

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CHARRETTE REVIEWER COMMENTS & CONCERNS

We were encouraged and challenged by the number and caliber of applications we received for the May 2008 charrette – over 100 for the 20 available slots. Each application was assessed by three reviewers, with geographic and institutional diversity considered in the final selections. Below please find a summary of the reviewer comments for those applications that were not selected.

Most frequent reviewer comments & concerns:

- **Did not indicate a goal of campus-wide faculty development.** Applications with very broad goals that couldn't tie those goals to their participation in the charrette were not competitive. For example, becoming a more community-engaged institution is a broad goal that while important is not specific to attending the charrette. Similarly, applications that had specific goals not central to the charrette's purpose were not competitive. For example, changing promotion and tenure policies but not linking that to a campus-wide faculty development effort.
- **Did not have institution-wide focus.** One of the criteria of the charrette is that the team work on institution-wide faculty development – not focus on one school, college, or department. Applications that focused on only one particular school, college, or department, as articulated in their goals and outcomes and/or in their team composition, were not competitive.
- **Did not state goals and outcomes.** Applications that did not clearly articulate goals for attending the charrette and the institutional outcomes they were hoping to achieve were not viewed as competitive.
- **Did not have a strong team in place.** The team composition in some applications raised reviewer concerns about their ability to implement campus-wide faculty development (e.g., team members all from one department, school or college). In some cases, teams did not include the required community-engaged faculty member.
- **Did not demonstrate strong institutional support.** Letters of support provide an opportunity for applicants to demonstrate strong institutional support and make points not contained in other parts of the application. Several types of letters raised concerns among reviewers: those that made no specific commitments to support the team once they returned from the charrette, those that did not mention how the charrette might advance institutional strategic priorities, and those that simply repeated verbatim text from the application narrative.
- **Did not answer essay questions and instead provided a laundry list of programs and activities.** Applications that gave extensive overviews of programs and activities but failed to directly answer the essay questions as instructed were not competitive.
- **Did not demonstrate an understanding of community-engaged scholarship.** Applications that spoke about community engagement or outreach, service-learning, or student engagement – and used community-engaged scholarship interchangeably with those terms – were not competitive.