

Collaborative Peer Review Workgroup
Teleconference Call #1: Oct. 6, 2005
Call Minutes

Workgroup members/Staff Present: **Lead: Cathy Jordan (Minnesota)**, Carol Savrin (Case Western), Jen Kauper-Brown (Staff), Sarena Seifer (Staff), Chris Hanssmann (Staff)

Workgroup members Not Present: Debbie Aloschen (Case Community Partner), Carol Christianson (Cincinnati), Barbara Clinton (Vanderbilt), Evelyn Crayton (Auburn), Doreen Harper (UMass), Paul Jugnickel (Auburn), Rebecca Leugers (Cincinnati), Judy Peters (Loma Linda), Arnold Strauss (Vanderbilt), Chris Turner (Colorado), Heather Ulrich (Colorado)

Topic 1: Review of the charge of the workgroup and what has already been done

Workgroup members briefly reviewed the charge of the workgroup and the topics of discussion at the workgroup meeting at the Collaborative's annual meeting in Nashville.

Topic 2: Identification and Discussion of Potential Workgroup Projects/Activities

On the call, participants reflected on current issues and challenges in peer review of community-engaged scholarship at their institutions and in their disciplines. Several ideas for workgroup action were discussed and are described below.

Establishing a network of external reviewers with expertise in community-engaged scholarship

There is a lack of general knowledge on most Review Promotion and Tenure (RPT) committees regarding community-engaged scholarship (CES). Thus, there is a need for senior level people who can serve as external peer reviewers for community-engaged faculty going up for tenure. The workgroup could work to develop a network of such senior level individuals to serve as external reviewers.

- Within the Collaborative, the workgroup can identify potential external reviewers in providing support to individual members in Collaborative schools going up for promotion. It would also be necessary for the workgroup to identify potential CES external reviewers from other institutions since there is only limited representation from each discipline in the Collaborative (e.g. only one Collaborative team is from Allied Health).
- This type of network could be initiated as a pilot project that initially would serve Collaborative members and later expand in scope to support community-engaged faculty at other institutions.

Peer Review of Scholarly Products other than Journal Articles

MedEdPORTAL, administered by the American Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC), is a recently launched web-based tool that is working to facilitate the exchange of peer reviewed educational materials. Faculty submit educational materials that then undergo a peer review similar to that used by academic journals. When a product is accepted, the AAMC Peer Reviewed Logo may be included on that product or in the faculty member's portfolio. It is hoped that this logo will be considered a special mark of distinction that will be recognized by many in the academic medicine community as an indicator of quality. In later phases, MedEdPORTAL will also serve as a central repository of educational materials such as PowerPoint presentations, assessment materials, virtual patient cases, and faculty development materials. More information about MedEdPORTAL is available at www.aamc.org/mededportal

Although MedEdPORTAL is currently focused on educational scholarship in medical schools, it may serve as a model for peer review of community-engaged scholarship that occurs outside of the traditional channels of journal article peer review and publication. If the Collaborative considers developing a similar peer review process for scholarly products other than journal articles, credibility will be a central issue. RPT committees are often resistant to change and may immediately rebuff "non-traditional" sources of review. How can we "borrow credibility" (e.g. MedEdPORTAL gains credibility by being part of AAMC)?

Development of Criteria/Templates of CES Review Criteria for RPT Committees

The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement reviews full portfolios of faculty seeking promotion based on community-engaged scholarship. Their criteria for assessing scholarly work are outlined on their webpage at <http://www.scholarshipofengagement.org/>.

The workgroup could borrow these and other examples as a starting point for creating criteria and templates for review. Connection to disciplinary and health professional school associations is vital for credibility. One of the flaws of the National Review Board is that it is *not* linked up with any discipline or other association. It will be important to craft these criteria as a “seal of approval” that will be recognized by both RPT committees and faculty in general. These templates/criteria could be “pilot-tested” at Collaborative schools.

Training for RPT Committees on Reviewing CES Faculty/Portfolios

RPT committees often lack training and orientation on serving as committee members generally, as well as specific information regarding the review of CES faculty/portfolios. The Collaborative could encourage more formal training orientations and the integration of education about review of CES in these trainings. It will be important to ensure that CES is part and parcel of any orientation and not considered “fringe.” The workgroup also discussed that there is a need to educate all faculty (not just those on RPT committees) about CES. RPT committee education may be a good mechanism for testing good ways for providing this type of education. It was noted that Diane Calleson is currently working on developing the next component of the Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit. This unit will be directed at RPT committees and may intersect with the work of this workgroup. The workgroup discussed the need to ask other Collaborative members about the whether their institutions offer orientation for new RPT committee members and if so, what the content and format of this training is.

Increasing Publication of CES in Top-Tier Peer Reviewed Journals

At the same time we are in the lengthy and continuous process of educating RPT committees to accept newer forms of peer review and products other than journal-published articles as scholarship, the call participants also discussed the need to work with faculty doing community-engaged scholarship to get their articles published in their discipline’s top-tier peer-reviewed journals. It was noted that it is important to also work *with* traditional systems to “make them work for us.”

The workgroup could work with journals to expand outlets for scholarship by encouraging the publication of CES theme issues and more CES articles. The workgroup could survey Collaborative team members about their institutions’/disciplines’ top 3 “journals that count” and target these with regard to CES.

Topic 3: Next Steps

There were only a small number of workgroup members on the call. Minutes from the call will be distributed on the workgroup listserv with a request for feedback from all workgroup members. A brief online survey will also be developed and distributed to collect additional ideas and comments from workgroup members.

► **Action:** Workgroup Chair Cathy Jordan and CCPH Staff will distribute call minutes to the workgroup listserv and develop an online survey to assist workgroup members in providing feedback.

► **Need Feedback:** Workgroup members should respond with comments and suggestions about the relevance and interest in the ideas and issues discussed on the call.

Next call: Wednesday, November 16th, 3:00-4:30 PM Eastern/12:00-1:30 PM Pacific