



***NERCHE Working Paper: 2014 Series, Issue 2***

---

***The Challenges of Rewarding New Forms of  
Scholarship: Creating Academic Cultures that  
Support Community-Engaged Scholarship***

*A report on a Bringing Theory to Practice seminar held May 15, 2014*

---

**John Saltmarsh**

*University of Massachusetts, Boston*

**John Wooding**

*University of Massachusetts, Lowell*

**Kat McLellan**

*University of Massachusetts, Amherst*

**September 2014**



## Table of Contents

---

<i>Preamble</i> .....	2
<i>Purpose of the Seminar</i> .....	3
<i>Context</i> .....	4
<i>Seminar Structure</i> .....	6
<i>Findings</i> .....	7
<i>Recommendations</i> .....	10
<i>Dissemination</i> .....	13
<i>Participants</i> .....	13

*When citing this working paper, please use the following format:*

Saltmarsh, J., Wooding, J., & McLellan, K. (2014). The challenges of rewarding new forms of scholarship: Creating academic cultures that support community-engaged scholarship. A report on a Bringing Theory to Practice seminar held May 15, 2014. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

*Please send correspondence to:*

John Saltmarsh  
Director, New England Resource Center for Higher Education  
University of Massachusetts, Boston  
[john.saltmarsh@umb.edu](mailto:john.saltmarsh@umb.edu)

## Preamble

---

The need for and value of civic engagement is widely acknowledged and frequently advocated by students and faculty at American universities. Over the last several decades, recognizing the variety of forms of scholarly research and academic achievement has become commonplace on many campuses. The Carnegie Foundation now assesses and validates community engagement as one critical measure of a university's identity and success. Many faculty stress community involvement, internships, and various forms of experiential learning in their courses and view them as critical components of a university education. Numerous faculty engage in community-engaged research, working with local organizations, local businesses, and city and town governments, solving problems and helping to collect data and information. There exists a considerable literature—by and for faculty—documenting the scholarship and pedagogical impact of civic engagement strategies and the promotion of community-engaged research.

Frequently, however, such activities are not rewarded or supported in the recognition and promotion process of faculty in higher education. Faculty and universities are still judged primarily by the research profile of their individual and combined achievements. This profile exclusively rewards models which assume that all valid knowledge of the physical and social world is obtained by faculty pursuing their research agendas and getting validation for that work in the form of peer-reviewed publications, successful grant applications, and recognition in national and international discipline-based associations. While some universities are recognizing emerging forms of scholarship in ways that challenge this traditional model, there are powerful counterforces that undermine higher education's commitment to community engagement. The decline in funding for state universities and the competition over fewer and fewer funding opportunities have pushed many institutions to return to a narrow model of excellence built on traditional ideas about academia's function and role. Increasingly, universities are engaged in a prestige race in which the winners are defined by the presence of star faculty (i.e., those who publish widely, obtain large grant-funded research projects, and who receive wide public acclaim for their research) and by their success at recruiting top students and placing them in high paying, high skill careers. Administrators focus on encouraging these traditional activities as they seek funds from wealthy sponsors, alumni, foundations, and grant funding institutions to replace dwindling state support. The recognition of faculty committed to community engagement is often counterbalanced by institutional striving for higher prestige through narrow and restrictive measures of excellence.

Our concern for finding better ways to recognize the work of University of Massachusetts (UMass) faculty who pursue emerging forms of scholarship, including community engagement—and who encourage their students in community engagement—prompted a one-day seminar on the assessment and reward structure for university faculty's community engagement activities. As a result of a vibrant and active discussion that showcased what has been happening on the five campuses of the UMass system, we have formulated the following statement of concerns and actions needed to better recognize the value of community engagement for students, faculty, our campuses, and the University as a whole.

## Purpose of the Seminar

---

The purpose of this seminar was to examine and explore a wide range of faculty rewards (including promotion criteria, awards, faculty development support, and policies at various levels) that provide incentives and recognition to faculty for undertaking community-engaged scholarship (CES). Throughout our discussions, we considered community-engaged scholarship as the advancement of knowledge focusing on social issues through mutually beneficial, reciprocal collaboration with peers outside the university who have locally grounded knowledge and experience.

The central problem the seminar addressed is that most universities lack a system of incentives and supports for faculty who undertake (or are considering) community-engaged scholarship addressing broad social impact. The policies and cultures that shape faculty behavior for career advancement have not kept pace with changes in knowledge production and dissemination. Campuses are attempting to address new and rapidly changing internal and external environments, including (1) increasing the ethnic and gender diversity of the faculty, (2) creating space for new perspectives on advancing knowledge, and (3) addressing the need for organizational change so that universities are publically accountable and have greater legitimacy. In such an environment, community engagement, publically engaged scholarship, and university-community partnerships become increasingly important ways for universities to more effectively generate knowledge, address social issues, improve the human condition, and fulfill their academic and civic purposes. The central question is whether the existing academic policies sufficiently and appropriately enact the core mission of the University of Massachusetts, an “integrated tripartite mission of discovery (a public trust), education (a moral vocation), and engagement (a societal obligation).”<sup>1</sup>

The need for new and revised structures to reward new forms of scholarship is being examined nationally and globally. It is also being examined on campuses that make up the University of Massachusetts system<sup>2</sup>. All of the UMass campuses currently retain the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification and are in the process of seeking re-classification. As a part of the re-classification process, campuses address the following question: “In the period since your successful classification, what, if anything, has changed in terms of institutional policies for promotion that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?” The seminar was an opportunity to share current campus practices and processes for bringing about institutional change, to reflect on the state of current reward structures, and to consider ways to effect meaningful cultural change.

Thirty individuals participated in the seminar, primarily faculty and administrators from the five campuses in the University of Massachusetts system representing a range of disciplines and various levels of faculty rank. A list of participants is included at the end of this report. The seminar was sponsored by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, in collaboration with Boston URBAN (Urban Research-Based Action Network).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Remarks of Vice President for Academic Affairs, Marcellette Williams, to the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, June 4, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> The five campuses of the University of Massachusetts system are Amherst, Boston, Dartmouth, Lowell, and the Medical School.

<sup>3</sup> Urban Research-Based Action Network (URBAN) is an emerging network of researchers and community members who have come together (1) in order to identify opportunities for collaborative research (and thinking) that addresses critical needs facing urban communities. Additionally, (2) URBAN provides a platform for “engaged” scholarship where individual faculty members from

## Context

---

*“To be candid, I believe that my ‘traditional’ scholarship alone (read: grants and papers) should be strong enough for a positive tenure decision. I am still deciding on how to incorporate my engagement work into the portfolio I put together. I would like to have it be a major part of my essays on my research, teaching, and five-year plan that form part of my package, but am still not sure if this is the best strategy. I will be putting these documents together in the fall, and my strategy is to wait and see how the landscape looks at that point in time, and act accordingly.”*

The passage above quotes a faculty member who is coming up for tenure review and is ambivalent about how to present her community engaged scholarly work. The quotation captures the struggle over scholarly identity and the cultural politics of navigating academic systems that don't recognize and support the kind of scholarship that defines the faculty member as a scholar. This is a common dilemma. It occurs on campuses across the U.S. when a new generation of scholars who are producing knowledge through new forms of scholarship encounter academic systems that do not recognize and reward their scholarship and allow them to thrive as scholars. As Tierney and Perkins observe, “the professional reward structure needs to shift. Institutions need a diversity of routes to academic excellence and some of them will pertain to being involved outside the ivory tower...Academic work needs to have an impact in order to provide society's return on investment...For that to happen, the reward structure and those practices that socialize faculty need to shift in a way that supports engagement rather than disdains it” (“Beyond the Ivory Tower: Academic Work in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century,” in Genevieve Shaker, Ed., *Faculty and the Public Good*, New York: Teacher College Press, forthcoming).

Some campuses are addressing the need to change the academic reward structure, but progress has been slow and fraught with conflict. At a campus like Tulane University, which has both a Carnegie Classification as a “Research, Very High Activity” campus and an Elective Community Engagement Classification, the conversation about change is in the early stages. In February 2013, the Provost issued *Academic Review and Engagement at Tulane University: A White Paper for Discussion*, declaring that “[g]iven the centrality of engagement to Tulane's mission and ongoing strategic planning process, we cannot continue to sustain a culture of academic review that is silent on engagement.” At Syracuse University, also a campus that has both a Carnegie Classification as a “Research, Very High Activity” campus and an Elective Community Engagement Classification, with strong administrative leadership and faculty commitment, the faculty and administration went through a four- to five-year process that led to a revision of the promotion and tenure guidelines that explicitly incorporates community engagement into the reward policies of the campus. The faculty handbook now reads:

*Syracuse University is committed to longstanding traditions of scholarship as well as evolving perspectives on scholarship. Syracuse University recognizes that the role of academia is not static, and that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines change over time. The University will continue to support*

---

multiple disciplines (and institutions) can connect with one another and members of communities to share ideas and be supported within the academy as they endeavor to pursue a community based “activist” research agenda. URBAN.BOSTON is the local node of the URBAN network and is committed to building and sustaining an emerging network in the Boston metropolitan area.

*scholars in all of these traditions, including faculty who choose to participate in publicly engaged scholarship. Publicly engaged scholarship may involve partnerships of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, creative activity, and public knowledge; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address and help solve critical social problems; and contribute to the public good. (Faculty Manual 2.34 Areas of Expected Faculty Achievement: Teaching, Research, and Service: <http://provost.syr.edu/faculty-support/faculty-manual/2-34-areas-of-expected-faculty-achievement-teaching-research-and-service>.)*

Across the country, many campuses are at some stage of reconsidering and revising their reward structures to provide recognition for new forms of scholarship—community-engaged scholarship, digital scholarship, interdisciplinary scholarship—and the scholars who are producing it. The scholar quoted at the beginning of this section is part of a larger phenomenon in higher education of a substantial number of faculty doing engaged scholarly work across their faculty roles. The 2010-2011 Faculty Survey from the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA asks the question, “During the past two years, [have you] collaborated with the local community in research/teaching?” The response from faculty at all undergraduate campuses was 42.5%. When asked what “Issues you believe to be of ‘highest’ or ‘high’ priority at your institution,” 29.2% of faculty responded that it was “[t]o provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research.” There is clearly a movement to embrace community-engaged, interdisciplinary, and innovative approaches to scholarship and research.

Across the five campuses of the University of Massachusetts system, academic policies are specified in various documents approved by the Board of Trustees and through faculty union collective bargaining contracts. Most of the policy documents articulate community involvement as an area to be recognized as part of a faculty member’s service obligations. This is typical and widespread—that is, community involvement is recognized as service activity, and in the context of a research university, the norm is that research and scholarship and creative activity count the most, teaching and learning count less than scholarship, and service counts the least. None of the UMass policy documents specifically articulate community engagement as a part of the faculty’s teaching role or research, scholarship, and creative activity role. As is happening on other campuses nationally, some of the campuses in the system—in particular UMass, Amherst and UMass, Boston—are exploring ways to create policies to reward community-engaged scholarship.

At the University of Massachusetts, Boston, the data on faculty community-engaged scholarship mirror the national data. In a survey done at UMass, Boston in 2009, 33% of faculty described their scholarship as “Public scholarship (engaged research, action research, community-based research).” While a third of the faculty are involved with community-engaged scholarship, the academic policies specifically reward community involvement only as part of the faculty’s service role.

During the academic year 2013-2014, a Working Group was formed at UMass, Boston and was charged by the Provost to submit recommendations for rewards for community-engaged scholarship. The working group found that:

- the dominant perception among faculty was that there are not clear policies in place that articulate the value of community engagement as core academic work of the faculty in their scholarship and in their teaching;
- the pervasive perspective is that if community engagement is going to be part of the institutional identity of a research university, it has to be encouraged, supported, and valued as scholarly activity; and,
- advancing CES does not mean that all faculty will be involved with CES, but that those who are doing CES or aspire to do CES will be recognized and rewarded for their community-engaged research, scholarship, and creative activities.

The Working Group issued specific recommendations in the following areas:

- Guidelines for inclusion in tenure and promotion policies
- Changes to the Annual Faculty Report
- A new award for community-engaged scholarship

(Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston. A Report of the Working Group for an Urban Research-Based Action Initiative, March 2014. [http://cdn.umb.edu/images/research/Report\\_on\\_Community\\_Engaged\\_Scholarship.pdf](http://cdn.umb.edu/images/research/Report_on_Community_Engaged_Scholarship.pdf))

The seminar offered an opportunity to examine what is being done to reward community engagement across the campuses of the University of Massachusetts system within the context of national efforts and change initiatives, and in light of some emergent campus discussions.

## Seminar Structure

---

Prior to the seminar, members of each of the campus teams were asked to prepare a short presentation addressing:

- (1) the current reward structure for faculty;
- (2) how CES is being rewarded on their campus;
- (3) what challenges are faced in rewarding CES;
- (4) what changes have taken place on campus that provide rewards for CES;
- (5) what the process is for bringing about change; and,
- (6) what the central barriers are for change.

The campus presentations focused the discussion to address first what is in place on each campus—hiring practices, awards, faculty development for implementation, institutional policies, college policies, departmental policies, faculty development for evaluation. Campuses also presented on what changes seem to be more effective than others (e.g., Does support for faculty development work without changes in policies? Why?). During these presentations, a great deal of clarification, questions, and discussion formed the basis of a wide-ranging conversation on how the systems worked and how they often failed.

During lunch, Dr. Linda Silka, Director of the Margaret Chase Smith Policy Center and Professor in the School of Economics at the University of Maine, delivered a keynote presentation entitled, “We Are All in this Together: Combining Resources to Find Innovative Solutions to the Problem of Rewarding Engaged Scholarship.”

After lunch, the discussion continued with a focus on how change has come about (as it had on some campuses) and what this has meant for recognition and rewards for CES. This led to some focused questions, such as: What are effective strategies for engaging faculty and administrators in campus change? What are effective ways to frame community-engaged scholarship? Who needs to be part of the change process? What are strategies for working through obstacles in the change process?

After these discussions, the focus of the seminar shifted to the question of next steps in changing the structures and culture of faculty reward systems. Specifically, participants addressed the question, “How will you advance rewards for CES on your campus?” This part of the seminar provided an opportunity for collective problem solving that drew on the knowledge and experiences of the participants and lessons learned during the seminar.

## Findings

---

As noted in the preamble, this report is intended to be actively used to engage further discussion and to provide recommendations to the UMass system on how changes to faculty rewards can be developed and how the University’s commitment to CES can be further encouraged. Extensive notes were taken during the seminar and the ten findings below are distilled from the transcript of the meeting. We have organized these findings around key themes that emerged from the seminar.

### Annual Faculty Reports

The existing process for reporting and documenting faculty activity is an opportunity to signal the importance of community engagement across the faculty roles. Annual Faculty Reports function primarily as a means for (1) collecting information about faculty activity on an annual basis, and (2) assessing faculty productivity for purposes of distributing merit pay. Annual Faculty Reports also serve to define faculty workload and are properly shaped in concert with the union that serves as the bargaining unit for the campus. The example from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, of having a committee of the faculty senate work with the union and the office of the Provost to implement revisions to the Annual Faculty Report, highlights the importance of this process as one way of providing recognition for community engagement. The revised Annual Faculty Report at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst now includes community engagement as an area for reporting in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service. For faculty doing community engagement, they now have a way to report—and be recognized for—their community engagement across the faculty roles.

### Faculty Senate/Council

The unit that serves as the voice of faculty governance on the campus can serve a role in the recognition and rewarding of community engagement. It is important that community engagement as core academic work fall under the purview of faculty, and not be perceived as being imposed upon the faculty by administration. An example of this exists at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, with the Faculty Senate Council on Public Engagement and Outreach, which is one of a number of councils of the faculty senate and is charged with coordinating engagement.

### Redefining Scholarship

While Ernest Boyer started a national conversation about reconsidering how we define scholarship in the 1990s, the conversation continues in new and perhaps more urgent ways. A new generation of scholars approaches knowledge-generation in ways that are not fully recognized by existing policies and structures. Boyer raised the issue of interdisciplinary scholarship in 1990, and the scholarship of engagement in 1996, but didn't foresee the prominence of digital scholarship in some disciplines and for some scholars. The key point here is to open up space for new forms of scholarship to be adequately, appropriately, and fairly rewarded. None of these new forms of scholarship should be considered as additions to traditional forms of scholarship; if they are, then they will in fact be added on to existing faculty scholarly expectations.

### Explicit Policy Criteria

First, having community engagement specifically articulated in reward policies is essential. It may be that the most effective, short-term way for campuses in the system to accomplish this is through interpretive policy statements issued by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on the respective campus. For instance, in its report, the University of Massachusetts, Boston's Working Group to the Provost articulates specific recommendations for how that policy document could be written. For the long-term, a comprehensive revision of Trustee policy documents would be in order, as some of these documents date back to 1976. While policy revision is essential, it is not sufficient. Campus leaders will need to have a long-term commitment to aligning policies across campuses (and across Colleges and Departments) and to provide professional development and guidance for (1) faculty in the tenure pipeline on how to present their engaged scholarly work, and (2) faculty on personnel review committees on how to evaluate community-engaged scholarly work.

### Research Prestige

One of the seminar participants provided an observation that resonated strongly with participants at the seminar—that across the system, there is a “savage ambition” to rise in the research profile, and that this striving can inhibit innovation and recognition of emergent scholarly work. Too often, improving the “research profile” means growing and supporting traditional scholarship (e.g., journal articles, research grant awards, positivist methodologies, single-author publications) while not recognizing the values of community-engaged research and scholarship. It is important that academic leaders across the system nurture an academic culture that values community engagement as scholarship that raises the profile of campuses, brings about an understanding that community-engaged research contributes to broader social impacts across the Commonwealth, and demonstrates tangible public accountability. Campus and system leaders can advance community engagement as an added value to the University. An example of how this might be done is to make visible that the University of Massachusetts is the only state university system in the country in which every one of the campuses has the Elective Community Engagement Classification from the Carnegie Foundation. This national recognition, and community engagement as core faculty work, should be viewed as contributing to the prestige of the campuses and the system. Such scholarship is valued and understood by the Commonwealth's citizens and their legislators.

### Research Grants

Each of the campuses in the system provides internal funding opportunities for faculty research. The more campuses create funding opportunities for community-engaged

research, and the more the campuses invest in these opportunities, the more incentives that are created for faculty to undertake community-engaged research; and for faculty already doing community-engaged research, they will find greater support for their research. An example of this kind of research opportunity is at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, which revised the guidelines for a longstanding “Public Service Grant.” The revised guidelines now articulate and fund community-engaged research:

*As a public urban research university, one way, and possibly the best way, to foster outstanding public and community service is through community-based research and engaged scholarship...Publicly engaged scholarship involves collaborative, reciprocal partnerships that couple university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to sharpen and enrich research to increase public knowledge and better inform community service.*

### ScholarWorks

Each of the campus libraries has adopted ScholarWorks as a way of electronically disseminating faculty scholarship. ScholarWorks can be an important mechanism for highlighting community-engaged scholarship. An example of this is at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, which has created specific search functions that compile community-engaged scholarship and at the same time provide a platform for faculty doing community engagement to make their work more visible. This is another incentive for faculty and another means for signaling to faculty that community-engaged scholarship is valued and taken seriously.

### Chief Academic Officer Leadership

In order for community engagement to be valued as core academic work, the Provost plays a central role in providing the leadership for and signaling the importance of community engagement. If there is ambiguity about the value of community engagement or inconsistent messages about it from the Provost, then deans, chairs, and faculty will be unsure about whether it is something they should embrace and advance. More than any other campus administrator, it is the Provost who sets the tone for where community engagement fits as an institutional priority for faculty and how it will be valued.

### Strategic Plan

Community engagement should be a clearly identifiable part of academic goals of the strategic plan for the campus. If community engagement is not included in the strategic plan, it will not be seen as an institutional priority, and if it is not an academic goal, then it will not be seen as the work of the faculty. Beyond vague and lofty references to public purpose and civic commitment in mission statements, and references to the importance of the campus to Massachusetts’s communities in the campus vision statements, what is needed is the structuring of community engagement as a priority with clear benchmarks for implementation.

### Award for Community Engaged Scholarship

At both the campus level and at the system level, one way to signal the importance of community engagement is through an annual faculty award. What currently exists is a set of awards that recognize excellence for each of the segmented faculty roles – teaching, scholarship, and service. These are important, but they do not capture community engagement and the way that community-engaged scholars often integrate their faculty roles doing engaged scholarly work across teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. Historically, there are numerous

examples of faculty receiving the “service excellence” award for their community service but without recognition that their service work with the community was linked to and improved their teaching and learning role, and that both their service and teaching were linked to their research. An award that recognizes excellence in community engagement, celebrating faculty who integrate their faculty roles in deep collaboration with community partners, would be an important public symbol of the importance of community engagement.

## Recommendations

---

Based on the seminar discussion and in light of activities currently ongoing at UMass, we would like to propose the following recommendations with the goal of improving and enhancing the reward structure for faculty who engage in community-engaged research and education.

### 1. UMass Systems Office

It is critical that the UMass President’s Office embrace and advocate for the importance of innovative research and teaching and, in particular, for community-engaged research and education. Academic work now embraces digital publications, social networks, public presentations, training and support for community activities with public, private, and not-for-profit institutions. In short, the array of activities now considered part of an academic career transcends traditional publication and research. In order to embrace these innovations and to recognize the value of community-engaged scholarship, we recommend that the UMass system do the following:

- Review and revise system-wide documents that relate to faculty work and expectations throughout the UMass system to insure that they recognize and explicate new forms of scholarship, research, and pedagogy. Many of these documents have not been updated since the 1970s.
- The UMass system is the only state system in which all campuses are now recognized by the Carnegie Foundation as Community Engaged. The President’s Office should make this achievement visible as a demonstration of the public accountability of the University and as a way to advance deeper community engagement across the system.

In light of this significant achievement and the value community engagement brings to the University as a whole, including the major contribution it provides as an indication to the wider public of the valuable role the University plays in contributing to the daily lives of people, we recommend that the President’s Office create an initiative on Community Engagement that parallels the current initiative on International Relations (<http://www.massachusetts.edu/international/index.html>).

The initiative could be described in this way:

#### ***Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts***

*Nearly 150 years ago, the University of Massachusetts was founded to impact communities across the Commonwealth. Today, through Community Engagement at UMass, the University extends its tradition of excellence through collaboration between UMass campuses*

and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The campuses have long been involved with community engagement. As part of the [Office of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and International Relations](#), we support the campuses' efforts and strive to form partnerships that will create opportunities to expand the University's community impact.

To better engage the world in which we live—the world our faculty work and our students will enter—UMass is focusing on:

- *Developing and integrating into the curriculum community engagement opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.*
- *Promoting and encouraging faculty to engage in community-engaged research, teaching, and service.*

Additionally, as with the initiative on International Relations, the initiative on Community Engagement website could include the following:

#### **Information**

- [Home](#)
- [Academic Affairs, Student Affairs & International Relations](#)
- [Community Engagement Advisory Council](#)
- [Message from the Senior Vice President](#)
- [Carnegie Foundation Recognition](#)

#### **Opportunities**

- [Campus Information](#)
- [Campus Funding Opportunities](#)
- [Community Partnership Database](#)
- [Faculty Resources](#)

As part of the initiative, we would also recommend the following:

- The creation of an Advisory Board comprising selected faculty from each campus.
- Sponsorship of the following activities:
  - An Annual Meeting on Best Practices for community engagement, showcasing current examples of innovative scholarship and community engagement.
  - An Annual Award for Community Engaged Scholarship.
  - An Annual Grant Program similar to the Creative Economy Grant to aid and stimulate community-engaged scholarship.
  - An Annual professional development opportunity that would provide faculty and senior administrators from all campuses the chance to learn about innovative scholarship and community engagement.

## **2. Campus Initiatives**

- The Chancellor and Provost should share this report with executive leadership on the campus and put it on the agenda of meetings of the Dean's Council.

- The Chancellor of each campus should establish an annual award recognizing community engagement integrated across the faculty roles.

Such an award could be framed in this way:

*The Chancellor's Award emphasizes community-engaged scholarly work across faculty roles. The scholarship of engagement (also known as outreach scholarship, public scholarship, scholarship for the common good, community-based scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship) represents an integrated view of faculty roles in which teaching, research/creative activity, and service overlap and are mutually reinforcing, is characterized by scholarly work tied to a faculty member's expertise, is of benefit to the external community, is visible and shared with community stakeholders, and reflects the mission of the institution. Community-engaged scholarship (1) involves academic projects that engage faculty members and students in a collaborative and sustained manner with community groups; (2) connects university outreach with community organizational goals; (3) furthers mutual productive relationships between the university and the community; (4) entails shared authority in the research process from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the results, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer review; (5) results in excellence in engaged scholarship through such products as peer-reviewed publications, collaborative reports, documentation of impact, and external funding, and (6) is integrated with teaching and/or with service activities. (Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston. A Report of the Working Group for an Urban Research-Based Action Initiative, March 2014, pp. 6 & 38. [http://cdn.umb.edu/images/research/Report\\_on\\_Community\\_Engaged\\_Scholarship.pdf](http://cdn.umb.edu/images/research/Report_on_Community_Engaged_Scholarship.pdf))*

- The Chancellor should support the attendance of the Provost and, with the Provost, Academic Deans, at the Engagement Academy for University Leaders in order to develop leadership on campus-community engagement (<http://www.cpe.vt.edu/engagementacademy/eaui/index.html>).
- The Provost on each campus should work with the Faculty Senate (or Faculty Council) to establish a "Public Engagement Council" as a faculty committee to advance community engagement on the campus. This can be modeled on the Public Engagement Council of the Faculty Senate at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- The Provost on each campus should work with the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Union to revise policy documents such as the union contract and Annual Faculty Reports to specifically include community engagement as core faculty work.
- The Provost on each campus should issue a set of guidelines for the inclusion of community engagement in tenure and promotion such that community engagement is incorporated in each of the three categories considered in personnel matters concerning tenure and promotion—that is, scholarship, teaching, and service. It should be considered one important way to contribute to the university's mission in each area, but not as a required practice for all members of the faculty. In other words, one significant way to contribute to scholarship in a field is through community-engaged scholarship.

- The Provost should work with the campus office for teaching and learning to offer workshops for senior faculty who serve on personnel review committees aimed at developing expertise in evaluating community-engaged scholarship. Additionally, the campus office for teaching and learning should offer workshops for junior faculty on documenting community-engaged scholarship in their tenure and promotion portfolios.

## Dissemination

---

This report will be sent to *Bringing Theory to Practice*, and it will be posted as a resource on the websites of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education and URBAN.

Additionally, the report will be sent to the President of the University of Massachusetts, the Chancellors and Provosts on each campus of the University of Massachusetts, and to all of the participants in the seminar.

## Participants

---

Joan Arches, *UMass Boston*  
 Kathleen Banfield, *UMass Boston*  
 Kelly Bates, *Emerson College*  
 John Bryan, *UMass Amherst*  
 Joanna Cain, *UMass Medical*  
 Suzanne Cashman, *UMass Medical*  
 Nicky Champagne, *UMass Lowell*  
 Nancy Cohen, *UMass Amherst*  
 Mignon Duffy, *UMass Lowell*  
 Dwight Giles, *UMass Boston*  
 Heather-Lyn Haley, *UMass Medical*  
 Joseph Krupczynski, *UMass Amherst*  
 Kat McLellan, *UMass Amherst*  
 Julie Nash, *UMass Lowell*  
 John Reiff, *UMass Amherst*  
 Lorna Rivera, *UMass Boston*  
 Jonathan Rosa, *UMass Amherst*  
 Matt Roy, *UMass Dartmouth*  
 John Saltmarsh, *UMass Boston*  
 Amy Shapiro, *UMass Dartmouth*  
 Linda Silka, *University of Maine*  
 Glaucia Silva, *UMass Dartmouth*  
 Rajini Srikanth, *UMass Boston*  
 Shirley Tang, *UMass Boston*  
 Shelley Tinkham, *Massachusetts Department of Higher Education*  
 Adrian Tió, *UMass Dartmouth*  
 Robin Toof, *UMass Lowell*  
 Elaine Ward, *Merrimack College*  
 Mark Warren, *UMass Boston*  
 John Wooding, *UMass Lowell*