Models for Faculty Development: What Does It Take to be a Community-Engaged Scholar?

Lynn W. Blanchard, Chris Hanssmann,
Ronald P. Strauss, Juan Carlos Belliard,
Kathleen Krichbaum, Emily Waters, and Sarena D. Seifer

Abstract

Community-engaged scholarship (CES) is gaining legitimacy in higher education. However, challenges of institutionalizing and sustaining it as a core value remain. Significant barriers exist for faculty choosing to incorporate CES into their teaching and research. Faculty development programs are a key mechanism for advancing faculty skills as well as increasing institutional support. This paper provides a framework and set of competencies for faculty pursuing CES, developed by the Faculty Development Workgroup of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative. Examples of promising faculty development programs already underway and guidance for new programs are also offered.

In 1990, Ernest Boyer started a national discussion regarding scholarship in institutions of higher education with his seminal publication *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Boyer promoted broadening the scope of what is recognized and rewarded in the academy to encompass the tri-partite institutional mission of teaching, research, and service, and he proposed accomplishing this through four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching (Boyer 1990). With the *Report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities* (2000) promoting the concept of engagement rather than traditional service, the discussion Boyer started has grown in intensity. Most recently, the Carnegie Foundation on the Advancement of Teaching has introduced community engagement to their classification system. However, at the same time the acceptance of engagement is gaining ground, preparing and supporting faculty for it, and determining how it fits with the goals of the academy remain a challenge.

Faculty development efforts occur at institutions of higher learning to build and enhance the scholarship of faculty members as it relates to teaching and research. Faculty development programs may offer support or instruction in instructional methods, curriculum development, research, grant writing, and career enhancement. Such programs generally target faculty members on an individual level and aim to expand their skills in all of the facets of their position: as teachers, as scholars, as professionals, and as people (POD n.d.). There has been significant movement within

the field of faculty development to incorporate Boyer's model (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland 2002; Fincher et al. 2000; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997).

Faculty members in the health professions may also have clinical responsibilities, and in many cases, must prepare students for patient or client care settings. Due to the unique features of health professional education and its focus on educating skilled health professionals, health professional schools use a multitude of approaches to faculty development including faculty development programs crafted to hone the skills of those in health professional fields. Nevertheless, health professional faculty members are expected to professionally progress under a conventional academic rubric that includes promotion and tenure guidelines generally developed with a broader university vision.

All faculty development must work well within the established norms of institutional parameters for promotion and tenure. Therefore, whether in health or academic affairs, faculty members who depart from traditional forms of scholarship are likely to find themselves without related faculty development opportunities and may also find themselves at risk for promotion and tenure.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) is a nonprofit organization that promotes health through equitable and authentic partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions. CCPH has promoted Boyer's model of scholarship as it seeks to promote health through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions, and other partnership strategies (www.ccph.info). Building on a series of national initiatives designed to support community-engaged faculty (Seifer et al. 2009), CCPH convened the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative in 2004 with funding from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative 2005). The Collaborative is a group of nine health professional schools across the fields of allied health, dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, and public health that aim to build capacity within their institutions and among others in their disciplines for CES.

Schools in the Collaborative identified review, promotion, and tenure issues as major impediments to sustaining and expanding CES. Each school formed a team of faculty, administrators, and community partners to lead the change process. The Collaborative decided to establish three workgroups, each focusing on one facet of institutional support: sustainable funding, peer review processes, and faculty development. This paper focuses on the work of the Faculty Development Workgroup within the Collaborative.

What is Community-Engaged Scholarship?

A common understanding of terms is fundamental to effective faculty development. "Community" entails a group of people who share a common location, interests,

values, work, or identity, and who have an association due to common traditions, or political, civic, social, cultural, or economic interactions.

"*Community engagement* is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities, through collaboration with these communities" (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, 12).

"*Scholarship* is teaching, discovery, integration, application, and engagement that has clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique that is rigorous and peer-reviewed" (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, 12).

"*Community-engaged scholarship* (CES) involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community." It can be interdisciplinary and/or draw on the principles of community-based participatory research. According to the 2005 Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, "it is important to point out that not all community-engaged activities undertaken by faculty are scholarship. For example, if a faculty member devotes time to developing a community-based health program, it may be important work and it may advance the service mission of the institution, but unless it includes the other components that define or represent standards for scholarship (e.g., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, reflective critique, rigor, and/or peer review) it would not be considered scholarship (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, 11-12).

Faculty Development Programs in Support of Community- Engaged Scholarship

Faculty development programs with an emphasis on community engagement can facilitate the development and success of potential community-engaged scholars. The choice to pursue CES presents academics with a number of opportunities and challenges. The primary opportunity is the capacity to have an impact on issues of salience in the community and to partner with colleagues within the academy and the community. Bridging the gap between the "ivory tower" and the "real world" is exciting and will potentially attract early innovators who find sustainable and systemic change possible.

The path to doing CES is not easy. For example, the "publish or perish" mentality in tenure-track positions poses difficulty to community-engaged faculty whose work requires a large amount of relationship-building and time before a publication might be possible. In addition, although large scientific funding agencies, including the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, have begun to give credence to community-engaged research, securing sustained funding continues to be a challenge. Building a faculty portfolio for promotion and tenure review can be

daunting for those focusing on CES, particularly when review committees are not familiar with this form of scholarship (Calleson, Jordan, and Seifer 2005).

Faculty development programs can provide support and guidance to interested faculty. These programs take on different forms but share a common commitment to helping faculty fulfill their scholarly potential. In addition to the benefit to these scholars, these programs support academic institutions by linking the common tri-partite mission of teaching, research, and service through the concept of CES.

Attitudes in Community Engagement

In a series of meetings, participants in the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative identified a specific set of measurable skills and competencies, and also a more abstract set of attitudes and values for faculty pursuing CES. Because CES takes a different approach than does more traditional scholarship, we believe that there are assumptions that are shared by successful CES scholars. These are less concrete and measurable than skill-based competencies but are at the foundation of effective CES.

Several institutions and projects have developed "Principles of Engagement" to guide community-based or community-engaged learning or research (Blumenthal 1996; Israel et al. 2001; University of Washington, School of Public Health and Community Medicine n.d.). Each of these refers in some way to collaboration, reciprocity, information and/or power sharing and inclusion of community at all levels of research. These tenets acknowledge several assumptions about community and community-based research:

• The community holds specialized knowledge.
• The community has a unique and valuable vantage point in research.
• Knowledge production involving academics and communities must be shared.

CES is distinct from traditional scholarship in that it necessitates culture-bridging and negotiation around research agendas. It requires flexibility in terms of research methodologies, willingness to share credit and material resources, and attention to the potential for advocacy and political action in academic scholarship. Though more difficult to measure than competencies, these attitudes can be demonstrated by community-engaged scholars in and through community feedback and evidence of impact in terms of policy or community infrastructure (Peer Review Workgroup 2007).

Faculty development programs that aim to support community-engaged scholars in their professional development should focus on cultivating concrete skills and contributing to an academic environment that is supportive of CES. However, some academics may be better suited than others to being successful in CES due to attitudes about scholarship and community as these set the stage for skill and knowledge development.

CES and Faculty Development

CES may begin at any point in one's academic career, and it is possible to foster professional development through the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and experience. Gelmon and Agre-Kippenhan (2002) present a case for using an adapted Dreyfus model of skill acquisition in faculty development, ranging from novice to expert (Benner, Tanner, and Chesla 1992; Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1996). These levels do not necessarily correlate to one's academic rank, but rather they provide a framework specific to experience with CES. We have elected to use novice, intermediate, and advanced levels for the faculty development framework presented here

At each developmental stage, a community-engaged scholar is expected to demonstrate a set of competencies. Competencies are linked with skills in each developmental stage and are cumulative. Whether one's "novice" stage occurs mid-career or in graduate school, each developing community-engaged scholar will likely share similar values and attitudes about community and scholarship, and his or her respective CES skills can be developed along a similar continuum of learning.

Although we have stated the likelihood that those choosing to pursue CES will hold some specific attitudes about the work, we believe that all academics should have at least a working knowledge of CES, and the framework reflects that assumption. Even if it is not a career path they choose to take, any faculty member may mentor students who have an interest in CES, work in departments with community-engaged colleagues, or serve on a review board that considers promotion and tenure for community-engaged scholars. It is vital that they are aware of community-engagement as a legitimate scholarly path.

Table 1: General CES Competencies

Value and understand legitimacy and significance of CES concepts and social determinants of health, some experience in research

Comprehend availability of faculty career positions in CES, have some knowledge of CES resources

Have basic knowledge/awareness of:
- definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality
- CES-involved colleagues and campus resources, capability to refer students interested in CES to appropriate faculty and/or resources

Have respect for quality and importance of field

Possess basic ability to evaluate scholarly content of CES projects, particularly if interested in serving on Review, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Committee

Competencies for Community-Engaged Faculty Members

To support development of community-engaged scholars, it is desirable to have a set of measurable competencies to ascertain progress and development. The Kellogg Community Health Scholars Program has defined a set of skill-based competencies for community-engaged scholars which we have adapted for use in this framework (Community Health Scholars Program n.d.). They begin at "novice" and continue through the "advanced" levels. All competencies are considered cumulative.

Table 2: Competencies Required for Successful Practice of Community-Engaged Scholarship

Novice ....1. Understanding of the concepts of community engagement and community-engaged scholarship (CES); familiarity with basic literature and history of CES (i.e:,Boyer, Glassick, etc.)

Novice ....2. Understanding of the various contributors to community issues (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental); developing skills and commitment for fostering community and social change

Novice to Intermediate........3. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of CES in theory and practice, including:
  • Principles
  • Theoretical frameworks
  • Models and methods of planning
  • Implementation and evaluation
  (Examples: community governance, equitable participation at all levels, local relevance of public health problems, dissemination of findings, trust-building, benefits to community-involved community partnerships, service and learning objectives, fostering critical reflection, meaningful community service activities in response to community-identified concerns)

Intermediate.........................4. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities

Intermediate.........................5. Ability to negotiate across community-academic groups

Intermediate.........................6. Ability to write grants expressing CES principles and approaches

Intermediate.........................7. Ability to write articles based on CES processes and outcomes for peer-reviewed publications

Intermediate to Advanced....	8.	Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty; recognition by the community
Intermediate to Advanced....	9.	Knowledge and successful application of definition of CES, CES benchmarks, scholarly products, outcomes, and measures of quality
Advanced............................	10.	Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policy
Advanced............................	11.	Ability to balance tasks in academia (e.g., research, teaching, service) posing special challenges to those engaged in CES in order to thrive in an academic environment
Advanced............................	12.	Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion, and/or tenure
Advanced............................	13.	Knowledge of RPT process and its relationship with CES; ability to serve on RPT committee
Advanced............................	14.	Ability to mentor students and junior faculty in establishing and building CES-based portfolio

CES Faculty Development Programs

As outlined above in listings of competencies in Table 2, there are a number of skills for individuals interested in pursuing CES to acquire in building their expertise. The means to support the development of those who choose to pursue a career in CES will inevitably differ from institution to institution. For example, a large land-grant institution with a specific mission and resources for community outreach, may offer a more expansive faculty development program. A smaller school that may have fewer faculty members engaged in such work may support their professional development through a smaller or less formal means but may have close relationships with the communities in which they are located, offering unique CES opportunities.

In addition to institutional efforts, professional associations and regional and national organizations may provide interested faculty with opportunities for developing their expertise. The following two tables provide some summary overview of potential faculty development efforts. Table 3 includes learning content, type of guidance and support, incentives, and portfolio development. Table 4 follows and outlines structures, goals, and methods of faculty development efforts by level and scope.

Faculty Development Plan by Level of Expertise

This grid displays areas to target in faculty development in CES at level of expertise. "Novice" is not synonymous with junior faculty, as a faculty member might begin CES (e.g., community-based research and learning, etc.) at any point in his or her career.

Table 3: Faculty Development Plan by Level of Expertise

Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Learning Content		
Information about CES provided to faculty and training offered in community-based learning and research Meet with potential community partners	CES workshop/seminar series Inter- or multi-disciplinary faculty scholar program	Advanced community-based research training seminars
Guidance and Support		
Introduction to individuals and campus units doing CES for potential collaboration Opportunities to meet and learn from potential community partners Integration of CES into professional development services Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group Informal and formal preceptor/mentor matched to CES interest initiated. If mid-career, initiate additional or new mentorship relationship	Continued opportunities for planning and learning with community partners and mentors Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group (on-going) Opportunities for community and faculty mentorships continuing through career	Annual orientation to policies with opportunity for input Inter-disciplinary and/or inter-institution network and/or CES faculty support group (on-going) Mentor novice and junior faculty, focus on CES (ongoing)

	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Incentives			
	Information on CES resources and opportunities	Community-based learning and research training development grants and mini-grants	Support for providing CES leadership and mentorship of interested faculty
		Project seed and mini-grants	
		Faculty development credits for CES-related workshops	
Portfolio development			
	Review of RPT guidelines in regard to CES	Tutorials and workshops specific to CES portfolio	Mini-sabbatical grants to work on portfolio
		Participate in mock portfolio reviews	Conduct mock portfolio reviews
			Participation in departmental and/or institutional RPT committees

Table 4: Faculty Development Resources by Level and Scope

SOURCE

Informal network–based	School-based	University-based	Association- and Organizationally-based
Structure			
Informal	Formal/small-scale	Formal/institutional	Formal, society- or health professional association-based, and/or multi-disciplinary, inter-institutionally-based, either with individual or institutional membership

Informal network–based	School-based	University-based	Association- and Organizationally-based

Goal

Create informal networks to develop or support individuals as faculty members	Tailor faculty development programs in all dimensions to discipline, school, or program	Provide university-wide faculty development programs in all dimensions to generally enhance skills, personal and professional development	Provide faculty and professional development programs in all dimensions to those with professional membership (and others) in society or association

Methods

Informal (non-organizational) support group, writing group, listserv, etc. Informal faculty development may take place in the form of a writers' group, a support group, an informal learning community, or a non-organization-affiliated listserv.	School/discipline/program-specific workshops, mentoring, grants, career planning assistance, etc. School-based programs are particularly appropriate when faculty development needs are specific to a field, such as teaching skills around patient interaction.	University-wide centers or offices offering seminar series, workshops, mentoring, grants, etc. University-wide faculty development academy-based programs. Many institutions have faculty development centers or grants programs which can offer CES opportunities. In addition, centers for service-learning, community-based participatory research, or community engagement often offer faculty development workshops on these topics.	Association or society-wide training programs, continuing education programs, seminars, workshops, mentoring programs, etc. Formal organization, listserv, member organization (intended for faculty members and faculty developers)

Informal network–based	School-based	University-based	Association- and Organizationally-based

Examples

The UNC School of Public Health holds **Conversational Living Rooms** in a large open gathering space at the school. Interdisciplinary research ideas are discussed in an informal setting in which faculty members present their research for which they may need collaborators. Posters with background information on each research concept are displayed to allow faculty to mingle and discuss. The concept is to give faculty members, long in advance of submitting a grant, a platform to present their ideas and engage others who might have something important to contribute to the growth of the idea.	The **Leadership in Academic Medicine Program** (LAMP) at Indiana University School of Medicine is an invitational year-long program that meets monthly for half-days. Sessions include topics such as promotion and tenure guidelines, dossier preparation, career development strategies, mentor-protégé issues, conflict management and negotiation, conducting oral presentations, and writing a scientific paper. Each session ends with "group mentoring." The **Health Disparities Work Group** at the University of Minnesota meets throughout the academic year, and, with community-based and funding partners, oversees projects such as "Commercial Tobacco Use in Urban American Indians" and "Native Teen Voices Study."	The **Outreach Scholars Academy** (OSA)of the University of New Hampshire and the Faculty-Engaged Scholars Program (FESP) at UNC-Chapel Hill are campus-wide efforts supporting an engaged faculty from a range of academic disciplines. The OSA is a semester-long program for faculty to learn about best practices in engaged scholarship and move faculty from the perspective of public service to one of engaged scholarship. FESP is a two-year program, with programming and assessment grounded in the faculty competencies (Table 2). A new cohort of scholars is selected annually for the program which aims to create and sustain a community of engaged scholars from diverse perspectives, promote engaged scholarship across disciplines, and strengthen institutional commitment to strong university-community relationships.	**Campus Compact** joined with Tufts University in 2005 to convene a group of leading scholars in community engagement at research universities. The group has since met several times to discuss ways to promote and expand the engagement movement among research universities and has produced two reports: New Times Demand New Scholarship (Gibson 2006) and New Times Demand New Scholarship II (Stanton 2007). **Community-Campus Partnerships for Health** (CCPH) focuses on promoting health through partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions, and other partnership strategies. CCPH also offers a number of online resources including the *Community Engaged Scholarship Toolkit and the Faculty Toolkit for Service-Learning in Higher Education.*

Although not all of the above examples are exclusive to CES, all are inclusive of it. In addition to those listed, other resources exist including fact sheets from the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse and a report from a task force on community engagement convened by the University of California-San Francisco (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse n.d.; UCSF Task Force on Community Partnerships 2005). Examples of programs may also be found in the representative applications of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching elective classification in community engagement posted on the Campus Compact Web site (http://www.compact.org/carnegie/applications/).

In 2007, CCPH received funding for a three-year initiative, Faculty for the Engaged Campus. This national initiative, in partnership with the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, aims to strengthen and support community-engaged career paths in the academy by developing innovative competency-based models of faculty development, facilitating peer review and dissemination of products of CES, and supporting community-engaged faculty through the promotion and tenure process.

During the first year of the initiative, Faculty for the Engaged Campus issued a call for institutions to participate in a two-day charrette (an intensely focused multi-day session that uses a collaborative approach to create realistic and achievable designs) to facilitate development of innovative *campus-wide* mechanisms for preparing and supporting community-engaged faculty. The charrette was designed to bring together teams from twenty diverse U.S. institutions of higher education for an intensive planning experience from which they would leave with action plans to implement faculty development activities on their campuses. Applicants were required to complete an application, designate a team that included at least one senior level faculty member, and have a written letter of support from a senior administrator with campus-wide responsibility (e.g., provost, vice president/chancellor) elaborating on the institutional support for participation in the charrette and the implementation of preparing faculty for CES. One hundred and two institutions responded to the call representing a range of four-year colleges and universities including public and private, small and large, liberal arts and research-focused.

Participating teams completed two pre-charrette assignments (an institutional assessment and an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats). Using these and the competencies as a framework, charrette organizers developed a structured set of exercises and planning time, so that each team left the event with a draft action plan for their campus. For example, during one exercise, groups of participants were assigned two competencies for which they brainstormed potential faculty development activities.

The competencies can be utilized in other ways as well. The Faculty Engaged Scholars Program at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is using them as an assessment tool. Before beginning the program, faculty rated themselves individually on each of the competencies, using a six-point scale from minimal to complete

mastery. The results were used by program organizers to inform content for the four day-long sessions. Participants will complete the self assessments again at the end of the first and second years of the program, providing data on the effectiveness of the program as well as on-going areas for additional faculty development.

Discussion

CES is an important means of knowledge production and is a bridge between institutions of higher learning and the communities they serve and/or in which they exist. It also presents particular challenges to faculty members who choose to pursue it as part of their scholarship.

In 2005, Campus Compact and Tufts University convened scholars from research universities around the country to discuss their efforts to promote civic engagement. The report from the conference, *New Times Demand New Scholarship*, describes a number of common barriers to engaged scholarship (Gibson 2006):

1. A focus on individual disciplines rather than on public problems or issues
2. An emphasis on abstract theory rather than actionable theory derived from and useful for real world practice
3. Lack of understanding about what scholarship is and how it works
4. Few incentives to reward engaged scholarship
5. Institutions are organized in ways that prohibit engaged scholarship

These barriers offer challenges to faculty development efforts and also insight into potential direction and content for those efforts. Our premise that some level of effort should be directed toward all faculty as well as the implicit suggestion that faculty development efforts should be inter-disciplinary, speak to several of the above.

A particular and common challenge implicit in the barrier of few incentives is related to review, promotion, and tenure within the academy. Because aspects of CES may include non-traditional methods and scholarly products, it may be difficult to assess within existing institutional policies and procedures. Additionally, the practice of CES is accompanied by the challenges of working with community members. For example, faculty may find that research moves along slowly or that the agendas of communities must be negotiated over the course of a project. Faculty members can benefit from building their skills in approaching and interacting with communities. Communities, in turn, can benefit from working with faculty members who have built up a set of competencies in CES.

Engagement with communities requires a foundation of identifiable values and a set of specialized skills. It is important to support and cultivate the professional development of community-engaged faculty members at whatever point in their professional trajectory they choose to begin this work. Access to and participation in a variety of faculty development programs will not only support individual faculty members, it will strengthen the value and effectiveness of the work and build networks of faculty

throughout and between institutions of higher education. This can lead to policy change that creates a more positive, supportive, and productive environment for CES.

Although we have stated our strong belief that faculty can "enter" into CES at any point in their careers, the career level of the faculty will have an effect on how they incorporate CES into their scholarship. For instance, tenured and full professors may have more freedom to fully immerse themselves in CES efforts and also have an opportunity to promote the concept more vocally than those who are untenured. Although all faculty should approach CES with academic rigor (and faculty development efforts should support ways to do so), more junior faculty need to do so with the highest level of documentation and attention to the process. They also need to garner the support of senior faculty, chairs, deans, and senior administrators to assure they can be successful.

It is also critical to understand that successful CES cannot happen without substantive, meaningful partnerships with the community. As in any true partnership, this requires knowledge and negotiation of each others' perspectives. Too often, CES is limited by the belief that it rests solely on the institutional partner to understand and adapt to the community. In CES, it is also critical for community partners to understand and be able to negotiate the academic environment. Although this paper does not directly deal with this issue, there is space within the framework presented for opportunities to promote such learning.

Given all this, we believe the faculty competencies and levels of expertise presented in this paper provide a specific structure and content for addressing barriers as well as a framework for programmatic faculty development CES activities. In addition, they provide insights into how individual and programmatic progress and effectiveness can be evaluated.

In summary, there are specific ways that faculty development efforts can support both the work of individual faculty and the field in general. There are aspects of community-engaged scholarship that are necessary for all faculty to have as well as competencies and skills essential for those choosing to pursue it. Most institutions of higher education are grounded in a civic mission as well as an academic mission. Community-engaged scholarship can connect those missions in ways that honor the traditions of each, and we believe effective faculty development will assure that can happen.

References

Benner, P., C. A. Tanner, and C. A. Chesla. 1992. From beginner to expert: Gaining a differentiated clinical world in critical care nursing. *Advances in Nursing Science* 14 (3): 13-28.

Blumenthal, D. S. 1996. Ethics issues in academic-industry relationships in the life sciences: The continuing debate. *Academic Medicine* 71 (12): 1291-1296.

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Braxton, J. M., W. Luckey, and P. Helland. 2002. Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* 29 (2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Calleson, D. C., C. Jordan, and S. D. Seifer. 2005. The scholarship of community engagement: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine* 80 (4): 317-321.

Campus Compact. n.d. *Carnegie community engagement classification applications.* http://www.compact.org/carnegie/applications/ (accessed February 28, 2008).

Campus Compact. n.d. *Civic engagement at research universities.* http://www.compact.org/initiatives/research_universities/ (accessed February 28, 2008).

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. 2005. *Linking scholarship and communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions.* Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. www.ccph.info (accessed February 28, 2008).

Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative. 2005. *National collaborative seeks to change academic culture to embrace community engagement.* Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. www.ccph.info (accessed February 28, 2008).

Community Health Scholars Program. n.d. *Program goals and competencies.* http://www.sph.umich.edu/chsp/program/index.shtml (accessed February 28, 2008).

Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Peer Review Workgroup. 2007. *Community engaged scholarship review, tenure, and promotion package.* Seattle: Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

Dreyfus, H. L., and S. E. Dreyfus. 1996. The relationship of theory and practice in the acquisition of skill. In *Expertise in nursing practice: Caring, clinical judgment, and ethics*, eds. P. A. Brenner, C. A. Tanner, C. A. Chelsa. New York: Springer, 29-47.

Fincher R., D. Simpson, S. Mennin, G. Rosenfeld, A. Rothman, A. McGrew, P. Hansen, P. Mazemanian, and J. Turnbull. 2000. Scholarship in teaching: An imperative for the 21st century. *Academic Medicine* 75 (9): 887-894.

Gelmon, S., and S. Agre-Kippenhan. 2002. A developmental framework for supporting evolving faculty roles for community engagement. *Journal of Public Affairs*, Suppl. issue 1.

Gibson, C. M. 2006. *Report on new times demand new scholarship: Research universities and civic engagement: A leadership agenda.* Medford, MA: Tisch College, Tufts University and Campus Compact.

Glassick, C. E., M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Indiana University School of Medicine. 2007. *Leadership in Academic Medicine Program, LAMP 2007-2008 Brochure.* http://medicine.iu.edu/documents/professional%20development/LAMP_brochure_0707.pdf.

Israel, B. A., A. J. Schulz, E. A. Parker, and A. B. Becker. 2001. Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for Health* 14 (2): 182-197.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 1999. *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution.* Third report. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Office of Public Affairs.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 2000. *Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world.* Sixth report. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Office of Public Affairs.

Macaulay, A. C., L. E. Commanda, N. Gibson, M. L. McCabe., C. M. Robbins, and P. L.Twohig. 1998. *Responsible research with communities: Participatory research in primary care* (North American Primary Care Research Group). http://napcrg.org/exec.html (accessed February 28, 2008).

National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. n.d. *Higher education fact sheets.* http://www.servicelearning.org/instant_info/fact_sheets/he_facts/index.php (accessed February 28, 2008).

POD. See *Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education.*

Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. n.d. *What is faculty development?* http://www.podnetwork.org/development.htm (accessed February 28, 2007).

Seifer S. D., K. Wong, S. Gelmon, and M. Lederer. 2009. The community-engaged scholarship for health collaborative: A national change initiative focused on faculty roles and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities* 20 (2).

Stanton, T. K. 2007. *New times demand new scholarship II: Research universities and civic engagement: Opportunities and challenges.* Los Angeles: The University of California, Los Angeles.

University of California San Francisco, Task Force on Community Partnerships. 2005. *Report of the executive vice chancellor's Task Force on Community Partnerships.* San Francisco, CA: Task Force on Community Partnerships, University of California San Francisco. http://www.familymedicine.medschool.ucsf.edu/pdf/CPTF_Report.pdf (accessed February 28, 2008).

University of Minnesota, School of Public Health. n.d. *Health disparities work group forum.* http://www.sph.umn.edu/cpheo/healthdisparities/home.html (accessed February 28, 2008).

University of New Hampshire. n.d. *Outreach scholars.* http://www.unh.edu/outreach/champions.html (accessed February 28, 2007).

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Public Health. n.d. *Conversational living rooms.* http://www.sph.unc.edu/research/conversational_living_rooms_423_1957.html (accessed February 28, 2007).

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carolina Center for Public Service. n.d. *Faculty-engaged Scholars Program* (FESP). http://www.unc.edu/cps/faculty-engaged-scholars.php (accessed February 28, 2007).

University of Washington, School of Public Health and Community Medicine. n.d *Community-based research principles.* http://sphcm.washington.edu/research/community.asp (accessed February 28, 2008).

Acknowledgments

Author Information
Lynn W. Blanchard, MPH, PhD, is the Director of the Carolina Center for Public Service at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Clinical Associate Professor in the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education at the UNC School of Public Health.

Chris Hanssmann, MPH, is a graduate of the School of Public Health at the University of Washington, where he worked with an experienced faculty practitioner of community-based participatory research to conduct thesis research using this approach. He is currently working as a Clinical Research Associate in Seattle.

Ronald P. Strauss, PhD, DMD, is the Executive Associate Provost and a Distinguished Professor and Chair in the School of Dentistry (Department of Dental Ecology) and Professor in the Department of Social Medicine at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Juan Carlos Belliard, PhD, MPH, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Global Health and Department of Environmental & Occupational Health at the School of Public Health at Loma Linda University.

Kathleen Krichbaum, PhD, RN, is an Associate Professor in the School of Nursing at University of Minnesota and Interim Associate Dean for Academic Programs.

Emily Waters, MPH, is a graduate of the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education at the UNC School of Public Health and served as graduate assistant at the Carolina Center for Public Service.

Sarena D. Seifer, MD, MS, is the Founding Executive Director of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health and Research Associate Professor of Public Health at the University of Washington.

Lynn W. Blanchard
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Carolina Center for Public Service
CB# 3142
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3142
E-mail: blanchard@unc.edu
Telephone: 919-843-7568

Chris Hanssmann
E-mail: ch6@myuw.net

Ronald P. Strauss
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Office of the Provost
CB# 3000
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7450
E-mail: ron_strauss@unc.edu
Telephone: 919-962-4510

Juan Carlos Belliard
Loma Linda University
School of Public Health
Nichol Hall Room 1302
Loma Linda, CA 92350
E-mail: jbelliard@sph.llu.edu
Telephone: 909-558-4902, ext. 44902

Kathleen Krichbaum
University of Minnesota
School of Nursing
5-160 Weaver-Densford Hall
308 Harvard Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
E-mail: krich001@umn.edu
Telephone: 612-624-2489

Emily Waters
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Carolina Center for Public Service
CB 3142
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3142
E-mail: wmemily@email.unc.edu

Sarena D. Seifer
27 Alcorn Avenue
Toronto, ON
M4V1E5
Canada
E-mail: sarena@u.washington.edu