Publicly Engaged Scholarship Evaluation Rubric

[adapted from University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, 2018; Jordan, 2007; [Wood et al. 2016](https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/9713)]

About: The landmark study [Scholarship Assessed](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED461318) (Glassick et al. 1997) helped establish common dimensions of quality that characterize all scholarship (i.e., teaching, research, service, engagement). This rubric incorporates multiple foundational studies on the evaluation of engaged scholarship in higher education. For questions about IUI’s adaptation of the rubric, please contact Margie Ferguson, mferguso@iupui.edu or Keith Avin, keigavin@iu.edu.

Publicly engaged scholarship characteristics: Publicly Engaged Scholarship (PES) has several attributes that may distinguish it from traditional scholarship:

1. Products are often published and disseminated in both traditional disciplinary outlets and non-traditional venues and formats [e.g. digital, installations, performances, exhibitions, datasets, manuals, policy briefs, etc.]
2. Work is often multi-, inter- or transdisciplinary.
3. Scholarly products often include multiple co-authors, including community partners and students, who contribute to the work in significant way
4. Integrated approach of research, teaching, and service that challenges traditional compartmentalization 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.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Indicators** | **Evaluation/Comments** |
| **1. Clear Academic & Community Change Goals***Objectives defined**Clear purpose and focus of inquiry* | ***The scholar provides evidence of clear goals such as—**** Stating the basic purpose of the work and its value for the discipline(s) AND the public good
* Documenting the alignment between the scholarship and the scholar’s role, departmental priorities, and university mission
* Defining goals and objectives that are realistic and achievable
* Identifying significant intellectual questions in the discipline or practice AND for the community/external stakeholders with whom the scholar is partnered
* Articulating a coherent program of inquiry/research and objectives
* Articulating goals for teaching, student learning and/or program development that

are mutually beneficial to the university and to the involved community/external stakeholders | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |
| **Comments:** |
| **2. Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community** | ***The scholar provides evidence of adequate preparation and relationship buidling in the community such as—**** Investing time and effort in developing community partnerships
* Bringing necessary skills to the collaboration
 | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Preparation and knowledge about developments in the field of study and relevant community context* | * Participating in training and professional development that builds skills and competencies in conducting publicly engaged scholarship (PES)
* Demonstrating an understanding of relevant existing scholarship and the work is intellectually compelling
* Understanding the norms and expectations of high-quality collaboration and

partnership | **Comments:** |
| **3. Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement***Rigor is evident in research design, data collection, interpretation, and reporting of results. Rigor is maintained, or even enhanced, through community- engaged approaches.* | ***The scholar provides evidence of scholarly rigor informed/enriched by engagement such as—**** Refining a research question, or confirming its validity, through collaboration or co-generation with community/external partner(s)
* Using methods appropriate to the goals, questions, and context of the work and providing a rationale for selection of methods
 | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |
| **Comments:** |
| **4. Significant Results: Impact on the Discipline/Field and the Community***Beneficial impact in the communities in which the scholarship is conducted.**Assessment of knowledge created (in field, discipline, community).* | ***The scholar provides evidence of significant results/impact such as—**** Achieving the intended or notable goals, impact, or change consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time
* Contributing to new knowledge in the field/discipline through publication in peer- reviewed journals and other scholarly outlets
* Contributing to and benefiting the community/ external partner
* Making progress towards social equity and/or systemic change that promotes the public good
* Securing increased funding for additional research, program implementation, and/or community partners
* Increasing capacity of community to advocate for themselves
* Adding consequentially to the discipline on issues that matter to the external partners and the community
* Opening additional areas for further exploration, inquiry, and/or collaboration
* Advancing knowledge/understanding for the community in which the work is situated, and discussing its generalizability/transferability to other populations or as a model that can be further investigated in other settings
* Enhancing the ability of students to assume positions of leadership and community engagement
* Increasing access to higher education among under-represented and/or

marginalized students in communities served by the university | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |
| **Comments:** |
| **5. Effective Presentation and Communication to Academic and Community Audiences** | ***The scholar provides evidence of effective presentation and dissemination such as—**** Communicating with/disseminating to appropriate academic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the institution
	+ Publishing research results, teaching innovations, clinical innovations, etc. in peer-reviewed, practitioner, or professional journals
 | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Scholars effectively communicate with appropriate audiences and subject their ideas to independent review.* | * Using appropriate forums and presenting information and materials in forms that community stakeholders and external partners find accessible and understandable
	+ Disseminating information through media used/read by community members
	+ Producing documents directed towards service providers, policy makers, or legislators
* Communicating outcomes of community engaged work in collaboration with community/external partners
 | **Comments:** |
| **6. Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve Scholarship and Community Engagement***Reflective critique of community partnerships. Evaluation of partnership successes and failures.* | ***The scholar provides evidence of reflective critique such as—**** Critically evaluating the work with appropriate evidence
* Seeking evaluations from community members and using those evaluations to learn from and direct future work
* Changing project/course design or line of inquiry based on feedback and lessons learned
* Being involved in a local, state, national, or international dialogue related to the work
* Engaging in personal reflection concerning, for example, issues of privilege,

racism. | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |
| **Comments:** |
| **7. Collaborative Leadership and Personal Contribution***The scholar’s work has earned a reputation for rigor, impact, relevance, a commitment to inclusive, shared decision-making and the capacity to advance the discipline, a campus and/or a community agenda.* | ***The scholar provides evidence of leadership and personal contribution such as—**** Describing how the work has been recognized, used, or built on by academic peers
* Describing how the work has been recognized, used, or built upon by community members, practitioners, professionals in the field, and external experts
* Illustrating how the work has been organized and implemented to develop trust, foster inclusive decision-making and shared authority among academic and community stakeholders to advance mutually beneficial goals [e.g. project team meeting minutes, establishment of a community advisory council, course partnership agreements, course syllabi, results from partnership assessments]
* Providing comments or reviews (solicited/unsolicited, formal/informal) from academic and non-academic colleagues, peers, and experts
* Receiving awards or letters of appreciation from community-based organizations for contributions to the community
* Receiving invitations to present to professional society meetings and conferences, to present to community audiences, to testify before legislative bodies, to appear in the media, or to serve on advisory or policymaking committees
* Mentoring students, early career faculty, and community partners
 | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |
| **Comments:** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8. Socially and Ethically Responsible Conduct of Research, Teaching and/or Service***The work is conducted with honesty and integrity. Scholar’s work is conducted in a way that fosters respectful relationships with students, community participants, external partners, and peers.* | ***The scholar provides evidence of consistently ethical behavior such as—**** Socially responsible conduct of research, teaching, service and outreach in writings, discourse, approach to scholarship, and nature of collaboration
* Cultivating the conduct of "good science" or creative activity as appropriate; using sound research techniques, appropriate engaged pedagogies, clinical methods, etc. that result in meaningful and beneficial contributions to communities
* Adherence to a community or university IRB committee for all community-based research endeavors
* Approaching and working with communities/publics as mutual partners to foster trusting, equitable relationships
* Engaging communities in a respectful and inclusive manner such as preparing learners to learn and work in diverse contexts and with diverse populations
* Recognizing and valuing community knowledge systems and incorporating them into the research, teaching, service, and scholarship process as appropriate
* Gathering and using assessment or evaluation data to understand the impact of engaged pedagogies and/or clinical practices on communities
* Appropriately involving community/external partners in writing and reviewing

products and acknowledging their work | * **Not Observed**
* **Emergent**
* **Satisfactory**
* **Exemplary**
 |
| **Comments:** |