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Executive Summary

Why this Report?
We seek to make tangible progress in furthering UCLA’s Strategic Priorities for Global and Local Engagement. The purpose of this report is to share why recognizing community-engaged scholarship matters for UCLA and how UCLA can move forward.

Based on national benchmarking and extensive consultation with UCLA College faculty, this report outlines the steps needed to address the evaluation of engaged scholarship. We define engaged scholarship, share models and practices from peer R1 universities for evaluating that scholarship, foreground faculty voices, and provide recommendations for integrating standards for engaged scholarship in academic personnel review.

Specific Problem and Opportunity
Community-engaged scholarship is an important way to fulfill the public mission of the university and facilitate social innovation. Yet, as more faculty have embraced community engagement in their research and teaching, university cultures and structures for evaluation have not changed, particularly in R1 universities, creating impediments and disincentives for community-engaged scholarly work.

At UCLA, faculty report that the academic review process discourages community-engaged scholarship by not recognizing the distinctive characteristics of such work. UCLA’s recognition of excellence in community-engaged scholarship will allow the campus to develop more transformative partnerships and leverage additional resources as funders are increasingly asking universities for evidence of commitment to engaged scholarship (Ozer, 2021; London, 2021). Recognizing and establishing review criteria for community-engaged scholarship in the research and teaching categories of review will unleash the faculty’s potential for innovation and creativity in their research to address urgent challenges.

Peer Practices, Models, and Faculty Voices
UC Berkeley is the first campus in the UC system to recognize community-engaged scholarship in academic personnel review in the spring of 2021. Other UC campuses are also making strides towards recognizing engaged scholarship. The University of Minnesota, University of North Carolina, and Syracuse University have been leaders in university-level policy recognition of engaged scholarship. Other universities, discussed in the report, have made strides at the school and divisional levels.

Three models have emerged among peer institutions: “Continuum of Scholarship,” “Opt-in Supplemental Review,” and “Decentralized Criteria within an Institutional Framework.” They all recognize community-engaged scholarship in academic personnel review and provide criteria for
appropriate evaluation of engaged scholarly work. All normalize and recognize the legitimacy of engaged scholarship as *scholarly work*. They vary in how faculty members navigate the review process, whether as a continuum within which they situate themselves, an opt-in supplementary review option, or through the application of articulated criteria established at the department/divisional level embedded within the standard review process.

**Recommendations**

The Center for Community Engagement recommends that UCLA adopt a combination of the “Continuum of Scholarship” model and the “Decentralized Criteria within an Institutional Framework.” The former unequivocally recognizes that diverse types of scholarship count, and the latter would allow UCLA’s diverse schools and divisions to articulate criteria relevant to their fields within the commitment to engaged scholarship enacted by the Academic Senate.

There are next steps we recommend for consideration (suggested responsible units noted in parentheses):

**University-level policy and practices:**

1. **Broadly disseminate this report to UCLA faculty** (Academic Senate, Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Council on Academic Personnel, Deans, Center for Community Engagement)

2. **Appoint a Committee on Community-Engaged Scholarship to guide the establishment of Academic Senate policy and guidelines for reviewing community-engaged scholarship** (Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Academic Senate). This committee would be charged with:
   a. Review and adopt the UC Berkeley statement recognizing engaged scholarship and guidelines for review, or craft a variation thereof or a newly developed statement particularly suited to UCLA (Academic Senate)
   b. Institute an annual workshop for new Council on Academic Personnel members to familiarize them with the principles and practices of engaged scholarship, as well as criteria for review of excellence and impact (Council on Academic Personnel, with support from Center for Community Engagement)

**Division/School-level policy and practices:**

1. **Convene information sessions across each school and division** to both answer questions and to gather further input to guide the establishment of Academic Senate policy and guidelines for reviewing community-engaged scholarship (Deans, committee to be appointed by Academic Senate/Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, with support from the Center for Community Engagement)

2. **Appoint a Committee of Engaged Scholars within each school/division** to formulate appropriate criteria for evaluating excellence and impact of community-engaged scholarship in research and teaching (Deans)
3. Encourage all UCLA community-engaged scholars to utilize UCLA Collaboratory to record and track their record of public-facing and community-engaged work as part of developing their dossiers of community-engaged scholarship (Deans, with orientation, training and support to faculty provided by the Center for Community Engagement)

Department-level policy and practices:
1. Convene working groups to formulate review criteria appropriate to specific departmental-level review of community-engaged scholarship (Department chairs, supported by the Deans and Center for Community Engagement)
2. Assign mentors to pre-tenure community-engaged scholars (Department chairs)
Recognizing Community-Engaged Scholarship in Academic Personnel Review

The Context of this Report--Advancing UCLA’s Strategic Priorities for Global and Local Engagement

In the UCLA Strategic Priorities for Global and Local Engagement, the Center for Community Engagement was tasked with advancing the action item to recognize community-engaged scholarship in the academic personnel review process. The purpose of this report is to share why recognizing community-engaged scholarship matters for UCLA and how UCLA can move forward. In AY 2020-2021, we gathered best practices and models from peer institutions, surveyed a range of disciplinary associations, and reached out to leaders in the field of community engagement in higher education. We also interviewed over 50 UCLA faculty across a range of departments within the four divisions of the College to learn how they have integrated community-engagement within their research and/or teaching, and how they have navigated the academic review process in relation to their community-engaged scholarly activities.¹ Our faculty interviewees contributed ideas for next steps. A more detailed description of our methodology over the past year can be found in Appendix 1.

Fulfilling the Public Mission of UCLA at this Critical Moment

The COVID-19 pandemic, social inequality, racial injustice, challenges to democracy, and ecological crises are critical issues that demand the involvement and leadership from higher education. In response to the “ivory tower critique” that higher education is out of touch with contemporary challenges, universities have increasingly begun to assert their relevance and commitment through community engagement (Dempsey, 2010). Community-engaged scholarship is an important way to fulfill the public mission of the university as well as facilitate social innovation (Beaulieu, Breton & Brouselle, 2018; Olsson et al., 2017; Vogelgesang et al. 2006). However, the literature shows that for R1 universities, the culture, rewards system and other institutional structures and procedures negatively impact the careers of community-engaged researchers (Ozer, 2021; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Harkavy & Hartley, 2012; Sandmann et al., 2008; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). There have been shifts in recent years in the way that faculty actively seek community-engaged scholarly activity and conceptualize their community-engaged work as scholarship through their research and teaching, and not as a function of

¹ We recognize that there are faculty in every school that also integrate community-engagement in their research and/or teaching. Indeed, community-engagement is built into the very fabric of multiple programs in the professional schools. We started with interviewing faculty in the College since they carry the greatest responsibility for the undergraduate curriculum.
service. Often there are interactions across these buckets concurrently and over time. For example, in many fields that utilize field-based research methods, scholars are only successful in their research due to previously undervalued “engagement” that may look like “service” -- volunteering and even governance roles. Similarly, students are actively seeking community-engaged learning opportunities, and both public and private funders are asking for broader societal impacts (Blanchard & Furco, 2021).

Community-engaged scholarship intersects with equity, diversity, and inclusion in a critically important way. Women and faculty of color are more likely to enter academia with an interest in connecting their scholarship with societal issues as well as pursuing community-engaged scholarship or teaching (Miller et al. 2018). Tenure and promotion policies that recognize the legitimacy of community-engaged scholarship and provide appropriate strategies to evaluate the scholarly output and impact of this work can contribute to greater retention and advancement of women and people of color in the faculty ranks (Antonio, 2002; Miller et al. 2018).

The question of how to treat community-engaged research and teaching as scholarly activities and not as service in tenure and promotion has been the focus of discussion at UCLA for years. When UCLA was reviewed in 2015 for “reclassification” by the Carnegie Foundation’s Elective Classification for Community Engagement, the external reviewers noted that the university would need to show progress, as peers have done, on valuing community engagement in tenure and promotion policies to continue to be recognized in the 2025 cycle of this sought-after elective classification. Both the 2017 UCLA Civic Engagement Task Force Report and 2020 UCLA’s Global and Local Engagement Strategic Priorities included recommendations to specifically modify tenure and promotion policies to address issues related to community-engaged scholarship.

UCLA lags behind its peers nationally, as we will discuss further in the report below. Leading R1 universities have implemented a range of strategies for formally recognizing community-engaged scholarship in their review processes for tenure and promotion. This past academic year, UC Berkeley became the first UC campus to recognize community-engaged scholarship in its academic personnel review process.

**Defining Engaged Scholarship**

The Carnegie Foundation defines community engagement as “the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and

---

2There are currently 361 U.S. colleges and universities with the elective Community Engagement Classification, including UCLA, UC Davis and UC Merced (https://www.brown.edu/swearer/carnegie)
reciprocity” (Carnegie Classification Framework, 2020). We recognize that different fields have different terminology for this kind of work. There is also a continuum of activities, from outreach to public engagement, public scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship.

In our survey of the state of the field and in our conversations with faculty, we intentionally had a broad and open view to learn how faculty understood engagement, situated their work, and navigated their work in relation to academic personnel review. To convey this broad and open understanding, we use the term “engaged scholarship” throughout this report (following Blanchard & Furco, 2021). In our review of the literature and survey of models and best practices, we also focused on engaged scholarship, or as noted by the Carnegie Classification framework, “the teaching, learning, and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration (Carnegie Classification Framework, 2020).

Engaged scholarship builds on a long history and varied set of theories and philosophies of higher education, such as social empowerment, critical theory and pedagogy, democratic engagement, and participatory action research, among others (Freire, 1970; Dewey, 1916; Lewin, 1946; Boyer, 1996 in Blanchard & Furco, 2021). Despite the varied terminology one encounters--civically-engaged scholarship, community-engaged scholarship, publicly-engaged scholarship, and critically-engaged scholarship--they share a range of principles and practices, including participatory practices, reciprocity, co-construction, democratic practices, shared authority, and shared resources (see Figure 1) (Beaulieu, Breton & Brouselle, 2018). Blanchard and Furco (2021) note, “for the purposes of conducting scholarly work, engagement, in its strongest and most authentic form, is built on reciprocal, mutually beneficial relationships between members within and outside of the academy. In this form of engagement, there is shared authority and a co-creation of goals and outcomes” (p. 22). Within the framework of engaged scholarship, faculty co-produce knowledge(s) with partners and are “actors” of change with other stakeholders (Beaulieu, Breton & Brouselle, 2018). This epistemological shift calls attention to competing ideas of how knowledge is constructed, what is viewed as legitimate knowledge in higher education, and the possibilities for new and transformative forms of knowledge (Sandmann et al., 2008).

3 We will explore the texture of community-engaged research and teaching later in the report in a section dedicated to faculty conversations.
While mission statements of higher education institutions have long been framed in terms of providing for the public good or preparing students as citizens in a democracy, the movement towards engaged scholarship seeks to realize the rhetoric of mission language in immediate and tangible ways in relation to particular stakeholders outside of academia. Yet even as more faculty have embraced engagement in their research and teaching, university cultures and structures for evaluation have not changed, particularly in R1 universities, creating impediments and disincentives for engaged scholarly work. Faculty members “express frustration that promotion and tenure systems have not caught up with institutional priorities or changes in the dynamic nature of scholarship or the aspirations of the emerging guard of academic citizens” (O’Meara et al., 2015, para. 1). As O’Meara et al. (2015) note, it is challenging to practice reciprocal, sustained engagement with partners when there are no incentives or clear policies for recognizing this work. The tenure and promotion policies of research universities have not caught up with calls for publicly engaged scholarship, and thus serve as a critical impediment for faculty to practice engagement (Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara, 2002; Post et al. 2016).

How Engaged Scholarship has been Incorporated in Academic Personnel Review: Models and Peer Practices

Three approaches have emerged among peer institutions. They all recognize engaged scholarship in academic personnel review and provide criteria for appropriate evaluation of engaged scholarly work. All approaches normalize and recognize the legitimacy of engaged scholarship as scholarly work. They vary in how an individual faculty member enters the review process, whether as an opt-in option that supplements or parallels traditional review, or as a set or criteria...
that have been embedded within the standard review process. With the singular exception of Syracuse University, we found no peer R1 university that expects all faculty to demonstrate public or community engagement as part of the academic personnel review. The dominant framework is to value and recognize engaged scholarship for those faculty who choose to develop this work as part of their record of scholarly output and achievement.

The first model is the **Continuum of Scholarship Model** (Figure 2). This model was first described in Imagining America’s groundbreaking report on tenure policy in the engaged institution (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). The principal value in this model is the way that it normalizes engaged scholarship within a broad range of scholarly interest and output along a continuum. In this model, a faculty member who is doing work that integrates engaged scholarship is recognized as equally legitimate to more traditional scholarship. Additionally, this model provides for the multiple ways that engagement might find its way into a faculty member’s research or teaching or both. The review process then recognizes each of these forms of scholarship and provides for their consideration during academic personnel review. The Continuum of Scholarship model requires institutional adoption, and then provides individual faculty members the agency to locate themselves along the continuum.

**Figure 2. Continuum of Scholarship Model**

The second model (Figure 3) is an **Opt-in Supplemental Review**. In this model, the individual faculty member always undergoes a standard review, and has the option of adding a supplemental review of what they identify as their engaged research and/or teaching. This approach recognizes that engaged scholarship is integrated into the research and teaching output of the faculty member and needs attention by peer reviewers who are familiar with the standards and criteria for excellence; however, this approach places that review outside of the standard review.
The third model (see Figure 4) is built on **Decentralized Criteria within an Institutional Framework**. This can happen when the institution itself adopts a broad policy that recognizes engaged scholarship and then delegates the task of defining the parameters and characteristics of engaged scholarship to each constituent school or division. Then, each department is tasked to articulate a framework of standards and criteria for evaluating engaged scholarship for its academic personnel review. In this model, engaged scholarship is clearly recognized institutionally, while allowing the specific fields to define the particular characteristics of engaged work. Engaged scholarship is treated as part of the research and teaching output as appropriate to a faculty member’s field. An engaged scholar coming up for review in a particular department would know exactly what the criteria will be for the evaluation of their work within that department, at the dean’s level, and at the academic senate level.

**Figure 4. Decentralized Criteria within an Institutional Framework**
Peer Practices

The models presented here have been adopted and adapted by a number of leading R1 universities including University of Minnesota, University of Wisconsin, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, and Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI).

The University of Minnesota formally adopted a university-wide definition and framework for public engagement in 2005 (Blanchard & Furco, 2021). After the University of Minnesota received the Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement classification in 2006, its faculty senate revised and adopted tenure and promotion guidelines to include support for community-engaged scholarship and teaching, including an opt-in, supplemental review model through either a holistic, teaching or scholarship review. Institutionally, there is currently engagement at the department and college levels in clarifying definitions, standards, and expectations around engagement.

Similarly, the University of Wisconsin’s Social Science Division also utilizes an opt-in supplemental review model. Faculty have the option to choose an integrated path across the domains of research, teaching, and service. IUPUI has recognized engaged scholarship and provides training to the members of its academic personnel council to inform evaluators of what engaged scholarship is and how to evaluate the quality and impact of such work.4

The University of North Carolina, Greensboro, formally recognized engaged scholarship at the academic senate level, reflecting the decentralized criteria within an institutional framework model. As a part of this recognition, the university shared terms and definitions related to community engagement.5 They also provided resources related to measuring the impact of engaged scholarship and the spectrum of scholarly products.6 Then at the division and departmental levels, all units were asked to define the characteristics of engaged research, teaching, and service in the context of their unit’s discipline or area(s) (note: forthcoming is an evaluative publication of their experience).

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill has a long history of considering engaged scholarship. Although it does not have a formal campus-wide policy, particular schools and departments have adopted review policies addressing community-engaged scholarship (Blanchard & Furco, 2021).

---

4 Personal conversation with John Saltmarsh (Bemmy Maharamli), February 2021
In terms of private R1 universities, Syracuse University formally implemented the continuum of scholarship model to be inclusive of the epistemological range of engaged scholarship approaches and beyond (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). The University of Richmond is currently in the process of exploring how to recognize engaged scholarship, emphasizing links to equity, diversity, inclusion to valuing engaged scholarship efforts. Duke and Emory are at nascent stages of exploring faculty review policies as part of their overall commitment to supporting community-engaged work.

**Perspectives from Disciplinary Associations**

The guidance that disciplinary associations offer with regard to tenure and promotion and engaged scholarship can inform departmental practices as well as efforts to change policy at the institutional level (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). To better understand how disciplinary associations are approaching public engagement and the relationship to tenure and promotion policies, we undertook a review of select disciplinary associations’ guidance within the Humanities and Social Sciences. Thus far, we found no disciplinary associations in the Life and Physical Sciences that offer guidance on engaged scholarship.

The American Historical Association’s report on tenure, promotion and the publicly engaged academic historian (updated 2017) suggests that tenure and promotion guidelines should align with institutional values and mission. They advise that if a department hires an engaged scholar, they should honor good work by ensuring that departmental guidelines reward publicly engaged scholarship. They also note that departments should value engagement efforts at all stages of a scholar’s career.

The Modern Languages Association (MLA), the largest association for the humanities, has a Valuing Public Humanities Committee that is currently developing guidelines for how to consider public scholarship. This guidance is expected to be finalized by 2022. In 2007, the MLA’s report on evaluating scholarship for tenure and promotion does have limited references to engaged scholarship. Like AHA, MLA recommends aligning guidelines with institutional values and mission. The MLA report cites Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), and how scholarship can address society’s challenges. It acknowledges the already too many demands placed on faculty and suggests that service should overlap and involve the other elements.

Finally, the American Anthropological Association issued a report (2017) that offered guidelines for tenure and promotion review of public scholarship in anthropology. In this report, AAA acknowledged growing demand for public scholarship and the need to go beyond established norms of “impact.” They defined public scholarship as, “that which is in dialogue with non-academic and academic audiences and informed by anthropological scholarship and knowledge”
This report encouraged more communication of knowledge in digital and public ways and recommended articulating what counts for excellence.

Although disciplinary associations in the humanities and social sciences are still at the early stages of recognizing engaged scholarship and establishing criteria for evaluating such scholarly work, these examples noted above suggest that disciplinary associations will play a key role in establishing definitions and standards for their fields.

**Engaged Scholarship across the UC System**

In comparison to the other UC campuses, UCLA has an advanced state of infrastructure to support engaged scholarship. As evidence, UCLA has received the elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification twice—in the inaugural classification of 2007 and then again in 2015. Since the early 2000s, UCLA has had a Center for Community Engagement that serves as the campus hub for advancing community-engaged teaching, learning, and research. The campus also has a campus-wide community-engaged course designation, used to identify such courses in nearly forty departments across campus. More than twenty-five majors and minors build community-engaged courses into their curricular requirements and electives. UCLA has also been distinguished among its peers for creating a minor, initially in Civic Engagement (2006) and later revised to become the current Community Engagement and Social Change minor (2018). In 2020, UCLA identified global and local engagement as one of four campus strategic priorities. In spring quarter of 2021, the Center for Community Engagement launched an Affiliated Faculty Network, quickly attracting over 100 faculty members across all divisions of the College and other Schools. In 2021, The Center for Community Engagement launched UCLA Collaboratory, an innovative software platform that helps higher education institutions better understand, highlight, and evaluate community engagement. Collaboratory has the potential to serve as an important tool for UCLA across levels of the institution—from deans, chairs, and individual faculty—to understand, make legible, and evaluate engaged scholarship. The Center for Community Engagement has started to provide trainings and workshops on how to use Collaboratory, whether as an individual scholar or at the departmental level.

---

7 The other UC’s that have received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification are UC Davis and UC Merced: [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1bdX3pEIM68m-K40pDVcTce2470kDzDAZtFYzczebSEFk/edit#gid=412951418](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1bdX3pEIM68m-K40pDVcTce2470kDzDAZtFYzczebSEFk/edit#gid=412951418)
8 Following the recommendations of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Service-Learning (1999), UCLA established the Center for Experiential and Service-Learning in 2001, renamed the Center for Community Learning in 2003, and renamed it the Center for Community Engagement in 2020.
9 The Undergraduate Council adopted the “service-learning” (SL) course framework in 2008, revised to become the “community-engaged” (XP) course framework in 2020.
10 The actual number of UCLA faculty who do engaged research and teaching is not yet known, though we estimate a number many times bigger as we continue to reach out to and work with more units across the university.
11 Collaboratory website: [https://cecollaboratory.com/](https://cecollaboratory.com/); which hosts UCLA Collaboratory: [https://he.cecollaboratory.com/ucla](https://he.cecollaboratory.com/ucla)
In the spring of 2021, UC Berkeley, was the first campus in the UC system to recognize community-engaged scholarship in academic personnel review. UC Berkeley’s Vice Provost for the Faculty posted the following guidelines:

Community-Engaged Research. Assessment of records that include community-engaged research (e.g., partnerships with non-academic entities that work in the public interests) can sometimes be challenging to assess in an academic context. Berkeley has issued guidelines for assessing community-engaged research to assist faculty members, chairs, and others involved in the review process (UC Berkeley guidelines are provided in Appendix II).

UC Berkeley’s journey to recognizing engaged scholarship included the precedents of faculty evaluation criteria changes around contributions to equity and diversity as well as creative activity in the arts. These institutional changes were driven by mid-career faculty who had strong relationships with campus leaders, coupled with an institutional challenge grant and feedback from the foundation questioning whether the university was “committed to making changes to faculty evaluation” (Ozer, 2021).

In May 2020, the UC Davis Provost’s Work Group produced a report with recommendations on public scholarship and engagement. UC Davis created a new leadership position for a Vice Provost for Public Scholarship and Engagement. This Vice Provost leads university-wide efforts to recognize public scholarship in research, teaching, and creative practice, also articulating strong links to EDI and epistemic justice. UC Davis is currently in the process of drafting language on public scholarship and engagement for merit review, promotion, and tenure.

UC Santa Cruz is launching a new campus center to give greater visibility to the community-engaged work of faculty, staff, and students and to support sustained community partnerships (London, 2021). Like UC Berkeley, UC Santa Cruz also recently received an institutional challenge grant around engaged scholarship, specifically youth leadership through engaged research. The grant has provided the impetus for the campus to develop ethics guidelines for community-based research and university-wide standards for engaged scholarship with feedback from partners like United Way (Soergel, 2021). UC Santa Barbara is in the early stages of trying to better understand the engaged scholarship landscape on its campus.

UCLA’s Center for Community Engagement recently played a leadership role nationally to convene a working group among R1 university academic administrators on advancing tenure and promotion policies for engaged scholarship. Four UC campuses joined this group (UCB, UCD, UCSB, UCSC). Center for Community Engagement staff, along with the UC Davis Vice Provost, Michael Rios, have initiated a new community engagement network of academic
administrators and engaged faculty across all UC campuses. In May 2021, UC Davis’ Office of Public Scholarship and Engagement, convened a first meeting of a UC Community Engagement Network. At this meeting representatives from each campus discussed successes, challenges, and explored opportunities to work with one another on the UC system level. Rios has subsequently surveyed campus stakeholders across the UC system to collect input to guide the next steps of this network, including strategies to work at each campus level to raise the profile for engaged scholarship at the system level.

**UCLA College Faculty Conversations**

The Center for Community Engagement conducted approximately 50 one-on-one conversations with faculty members across ranks and departments in the UCLA College during AY 2020-21. The picture that emerged from these conversations is that there are substantial numbers of UCLA faculty for whom engaged scholarship is a central part of their research and teaching, and yet they largely feel unsupported by their departments and the university for work that directly fulfills the public mission of the university.

**UCLA Faculty Perspectives on Engaged Scholarship**

UCLA Senate faculty expressed various perspectives on engaged scholarship. Some faculty defined engagement as sharing their work with the public through media, print, social media, or public lecture series and panels. Others saw engagement more as outreach or pipeline programs with K-12 schools or underserved K-12 or community college students, meeting the need to bring greater diversity to their fields.

Faculty practice community-engaged scholarship in multiple ways over the course of their career and sometimes in multiple, overlapping ways at the same time. For example, some initially focused more on public engagement and then later moved into more engaged, stakeholder-driven, long-term relationships with a partner. Other faculty reported intentionally practicing multiple forms of engagement at the same time, with one faculty member describing how three facets--community engagement, public partnership, and working within a framework of social justice--fit within a broad rubric of their action-oriented engaged scholarship.

For a significant number of faculty interviewed, engaged scholarship is characterized by the principles of accountability, reciprocity, activist engagement, decolonizing practices, redressing inequalities, and epistemic justice. Their work is intentionally non-extractive, in the sense that they want to avoid relationships where they “take” from their community partners and stakeholders without also contributing to capacity-building and community wellbeing. One faculty member explained:
Engagement means ultimately accountability that a scholar has to the communities they study. That accountability should be intimate, reciprocal, and compassionate. Grandparents would say, “Accountability that is intergenerational.” You are a public intellectual, not an ivory tower scholar.

Some faculty conveyed that their engaged work is closely associated with public scholarship and the “public circle of knowledge making,” including stakeholder-driven work to inform policy, planning, and “grounding science with real world planning.” Some faculty described their engaged scholarship as driven by wanting to engage students with real world issues and help them find career paths through public-facing curricula (undergraduate and graduate programs). Figure 5 conveys the keywords used by UCLA faculty to convey their understanding of engaged scholarship.

Figure 5. UCLA Faculty Meanings of Engaged Scholarship

Faculty also expressed links between engaged scholarship and equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI). They lamented the lack of diversity at UCLA at many levels, both for faculty and students. Some faculty expressed that the Black Lives Matter movement and the racial unrest in the country created the recognition that change is desperately needed. We saw ample evidence in the literature and heard from interviewees that faculty who identify as engaged scholars skew
along gender and racial lines. Some faculty expressed that more diverse forms of knowledge, including that of non-academic peers, need to be more equitably and inclusively recognized. Many faculty also made specific connections between recognizing engaged scholarship in the review process and the part of the UCLA academic review process that recognizes contributions to EDI (UCLA CALL, Appendix 41).

The faculty that we interviewed conveyed multiple concerns about their perceived lack of university support for engaged scholarship, in particular: 1) the impact that lack of recognition for engaged scholarship and the absence of criteria for review have for their tenure and promotion review, and 2) support for engaged scholarship and pedagogy. They identified critical issues for the review of engaged scholarship, including evaluating excellence and impact.

Lack of Recognition and Absence of Review Criteria for Engaged Scholarship Impact Faculty Across the Ranks

A recurring theme heard from faculty across all divisions of the College was that the current review process does not effectively recognize their engaged scholarship within the research and teaching categories. Some faculty explained that they have not attempted to incorporate their engaged scholarship in their review because they have assumed it would not count. Other faculty noted a soft “appreciation” for community engagement; “it’s icing on the cake, but it’s not the cake.” Some faculty who have received the Chancellor’s Award for Community-Engaged Scholars have noted the irony of receiving a $10,000 award and support to develop new community-engaged research courses for undergraduates while this very work is not necessarily valued within their tenure and promotion review. Generally, faculty convey that the university’s message is that engaged scholarship is not valued as core work. One could get promoted with “zero engagement.” In the experience of some faculty, engaged work was even frowned upon or viewed with skepticism. A faculty member described that if they “had just focused on the science they would be doing better [... and] would have accelerated more up the ranks.” This individual noted the “significant personal costs to their professional standing, but they were ok with it [because] it was the right thing to do.” Multiple faculty shared that their engaged scholarship “comes at a cost” or they “pay a price.” In general, all faculty are concerned with how the Academic Senate’s Council on Academic Personnel will interpret their work, sharing that, “if they don’t understand, it doesn’t count.” There is also a sense that this is changing, although slowly. Where this type of scholarship used to be dismissed, there is now more acceptance. However, this acceptance is muddled by a lack of clear standards on how to evaluate engaged scholarship.

While in July 2021, there was recognition of faculty service in promoting equity and career advancement, particularly as it relates to the disproportionate service burden that women faculty and faculty of color bear, this still does not remedy challenges associated with recognizing engaged research and teaching.
Faculty members described how this discouragement and lack of recognition for engaged scholarship exists pre-tenure and extends past the point when tenure is achieved. Faculty expressed that they are “strongly discouraged” [to do engaged scholarship] pre-tenure, conveying the stress and pressure to not “do anything unusual.” If you are a junior scholar, “maybe do a little bit, but you should spend your time on doing traditional things pre-tenure.” Pre-tenure, engaged scholarship is seen as extra, with a faculty member expressing, “at the end of the day if the book is not written, they won’t get tenure.” Under the current system, it is an act of “self-preservation” to not do engaged scholarship, particularly if junior scholars are not sure how their interest to integrate engagement in their research and teaching will be viewed by the senior colleagues in their department. The message is to “do less service-scholarship and teaching to advance more quickly up the ladder.” Some faculty reported getting mentored to “lay off” or “admonished” if they are doing too much. This highly risk averse environment is in direct tension with the motivations that drew junior faculty to work in their fields in the first place. As a result, junior faculty most often believe they cannot do this type of scholarship until after they are tenured.

Faculty also expressed the negative impacts of the current conditions for those who are tenured. One senior faculty member shared how public facing work is “devalued by the university,” sharing how they recently decided to do more public-facing work during the COVID-19 pandemic, but that their next promotion would “take a hit.” Even at the senior ranks, “they live a double life.” Another faculty member expressed their perception that women and faculty of color that identify as engaged scholars often struggle to move up the ranks post-tenure. On the other hand, some faculty reported that they felt that their own departments welcomed and supported their engaged scholarship, but they were still concerned about how this work is perceived at the level of the Council of Academic Personnel.

One of the critical issues expressed by engaged scholars among the UCLA faculty is that community engagement gets shunted to the “service” bucket in academic personnel review. This is problematic for three reasons. For engaged scholars, community engagement is at the core of the way they do their research and/or teaching. An academic culture and review process that describes engagement as “service” undervalues the significance of the work in relation to research and teaching. Engaged scholars view engagement as integrated across research, teaching, and service. It all ties together--the purpose and processes of their work.

This lack of recognition for how engagement is integrated into research and/or teaching gives many faculty the sense that they are working to meet the expectations for traditional scholarship from their department and working to advance their vision of engaged scholarship that motivates their work, with only the former counting in their tenure or promotion review. They described that this dichotomy can contribute to the experience of doing two things poorly, versus doing one integrated thing really well. One faculty member described “constantly having to do extra.”
Another described their engaged scholarship as an “extra credit assignment,” except that they are not getting even basic credit.

We suspect that the issues related to recognition of engaged scholarship reflect deeper epistemological divides within academia generally and within individual fields. Multiple faculty members noted that engaged scholarship reflects a different epistemology around how knowledge is produced, who can produce it, who can evaluate it, what knowledge is legitimate, the implicit hierarchies of knowledge(s), and the inherent complexities and politics that accompanies all these issues. These are issues that should be discussed and debated to make room for emerging paradigms of scholarship.

Issues in the Review of Engaged Scholarship

Faculty note that since engaged scholarship is based on developing and maintaining relationships with non-academic partners, the time it takes to practice engaged scholarship makes it more challenging than solitary academic work. A faculty member shared that for a recent journal article, they could have sole-authored the piece, but chose to co-write the work instead with a community partner, asserting, “it should count just as much as a single-authored article. Community scholarship takes more work and accountability.” It takes time to develop and manage relationships as well as to “fit” partnership work within UCLA’s quarterly academic schedule. The process of engaged scholarship takes longer, and that matters in the context of fixed timetables for reviews of junior and senior faculty.

A major challenge for the engaged scholar is that what matters most in academic personnel reviews is publishing in flagship journals and completing a book by a top press. Faculty expressed that they have experienced uneven, sometimes scant, editorial attention to engaged scholarship by flagship journals and top book presses. While the “flagship journal and top press” was a repeated theme in our conversations, it should be noted that there is an emerging ecology of journals and associations dedicated to engaged scholarship, which may not be as well known among traditional circles. In addition, engaged scholarship often results in non-traditional scholarly products, which can be perceived by reviewers as more difficult to assess. Some examples of non-traditional scholarship products include exhibits, digital tools (e.g., website and/or software application), policy development, legislation, program evaluation, and more. For this reason, some research related to recognizing engaged scholarship has centered around measuring the impact of a more diverse array of products and processes and “honoring the mosaic of scholarly products” (Janke, Medlin & Holland, 2014).

13 Community Engagement Journals: https://communityengagement.ucla.edu/faculty/resources/#publishing-opportunities

Despite these challenges, faculty had many innovative ideas about how UCLA could better recognize excellence in engaged scholarship. Faculty ideas ranged from workshops for the Council on Academic Personnel on how to evaluate engaged scholarship to clear guidelines, or criteria, for evaluating engaged scholarship, including the incorporation of input from non-academic peers and the evaluation of non-traditional scholarly products.

During conversations, faculty discussed how what is meant by “peer” and “impact” should be redefined. Faculty were concerned that those who were deemed their peers were too narrow, limited to a confined group of academic specialists. Since engaged scholars take seriously the knowledge held by community scholars, these community scholars can in turn dialectically contribute to the evaluation of excellence and impact of the engaged scholarly work. Faculty conveyed that “impact” means different things for the public and community partners than the university, and that there is tension between the interpretations of these meanings. For a community partner, impact is measured by positive social change and progress at varying scales, and for traditional academic review, impact is measured by publication in a flagship journal and/or top press (and subsequent citations received). Faculty expressed how assessments should be based on how their work impacts government, public agencies, and communities, for example, and go beyond papers and books. The lack of recognition of public impact prevents innovation. As one faculty member conveyed, “knowledge was not meant to circulate among closed circuits. We need to think about impact. The possibility of change. It’s [academic scholarship] not changing the world much.”

Support for Engaged Scholarship and Pedagogy

Faculty expressed that it is important to not only recognize engaged scholarship, but also to support it. Faculty identified a variety of strategies, some which are within the scope of services that could be provided by the Center for Community Engagement, and others that would need the attention of department chairs and deans. The support that faculty are looking for include:

- Facilitate engaged writing groups to support faculty and help them make their engaged scholarship more legible
- Provide training and support in letter writing and dossier formation, including guidance on peer letter from community partners or public stakeholders
- Explore linkages between their engaged research and/or teaching and EDI

The literature notes that both process and product need attention in the evaluation of community-engaged research: "To assess the quality of community-engaged scholarship, one must evaluate both the project process through which the product was developed and the product itself to determine whether it is of high quality. Therefore, faculty candidates should present (and evaluators must review, in addition to the product or artifact) a reflective critique of the community-engaged processes that led to the development of the products listed/presented in the dossier to fully assess the quality of community-engaged scholarship." (Janke, Medlin & Holland, 2014; Jordan et al. 2009).
● Provide guidance on teaching different types of community-engaged courses, such as a community-engaged course at scale
● Expand visibility for engaged scholarship, including publications and other media
● Fundraise to support costs associated with community-engaged courses and incentivize engaged research
● Compile anonymous case studies of “precedent” academic reviews as a guide to future cases
● Establish a standing advisory committee of engaged scholarship advisors for evaluations at the departmental level and for the Council on Academic Personnel
● Incorporate attention to engaged scholarship in new faculty orientation
● Develop an engaged scholarship mentoring program and assigning junior faculty engaged scholarship mentors early on
● Provide tangible support to faculty teaching community-engaged courses, such as:
  ○ Make funds accessible to support XP course design and transportation costs for students associated with the community-engaged work,
  ○ Assign a GSR or TA to community-engaged courses to assist with the coordination and monitoring of student work with community partners,
  ○ Permit the assignment of TAs for community-engaged courses at a lower enrollment threshold than a regular course
  ○ Attach a lab and/or some sort of additional course credit for teaching a community-engaged course in recognition for the extra work it requires

**Recommendations and Next Steps**

As we conclude a year-long effort to research best practices and listen to UCLA’s engaged scholars, we are motivated by the voices we have heard from through this process. Faculty, leaders in the higher education and community engagement realm, and colleagues from other universities are striving to make academic research relevant to the public and in specific community contexts. Given the centrality of UCLA’s public mission, it is critical that UCLA modify its internal structures to unleash the faculty’s potential for innovation, creativity, and critical research to address urgent challenges. As things stand, the incentive and reward structures built into the current academic personnel review push faculty away from the kind of engaged scholarship which so many want to do. The pressure for faculty to conform and the lack of authentic recognition for engaged scholarship stifles the innovative and transformative public impact UCLA could and should have.

UCLA is poised to take a significant step to advance the systemic conditions that would support engaged scholarship by recognizing such work as scholarship within the research and teaching categories for academic personnel review and by establishing criteria and guidelines for such review. In doing so, UCLA would be fulfilling a key recommendation contained in the 2017 Civic Engagement Task Force Report, reinforced by its inclusion in the 2020 Strategic Priorities
for Global and Local Engagement. Additionally, UCLA would be meeting the external review expectations set forth in the reclassification notification letter from the 2015 Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. UCLA will be expected to report on progress recognizing and evaluating community-engaged scholarship in the next cycle, beginning in 2023.

Based on the models, best practices and insights derived from a year-long survey of the field nationally and interviews with UCLA faculty, the Center for Community Engagement recommends that UCLA adopt a combination of the “Continuum of Scholarship” model along with the “Decentralized Criteria within an Institutional Framework.” The former unequivocally recognizes that diverse types of scholarship count, and the latter would allow UCLA’s diverse schools and divisions to articulate criteria relevant to their specific fields within the broad commitment to engaged scholarship enacted by the Academic Senate. We specifically do not recommend the “Opt-In Supplemental Review” model as it perpetuates the double-work experience that engaged scholars currently experience.

There are several next steps we recommend for consideration (suggested responsible units are noted in parentheses):

**University-level policy and practices:**
1. **Broadly disseminate this report to UCLA faculty** (Academic Senate, Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Council on Academic Personnel, Deans, Center for Community Engagement)
2. **Appoint a Committee on Community-Engaged Scholarship to guide the establishment of Academic Senate policy and guidelines for reviewing community-engaged scholarship** (Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Academic Senate). This committee would be charged with:
   a. Review and adopt the UC Berkeley statement recognizing engaged scholarship and guidelines for review, or craft a variation thereof or a newly developed statement particularly suited to UCLA (Academic Senate)
   b. Institute an annual workshop for new Council on Academic Personnel members to familiarize them with the principles and practices of engaged scholarship, as well as criteria for review of excellence and impact (Council on Academic Personnel, with support from Center for Community Engagement)

**Division/School-level policy and practices:**
1. **Convene information sessions across each school and division** to both answer questions and to gather further input to guide the establishment of Academic Senate policy and guidelines for reviewing community-engaged scholarship (Deans, committee to be appointed by Academic Senate/Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, with support from the Center for Community Engagement)
2. **Appoint a Committee of Engaged Scholars within each school/division** to formulate appropriate criteria for evaluating excellence and impact of community-engaged scholarship in research and teaching (Deans)

3. **Encourage all UCLA community-engaged scholars to utilize UCLA Collaboratory** to record and track their record of public-facing and community-engaged work as part of developing their dossiers of community-engaged scholarship (Deans, with orientation, training and support to faculty provided by the Center for Community Engagement)

**Department-level policy and practices:**

1. **Convene working groups to formulate review criteria appropriate to specific departmental-level review of community-engaged scholarship** (Department chairs, supported by the Deans and Center for Community Engagement)

2. **Assign mentors** to pre-tenure community-engaged scholars (Department chairs)

The Center for Community Engagement will continue to roll out resources and provide support to faculty related to tenure and promotion, including but not limited to:

- **Build on CCE’s newly formed Affiliated Faculty Network (AFN) to:**
  - Foster an engaged writing group to support faculty, in part to help them make their engaged scholarship more legible
  - Train and support in letter writing and dossier formation, including guidance on peer letter from community partners or public stakeholders

- **Through our longstanding Community-Engaged Pedagogy Workshop Series, offer workshops focused on:**
  - Engaged pedagogy, such as teaching a community-engaged course at scale
  - Nurturing letter writing and dossier formation, including guidance on peer letter from community partners or public stakeholders
  - How to cultivate connections between EDI and engaged teaching and/or research

- **Support faculty (and units) across campus to identify and create synergies between EDI and their engaged research and/or teaching**

- **Utilize the Center’s website as a platform to provide greater visibility for engaged scholarship, including publications and other media**

In addition, the Center for Community Engagement will seek to identify new resources to undertake the following, in collaboration with appropriate campus leaders and units:

- **Collaborate with deans and department chairs to:**
  - Encourage engaged scholarship among faculty in their schools/divisions and departments
  - Bring attention to engaged scholarship in new faculty orientations
○ Establish a network of engaged scholarship advisors to assist with evaluations at the departmental level
○ Secure additional funding resources to support costs associated with community-engaged courses and incentivize engaged research
● Collaborate with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion to build connections between EDI and engaged scholarship
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Appendix I. Methodology for this report

In accordance with the UCLA Global and Local Engagement Strategic Priorities (2020), the Center for Community Engagement initiated a process to explore the best options for establishing engaged research and teaching as a meaningful criterion in faculty academic personnel reviews. Below we describe the methods for the first year of this process (Academic Year 2020-2021), where we focused on a review of the literature, gathering evidence from peer institutions and disciplinary associations, and initiating conversations with UCLA faculty.

Data Collection

Collecting policy guidance, best practices, and models

Disciplinary association’ guidance around tenure and promotion and community and public engagement can inform faculty within those disciplines, departmental chairs and departments, and larger efforts to change policy at the institutional level (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). To understand how disciplinary associations are approaching public engagement and the relationship to tenure and promotion policies, we undertook a review of related disciplinary associations’ guidance. We investigated any guidance offered by disciplinary associations affiliated with the Humanities and Social Sciences. We also asked faculty during our conversations with them if they knew of any disciplinary associations that had guidance related to engagement. We conducted an online search to survey related reports or guidance from disciplinary associations, and then we utilized the key words of name of association + tenure and promotion + public/community-engaged scholarship. We then compiled the results of the search in a spreadsheet, noting the name plus link if such guidance existed for later analysis or marking if none such guidance was found. Some of the disciplinary association materials that were evaluated include the Modern Languages Association, American Historical Association, American Anthropological Association, American Sociological Association and more. Based on conversations with faculty in the Life Sciences and Physical Sciences, to their knowledge there were no disciplinary associations that have guidance pertaining to community/public engagement.

To gather best practices and models from peer institutions, we conducted outreach to peer institutions via a Campus Compact TRUCEN (The Research University Civic Engagement Network) list-serve request. Our request sought for peer universities to share any links, documents, or information on tenure and promotion policies regarding publicly engaged scholars and their adoption. Some of the universities that responded to this request include University of Wisconsin, University of Minnesota, and the University of Richmond. As described earlier in this report, some peers have developed formal processes and others are in process.
As a part of Campus Compact’s TRUCEN (The Research University Community Engagement Network), UCLA proposed and convened a sustained conversation group to explore ways to approach tenure and promotion policy that recognizes community engagement in and across research, teaching, and service. The goals of this conversation group were to share best practices and approaches with peer institutions, create opportunities to learn from peer institutions, and develop accessible ways of sharing resources, knowledge and lessons learned. Our conversation group started with ten members in January of 2021 and grew to 20 members by April 2021, with all original participants remaining as active participants. In June 2021, the group presented at the 2021 Annual TRUCEN National Conference, sharing what they learned from the exchange, presenting case studies across peer institutions, and proposing next steps. One of the group’s proposed next steps is to form a National Learning Community on Promotion and Tenure for Engaged Scholarship (NLC-PTES).

In August 2021, we obtained the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification Dataset. This dataset will allow us to learn more about the tenure and promotion policies and practices of institutions applying for the Carnegie Foundation’s Elective Classification for Community Engagement. This past academic year, Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification was in transition from Brown University to Albion College, so one limitation of this effort was the delay we experienced in receiving the data because of this transition. We will be working with colleagues at the University of Michigan to analyze this dataset in terms of tenure and promotion practices at other classified institutions.

We also reached out to leaders in the public/civic/community engagement field, including Kal Alston of Syracuse University, John Saltmarsh of University of Massachusetts, Boston, Emily Janke of University of North Carolina, Greensboro, and Michael Rios of UC Davis, to obtain their perspective on what has worked and what has not worked in their process to advance recognition of engaged scholarship in tenure and promotion policies in their institutions and at others.

**Facilitating faculty conversations**

Based on the best practices from peer institutions and community and public engagement networks, an important step in considering how to recognize public engagement in tenure and promotion is to have conversations with faculty to listen and better understand their experiences.

---

16 Shalom Staub, UCLA, co-convener, Bemmy Maharramli, UCLA, co-convener, Walid Afifi, UC Santa Barbara, Neeraja Aravamudan, Michigan, Lynn Blanchard, UNC-Chapel Hill, Vialla Hartfield-Mendez, Emory, Tessa Hill, UC Davis, Richard Kiely, Cornell, Regina Langhout, UC Santa Cruz, Jay Levine, NC State, Rebecca London, UC Santa Cruz, Agnieszka Nance, Tulane, Emily Ozer, UC Berkeley, Julie Plaut, Brown, Michael Rios, UC Davis, Emily Rountree, University of Kansas, Bridget Smith, Tulane, Marieka Schotland, UC Berkeley, Susan Stone, UC Berkeley, Kristen Wright, George Mason

17 There are currently 361 U.S. colleges and universities with the elective Community Engagement Classification, including UCLA, UC Davis and UC Merced (https://www.brown.edu/swearer/carnegie)
in situating and navigating their engaged scholarship in their academic personal reviews. The goal of our conversations was to learn more about their experiences navigating tenure and promotion processes in relationship to community-engaged scholarship and to gain a better understanding about how engaged scholarship is valued and evaluated in their discipline and department. The rich, in-depth data from the conversations was important for us to better understand the experiences of UCLA faculty, compare, and contrast similarities and differences, anonymously share with colleagues to illustrate the importance and practices of engaged scholarship, identify faculty colleagues that can be part of our process going, and inform our recommendations.

Together with the Deans of the UCLA College and with the support of the Academic Senate’s Council on Academic Personnel, we facilitated conversations with 50 faculty, across ranks and departments. The Center compiled an initial list of faculty to share with the Deans of the UCLA College (with the exception of physical sciences, we invited the Dean to invite people they recommended), with this list including faculty name, rank and department. This list was based on faculty the Center has worked with, such as on service learning (now community-engaged, or XP, courses) or 195CE courses, faculty that have attended CCE community-engaged pedagogy workshops, faculty that CCE directors have had meetings with, etc. We shared this preliminary list with the Deans for their consideration as they invited and added faculty in their division. Conversations with faculty continued through the spring quarter 2021.

CCE developed a conversation protocol to guide the conversations with faculty. To evaluate the conversation protocol, in the fall quarter we piloted a series of one-on-one conversations (via Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic) with faculty that have a history of working with the Center, specifically the Community Engagement and Social Change minor Faculty Advisory Committee members and Chancellor’s Awardees for Community-Engaged Scholarship, etc. We refined the conversation guide after these preliminary conversations and then began to hold a series of individual conversations with the faculty as invited by each of the Deans of the College. We sought at least 12 faculty members from each division of the College, with four each at the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professors and across a broad distribution of departments.

We sought verbal consent to audio-record the one-on-one conversations. The CCE Director that facilitated the conversations explained to the participant that their privacy and confidentiality would be protected, and information always managed securely. We also reassured them that at any time during the conversation they could ask for the audio-recording to pause or stop. In addition to audio-recording the conversations, with the permission of the faculty, detailed notes of the conversation were taken.
Data Analysis

Once broad themes begin to emerge, we drafted initial findings as an analytical tool, iteratively interacting back and forth between the data and literature. We took and then summarized notes from conversations from disciplinary associations, thought leaders, and colleagues at peer institutions for analysis. We analyzed the content in terms of:

- Relationships between scholarship and (civic, community, critical, and/or public) engagement (e.g., recognition of their integration)
- Challenges and opportunities for community-engaged scholarship
- Guidance around tenure and promotion recognition for, and review of community-engaged scholarship

In the spring of 2021, we completed faculty conversations and began data analysis. We completed the draft report in July 2021. We solicited comments from the Center’s Faculty Advisory Committee, other faculty of the College, and Deans of the College to finalize this document.
Appendix II. UC Berkeley’s Community-Engaged Research Assessment and Guidance

Assessing the Research Record

The APM states that the record should be evaluated and not merely enumerated: “There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance” (APM 210-1-d-2).

Levels of assessment. Although they are not required to do so, candidates are encouraged to upload into APBears a self-statement that includes a summary of the results of their research during the review period, indicating where they believe the quality and significance of their work lie. Candidates are especially encouraged to note ways in which their research or creative activities contribute to the University’s mission with respect to diversity and equal opportunity, as detailed in APM 210-1-d. Department-level review provides the primary source of assessment that is informed by those with disciplinary expertise. Broader perspective may be provided by reviews carried out by deans, campus ad hoc review committees, the Senate’s Budget Committee, and central administrators. See review paths.

Indices of quality. Information about such indices can be helpful to reviewers who are not themselves in the field. Indices will vary from field to field, but they may include prizes, fellowships, awards, and the like; numerical indices of impact, such as citation counts; or information about the selectivity and reputation of venues of publication, exhibition, or performance. These indices will be more likely to carry weight when reasons are given for taking them to be important.

Quality and quantity. It is usually easy to document the quantity of research a faculty member has carried out during a review period and harder to provide an assessment of the quality of the research carried out. Efforts should be made at every level of review to assess quality in addition to documenting quantity. A large number of so-so articles may be less meritorious than a small number of superb articles. Assessments of quality would answer such questions as these: What new knowledge or understanding has the faculty member’s research created? What important questions has the faculty member’s research posed or answered? Are the research contributions original? Did the faculty member’s work include a solution to an especially difficult technical or methodological challenge? Is the faculty member’s developing body of work making a significant difference to the shape or direction of the field?

Creative achievements. Assessment of records that include creative accomplishments (e.g., musical compositions, buildings or building designs, paintings) can be particularly challenging to
assess in an academic context. Berkeley has issued guidelines for assessing creative accomplishment to assist faculty members, chairs, and others involved in the review process.

**Community-Engaged Research.** Assessment of records that include community-engaged research (e.g., partnerships with non-academic entities that work in the public interest) can sometimes be challenging to assess in an academic context. Berkeley has issued guidelines for assessing community-engaged research to assist faculty members, chairs, and others involved in the review process.

**Contributions to diversity and equal opportunity.** Per APM 210-1-d, contributions to diversity and equal opportunity should be noted and assessed. As examples of possible contributions are

- Research focused on underserved communities or addressing disparities. Research that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population.
- Promoting and being accountable for inclusive, equitable, and respectful collaboration in research environments.

**Here is what faculty see when they click on the Community-Engaged Research link:**

**Assessing Community-Engaged Research**

January 2021

These guidelines frame some principles on the assessment and crediting of research projects that involve partnerships with non-academic entities that work in the public interest (“agencies”).

Many faculty who pursue this kind of research publish peer- and non-peer-reviewed articles, chapters, or monographs that draw on and disseminate the findings of their community partnerships. These publications are credited in the same way as any other publications.

The campus’s current practice is to credit policy papers, reports, and other such documents as research. The campus considers such material to be “published” if it has been submitted to an agency, provided it is generally accessible to the public. This accessibility condition is met if the agency publishes or otherwise disseminates the material or, if the agency does not, the candidate makes it available broadly. Such publications will normally be treated as non-peer-reviewed unless there is a formal vetting process by the agency (this should be described); nevertheless, such publications can and will be credited if the Chair and/or Dean presenting the case provides an assessment of the work’s status, importance, and impact. When the work is a contribution to equal opportunity, diversity, equity, and inclusion, this should be noted, as stipulated in Section 210–1d of the Academic Personnel Manual.
In assessing the work, it will be critical to understand how the work has shaped policy or changed practices (or what its potential to do so is). Such an assessment is essential to reviewers’ ability to award fair credit. If the research undertaken did not bring about any such concrete changes nor is it likely to do so in the future, the work may nevertheless be of value if it advances knowledge; in such cases, an assessment of how knowledge was advanced will be critical.

In situations where a faculty member has served as an advisor or expert consultant to a governmental agency or a non-profit, but that engagement has not resulted in any written document, campus practice is to credit such engagement as service. That noted, there may be instances in which such engagements can be credited as research, if they meet some basic minimum criteria for dissemination and influence:

1. To be considered as research rather than service, outcomes (findings, analyses, conclusions, etc.) must be communicated in some form that has permanence and is accessible to the public beyond the immediate sphere of the candidate and the agency for which the work was performed.

2. To be considered as research rather than service, work must be cast in a form that can be disseminated beyond the first-hand, in-person encounters between the researcher and the main research partners. In other words, research must be presented in a form that can have influence beyond its immediate context.

According to these criteria, documents such as policy reports, development plans, and apps can be credited as research, as long as the importance and influence of the work is explained and assessed by the Chair and/or Dean, as well as subsequent reviewers. Oral communications, such as presentations to public bodies or viva voce consultations with a non-profit, are generally not to be credited as research in the absence of written documentation and/or clear evidence of impact.
Appendix III. University of Minnesota Assessment of Community-Engaged Scholarship

Public Engagement at the University of Minnesota Defined:

Public engagement is the partnership of University knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Publicly Engaged Scholarship—many models all encompass work that demonstrate a high-level commitment to academic scholarship and collaborative inquiry and positively impact the public good. Hanover Research (2018, April), Publicly engaged scholarship frameworks, p, 6

Characteristics of engaged scholarship

Engaged scholarship has several attributes that may distinguish it from traditional scholarship:

1) Products are often published in both traditional disciplinary outlets and non-traditional venues.

2) The work is often multi-disciplinary.

3) Scholarly products often include multiple co-authors, including community partners who contribute to the work in significant ways.

4) The work often integrates research, teaching, and service in a way that makes it difficult to compartmentalize into a single category (e.g., teaching, research, service).

5) The work requires significant relationship-building with external partners to maximize its quality and impact.

In applying the following criteria, the Review Committee is mindful of the variation in contexts, the breadth of faculty work, and departmental promotion and tenure guidelines.