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*Purdue University*
**EVOLUTION OF ENGAGEMENT**

**TIMELINE**

- **1990**: Boyer’s “Scholarship Reconsidered” published
- **2001**: Purdue Engagement Council Established
- **2004**: Engagement Awards Program Initiated
- **2011**: SoE Fellows Program Initiated
- **2013**: Promotion & Tenure Task Force
- **2014**: Faculty Engagement Survey
- **2016**: Purdue Policy for P&T Revised
- **2017**: Guidebook and Faculty Development
- **2018**: Purdue Office of Engagement Established
I. SURVEY RESULTS

CLARITY OF DEFINITIONS

Scholarship

Engagement

Scholarship of Engagement
I. SURVEY RESULTS

CLARITY OF DEFINITIONS

**Scholarship:**
- innovative with a high level of disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, produces documented results that are impactful, and is professionally or peer-reviewed

**Engagement:**
- collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity

**Scholarship of Engagement:**
- a reciprocal relationship that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professional and/or peer reviewed, and has evidence of impact
CHARACTERISTICS OF SOE

- High level of disciplinary expertise
- Innovative
- Capable of being replicated and elaborated
- Documented results
- Impactful
- Professionally and/or peer reviewed
EXAMPLES OF SOE

- Laws/public policy
- Video archives, documentaries, films
- Adoption of innovations
- Delivery of products/services
- Changes in professional practice
- Refereed publications
II. SURVEY RESULTS

KNOWLEDGE GAP

[Bar chart showing documented impact and evaluating impact for different departments (Ag, Ed, Eng, HHS, Honors, Krannert, Lib Arts, Libraries, Pharm, PPI, Sci, Vet).]

- Documented Impact
- Evaluating Impact
Define the issue → Engage external partners → Document outputs

Report impact
“Did the collective outputs from the faculty member and partners result in new knowledge, changes to laws or public policy, the adoption of new practices or innovations, while addressing the defined issue”
FRAMING THE DOSSIER

Learning

Discovery

Integrated Engagement

Engagement-Learning

Engagement-Discovery

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
EVALUATING ENGAGEMENT DOSSIERS

Engagement → Scholarship → Impact
**Box 5. Example Engagement Evaluation Template**

Degree of Professional Excellence Obtained: E  VG  G  F  P  U

**C. Engagement**
- Evidence of Engagement
- Evidence of Scholarship
- Evidence of Impact
- National recognition
- International recognition
- Integration with research
- Integration with teaching
- Evidence of reciprocal Community Partnership
- Overall rating

**D. Overall Impact and Potential for Future Growth**

*Rating: E-excellent, VG-very good, G-good, F-fair, P-poor, U-unable to judge
*Rating of a “Good” or less requires written comment

---

Insert Feedback for Candidate

Reviewer Name (optional) ________________________________

Note - Rubric modified from a promotion and tenure form adopted by faculty within the Dept. of Forestry and Natural Resources
EVALUATION QUESTIONS

EXPERTISE
- How is the work viewed within the scholar’s field?
- How does the work build upon the knowledge, research, or practice in the field?
- Did the work result in the development of new information, methods or approaches?

INNOVATION
- How does the work respond to an identified need?
- Are results valid and reliable?
- Were limitations discussed?

REPLICATED
- Was the methodology clear and sound?

DOCUMENTING
- How has the work been shared with colleagues?
- How has the work added to the body of knowledge?
- Where is the work accessible?

REVIEWED
- How has the scholar’s work been shared: published articles, academic presentations, exhibition of work, creative performances?
- How has the scholar’s work resulted in the receiving of an award, honor by peers?
- How has the scholar’s work resulted in testimonials, letters of recommendation, or adaptations that affirm the value of this work?

IMPACTFUL
- What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work?
- What measurable impacts occurred as a result of the effort (e.g., knowledge gained, information shared, behavior changed)?
- How were the developed materials or processes subsequently used by others?

ASSESSING SCHOLARLY WORK
EXAMPLE VIGNETTES

EXERCISE 2

Engagement  Research
THANK YOU!!

ENGAGE PURDUE

PURDUE.EDU/ENGAGEMENT
Box 1. Example vignette for Engagement and Learning: College of Pharmacy

Dr. Schellhase’s engagement efforts have focused on establishing the PU College of Pharmacy as a leader in the provision of health care services and learning opportunities for global health and underserved populations. Her engagement activities focus on developing a unique program to address patient care needs in the resource-constrained setting of western Kenya.

In 2002, Dr. Schellhase was one of four faculty members who initially visited the Academic Model Providing Access to Healthcare (AMPATH) in Eldoret, Kenya. After the initial visit, she championed the creation and continued development of the PKP, the first international practice site for the College of Pharmacy, through collaboration with both Kenyan and American colleagues. Dr. Schellhase serves as the program leader in the US for the PKP, a model student training program and international practice site in global health. Since 2002, she has focused her attention on the development and implementation of the clinical practice site in Kenya as well as the creation of a robust, one of a kind experiential student training opportunity. The PKP is novel as no other college of pharmacy to date has created this type of sustainable global engagement program.

In 2003, as Dr. Schellhase began developing the practice site in Kenya and creating the PKP Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience (APPE), she identified the need to better equip students with the necessary knowledge and practice skills required in a resource-constrained setting, prior to their arrival in Kenya. To meet this need, Dr. Schellhase developed and implemented Pharmaceutical Care in Developing Countries, an elective course that is required of all PKP APPE participants.

PHRM 88000 Purdue Kenya Program Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience

In 2003, Dr. Schellhase and her colleagues developed an APPE based in Eldoret, Kenya. This is an eight-week experience that is part of the PKP. Student pharmacists completing this APPE round daily with an internal medicine team that is comprised of a Kenyan physician or consultant, a registrar or resident, an intern and several medical students. The team also has visiting American physicians, residents, medical students and a pharmacist. The student pharmacists manage medication administration records, answer drug information questions, secure medications for patients and complete other patient care responsibilities. They also participate in topic discussions and patient case discussions that are led by their pharmacy preceptors. In addition to their responsibilities on ward rounds, they participate in AMPATH programs such as the Family Preservation Initiative, Orphans and Vulnerable Children site visits, AMPATH farming initiatives, and visit some of the more than 50 outpatient HIV clinics affiliated with AMPATH. Dr. Schellhase developed a manual for the APPE. This manual (more than 300 pages in length) includes orientation materials, instructions for travel and housing preparation, cultural materials, and policies and procedures. Dr. Schellhase has updated this manual annually. All student participants required to sign off before participating in the APPE. Since the APPE began in 2004, many changes and adaptations with the goal of providing a safe and professional experience. Dr. Schellhase has worked with Risk Management, the AMPATH consortium, and colleagues in the PKP to develop policies and procedures for the APPE (i.e. Code of Conduct, Housing Agreement, Cell Phone Policy, Trunk Travel Policy). Dr. Schellhase has worked with her colleagues in Kenya to ensure that this APPE continues to improve, allowing student pharmacists the opportunity to provide meaningful patient care. To evaluate the role of the students on this APPE, Dr. Schellhase and her colleagues collected student intervention data. A brief evaluation of impact revealed students provided 14.4 consultations/day and the most common areas of consultation were for MAR reconciliation (50.4%), chart review (14.2%), medication acquisition (5.6%), and drug information for physicians (5.2%). Most commonly involved were the areas of HIV, cardiovascular diseases, and antibiotics. These findings illustrate the success of the curricular approach utilized to create a strong educational foundation for clinical pharmacy services.

This data has been published in the American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education 2011 Apr;75(3):42

In addition to preparing students for the APPE, Dr. Schellhase works to link students with the community of Eldoret through service learning projects implemented during the APPE. These projects are an opportunity for student pharmacists to further enhance their patient care skills, identify with the local culture, and link their experiences to learning. Dr. Schellhase has collaborated with the Tumaini Drop-in Center, Moi Teaching and
Referral Hospital, Riley Mother Baby Hospital, and the Sally Test Pediatric Center. Dr. Schellhase has worked with 28 students on 9 service learning projects. Dr. Schellhase has provided mentorship to students who submit their projects to the Purdue University Office of Engagement Community Service / Service Learning Grant program. These projects have cumulatively received $34,700 of funding and many of them have been renewed for several semesters because of their excellence. Students have extended their learning by presenting professional posters about these projects and writing publications. For her work with service learning, Dr. Schellhase was named as a Purdue University Service Learning Faculty Fellow in 2009. Dr. Schellhase has also collaborated with student pharmacists to develop and implement research projects related to the PKP. These projects have either been presented as posters at national meetings or developed into publications.

Outside of establishing the student program, one of her most significant accomplishments is the creation of lasting partnerships with the pharmaceutical industry. Within this role, she has secured more than $40 million worth of product support for disease state management programs in anticoagulation, oncology, diabetes, and mental health that have been essential in establishing the foundation for sustainable health care infrastructure in this setting.

Under Dr. Schellhase’s leadership, the PKP has been recognized with several awards: 2013 inaugural Purdue University Corps of Engagement Award, 2010 American Society of Health System Pharmacists Best Practices in Health-System Pharmacy, and 2010 American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) Community Engaged Service Learning Award.

As the PKP continues to receive attention for its novel, sustainable practice model in a resource-constrained setting, Dr. Schellhase has demonstrated excellence in the scholarship of engagement, publishing 9 peer-reviewed articles detailing PKP patient care activities and the student program and has received grants totaling $441,000 for global engagement activities within PKP. Because of her experience in global pharmacy program development and implementation, she has been an invited speaker at more than 13 national and international meetings.
Box 2. Example vignette for Engagement and Research: College of Agriculture

Dr. Beckerman’s primary responsibility at Purdue University is to lead the plant pathology extension education effort in horticultural crops by developing and enhancing a close working relationship between the University, extension educators, and members of the Green Industry. The horticulture industry in Indiana is highly diversified and consists of over 300 fruit growers, approximately 300 arborists, 262 greenhouse operators, and 3,320 licensed nursery growers/lawn and garden centers. In Indiana, the ornamental industry alone is valued at over $3 billion dollars, and employs approximately 42,000 people (Hall et al. 2005); Indiana produces almost 200,000 tons of fruit, valued at over $58 million dollars per year (IBRC, 2013). Most individuals involved in production of horticultural crops have little expertise in plant disease diagnosis, disease management, or fungicide resistance management, and the land grant university serves as the primary source of information for these groups of professionals.

There are two major approaches to managing plant disease in horticultural crops: Incorporating disease resistance, when possible, and utilizing fungicides, when necessary. The goal of my extension program is to enable commercial growers to effectively and sustainably manage both chemical (fungicide) and genetic (disease resistance) resources while protecting the environment.

Fruit Crops

Extension effort to minimize the risk of fungicide resistance in apple production. The successful management of disease requires an integrated approach for long-term, sustainable disease management. In 2007, the price received for fresh market fruit in Indiana was $0.42 per pound while the price received for processed apples (blemished apples) was $0.07 per pound (USDA et al., 2012) demonstrating that diseases (and insects) have the potential to reduce crop value by 85%; losses of up to 100% have been known to occur when apple scab is unmanaged. The multiple applications of fungicides, up to 25 applications per growing season, to maintain apple appearance and attain the higher fresh-market price has resulted in the development of fungicide resistance. Dr. Beckerman’s research has applied new approaches to rapidly identify fungicide resistance in plant pathogens (Beckerman, 2013; Lesniak et al. 2011; Quello et al. 2010; Cox et al. 2009), and identified the occurrence of isolates resistant to all major classes of fungicides (Chapman et al. 2011). This work has revealed some disturbing questions as to how our management practices may be exacerbating this issue (Beckerman et al., 2014). A press release describing how ‘Popular fungicides are failing’ was picked up by John Flesher (Associated Press), to wider release, in over 300 news agencies.

Outputs:

To quickly address grower concerns regarding fungicide resistance, Dr. Beckerman has:

- measured the frequency and distribution of fungicide resistance of the apple scab pathogen in Indiana and Michigan (Chapman et al., 2011; Lesniak et al., 2011).
- organized a symposium, Phytopathological Phreakonomics, for the 2011 APS meeting and co-presented a talk on the role IPM has played in the development of fungicide resistance.
- developed a screen to perform in situ assays of fungicide resistance and accurately identified resistance in 100% of the isolates tested (Quello et al., 2010). She found no evidence of benzimidazole resistance in any landscape crabapple, contradicting previous suspicions of fungicide resistance, and renewing landscape use of a safe and effective fungicide.
- published 14 peer-reviewed technical publications on fungicide use since 2010.
- co-authored the Midwest Commercial Tree Fruit Spray Guide (ID-168) and the Midwest Commercial Small Fruit Spray Guide (ID-169). These guides are multi-state efforts that provide growers with up to date information regarding pesticide use.
- updated and expanded ID-146: Managing Pests in Home Fruit Plantings, which is used by homeowners throughout the eastern half of the United States (2012; updated 2013).
- written over 60 articles for Facts for Fancy Fruit on fruit disease management.
- written 10 extension bulletins on fruit crop disease management; these bulletins were used in Michigan’s Crop Advisory Team (CAT) newsletters, and by Extension specialists in the Northeast through Mid-Atlantic
states, in addition to throughout the Midwest.
- spoken at the American Phytopathological Society, 2010, as an invited speaker on ‘Is Extension Right for You?’ Charlotte, NC and the North Central APS, 2014, meeting on the Extension Panel, Madison, WI. These workshops were designed for graduate students and professionals to explain what extension is and how to demonstrate impact within an extension program.
- given 15 talks across the Midwest and Northeast on fungicide resistance.

Impact:
As a result of this work, 86% of apple growers report they have changed their fungicide use practices and over 70% of the growers have adopted the use of urea or flail mowing to reduce over-wintering scab (Foster, EPA Apple Survey, 2012) from a baseline of 0% in 2008.
### C. Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Engagement</th>
<th>Rating*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E       VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of reciprocal Community Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Overall Impact and Potential for Future Growth

*Rating: E-excellent, VG-very good, G-good, F-fair, P-poor, U-unable to judge

*Rating of a “Good” or less requires written comment

---

Reviewer Name (optional) ________________________________________

Note -rubric modified from a promotion and tenure form adopted by faculty within the Dept. of Forestry and Natural Resources
ASSESSING SCHOLARLY WORK

EXPERTISE
How is the work viewed within the scholar’s field?

INNOVATION
- How does the work build upon the knowledge, research, or practice in the field?*
- How does the work respond to an identified need?*
- Did the work result in the development of new information, methods, or approaches?*

REPlicated
- Was the methodology clear and sound?
- Are results valid and reliable?
- Were limitations discussed?

DOCUMENTING
- How has the work been shared with colleagues?*
- How has the work been added to the body of knowledge?*
- Where is the work accessible?*

REVieWed
- How has the scholar’s work been shared: published articles, academic presentations, exhibition of work, creative performances?*
- How has the scholar’s work resulted in the receiving of an award, honor by peers?*
- How has the scholar’s work resulted in testimonials, letters of recommendation, or adaptations that affirm the value of this work?*

IMPACTFUL
- What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work?*
- What measurable impacts occurred as a result of the effort (e.g., knowledge gained, information shared, behavior changed)?*
- How were the developed materials or processes subsequently used by others?*