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Session Format and Content

♦ Goals of new self-assessment method
♦ Description of the six dimensions
♦ Summary instruments
♦ Applications/questions
♦ Website and RPT analyses
♦ Resources

- Diverse group of ten health professional schools
- Seek to recognize and reward community engagement as central to role of faculty members at own institutions and nationally
- Campus teams reflect key stakeholders
  - Community partners, provost representatives, deans, department chairs, promotion and tenure committees, faculty members
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Collaborative Schools

- Auburn University Harrison School of Pharmacy
- Case Western University School of Nursing
- Indiana University School of Dentistry
- Loma Linda University School of Public Health
- University of Cincinnati College of Allied Health Sciences
- University of Colorado School of Pharmacy
- University of Massachusetts Worcester School of Nursing
- University of Minnesota Academic Health Center
- University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill School of Dentistry
- Vanderbilt University School of Medicine
Goals of the Collaborative

♦ Increase capacity for community-engaged scholarship in participating schools

♦ Increase capacity for community-engaged scholarship in health professional schools nationally
Definitions and Frameworks

♦ Ernest Boyer - defining scholarship
♦ Charles Glassick - assessing scholarship
♦ Robert Diamond - changing RPT systems
♦ John Kotter - changing organizations
Community engagement: application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities.

Scholarship: teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement; has clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique; is rigorous and peer-reviewed.

Community-engaged scholarship: involves faculty member in mutually beneficial partnership with community.
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Collaborative Objectives

♦ Increase capacity for CES in participating schools
  ● Assess each school’s capacity
  ● Increase knowledge and support for CES among administrators and faculty
  ● Align RPT policies and practices with CES
  ● Share experiences, expertise, lessons learned

♦ Increase capacity for CES in health professional schools nationally
  ● Assess capacity for CES within the associations
  ● Increase knowledge and support for CES among association staff, leadership, members
  ● Share experiences, expertise, lessons learned
Three Assessment Methods

- Institutional self-assessment
- Website analysis
- Analysis of review, promotion and tenure (RPT) policies
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Institutional Self-Assessment
Goals of the Self-Assessment Instrument

♦ Assess the present status and capacity of a unit regarding community engagement and community-engaged scholarship
♦ Build knowledge about present status
♦ Identify future opportunities for action
♦ Serve as baseline for tracking progress over time
Self-Assessment Instrument

- Draws upon similar self-assessment tools created by Andrew Furco and Barbara Holland
- Includes six dimensions with various elements within each dimension
- Four assessment levels to determine current stage of community engagement for each dimension and element
Completion of the Self-Assessment

- Two perspectives to examine differences and similarities between teams and institution
- Provost representatives completed independently
- Teams completed collectively, without Provost representative
- Established baseline for internal discussions
- Assign scores based on level; compute average and percentage scores
Self-Assessment: Six Dimensions

I: The Definition and Vision of Community Engagement
II: Faculty Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement
III: Student Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement
IV: Community Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement
V: Institutional Leadership and Support for Community Engagement
VI: Community-Engaged Scholarship
## Example: Dimension II (Faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level One</th>
<th>Level Two</th>
<th>Level Three</th>
<th>Level Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Faculty Leadership in Community Engagement</td>
<td>None of the most influential faculty members serve as leaders for advancing community engagement.</td>
<td>There are one or two influential faculty members who provide leadership to the community engagement effort.</td>
<td>Some influential faculty members provide leadership to the community engagement effort.</td>
<td>A highly respected, influential group of faculty members serve as the community engagement leaders and/or advocates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose the stage that characterizes your school or college:  
[ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] Unable to assess

Choose the stage that characterizes your university as a whole:  
[ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] Unable to assess
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Summaries of Data

Aggregate:
- For each dimension, average score of all teams (pale blue bars) and of all provosts’ representatives (dark blue bars)
- Aggregate of all 10 sites

By Dimension:
- Comparison of team and provosts’ representative scores
  - Team rating of the school (pale blue bars)
  - Provost’s representative rating University as a whole (dark blue bars)
Summaries By Team

- Detailed responses by team/provost’s representative for each indicator
- Summary of “raw” scores for both by level
- Adjusted average score by dimension
- Average score expressed as percentage
- Aggregate of average score by dimension for all teams with identities blinded
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Average Aggregate Scores by Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dimension I: Definition and Vision of Community Engagement

- Definition of community engagement
- Promotion of community engagement through mission
- Essential component of education, research and service
- Strategic planning for community engagement
- Alignment of community engagement with strategic goals and initiatives
- Applications of community engagement
Definition/Vision of Community Engagement
Dimension II: Faculty Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement

- Faculty awareness
- Faculty involvement
- Faculty leadership
- Community engaged faculty as institutional leaders
- Institutional support for faculty development
- Faculty development and incentives
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Faculty Support for Community Engagement
Dimension III: Student Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement

♦ Student awareness
♦ Student involvement
♦ Student incentives and rewards
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Student Support for Community Engagement

![Bar chart showing student support for community engagement with scores ranging from 2.7 to 4.4.](image)
Dimension IV: Community Support for and Involvement in Institutional Community Engagement

- Community recognition as “engaged campus”
- Nature/extent of partnerships
- Community access to institutional resources
- Community partner voice and leadership in the institution
- Community partner incentives and recognition
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Community Support for Engagement
Dimension V: Institutional Leadership and Support for Community Engagement

- Institutional commitment
- Administrative support
- Policy support
- Coordinating structures
- Staff support
- Faculty recruiting criteria
- Recognition during faculty review
- Evaluation
- Dissemination
Dimension VI: Community-Engaged Scholarship

♦ Context:
  ● Definition, perception of value, determination of scope of community impact

♦ Nature of appointments:
  ● Tenure-track, RPT policies, rank and seniority of scholars

♦ Scholarship support:
  ● Value of nature of scholarship, various products, range of acceptable funding sources

♦ RPT process:
  ● Training and orientation of committee, community partner participation
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Summary Instruments

♦ Individual teams:
  ● Self-assessment map illustrates responses of both institutional teams and provost representatives
  ● Self-assessment raw scores illustrate average score across the dimension and percentage score

♦ All teams:
  ● Aggregate scores
  ● Illustrate potential benchmark institutions
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### Self-Assessment Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual School</th>
<th>University as a Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Definition of Community Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Promotion of Community Engagement through the Mission</strong></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Education</strong></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Research</strong></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative

## Self-Assessment Raw Scores: Individual School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Answered</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Self-Assessment Raw Scores: University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Answered</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Score</strong></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Aggregate Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>University 1</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>University 2</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>University 3</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>University 4</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>University 5</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Preliminary Insights

- Provosts’ representatives and teams often had differing perspectives on level.
- In some cases could not assess the other due to lack of information/experience.
- Some expressed that process useful for team-building and enhancing knowledge.
- Provides basis for work of Collaborative.
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Benefits of Self-Assessment

- Team-building activity
- Understand capacity for community engagement
- Prepared teams for involvement in the Collaborative
- Complemented team planning document
- Initial identification of areas for action throughout project
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Analysis of Review, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Criteria
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Analysis of Review, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Criteria

♦ A goal of most Collaborative participants
  ● To make changes in RPT process to recognize community-engaged scholarship

♦ Know from other institutions that reward and recognition essential to support community-engaged scholarship

♦ Modified RPT criteria are clear statement of institutional commitment
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Why Is This Important?

- A goal of the Collaborative is to help institutions in the change process
- Kotter Step 1: Establish a sense of urgency
- Kotter Step 2: Form a powerful guiding coalition
- Kotter Steps 3/4: Create and communicate vision
- Know these steps are necessary from experiences of various institutions
Goals of RPT Analysis

♦ Assess school/university RPT guidelines against set of criteria established by the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions

♦ Monitor changes in school/university guidelines over time against consistent criteria

♦ Identify promising practices among members of the Collaborative

♦ Inform Collaborative team actions around RPT policy revisions
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Strategy for RPT Analysis

- Locate RPT policies for participant in Collaborative; use university policies as default
- Review policies specifically for terms and concepts relevant to work of the Collaborative
- Apply nine indicators derived from self-assessment metrics
- Assess recognition of community-engaged scholarship -- absent, some activity, potential role model
- Comparisons with 3 potential role models
Findings: RPT Analysis

- Potential role models for four indicators
- Some activity on another three indicators
- Absent on:
  - Recognition of funding from variety of sources
  - Mandatory training of committee members
- Clarity on community engagement, but not on community-engaged scholarship
Future Use of RPT Analysis

- Several of collaborative schools are engaged in revisions of RPT policies
- Expect to see evolution over next year
- Can also track indicators where there were no potential role models or evidence of activity
Resources for Role Models: Specific Schools/Institutions

- Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis <www.iupui.edu>
- Portland State University <www.oaa.pdx.edu>
- University of North Carolina School of Public Health <www.sph.unc.edu/faculty/appointments>
- University of North Carolina Department of Family Medicine <depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/UNC.pdf>
- University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine <sphcm.washington.edu/gateway/handbook/index.asp>
- University of Colorado School of Medicine <www.uchsc.edu/sm/sm/FacultyCriteria.doc>
Resources for Role Models: National Resources

- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) <www.ccph.info>
- CCPH <depts.washington.edu/ccph/scholarship.html #Examples>
- Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit <www.communityengagedscholarship.info>
- National Review Board on the Scholarship of Engagement <www.scholarshipofengagement.org>
- National Service-learning Clearinghouse <www.servicelearning.org>
- Campus Compact www.compact.org
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Website Analysis
Analysis of Institutional and School Websites

- Websites present opportunity for easy review of public information
- Would expect to see public representation of:
  - Mission/vision/values statements
  - Strategic plans/directions
  - RPT criteria and procedures
  - Descriptions of engagement activities
  - Examples of projects, centers, areas of effort
Why Is This Important?

♦ Goal of Collaborative is to facilitate information-sharing
♦ Identification of promising practices to build knowledge and facilitate learning
♦ Websites may be used in selection process by potential students, faculty, staff
♦ Demonstrates what is important to an institution to specific external groups and general public
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Strategy for Analysis

♦ Goal: To identify role model practices
♦ Method: Apply series of 23 indicators organized by six dimensions (from self-assessment)
♦ For each indicator, aggregate assessment of quantity and quality of accessible information
♦ Judged as absent, some activity, or potential role model
♦ Can track over time to see developments
Relevance to Institutions

- Importance at individual institution/school of using website as dissemination vehicle
- Teams need to determine action steps for making change locally
- Can compare with relevant peers/role models
- In order to monitor change, initial analysis is useful starting point
Results of Website Analyses

- Reviewed university and school website for each of 10 Collaborative schools
- Also reviewed four potential role models (CSUMB, PSU, Utah, Washington)
- On 20/23 indicators, observed potential role models or some activity -- provide exemplars and benchmarks for others
Future Use of Website Analysis

♦ Consideration of three indicators where there were no potential role models or evidence of activity
  ● Community partner leadership roles
  ● Formal statements of governance and policy-making boards
  ● Formal definition of community-engaged scholarship
Resources and Discussion
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Resources

- Collaborative website: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/healthcollab.html
- Community-Engaged Scholarship electronic discussion group: https://mailman1.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/comm-engagedscholarship
- Community-Engaged Scholarship Resources: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/scholarship.html
- Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit: http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info
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