Committee Membership and Meetings

Membership

- Christina Aplin-Kalisz, SON
- Caleb Carter, Student Rep (Winter only)
- Emily Feuerherm, CAS (Chair)
- Laura Friesen, At Large (Fall only)
- Lisa Lapeyrouse, At Large (Winter only)
- Keith Moreland, SOM
- Paula Nas, ex officio
- Pamela Ross McClain, SEHS
- Erica Sherman, CHS
- Samantha Uptmor, Student Rep (Fall only)

Annette Patterson supported the work of the Committee: she provided preparatory information, minutes, and attended all meetings.

Meetings were held monthly and all agendas and minutes are posted on the Office of Outreach's website, under the tab for Faculty Advisory Committee.

Goals and Actions

The Committee advised the Director of University Outreach to achieve the following goals for 2018-2019:

1. Create a larger campus and community awareness of the programs and services offered by University Outreach
2. Improve support, systematic tracking, and data collection of programs and projects
3. Support expanded faculty/student research & civic engagement with partners
4. Coordinate and create community and economic development opportunities
5. Identify, coordinate and promote Tri-Campus services and activities

To meet these goals, the Committee’s work addressed several key themes: P&T Standards, CE Grants, Freeman True Blue and SAAB Signature Blue Scholarships, Carnegie re-classification, and Conceptualizing Public Engagement across the 3 campuses. These are described below.

P&T Standards: Committee members worked with their colleges and schools to analyze and address gaps in Promotion and Tenure Standards for community engaged scholarship and teaching. This resulted in CAS and SOM Deans and Executive Committees receiving a Committee-endorsed recommendation: revise P&T Standards to explicitly recognize community-engaged scholarship and teaching. This recommendation was also shared with Interim Provost Sue Alcock (see Appendix 1).

CE Grants: Civic Engagement (CE) Course Implementation Grants lost funding this year. In order to support faculty’s CE efforts, funding from the Flint Truth and Action Partnership Project (FTAAPP) was
used for Winter 2019 support. Proposals underwent a rigorous and faculty-led evaluation process similar to previous years. Additionally, in response to the loss of funding, the Committee developed a comprehensive list of recommendations to the Provost regarding civic engagement, which included CE Grants, and discussed this recommendation with her in their February meeting (see Appendix 2).

Freeman True Blue and SAAB Signature Blue Scholarships: The Committee met with Gary Ashley to receive updates regarding last year’s scholarship recipients, who are all doing great work in the community and meeting the requirements of their scholarships. We also met with Louanne Snyder to improve the scholarship application process for students this year and in the future. The committee evaluated student applications and made recommendations for student award recipients and alternate recipients.

Carnegie re-classification: The Committee received regular updates regarding the Carnegie Community-Engaged Campus re-classification application. Members also provided feedback on the development of the application.

Conceptualizing Public Engagement: Ann Arbor has developed a series of discussions and resources for community engaged work. We met with the leaders of this initiative and will be exploring the development of a similar series that is specific to the Flint campus for next year (2019-2020).
Appendix 1

Building Institutional Infrastructure to Support Civic Engagement

Endorsed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the University Office of Outreach on December 12, 2018

Summary Statement: The University of Michigan-Flint is Carnegie Classified for Community Engagement. Our mission, vision, and strategic planning priorities explicitly value engagement with the community. It is part of our identity as an institution. We must protect and build upon existing institutional infrastructure in support of community engagement. We can do this by committing to institutional infrastructure to support civic engagement.

Recommendations to the Provost to increase institutional infrastructure for civic engagement

1. (Re-)Establish a mentoring program to support community engaged scholarship, teaching, and service

Background: UM-Flint used to have a faculty mentoring/training program through the University Office of Outreach called the Boyer Faculty Scholars Program, which ended in 2015. This program was mothballed following de-funding, changes in staff, and a discussion that it might move to the TCLT. The program provided a small stipend and training in the best practices for community engaged teaching and research. Boyer Scholars were required to present their work to their departments, the university, and any other professional organizations that were disciplinarily relevant. This built a culture of community engagement across campus through programming, funding, and visibility.

Rationale: Having a mentoring program for community engagement supports faculty who are doing this for the first time or are new to the university. It is especially important to ensure that community engagement projects are reciprocally beneficial and sustainable, so that the institution’s reputation in the community is maintained.

2. Provide regular and reliable funding for community-engaged courses

Background: The Office of Outreach offered Civic Engagement Course Implementation Grants of $50-1000 to community-engaged courses. The total yearly budget was $30,000. The last offering of this grant was in Fall 2018, though the grant stopped being publicized in 2017. Faculty could apply for these small grants to fund service-learning deliverables, guest speakers, transportation for field trips, and documentation of service-learning activities. These were competitive grants rigorously assessed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Office of Outreach.

Rationale: Community engagement requires sustainable commitments to community partners in order to build positive relationships between the academy and the community. Many community engaged teaching projects require some funding. Not having reliable funding damages relationships between faculty and their community partners, which in turn hurts the institution and our students. We need a reliable funding supply for community engaged courses that is competitive and peer-reviewed. Such funding should be available through two options: (1) as a newly community engaged course and (2) as a regularly offered community-engaged course whose curriculum depends on sustainable partnerships in
the community. The two systems are important for developing new partnerships in the community and maintaining existing partnerships.

3. **Provide course release time or other incentive for faculty attempting to build new community engaged courses or research with new relationships in the community.**

**Background:** As part of the Boyer Faculty Scholars program mentioned above, faculty received a stipend of $1,500 for their participation in the program. This was the only faculty incentive that was tied specifically to community engagement. The TCLT offers pedagogical grants such as the Catalyst Course Design Program and the Faculty Development Pedagogical Grants to develop new courses or revise existing ones, but these do not require a focus on community engaged teaching nor do they support best practices for community partnership development.

**Rationale:** Community engagement requires a significant amount of time to develop the relationships and plan the teaching or research projects so that they are reciprocally beneficial and meeting a community need. However, there are no institutional incentives to do this work, and there is evidence that community engaged work is largely undertaken by faculty of color and women. Providing incentives rewards effort and supports diversity in our institution.

4. **Distribute regular and comprehensive reports of civic engagement that quantifies and qualifies the impact our institution has on the community**

**Background:** There are tracking mechanisms for community engaged teaching, such as the Civic Engagement Course Indicator, but there is not a report distributed widely with this data. Community engaged research is featured in the Research Updates from the Office of Research, but this information is not communicated out to the community. Service projects such as alternative breaks and MLK Day of Service should be featured alongside teaching and research.

**Rationale:** Having a yearly report on civic engagement would make (re)applying for the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement much easier. The reports could also be used to apply for external funding to support faculty mentoring, civic engagement course grants, or other community engagement projects. There should be more support from the University Communication & Marketing office and local media outlets to get this information back out to the community.
Appendix 2

Engaged Scholarship, Teaching, & Service in Promotion and Tenure
Presented by Emily Feuerherm
On Behalf of the Faculty Advisory Committee on University Outreach & Engagement
December 4, 2018

Recommendation to revise CAS tenure and promotion guidelines and standards to more explicitly value community engaged scholarship and creative activity.¹

Rationale

According to our Carnegie classification, we should have already done this.
Currently, CAS Standards for Promotion and Tenure do not include explicit statements about engaged scholarship, only recognizing civic engagement at the level of service. The Carnegie designation as a “community engaged” campus was earned in 2010 and this year we will be applying for re-classification. However, Carnegie expected that before re-classification we would “specifically review, evaluate, and reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods” explicitly in our P&T policies.

Other UM-Flint colleges and schools have already done this.
The College of Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, and the School of Education & Human Services have all incorporated the value of engaged scholarship into their P&T standards and guidelines. For example, the College of Health Sciences and School of Nursing explicitly orient to the Boyer model of scholarship which includes the scholarship of discovery, integration, application/engagement, and teaching. SEHS does not use the Boyer model, but does include scholarship that addresses “community issues and those challenges facing our K-12 educational community.”

We can meet strategic priorities and goals by doing this.
The P&T process is a central motivating force for tenure-track faculty and should reflect institutional values, such as our university-level priorities to excel in scholarship and be a vital partner with the community. At the college level, the faculty endorsed the action item that “CAS will further support and recognize the value of engaged scholarship and creative activity for both faculty and students.”

We should do this for the public (and institutional) good.
As an urban public institution, we have an obligation to provide a public service for good and research shows that valuing engaged scholarship has many benefits to faculty, students, and the community. Additionally, we want to retain community-engaged faculty who can represent and

¹ According to the new England Resource Center for Higher Education, “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 the faculty role in which teaching, research, 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.” Foundational values are social justice and citizenship. Foundational principles are high-quality scholarship, reciprocity, democratization of knowledge, boundary-crossing, sustainability, and identified community needs.
connect the academy and the community. Faculty of color and women are more likely to do engaged scholarship, so supporting engaged scholarship also supports diversity. Community partnerships that are fostered by faculty can lead to opportunities for our students (engaged learning opportunities, connections with potential employers) and our institution (the reputation of the institution, community connections for gifts and grants, increased visibility).

**Not doing this harms our faculty, students, and institution.**

If our P&T policies remain silent on the issue of community engaged scholarship and creative activity, we are supporting regimes of power that privilege only certain forms of scholarly excellence and those who focus on those traditional forms. In order to institute a culture of review that includes all forms of academic diversity, we must adopt an inclusive policy model that recognizes and values community engagement.

**Models**

There are several models to draw from for the revision of the P&T policies. The Boyer Model is a useful start to creating an inclusive perspective of scholarship and creative activity. The Boyer Model identifies and defines four types of scholarship: (1) the scholarship of discovery, (2) the scholarship of integration, (3) the scholarship of application and engagement, and (4) the scholarship of teaching. The standards by which these different types of scholarship are judged are that it will demonstrate clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. This model is used by UM-Flint’s SON P&T Standards (below).

Other models for revising P&T policies focus on defining community engagement (New English Resource Center for Higher Education, MSU’s Points of Distinction), developing indicators of excellence for community-based research (Taylor & Ochocka, 2017), providing networks for inclusive peer review (Community Campus Partnerships for Health), and defining the community engaged scholarship model for health professions (Register & King, 2018).

**Process**

If we choose to do this, the Executive Committee would take the lead of drafting the new language. A recommended process for undertaking this work is available through the AAC&U’s article “Advancing Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure: A Roadmap and Call to Reform.” The article identifies 5 steps and provides examples of universities and their policies that relate to each step.

1. Define community engaged scholarship and creative activity
2. Identify criteria for evaluating community engaged scholarship and creative activity
3. Consider what constitutes documentation and evidence
4. Make peer review more inclusive
5. Value local impact

**Models from UM-Flint**

**Example use of The Boyer Model, used by UM-Flint’s School of Nursing**

Boyer (1990) provides a framework for defining scholarship that is well suited for nursing, and his conceptualization of scholarship fits well with the SON faculty’s philosophy of scholarship which extends beyond creating research for its own sake. Boyer identifies a broad range of activities as scholarly (e.g., scholarship of discovery, integration, application/engagement, and teaching) as summarized below:
• Scholarship of discovery is aimed at the development or creation of new knowledge. It represents the traditional view of research, including primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis.

• Scholarship of integration connects disciplines, fitting one’s own or others’ research in larger intellectual patterns. It includes educating non-specialists, explaining/interpreting findings, doing original interprofessional work, conducting integrative reviews of literature, analyzing health policy, studying healthcare systems, conducting meta-analysis, or synthesis of literature from other disciplines.

• Scholarship of application (also called the scholarship of engagement/community-engaged scholarship) applies an integrative approach to the traditional domains of research, teaching, practice, and service. This category of scholarship is the use of knowledge in problem solving in the professions, industry, government, and community. Findings of this scholarship are applied in teaching/learning and practice. It includes development of clinical knowledge such as development or application of theoretical formulations and conduct of clinically applicable research and evaluation studies, evaluation of systems of care, development of delivery modes, and taking leadership roles in developing practice that improves access to or delivery of health care.

• Scholarship of teaching produces knowledge to support the transfer of information from teacher to student. It is inquiry and/or reflection about teaching/learning; assessment; evidence gathering; peer collaboration; and review and development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative teaching methods, program development, and outcomes.

Scholarly activities may reflect one or any combination of Boyer’s categories of scholarship. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are evaluated on the quality and, to a lesser extent, quantity of their scholarly activities. Work is expected to make a contribution to the profession/field/discipline, to interprofessional areas, and/or to pedagogical endeavors. The committee review is complemented by documentation from external reviewers.

Evidence of Scholarly Activities
Evidence of the scholarship of discovery, integration, application/engagement, and teaching may vary, depending on the focus of scholarship. Evidence should include, but is not limited to, a combination of the following:
• up-to-date curriculum vitae inclusive of all supporting evidence
• scholarship narrative statement including:
  o candidate’s identified and projected lines of scholarship
  o description of progressive development of a focused program(s) of research
  o description and classification of candidate’s scholarship (e.g., Boyer’s Model categories of scholarship or other models)
  o Description of role/contribution in co-authored publications, grant proposals, presentations, and other scholarly products
  o Evidence of scholarship impact and regional, national, and/or international recognition of scholarly achievements
• peer-reviewed research-based, interprofessional, pedagogical, and/or clinical publications
- publications in non-reviewed journals
- invited authorship and editorials
- funded (or approved but not funded) extramural grant proposals
- funded intramural grant proposals for research and/or creative scholarly projects
- peer-reviewed and invited keynote, podium, and/or poster presentations at regional, national, and/or international professional conferences
- monographs, books, chapters in books, and conference proceedings
- development and implementation of workshops related to identified areas of scholarship
- consultation reports
- development of policy papers and legislation
- creative or scholarly products
- honors, awards, and/or other forms of evidence of regional, national, and/or international reputation and recognition for scholarly achievements
- letters of support from internal/external colleagues (solicited or unsolicited)
- letters of support by arm’s length external reviewers from Masters Level Teaching Universities (preferred) or higher that, when taken together on balance, indicate support for the candidate’s promotion to associate professor or professor
- evidence of professional development related to research and scholarly activities

For promotion from associate professor to professor, the emphasis will be placed on achievements since the last tenure and promotion or promotion decision. The difference between the ranks of associate professor and professor is primarily one of the depth and breadth of achievement and significance of one’s contributions.

**Example used by SEHS**

Scholarly Activity Scholarly activity must be activity in the pursuit of new knowledge. The knowledge can take any format and can be abstract, symbolic, practical, applied, contingent, transactional, or aesthetic, but it must be new. Data collection, analysis, and synthesis, as well as strategic use of data, is often part of scholarship, but it does not in itself constitute scholarship. The key is that the knowledge that comes out of the activity, the understandings that result, must not be determined in advance.

In order for scholarship to count toward promotion, the new knowledge must have an impact beyond the School, and so must be disseminated in a form that is subject to scholarly review. While there are many ways for scholarship to be disseminated, as described below, this almost always must include articles, book chapters, or books. In addition, for knowledge to have an impact it must be validated by others in the field who are not already invested in the content of the knowledge, and so “arm’s-length” peer review is important. It is also important for the scholar to know the field well, so one can be sure that knowledge created is truly new.

Teaching may be considered scholarship if it meets criteria outlined in the Carnegie Foundation statement on the scholarship of teaching (see Appendix), and service may also be considered scholarship if it meets similar criteria of involving inquiry and public accounting subject to critical peer review.

The following types of scholarly activity are included:
A. Those creative activities documented as significant contributions to knowledge, works, techniques, and/or principles of the discipline. These scholarly activities occur in media, which are available to critical evaluation within the discipline(s) both in and outside the university; these activities may be interdisciplinary. It generally includes the generation of new knowledge that is critically evaluated and professionally recognized through:
   - Refereed journal articles
   - Monographs
   - Proceedings
   - Preparing grants and receiving resources to support the research
   - Public presentation of findings

B. Those scholarly activities that give meaning to isolated facts, putting them in perspective. These scholarly activities occur at the interface of disciplines, especially where one field of learning connects with another body of knowledge. The resulting interaction provides the setting for new insights and understanding as traditional facts and theories are considered in another part of the universe of learning. New bridges and relationships between and among disciplines are established. Those activities where knowledge is used to make connections across/within disciplines include:
   - Developing new courses and/or programs of study
   - Writing textbooks
   - Developing audio/video programs and/or computer software
   - Developing/sponsoring colloquia, forums, and interdisciplinary seminars

C. A third category of activities are those that use knowledge to address demanding, substantive, human problems including community issues and those challenges facing our K-12 educational community. These activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge. The scholarly work is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor and the accountability of all serious scholarship. These activities require the research to use knowledge to address demanding, substantive human problems by:
   - Conducting applied research and evaluation
   - Providing technical assistance and/or consulting to schools, agencies, etc.
   - Developing new products, practices, clinical procedures, etc.
   - Performing clinical service
   - Preparing grants and securing resources to address these problems
   - Promoting experiential learning and professional development