

**Peer Review Workgroup
Teleconference Call #2: December 15, 2005
Call Minutes**

Workgroup Members/Staff Present:) Cathy Jordan (UMN), Rebecca Leugers (Cincinnati), Carol Savrin (Case), Sarena Seifer (Staff), Kristine Wong (Staff)

Workgroup Members Not Present: Deborah Aloschen (Case), Barbara Clinton (Vanderbilt), Evelyn Crayton (Auburn), Carol Christianson (Cincinnati), Paul Jungnickel (Auburn), Judy Peters (Loma Linda), Arnie Strauss (Vanderbilt), Christopher Turner (Colorado Health), Heather Ulrich (Colorado)

Topic 1: Results of online survey on priority areas

Although only 3 responses were received, there was unanimous support for the top two priority areas:

Two people rated this option as #1: Develop criteria/templates for CES peer review: i.e. investigate what already exists, borrow the best and supplement for the rest

All three people rated this option as #2: Establish a network of external reviewers with expertise in CES: i.e. recruit senior level individuals within the Collaborative as well as from other institutions to be available to review portfolios and write letters for faculty

All three people rated this as #3: Train RPT committees on evaluating CES presented in portfolios: i.e. develop the content of a training module that could be embedded within the materials/orientation presentations provided to new RPT members

This option received a mixed response of #1, #2 and #4: Increase publication outlets for CES

This option received a mixed response of #2, #4 and #5: Create a peer review system for CES products (non-journal articles) within each discipline/profession: i.e. study existing peer review systems for teaching scholarship and scholarship of engagement, borrow the best, supplement for the rest

Topic 2: Deciding what the work group should focus on

The group discussed the online survey results and made additional comments about the options presented. There was agreement that “training RPT committees is not a practical project for this group to work on,” for several reasons:

- It may not be something RPT committees would want to do or make time for
- It may not make sense to train RPT committees about what community-engaged scholarship (CES) without having new RPT criteria that support CES in place first

Work group chair Cathy Jordan also mentioned that when she spoke by phone with one of the work group members, the person felt strongly about the importance of increasing journal outlets for publishing CES, and getting more CES into journals.

Ultimately, the group decided that “everyone is talking about criteria”, because establishing criteria for reviewing CES for RPT is a foundational step that needs to be

taken. If there is no shared understanding of how to assess CES products, for example, then how can RPT committee fairly evaluate candidates with CES work in their portfolio? The group agreed that developing CES review templates and criteria should be the #1 priority for the work group.

One topic seen as central to CES review criteria is expanding the notion that it is scholarly to disseminate CES products in not just peer review journals, but other outlets. This point is made clearly in the report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. RPT committees might be willing to accept a training manual, for example, as a scholarly product under new review criteria - but how do they know that it is quality work? This is where we need to push ourselves to develop criteria. One of the faculty members interviewed for the CES Toolkit (www.communityengagedscholarship.info) took it upon herself to conduct her own peer review process – she sent her product to several state health department directors for comment/review, and put the comments in her portfolio. It also seems most appropriate to solicit feedback and review from the partner community about the product's impact in the community.

There was also agreement that developing a network of external reviewers is a relatively easy thing for this work group to pull off and a good use of the work group's time. There was interest in the idea of a review board for CES. One scenario for how the review board could work is as follows: The dean or department chair would request an external review of the faculty member's portfolio and/or CES products if there is no one on the RPT committee who understands how to review these.

Finally, there was agreement not to take on more than these two priorities at this time (CES review criteria and the network of external reviewers) because of the intensity of the work involved in trying to get everything done and done well.

Topic 3: Moving ahead on our top priority of developing CES review criteria

The group agreed there is no need to “start from scratch” and there are some existing resources that need to be reviewed.

For example – for portfolio reviews:

- The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement follows a set of CES criteria in its assessment of faculty portfolios.
<http://www.scholarshipofengagement.org/>
- RPT policies from schools and universities that explicitly recognize and reward CES would be good to review and also find out from faculty/RPT committee members there how they review portfolios of community-engaged faculty members.
 - Portland State University – Collaborative evaluator Sherril Gelmon from PSU would know
 - Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis – Collaborative team member Bob Bringle would know
 - UNC Chapel Hill School of Public Health – Collaborative team member Lynn Blanchard would know or could find out
 - University of Washington School of Public Health – Sarena knows
 - Some of these and other examples are on the CCPH CES resources webpage at <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/scholarship.html#Models>

For example – for reviews of products of scholarship:

- MedEdPortal, sponsored by the Association of American Medical Colleges, is designed to elevate recognition and rewards for the scholarship of teaching in medical schools. Like CES, many of the products of scholarship of teaching do not end up in peer review journals; course syllabi and teaching materials, for example. MedEdPortal is a new online peer-review and dissemination system for products of teaching scholarship. It's hope is that over time, it will become recognized as a "Housekeeping Seal of Approval" so to speak that can be noted on a CV as evidence of rigorous peer review. Although it is focused on medical schools and is not focused on CES (although teaching includes community-engaged teaching of course), it is a possible model to look at. <http://www.aamc.org/meded/mededportal/start.htm>
- The American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine also maintains a peer reviewed collection of educational materials on its website at <http://www.aahpm.org/cgi-bin/wkcggi/search>. Again, this is focused in a particular content area (hospice and palliative care) and not focused on CES.

The group noted that a lot of the existing criteria for assessing faculty and products of scholars "still sound generic to just scholarship, and not CES."

The group discussed the ideas of inviting knowledgeable representatives from the National Review Board and/or the above-mentioned universities to be on the next call to hear how they do these reviews, and how they apply the criteria.

When hearing that the faculty development work group was developing a set of competencies for community-engaged faculty members, the group proposed the idea of relating the CES review criteria to the competencies.

Topic 4: Planning for the Collaborative Meeting in February

The group discussed several ideas for what the work group could present and discuss at the Collaborative meeting in February:

- Review what has already been developed for CES review criteria (ie, some of the above-mentioned examples) and build on those to develop a draft set of criteria for CES that could be presented and discussed at the February meeting.
- Conduct a "mock portfolio review" during the February meeting. For example, each team could review a faculty member's portfolio (one possibility would be Collaborative team member Dave Dyjack at Loma Linda, who recently got promoted) using the new criteria that the work group presents and/or each team's existing criteria. (We would ask permission from the individual before using his/her portfolio for the mock review). This would make it more "real" than reviewing a set of criteria/guidelines and talking through what one would look for as evidence in an abstract way.

Action Items/Homework Assignments:

Work group members on the call assigned themselves "homework" for the next call.

Carol – review the review criteria and process used by the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis,

University of Illinois-Chicago and Michigan State University (including MSU's outreach scholarship measurements).

Cathy – will review the criteria and process used by Portland State University and MedEdPortal.

Rebecca – will review the criteria and process used by UNC School of Public Health, and University of Colorado School of Medicine.

Each person will send a brief summary of what they found in MS Word format to work group chair Cathy by **January 5**, who will pull together and send out for the group to discuss on the next call. On that call, the group will discuss what to take from these criteria for presentation and discussion at the February meeting.

Next Call:

January 12 from 2 -3:30 PM EST

To access the call, please dial 1-800-791-2345, Code: 72854