**Strategies for Developing and Documenting Products of Public Scholarship**

**in Research and Creative Activity [V7]**

 [Adapted from Jordan 2007; Wood et al. 2016]

**What is Public Scholarship?**

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

Framing community engagement as a dimension of one’s research and creativity activity is influenced heavily by disciplinary conceptions of knowledge making. As a result, labels that refer to the products of engagement vary [e.g. community-engaged, publicly-engaged, translational scholarship]. It is important that candidates label and discuss their work using consistent terms throughout the dossier. IUPUI has elected to use the term "Public Scholarship" in both campus definition and criteria.

**Public scholarship, as framing of scholarly work and creative activity that is distinguished by its purposes, processes and outcomes, including:**

* co-production of knowledge between faculty and community stakeholders,
* significant time investment to cultivate relationships with community stakeholders,
* engagement with public(s) at multiple stages across time,
* interdisciplinary work and collaboration, and
* *an explicit goal of a public good impact.*

Public scholarship represents an expression of 21st century scholarly work that is increasingly collaborative, transdisciplinary and digital [Post et al. 2016] and whose production exists along a continuum of scholarly practice (Ellison & Eatman 2008).

**What are the Recommended Purposes of this Document?**

This document, as well as its future documents “Strategies for Developing and Documenting Public Scholarship in Teaching,” and “Strategies for Developing and Documenting Public Scholarship in Service,” are intended to support **early career faculty** as they develop, refine and implement a scholarly agenda that will lead to success in tenure and promotion. Early and intentional planning are critical to the successful advancement of faculty that integrate public engagement into their academic work [Colbeck 2002; Colbeck & Wharton 2006; Franz 2009 O’Meara 2016].

A primary audience for this document are early and mid-career faculty seeking tenure or advancement. While the strategies can be implemented at any point, the greatest benefit will accrue to those that integrate early in their appointment.

* A secondary audience for the guidance in this document are **chairs and primary committee members responsible for promotion and tenure evaluation. Others involved in coaching engaged faculty** in their conversations with candidates as they prepare to document particular product or process reflects the spirit of the criteria for public scholarship.

**What are the suggested IUPUI Criteria for Evaluating Public Scholarship?**

1. **Clear Academic and Community Goals**

A scholar should clearly define objectives of scholarly work and state basic questions of inquiry and means of co-production of knowledge. Clarity of public purpose and identification of the ‘public’ or community involved provide a critical context for evaluation of scholarly work.

1. **Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding Public Scholarship**

A scholar’s ability to conduct meaningful work depends upon mastering existing knowledge both, in one’s field as well as the practices of public scholarship. Hence, Promotion and Tenure Committees can consider a longer timeline for faculty engaged in public scholarship.

1. **Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement**

Meaningful scholarly work must always be conducted with appropriate rigor. In the case of research or creative practice, rigor facilitates valid project design, data collection (if part of project), interpretation & communication, so that valid conclusions can be drawn from the findings. In the case of teaching, rigor ensures that teaching methods and curriculum are grounded in practices known to produce student learning outcomes and in appropriate theoretical frames and research-based evidence. The engagement of communities, not only as participants but as co-producers of knowledge, can enhance rigor and facilitate the study of issues and questions that would not be as effectively studied apart from such interaction. Community engagement can also enhance the rigor of teaching and facilitate understanding of issues or theories presented in the classroom. Those engaged in public scholarship should provide evidence to demonstrate that rigor is maintained, or even enhanced, through such approaches.

1. **Significant Results: Impact on the Field and the Community**

Scholars and community partners should be invited to evaluate whether or not they achieve their goals and whether or not this achievement has an important impact. A primary goal of community-engagement is that impact be beneficial to the communities who are the focal point of the scholarship. The assessment of impact must go beyond just the reporting of positive, neutral, or negative outcomes of any given project. The scholar should explicitly describe the new knowledge they created or applied and what impact is has had, or may likely have in the future, on the field and the community(ies) of interest.

1. **Effective Presentation/Dissemination to Academic and Community Audiences**

Central to scholarly pursuits is the effective presentation and dissemination of results. Scholars should use effective oral, written, digital, tactile and/or visual communications skills that enable them to convert knowledge into formats that a public audience can readily understand and disseminate in formats used by the community most directly involved/implicated by the project.

1. **Reflective Critique: Lessons learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement**

Scholars should demonstrate an ability to critically reflect on the process of their work, their community partnerships, the issues and challenges that arise and how they are able to address these. Scholars should demonstrate an ability to consider, with their community partners, such questions as: why did this project succeed or fail to achieve its intended outcomes; what could be done differently in succeeding projects to improve outcomes; is this project an idea that is deserving of further time and effort?

1. **Leadership and Scholarly Contribution**

In addition to being a recognized contributor to their disciplinary or interdisciplinary field, scholars should demonstrate that their work has earned them a reputation for rigor, impact, and advancement and application of knowledge within their discipline, within the arena of public scholarship, and/or within their defined community of public stakeholders. In addition, scholars should demonstrate an ability to serve in leadership roles. One of the most consistent criteria for promotion or tenure in the academy is evidence of a national or international reputation, and scholars may argue on the basis of a reputation in their public stakeholder community.

1. **Consistently Ethical Behavior: Socially Responsible Conduct**

Consistently ethical behavior links scholarship to personal virtues and community values. This reference suggests that scholarly work must be conducted with honesty, integrity, perseverance and courage. Ethical behavior considers that scholars will foster a respectful relationship with students, community, participants, peers, and others who participate in, benefit or are affected by in their work. Ethical behavior ensures the responsible conduct and the respectful engagement of communities and individuals in research, teaching research, teaching, service and creative activity. Ethical behavior must consider cultural or community implications as well as university policies.

**What are Strategies to Develop and Document Products of Public Scholarship as Research and Creativity Activity?**

This section provides an orientation to the production of publicly-engaged scholarly products with an eye to strategic planning. It includes information on the development process, criterion, actions, evidence and items for documentation.

1. **Phase model and associated processes of development in Public Scholarship**



**Phase 1: Design and Develop**

Brief Description

**Phase 2: Implement**

Brief Description

**Phase 3: Demonstrate Impacts**

Brief Description

**B. Planning strategies to document public-engaged scholarly work as research and creative activity** [Adapted from Jordan, 2007; Wood et al. 2016]

Early planning to coordinate documentation of excellence in public scholarship is crucial for success in P/T as it requires gathering information from non-traditional sources. This tool is designed to walk a candidate through each phase of a research/creative project that is framed as public scholarship and how each phase maps to relevant PS criteria. The table below is not intended to serve as a rubric to evaluate a project or body of scholarship. Rather it is a planning tool to aid candidates. In addition to mapping project phases to criteria, the table provides recommendations on types of evidence that can aid candidates in making their case for excellence in research and creative activity as public scholarship. Depending on the nature and goals of your project, not all phases may apply. However, use of the tool should help you clarify the degree to which a project may be likely to yield signature products of public scholarship that you wish to highlight in your personal narrative.

****

| **Criterion** | **Actions** | **Evidence** | **Documentation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8** | Formulate research questions for public scholarship that target communities and issues (engage with community members; co-develop research approach; define roles and goals; strategize communication and planning)Develop funding (partnerships and grants)Define shared fiscal management and decision processes | Community forums, community focus groups, surveys that document community needs and concernsMechanisms for bi/multi directional communication between community members and investigators* Community members included on planning or working committees, take an active role in proposal writing or development
* Plans integrate project into an existing community advisory groups
* Budget for line items that support community activities or resources
 | * Community representatives requesting assistance on specific community issues.
* Proposals reflect collaborative effort and community-based impact
* Letters of support from community documenting their participation in designing the study/project
* Evaluation and modification of project design and methods in response to community feedback

Participation by and acknowledgement of community members at various points throughout project (from conception through development, dissemination, and impact measurement)Examples of transparency and sharing power in decision making [e.g. MOUs, Community IRB] |
|  |
| **3, 4, 6, 8** | * Identify and recruit community members with a vested interest in co-producing research and/or being affected by research.
* Design instruments and data collection techniques that fit local populations (tested with community groups and partners, informed by local needs and interests)
* Regularly evaluate relationship strength with participants and alter communication and interaction strategies as needed.
* Develop data analysis and interpretation strategies with community partners
* Conduct project using “good science” (research techniques, pedagogies, ethical standards and practices)
* Determine intervals for interim reporting of progress to community and to funding sources
 | * Community members work on planning or review committees; community members hired and trained as recruiters, data collectors
* Incorporation of opinions, suggestions and expertise of community that highlight the diversity of viewpoints in the project
* Advisors/partners inform potential barriers to participation; recruitment and retention strategies take community into account
* Decision process for project development involves a variety of partners in multiple ways
* Data collected or measurement instruments show community input
* Systematic process exists for community advisors to evaluate instruments, give feedback on language, and address issues of cultural sensitivity and relevance.
 | * Detailed profiles of roles community partners play; demonstrates equality or collaboration in the process
* Recommendations are focused on the needs of the stakeholder groups
* Process includes language and information relevant to community partners and grounded in community-based and disciplinary knowledge.
* Documentation of consensus of project protocols and shared decision processes
 |
|  |
| **4,5,6,7, 8** | * Translate findings into actionable knowledge
* Disseminate findings in different formats for community and scholarly audiences;
* Select outlets and formats that are accessible and relevant to the community/ies of interest
* Engage and acknowledge community members at various points of the project; maintain respectful community engagement
 | * Community partners involved in the development of recommendations and actions
* Multiple versions of information available where appropriate
* Community members participate in writing and dissemination of findings (articles, presentations, etc.)
* Community members and partners use and share information with others
 | * Examples and context for action items
* Explanation of dissemination outlets that reflect needs of different groups (scholarly, community)
* Articulate the integrated nature of your work in your personal statement
* Develop an impact statement
 |
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