To:	Deans and Chairs of all Main Campus Academic Departments
From:	Richard L. Wood, Interim Provost
Date:	November 27, 2018
Re:	P&T policy statements on how Departments wish to handle community-engaged research, teaching, and service

As you may be aware, UNM has for several years been building the infrastructure to become a Carnegie-defined "Community-Engaged University." As part of that effort, in February 2018 the Office of the Provost asked that all academic departments:

a) Decide how they will handle community-engaged research, teaching, and scholarship in departmental reviews: promotion-and-tenure, promotion, mid-probationary reviews, and annual reviews; and

b) Write that decision into their official promotion document(s) so that departmental standards are clear to all faculty.

The original deadline for doing so, communicated to Deans in February 2018, was the end of Spring 2018 semester. However, because some departments struggled with how they wanted to move forward in this matter, Academic Affairs subsequently extended that deadline to end of Fall 2018 semester (though note caveat below).

The Carnegie Foundation defines community engagement in higher education as follows:

> Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education 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 purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

More informally, we might say that community-engaged scholarship is an integrated approach to research, teaching, and/or service in collaboration with a particular community or organization (nonprofit, non-governmental organization (NGO), corporation, sovereign tribe, government agency, etc.), with the scholar and community members functioning at least partly as peers or equal participants in a project (though perhaps with different roles reflecting particular knowledge). Engagement implies a partnership and a two-way exchange of information, ideas, and expertise as well as some level of shared decision making.

I consider community-engaged work *research* if it is intended to lead to publication or other forms of wider dissemination; otherwise it is a form of service, outreach, or a dimension of teaching.

Please note that your Department is not being _required_ to recognize community-engaged research, teaching, or service in reviews. This is a matter for discernment and decision-making by faculty and chairs, according to departmental norms. Rather, we are asking that Departments make a clear choice

and record that choice in their official standards for review; that choice *can* potentially be to say that community-engaged research, teaching, and service will *not* be recognized as scholarly activity.

We strongly encourage you to think carefully before doing so, for three reasons:

1. In a broad range of disciplines—in the humanities, social sciences, *and* STEM disciplines, as well as in interdisciplinary fields—meaningful intellectual work is currently being done based on community-engaged methodologies.
2. In an age of attacks on science, defunding of the humanities, and denigration of intellectual work generally, it is arguably imperative that we all be engaging with the public so that they better understand what we do.
3. It may well be the case that as we strive to better diversify and strengthen excellence within all ranks of UNM faculty and administration, failing to recognize community-engaged work will become a liability (if it has not already).

Thus, please consider carefully, in dialogue with your faculty, how you can best approach this terrain in ways that buttress excellence and equity in your discipline/department. Then please write that into your review documents and include that language when submitting faculty hiring documents and future hiring plans.

Because this type of work has become much more common among younger scholars across a broad range of disciplines, we will ask Departments whether their review documents have been reworked to include such a statement when we consider approving new hires. Otherwise, junior colleagues risk entering a departmental culture in which they cannot be clear whether such work will be recognized officially in reviews. Thus, it is crucial that you indeed lead your Department to make a choice (yay or nay) and write that up in official policy.

Caveat regarding deadline: If you have for some reason not already begun that process, it may be impossible to get that done by the end-of-Fall-2018 deadline. If you are in that position, we will authorize an extension for your Department if you agree to attend or send a delegate to an upcoming institute for departmental tenure and promotion teams designed to give you the tools you need for considering this matter. This institute is being organized by the Office of Community Engaged Learning & Research and will take place in the Spring 2019 semester (date to be determined).

Doing this well in a research university that is committed to excellence in our academic mission will require real thoughtfulness and deliberation. Ultimately, peer-reviewed work is the coin of the realm for establishing excellence in the research/creative work mission, and I am wary of anything that sacrifices that standard, even in the name of something as important (in my view) as recognizing community-engaged research, teaching, and service. This is fairly unproblematic in the teaching and service dimensions of promotion reviews. In the research/creative work area, I suggest moving forward in ways that preserve the grounding of academic credentialing in peer-reviewed work. How best to do so depends greatly by discipline, so the following may or may not be precisely relevant in your Department. But please allow me to share how we chose to approach this in my home Department of Sociology a few years ago. The key paragraphs of our tenure and promotion review document read as follows (italics added):

> Other types of scholarly activity: Beyond the core scholarly work of research and publication in peer-reviewed venues, other forms of scholarly activity can contribute to a faculty member's profile. A profile may include supplementary activities such as grant-writing and leading funded research projects; *work in public sociology and engaged scholarship; work bringing academic expertise to bear beyond the university*; or

sociologically-grounded creative works. *The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate a profile anchored in peer-reviewed scholarly publishing and the sociological relevance of any supplementary activities.*

And later, regarding "Service":

Service to the Broader Community: Some faculty may choose to take on the role of public sociologists, using their knowledge and skills in service to groups, individuals, and organizations outside the university. Although community service is not required of faculty members when they are considered for tenure or promotion, the department views this activity as another element that can be used to judge a faculty member's strengths, again, as long as such commitments do not interfere with the development of a teaching and research record that
would support tenure and promotion.

If your department is struggling to decide how to proceed on this matter, my hope is that this memo may help you frame faculty discussions. In any case, Dr. Monica Kowal, Director of Community Engagement Initiatives for Academic Affairs, is available to advise you; you can reach her at kowal1@unm.edu or call (505) 277-7186.