



## Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative

Dear Collaborative members:

It has been my pleasure to serve as the chair of the Collaborative's Peer Review Workgroup. I am writing to acquaint you with the work of our group and to provide you with the context for the documents you are receiving. Our group initially discussed two related but separate review issues: first, processes and criteria for peer review of individual products of community-engaged scholarship (CES), and second, processes and criteria for reviewing the community-engaged scholar during review, promotion and tenure (RPT) decisions. We made a decision to focus on the RPT issue.

We chose to review existing RPT criteria and guidelines from universities, schools, and departments recognizing and valuing CES, as well as the Scholarship of Engagement National Review Board, a national entity that provides external reviews for community-engaged scholars in the promotion process, but is not typically used by candidates in the health sciences. The results of this scan will be sent to you by email for your information. As a result of this scan, we realized that few established criteria seem to get at the true spirit of engagement. We also reviewed the draft competencies for community-engaged faculty members developed by the Collaborative's Faculty Development Workgroup (and included in this packet with other materials from that Workgroup). The competencies came much closer to capturing the spirit of CES. We borrowed the best criteria and competencies from the documents we reviewed, and supplemented and revised them to attempt to tap what we felt to be the core qualities of the community-engaged scholar and the defining features of best practice in CES. Those draft criteria are included in this mailing.

In completing our scan and developing our draft criteria we came to understand the important relationship between criteria and appropriate documentation of meeting the criteria. When criteria are revised, the definition and prototypes of acceptable documentation must also be revised. Ultimately, this will likely lead to some recommendations for changes to or supplements to the standard promotion packet as the traditional dossier may not provide the appropriate evidence.

**During our time together in Nashville, we will be presenting our draft criteria for your feedback.** We will do this through an interactive exercise during which you will have the opportunity to use the criteria to perform a "mock review" by working with sections of a real dossier. We'd like to propose the following questions as you review the draft criteria and dossier material. [Note: the dossier material will either be included in your fed ex packet of meeting or materials, or distributed in Nashville]

- 1) Do the criteria capture the essence of CES?
- 2) Do the criteria capture the quality/rigor of the work as well as the significance of the work in terms meaningful to CES?
- 3) How easy or difficult is it to work with the criteria, and why?
- 4) What would you look for as evidence that each criteria has been met by the community-engaged scholar? (some ideas have been offered, but what else?)
- 5) Do you find such evidence in the traditional dossier materials provided?
- 6) How might the dossier be supplemented to better communicate this evidence?

Thank you for reviewing the enclosed material and giving it your thoughtful attention. I look forward to seeing you in Nashville.

Sincerely,

Cathy Jordan  
On behalf of the Peer Review Workgroup