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The Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative is a project of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health funded by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education in the US Department of Education.
Session Format and Content

♦ Overview of the Collaborative
♦ Description and illustration of the self-assessment instrument
♦ Applications in practice
♦ Questions and discussion
♦ Resources
The Community Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative

♦ Ten health professional schools
♦ Seek to recognize and reward community engagement
♦ Campus teams of key stakeholders: faculty, community partners, academic administrators
♦ Collaborative funded by FIPSE, 2004-2007
♦ Project directed by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH)
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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 (CES) in participating schools

♦ Increase capacity for CES in health professional schools nationally
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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
Definitions and Frameworks

♦ Defining scholarship
  ● Ernest Boyer (1990, 1996)

♦ Assessing scholarship
  ● Charles Glassick et al. (1997)

♦ Changing systems of tenure and promotion

♦ Model of organizational change
  ● John Kotter (1996)
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; clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique that is rigorous and peer-reviewed

Community-engaged scholarship: involves faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with community
Goals of the Self-Assessment Instrument

♦ Assess the capacity of each team regarding community engagement and community-engaged scholarship
♦ Identify opportunities for action
♦ Serve as baseline for tracking progress throughout project
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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

♦ Two perspectives: team and institution

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
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
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
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
Dimension III: Student Support for and Involvement in Community Engagement

- Student awareness
- Student involvement
- Student incentives and rewards
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
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
## Example: Dimension II (Faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3 Faculty Leadership in Community Engagement</th>
<th>Level One</th>
<th>Level Two</th>
<th>Level Three</th>
<th>Level Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></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 □
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 Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 Definition of Community Engagement</th>
<th>Individual School</th>
<th>University as a Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Promotion of Community Engagement through the Mission</th>
<th>Individual School</th>
<th>University as a Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Education</th>
<th>Individual School</th>
<th>University as a Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4 Community Engagement as an Essential Component of Research</th>
<th>Individual School</th>
<th>University as a Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</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>
## Self-Assessment Raw Scores Example: Individual School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual School</th>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
<th>Dimension 3</th>
<th>Dimension 4</th>
<th>Dimension 5</th>
<th>Dimension 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</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>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</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>
</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>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Self-Assessment Raw Scores Example: University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University as a Whole</th>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
<th>Dimension 3</th>
<th>Dimension 4</th>
<th>Dimension 5</th>
<th>Dimension 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Answered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Aggregate Scores Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University 1</th>
<th>University 2</th>
<th>University 3</th>
<th>University 4</th>
<th>University 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Scores:
- University 1: 2.1
- University 2: 2.7
- University 3: 3.5
- University 4: 2.8
- University 5: 2.4

**University 1:** 2.9, 2.8
**University 2:** 3.2, 3.4
**University 3:** 2.8, 3.2
**University 4:** 2.8, 3.2
**University 5:** 2.3, 3
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
Questions/Discussion

♦ Questions about instruments
♦ Thoughts on application of self-assessment in your own school/institution
♦ Suggestions for improvements
♦ Other observations?
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
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