This version has additional resources based on questions and answers during the live session.

Community and Publicly-Engaged Scholarship And Promotion and Tenure
Wait:

Changes are on the way, **but this workshop focuses on current requirements**.

A **balanced case** can be a good choice for a community-engaged scholar, but may not be: several P-CE scholars have presented research-only cases. **A different workshop went over balanced case**.

An **optional review committee** is available for third year (formative) reviews. Please contact Margie Ferguson (mferguso@iupui.edu)

This workshop focuses on **tenure** and promotion in the tenure-track ranks. “Scholarship” **has very specific restrictions when it comes to clinical and lecturer ranks.**
Are you wondering about Purdue?

**EVIDENCE OF CHANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 - 2014</th>
<th>2015 - 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Individuals promoted and/or tenured fully or partially on the basis of engagement.

*Comparison of faculty promoted and/or tenured on the basis of engagement within the past nine years.*
Topics

1. Defining
   - IUPUI values
   - National: U Minn, Purdue

2. Key issues
   - Public Scholars
   - Products: process documentation, intermediate, final

3. Process – Management
   - Offer letters, annual reviews, third year review
   - External scholarly reviewers
   - Community partners
   - Managing skepticism

4. Panel
Defining Publicly / Community-Engaged Scholarship
Definitions:
Speaking the language people are listening for...

IUPUI P&T Guidelines:

p. 6: “Civic Engagement: Faculty work that contributes to our role as a civically engaged institution, including participation in service learning projects and mentored internships is highly valued and should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

The nature of the scholarship and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics should be acknowledged as acceptable forms of documentation.

p. 10: “Public Scholars/Public Scholarship: ... Faculty appointments as a public scholar are typically determined at the time of hiring. Appointments can be revised and documented as one’s area of excellence is defined and refined.

IUPUI defines public scholarship as an intellectually and methodologically rigorous endeavor that is responsive to public audiences and non-academic peer review. It is scholarly work that advances one or more academic disciplines by emphasizing production of knowledge with community stakeholders.

...Given the importance of collaboration in this work, external evaluators must have knowledge of the processes involved in public scholarship activities and should have knowledge of the project content, rather than only experience based on the faculty member’s discipline. This may include scholars and experts from outside the academy.”
Purdue University

Reciprocal relationships

Disciplinary expertise

Innovation

Methodology

Sharing

Impact
University of Minnesota (Twin Cities)

Academic and community **goals**

Disciplinary expertise **and** community grounding

Methods including rigor and community engagement

Rigorous approach which incorporates ongoing revision / input

Results in impact on knowledge/discipline **and** community

Effectively presented

Reflective critique
IUPUI (and others): “It is scholarly work that advances one or more academic disciplines by emphasizing production of knowledge with community stakeholders.”
Key Issues

“Public Scholar”

Process documentation

Intermediate products

Multiple products:
   Community impact
   Disciplinary influence
Public Scholar: at IUPUI, this is a specific title

“Faculty appointments as a public scholar are typically determined at the time of hiring. Appointments can be revised and documented as one’s area of excellence is defined and refined.”

Look at your offer letter and annual evaluations
What are you expected to do? How is success defined?

Offer letters and evaluations are not typically included in a dossier.

BUT YOU CAN incorporate them.

Times change: if your responsibilities and opportunities shift, talk with your chair and dean.
Process documentation

Public/community-engaged scholarship is **distinctive in its process**: 

- Community partners (individuals or organizations) are involved in co-creation and adaptation of **goals** and **methods**. 
  - This proceeds with respect, ethics, and local knowledge.

- Results are disseminated **to and with and for the community** (as well as in scholarly venues).

- Many C/PES statements also reference **critical reflection**.

---

At IUPUI, consider what parts of this are best included in: 
- Candidate statement 
- Description of key accomplishments (3-5) 
- Other areas of the dossier

Confirm with statements from collaborators!
Products: intermediate, final ⇐ research stream

“Candidates compile records of sustained achievement in their respective fields of work”
“To full: ‘record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank.’”

Make visible your process and products

Strategically design intermediate steps

Grant – conference presentation – article – blog/op-ed
Grant – website – invited presentation
Website – white paper – legislative presentation

Not ALL steps need peer review but at least SOME steps of each stream do
Chair’s assessment of dissemination outlets

By Dr. Seuss

One fish
Two fish
Red fish
Blue fish

One book, two books....

What are your reviewers looking for?
Your CV makes your work visible
Your candidate statement explains YOU
Your dossier explains your work

Your actual work: explained effectively
Community and scholarly impact

Researchmetrics.iupui.edu

Focus on your work (not just the venue it appears in)

Include community impact

- Letters YOU solicit go in “appendices”
- Letters your CHAIR solicits go into “Solicited Letters” \( \Rightarrow \) greater weight
Additional resources for documenting community engaged work


https://public.imaginingamerica.org/blog/article/a-random-walk-to-public-scholarship-exploring-our-convergent-paths/

https://compact.org/trucen/research-university-engaged-scholarship-toolkit/

https://surface.syr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=ia
Process Management

Offer letters, annual reviews, third year review
External scholarly reviewers
External letter writers
Community partners
Managing skepticism
Offer letters, annual reviews, third-year reviews

Think about whether YOU want to include them.

Times to include:
• Your initial offer mentioned Public Scholar
• Third year review affirmed your accomplishments and direction
• Annual reviews were positive and affirming
• Review language reinforces community-engagement principles.
• Chair or dean have changed

Campus reviewers hate candidates getting mixed messages.
External scholarly reviewers: for time-limited work

Your chair can make special arrangements to have scholars provide peer review of work that is inherently time-limited:
• Community events
• Legislative hearings
• Exhibits

Think ahead!
External letter writers

Organized by chair
  but you can help

Must be arms-length
  but letters from collaborators can go into Solicited Letters file

Most must be academics from equal to or higher-prestige programs or institutions
  can be activity-specific

Must be able to articulate an evaluation within the language of scholarly standards
  do NOT have to be experts on exactly your own niche
Community partners as reviewers

Yes, there’s a place for them: Solicited Letters

Yes, they are essential for establishing that you have conducted yourself as a true community scholar.

No, they are not external academic reviewers

External reviewers are expected to have familiarity with the normal business of academia. External reviewers know about teaching, research and service, and the usual demands, calendars, and context of academia.
Managing skepticism

It’s not personal

It’s part of the context of academia:
• Student resumes that say they have great communication skills and also 5 typos
• Solicitations from junk journals and junk conferences
• Colleagues who list ‘service’ that they never actually did any work for

Concrete steps:
• Your statement should be enthusiastic and knowledgeable.
• Include verification of specific concrete actions and achievements
• Have someone else read it to see what you have missed articulating
Discussion - Panel

Questions from registrations:

- Publications: requirements, examples
- Grants vs. publications vs. awards
- What is ‘highly satisfactory’?

See: Balanced Case workshop
Panelists

Sue Hyatt, School of Liberal Arts

Elizabeth Kryder-Reid, School of Liberal Arts Evidence Grid

Laura Holzman, Herron School of Art and Design

Stephen Boehm, School of Science
Thank you!