

Level Three

There are some limited mechanisms in place to recognize community partner contributions to the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., recognition event, certificates of appreciation, mini-grants, compensation, awards).

Level Four

Many mechanisms are in place to recognize community partner contributions to the institution's community engagement activities (e.g., recognition event, certificates of appreciation, mini-grants, compensation, awards).

Dimension V: Institutional Leadership and Support for Community Engagement

5.1 Institutional Commitment to Community Engagement

Level One

The institution rarely demonstrates any efforts to review, discuss and strengthen its commitment to community engagement.

Level Two

The institution demonstrates an occasional but unplanned effort to review, discuss and strengthen its commitment to community engagement.

Level Three

The institution demonstrates selected planned efforts to review, discuss and strengthen its commitment to community engagement.

Level Four

The institution demonstrates a comprehensive and coherent plan to review, discuss and strengthen its commitment to community engagement.

5.2 Administrative Support for Community Engagement

Level One

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans do not visibly support the institution's community engagement efforts.

Level Two

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans do not collectively support the institution's community engagement efforts. Those that do support them do not visibly support them through their words and actions.

Level Three

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans support the institution's community engagement efforts, but they do not visibly support them through their words and actions.

Level Four

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans visibly support the institution's community engagement efforts, through both their words and their actions.

5.3 Policy Support for Community Engagement as an Institutional Goal

Level One

No-policy making boards or committees (e.g., board of trustees, faculty senate, council of deans, advisory council) have recognized community engagement as an essential institutional strategy or goal.

Level Two

One or more policy-making boards or committees (e.g., board of trustees, faculty senate, council of deans, advisory council) recognize community engagement as an essential institutional strategy or goal, but no formal policies have been developed (e.g., requiring community engagement for graduation, creating supportive institutional structures, modifying tenure and promotion policies).

Level Three

One or more policy-making boards or committees (e.g., board of trustees, faculty senate, council of deans, advisory council) recognize community engagement as an essential institutional strategy goal and have developed or implemented formal policies (e.g., requiring community engagement for graduation, creating supportive institutional structures, modifying tenure and promotion policies).

Level Four

All policy-making boards or committees (e.g., board of trustees, faculty senate, council of deans, advisory council) recognize community engagement as an essential institutional strategy and have developed or implemented formal policies (e.g., requiring community engagement for graduation, creating supportive institutional structures, modifying tenure and promotion policies).

5.4 Coordinating Structures for Community Engagement

Level One

There are no coordinating structures at the institution that are devoted to assisting in the implementation, advancement or institutionalization of community engagement activities (e.g., a committee, center or clearinghouse).

Level Two

There are one or more coordinating structures at the institution that are devoted to assisting in the implementation, advancement or institutionalization of community engagement activities (e.g., a committee, center or clearinghouse). However, they either do not coordinate community engagement activities exclusively or provide services to only a certain constituency (e.g., student, faculty) or a limited part of the campus (e.g., only to undergraduates).

Level Three

There are one or more coordinating structures at the institution that are exclusively devoted to the implementation, advancement and institutionalization of community engagement activities (e.g., a committee, center or clearinghouse). However, these structures provide services to only a certain constituency (e.g., student, faculty) or limited part of the campus (e.g., only to undergraduates). The institution provides some resources to support these structures.

Level Four

There are one or more coordinating structures that are devoted primarily to assisting various institutional and community constituencies in the implementation, advancement and institutionalization of community engagement. The institution provides substantial long-term resources to support these structures.

5.5 Staff Support of Community Engagement

Level One

There are no staff or faculty members whose primary paid responsibility is to advance and institutionalize community engagement.

Level Two

There are an appropriate number of staff and/or faculty members who understand community engagement fully and/or who have the authority and resources to influence the advancement and institutionalization of community engagement. However, these staff members are not paid additionally for this work, and are adding it to their current workload.

Level Three

There are an appropriate number of dedicated staff and/or faculty members who understand community engagement fully and/or who have the authority and resources to influence the advancement and institutionalization of community engagement. However, these positions are temporary or paid for by external grants.

Level Four

There are an appropriate number of paid staff and/or faculty members who understand community engagement and who have the authority and resources to influence the advancement of community engagement. These positions are permanent and paid for by institutional funds.

5.6 Faculty Recruiting Criteria

Level One

The institution does not recognize interests or expertise in community engagement in their faculty recruiting efforts.

Level Two

The institution does not encourage academic departments to recruit faculty with interests or expertise in community engagement, although some departments may do so.

Level Three

The institution encourages academic departments to recruit faculty with interests or expertise in community engagement and some departments do so.

Level Four

The institution encourages academic departments to recruit faculty with interests or expertise in community engagement and many departments do so.

5.7 Recognition During Faculty Review of Community Engagement

Level One

Community engagement is not recognized or considered during the review, tenure or promotion process.

Level Two

Community engagement is somewhat recognized and considered during the review, tenure or promotion process, but is not explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

Level Three

Community engagement is significantly recognized and considered during the review, tenure or promotion process and is explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

Level Four

Community engagement is substantially recognized and rewarded during the review, tenure or promotion process. It is explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

5.8 Evaluation of Community Engagement

Level One

There is no effort underway to account for the number, quality or impact of community engagement activities taking place (e.g., nature and extent of student and faculty involvement in community engagement, number of hours of service provided, community impact).

Level Two

There are very few efforts underway to account for the number, quality or impact of community engagement activities taking place (e.g., nature and extent of student and faculty involvement in community engagement, number of hours of service provided, community impact). These are not ongoing, systematic or coordinated.

Level Three

There are some efforts underway to account for the number, quality or impact of community engagement activities taking place (e.g., nature and extent of student and faculty involvement in community engagement, number of hours of service provided, community impact). These are not ongoing, systematic or coordinated.

Level Four

An ongoing, systematic and coordinated effort is in place to account for the number, quality or impact of community engagement activities that are taking place (e.g., nature and extent of student and faculty involvement in community engagement, number of hours of service provided, community impact).

5.9 Dissemination of Community Engagement Results

Level One

There is no effort to disseminate the results of community engagement activities.

Level Two

There is little effort to disseminate the results of community engagement activities.

Level Three

There are some efforts to disseminate the results of community engagement activities.

Level Four

There are extensive efforts to disseminate the results of community engagement activities through a variety of venues (e.g., community forums, presentations, journal articles, web sites).

Dimension VI: Community-Engaged Scholarship

6.1 Definition of Community Engaged Scholarship

Level One

There is no definition for community-engaged scholarship. The distinctions between the *practice* of community engagement and community-engaged *scholarship* are not clear. Terms are used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based teaching, research and service activities.

Level Two

There is a definition for community-engaged scholarship, but the distinctions between the *practice* of community engagement and community-engaged *scholarship* are not clear. Terms are used inconsistently to describe a variety of community-based teaching, research and service activities.

Level Three

There is a formal definition for community-engaged scholarship, but it is not universally accepted or used. Some inconsistency in use persists across the institution.

Level Four

There is a formal, universally accepted definition for community-engaged scholarship that is used consistently and is distinct from community engagement. Terms are used consistently to describe a variety of community-based teaching, research and service activities.

6.2 Valuing of Community-Engaged Scholarship

Level One

Community-engaged scholarship is not valued in any faculty appointment categories.

Level Two

Community-engaged scholarship is only valued for those faculty appointed in clinical, teaching and/or practice tracks.

Level Three

Community-engaged scholarship is recognized as a potential area of emphasis for those faculty in tenure tracks, and is valued for those faculty in clinical, teaching and/or practice tracks.

Level Four

Community-engaged scholarship is recognized and valued for all categories of appointments, regardless of tenure and/or clinical, teaching and/or practice emphasis.

6.3 Tenure-Track Appointments

Level One

None of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.

Level Two

Some of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.

Level Three

Many of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.

Level Four

Almost all of the community-engaged faculty are in tenure or tenure track positions.

6.4 Rank and Seniority

Level One

Most of the community-engaged faculty are junior in rank (e.g. instructor, assistant professor).

Level Two

Many but not all of the community-engaged faculty are junior in rank (e.g. instructor, assistant professor).

Level Three

Some of the community-engaged faculty are junior in rank (e.g. instructor, assistant professor), but many are more senior in rank (e.g. associate or full professor).

Level Four

There is a mix of seniority and rank among the community-engaged faculty are junior in rank.

6.5 Review, Tenure and Promotion Policies Regarding Community-Engaged Scholarship

Level One

Community-engaged scholarship is not recognized or considered during the review, tenure or promotion process.

Level Two

Community-engaged scholarship is somewhat recognized and considered during the review, tenure or promotion process, but is not explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

Level Three

Community-engaged scholarship is significantly recognized and considered during the review, tenure or promotion process and is explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

Level Four

Community-engaged scholarship is substantially recognized and rewarded during the review, tenure or promotion process. It is explicitly included in the review, tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

6.6 Institutional Leaders Value Community-Engaged Scholarship

Level One

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans do not support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution.

Level Two

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans do not collectively support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution, although some may express individual support for this form of scholarship.

Level Three

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution, but they do not visibly and routinely support this form of scholarship through their words and actions.

Level Four

The president, chief academic officer, trustees and deans visibly support community-engaged scholarship as an integral form of scholarship at this institution, and demonstrate this support through their words and their actions.

6.7 Valuing of Various Products of Scholarship

Level One

Review, promotion and tenure policies only recognize and value traditional products of scholarship such as publication in peer-reviewed journals.

Level Two

Review, promotion and tenure policies allow for dissemination of scholarship through a range of venues, but in practice only publication in peer-reviewed journals is valued.

Level Three

Review, promotion and tenure policies indicate support for dissemination of scholarship through a range of venues, and in practice these products of scholarship are valued.

Level Four

Review, promotion and tenure policies support and encourage dissemination of scholarship through multiple venues, and in practice these products of scholarship are valued.

6.8 Value of Nature of Scholarship

Level One

The review, promotion and tenure process places the highest value on disciplinary scholarship, rewarding faculty only for first-authored or single authored papers in disciplinary journals.

Level Two

The review, promotion and tenure process acknowledges the viability of interdisciplinary scholarship, but in practice faculty are rewarded for first-authored or single authored papers in disciplinary journals.

Level Three

The review, promotion and tenure process recognizes interdisciplinary scholarship and in practice faculty are rewarded for multiple authored papers in journals that are interdisciplinary or outside of the faculty member's discipline.

Level Four

The review, promotion and tenure process actively supports and encourages interdisciplinary scholarship, and in practice multiple authored papers in journals that are interdisciplinary or outside of the faculty member's expertise are given at least equal weight to first-authored or single authored papers in disciplinary journals.

6.9 Range of Acceptable Funding Sources

Level One

The review, promotion and tenure policies place the highest value on research grants from the National Institutes of Health and/or the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and in practice only these grants are valued.

Level Two

The review, promotion and tenure policies acknowledge the potential of funding of community-engaged scholarship from a variety of funding sources, but in practice only research grants from the National Institutes of Health and/or the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality are valued.

Level Three

The review, promotion and tenure policies recognize and value funding of community-engaged scholarship from a wide variety of sources, but in practice faculty recognition for such funding varies across units within the institution.

Level Four

The review, promotion and tenure policies recognize and value funding of community-engaged scholarship from a wide variety of sources. In practice, faculty are recognized and valued for receiving funding from these sources.

6.10 Training and Orientation of Review, Promotion and Tenure Committee Members

Level One

There is no training provided for review, promotion and tenure committee members with respect to community-engaged scholarship.

Level Two

There is no formal training provided for review, promotion and tenure committee members with respect to community-engaged scholarship, although some schools/departments do spend time discussing this as part of the review process.

Level Three

There is some formal training provided for members of review, promotion and tenure committees to ensure a broad understanding of the definition, nature, documentation and assessment of community-engaged scholarship.

Level Four

There is mandatory training for members of review, promotion and tenure committees to ensure a broad understanding of the definition, nature, documentation and assessment of community-engaged scholarship.

6.11 Community Partner Participation in the Review, Tenure and Promotion Process

Level One

There is no role for community partners in the review, tenure or promotion process for community-engaged faculty members.

Level Two

Community partners are allowed to participate in the review, promotion or tenure process of community-engaged faculty members by writing letters of support. In practice, these letters are not seriously considered.

Level Three

Community partners are allowed to participate in the review, tenure or promotion process of community-engaged faculty members by writing letters of support. In practice, these letters are seriously considered.

Level Four

Community partners are regularly invited to participate in the review, tenure or promotion processes in ways that go beyond writing letters of support (e.g., serving on a faculty review committee). In practice, these community partner contributions to the process are seriously considered and valued.

6.12 Scope of Community Impact

Level One

Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is not considered or valued in the review, promotion and tenure process.

Level Two

Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is occasionally considered or valued in the review, promotion and tenure process.

Level Three

Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is valued in the review, promotion and tenure process. However, the emphasis is on broad-scale impact affecting multiple populations, with little emphasis on local community impact.

Level Four

Community impact of community-engaged scholarship is valued and rewarded in the review, promotion and tenure process, with at least equal emphasis placed upon local community impact as that placed on regional, national and/or international impact.