



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

<http://muse.jhu.edu>

CES4Health.info: An Online Tool for Peer Reviewed Publication and Dissemination of Diverse Products of Community-Engaged Scholarship

Catherine Jordan, PhD¹, Sarena D. Seifer, MD², Sherril B. Gelmon, DrPH³, Katharine Ryan³, and Piper McGinley, MA²

(1) Children, Youth and Family Consortium, University of Minnesota; (2) Community–Campus Partnerships for Health; (3) Mark O. Hatfield School of Government, Portland State University

Submitted 20 October 2010, revised 24 January 2011, accepted 15 February 2011.

Abstract

Community-engaged scholarship (CES)—research, teaching, programmatic and other scholarly activities conducted through partnerships between academic and community partners—may result in innovative applied products such as manuals, policy briefs, curricula, videos, toolkits, and websites. Without accepted mechanisms for peer-reviewed publication and dissemination, these products often do not “count” toward faculty promotion and tenure (P&T) and have limited opportunities for broad impact. This paper

reports on CES4Health.info, a unique online tool for peer-reviewed publication and dissemination of products of CES in forms other than journal articles. In its first year, CES4Health.info has published 24 products and documented the satisfaction of users, authors, and reviewers.

Keywords

Community-engaged scholarship, tenure, scholarship, community engagement, peer review, dissemination

The peer-reviewed article published in a high-impact journal has traditionally been the gold standard within many disciplines. The article’s conventional format documents the scholarly nature and significance of the work for peer reviewers and readers. The ubiquitous presence of journals in academic libraries and increasingly on the Internet ensures broad dissemination to academic audiences. Peer review serves as a quality control mechanism, discouraging dissemination of poor-quality scholarship and, through revisions, encouraging improvements in content and presentation. P&T committees rely on peer review to substitute for their own comprehensive review of the scholarly work of a faculty member seeking career advancement.

Community-engaged scholars and their community partners are cognizant of the limited impact journal articles may have on community stakeholders owing to limited access to the scholarly literature and the esoteric and less applied lan-

guage often used in articles. Community–academic partners therefore may produce, in addition to articles, more accessible and useful products that result from community-engaged teaching, research, and programmatic activities. Products reporting the results of CES may take the form of documentaries, policy briefs, technical reports, and photovoice exhibits, as examples. Products may also take the form of tools that can be applied by others, such as assessment instruments, manuals, or patient education materials.

To date, there has been no peer-review mechanism or publication outlet for CES products. Absent peer review and broad dissemination, products other than journal manuscripts do not count in P&T. In addition, without mechanisms for promotion and distribution of these products, their impact can be limited to the communities in which the work was conducted.

This article reports on CES4Health.info, a mechanism developed by Community–Campus Partnerships for Health

(CCPH) for the rigorous peer review and online publication of diverse products of CES in forms other than journal articles.

DEVELOPMENT OF CES4HEALTH.INFO

CES4Health.info publicly launched in November 2009 (available from: <http://www.ces4health.info>). CES4Health.info was designed to be a searchable database of peer-reviewed CES products, a public portal for submitting products for review and applying to be a reviewer, and a password-protected administration tool for the editorial team and reviewers to access submitted products and complete online reviews. Over an 18-month period, a design team of six community-engaged academics, community partners, and individuals with experience in editing journals or online repositories developed and piloted review criteria, a reviewer application, author instructions, and an application to accompany product submission. Community-based design team members were particularly helpful in ensuring that the language and forms used on the site were inviting to nonacademic reviewers and authors. A web design firm developed and beta tested the user interface and administration tool. Details of the development of CES4Health.info have been previously published.²

Features of CES4Health.info

Submission Process. Products in English and from anywhere in the world may be submitted online at any time. In addition to the product itself, authors also submit an application* to document quality, scholarly basis, and the community-engaged approach.

Peer Review Process. CES4Health.info redefines the concept of “peer” in peer review by assigning each product to two community-based and two academic-based reviewers. The editorial team includes a community-based professional. The review criteria[†] are informed by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff,² who operationalized Boyer’s³ inclusive definition of scholarship, recommendations from the Kellogg Commission on CES in the Health Professions,⁴ and previous work of Jordan et al., who developed standards of quality CES.⁵ The review criteria and reviewer rating form (Appendix) are more detailed and

concrete than those typically used for reviewing manuscripts given the novel nature of the review task. Reviewers receive a 1-hour phone training to prepare for the review process.

Author Support. Authors are invited to provide names of academic colleagues they would like alerted to their successful publication. If the product is published, the editor sends a letter to those individuals that is intended to increase the visibility of CES4Health.info, enhance the credibility of CES, showcase the author’s achievement, and raise administrators’ and P&T committee members’ respect for CES. Authors are also encouraged to note their published product in their CV or resume as a peer-reviewed publication. CES4Health.info editorial staff can inform authors of the number of people who have downloaded their products as one measure of impact that faculty authors might include in P&T dossiers.

Public Portal. The portal includes instructions and forms for submitting CES products, becoming a reviewer, and registering as a user to access products. A robust search function enables users to identify and download products by general (e.g., public health) or specific (e.g., tobacco) topic keyword, resource type, methodology, and author.

Products Published and Downloaded

As of January 1, 2011, 35 products have been submitted and 24 products have been published through CES4Health.info (Table 1). There have been 749 product downloads by 382 users, an average of almost two products per user. All products have been downloaded, with the number of downloads of a given product ranging from 10 to 108.

EVALUATION OF CES4HEALTH.INFO

A comprehensive evaluation of CES4Health.info is ongoing, conducted by an independent external evaluator, in consultation with the editorial team. All evaluation instruments were approved by the Portland State University Human Subjects Research Review Committee. Selected evaluation data collected through November, 2010 are presented in this article.

Unique surveys were created for authors, reviewers, and users (people who have downloaded one or more products). All respondents were also asked a set of demographic descriptive

* Available on line from <http://www.ces4health.info/submit-products/submit-product.aspx>

† Available on line from <http://www.ces4health.info/reviewer/peer-review-process.aspx>

questions. Surveys of authors and reviewers focused on satisfaction with submission and review processes and feedback received, perspectives on how feedback from CES4Health.info would be used in P&T processes, personal insights gained through the review, utility of the CES4Health.info website, value of the review criteria, and suggestions for improvement. The survey of users focused on utility of the CES4Health.info website, satisfaction with the product(s) downloaded, plans to use and/or share the product(s), potential future use of the site, and suggestions for website improvements.

Satisfaction questions were scored on a 5-point Likert-style scale. Other questions used multiple response formats or yes/no as appropriate. Most responses were quantitative, but qualitative comments were also invited for specific questions.

Surveys were sent to all published first authors ($n = 24$), reviewers of those published products ($n = 58$), and users from the time of pilot testing through November 2010 ($n = 341$). Response rates were 71% ($n = 17$) for authors, 62% ($n = 36$) for reviewers, and 17% ($n = 58$) for users. Seventy-four percent of respondents ($n = 82$) were employed in academia. The other 26% ($n = 29$) were from government agencies, hospitals, health systems, community health centers, community-based non-profits, and philanthropic organizations. Because the number of respondents employed outside of academia in each group was relatively small (4 first authors, 13 reviewers, 12 users), we do not report their responses separately. As more individuals

from out of academe are involved in CES4Health.info and contribute to its evaluation, we will more fully report on the its community use and impact.

Author Perspectives

Authors were primarily motivated to submit a product by an interest in getting the product published. One author stated that, “CES4Health.info is both a wonderful educational tool and an appropriate and well-organized venue for peer review publication. It is so unique and so important. Thank you!” Authors also reported motivation to learn about the review process and to have the product disseminated. One respondent commented that it “has provided a great way to disseminate the product on a national level.”

Authors were satisfied with the support provided for preparing a submission, although one author indicated that “a simpler submission process” would help. Authors were also satisfied with communications about and content of the review they received. One respondent noted, “I appreciated the depth of background, justification, and rationale that was required of the reviewers. It instilled faith in the rigor and value of the peer review process.”

Several authors suggested ways to improve the feedback provided, such as including a more comprehensive overview compared with individual details and emphasizing how to improve the product as a teaching tool. Ratings were mixed

Table 1. Examples of CES4Health.info Products and Product Types

Resource Type	Title
Documentary	In harmony: Reflections, thoughts, and hopes of Central City, New Orleans ⁶
Evaluation Tool	Brooklyn Community District 14 Needs Assessment ⁷
Manual	Promotor(a) Community Health Manual: Developing a Community-based Diabetes Self Management Program ⁸
Policy Brief	Homeless Over 50: The Greying of Chicago’s Homeless Population ⁹
Training Video	Community-based Participatory Research with Indigenous People ¹⁰
Toolkit	Toolkit to establish and sustain year-long walking in rural communities ¹¹
Service Learning Material	Community Approaches to Mobilizing Partnerships and Service-Learning: The Practice Experience/Service Learning Guide ¹²
Website	Does it run in the family? ¹³
Syllabus	Community-Campus Partnership in Action: HE471 Program Planning ¹⁴
Curriculum	Developing and sustaining community-based participatory research partnerships: A skill-building curriculum ¹⁵

regarding the time to complete the review, with one author commenting, “the time that elapsed was frustrating.” This likely reflects a delay in completing the review in a few cases; of reviews submitted using the online system, the range of number of weeks to complete a review was 6 to 29, with a mean of 15 weeks. The goal is to complete reviews in 10 weeks.

Nearly three quarters of authors indicated they had received recognition for their published product from a supervisor or peers. About half indicated they noted the product as a peer-reviewed publication on their CV. Most of these felt it would make a difference in future performance reviews; a quarter felt that it would not. One respondent stated, “As a peer-reviewed publication, it will definitely count on my tenure review.” Another wrote:

I am faculty at a research-intensive university that appreciates the value and importance of diverse forms of knowledge mobilization but is also very cognizant of the importance of peer review for academic credibility. CES4Health serves a great need in this regard.

Reviewer Perspectives

Respondents were satisfied with communications about being a reviewer, the training, the materials provided in preparation to review, and the review criteria. Reviewers expressed some concern about the number of assigned reviews. This may reflect too frequent review assignment early on, when reviewers were few and too infrequent assignment as the review pool grew large. The amount of time allowed to do the review and the user-friendliness of the online review form were raised as mild concerns. Reviewers offered the following comments:

This is a great resource for [community-engaged] faculty. We need to continue making this available and involving more participants.

It’s always a balance of time to do these things and the daily work but this is very useful and should be shared with others.

One reviewer suggested that authors receive reviewer’s quantitative feedback in addition to the narrative; another felt that the feedback as provided is appropriate; still another indicated that they could not provide more detailed insights because they had only conducted one review.

User Perspectives

More than half of surveyed users indicated they were motivated to search the site because they wanted to see this new CCPH resource; nearly half also indicated curiosity. Some visited the site to look at a resource before they submitted a product or volunteered to serve as a reviewer.

When asked about the most recent product they had downloaded, more than half of respondents felt that it was either very or somewhat useful. Users were generally satisfied with the CES4Health.info website, primarily with the product details they were able to see before downloading a product, the product abstract, the look and feel of the site, the ease of site navigation, and the ability to access full products. About one quarter were satisfied with the number of products that matched what they were searching for, reflecting that in this early stage of development the volume of products available is limited. One respondent noted, “It would be nice to have more examples in each category.” Another wrote, “The more this develops, and the more resources that are available, the more powerful this will become. I am excited for that!”

Over two thirds of respondents expect to use CES4Health.info again in the future. One commented that it was “an easy-to-use website so it will be a regular stop for my work.”

Suggested Improvements

The most common suggestions recommended a web-based tutorial about how to submit a product and a better understanding of what products are appropriate for CES4Health.info. Users would like to post reviews of products and to e-mail authors directly from the site (author e-mail addresses are visible on the site). Many respondents felt that partnerships with other web-based, peer-reviewed repositories would be valuable.

Additional Feedback on CES4Health.info

In addition to the feedback solicited from authors, reviewers, and users, we have also received unsolicited comments about CES4Health.info. For example, one dean sent this response to the e-mail received from the CES4Health.info editor about a faculty member’s successful publication:

Thank you so much. I appreciate this notification, and the explanation. Our faculty has revised its standards for

tenure, promotion . . . to reflect the scholarship of engagement but, . . . we are embedded in the culture of the typical publicly-funded research intensive university . . . many T&P committees are dubious. In fact, getting [the author’s] tenure approved, the first under our new guidelines, was somewhat challenging. CES4Health is a godsend.

An author reported by e-mail that “I really appreciated the reviewers’ comments—suggestions to make us think differently and further in our next work with the project. But more than anything, the tone was appreciated. Some reviews I have received are just plain nasty, in my opinion. So much so that I don’t even want to share them with a community based team . . . because it is hard not to take them personally if you have not been around this publishing business for a while.” A medical school associate dean e-mailed to report that she regularly promotes CES4Health.info among her faculty and wrote, “I have to say that whenever we mention CES4Health there is palpable excitement in the audience.”

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The editorial team for CES4Health.info is using the evaluation findings to make continuous improvements to the site and the submission and review processes. We are pursuing several creative strategies to increase the number and diversity of CES4Health.info submissions. We have issued one themed call for products and are planning more in partnership with national organizations that are focused on community-based approaches to promoting health. In its manuscript acceptance notices, *Progress in Community Health Partnerships* encourages authors to consider submitting products to CES4Health.info. These strategies provide opportunities to communicate with targeted groups of potential authors and to provide additional promotion of published products to potentially interested audiences.

As more products are submitted, reviewed, published, and ultimately used by a growing number of academics, community members, and other stakeholders, it will be possible to better articulate the value of CES4Health.info. Our intent in the ongoing evaluation is to understand if and how CES4Health.info contributes to P&T decisions and efforts to improve the health of communities.

SUMMARY

The early experiences of CES4Health.info authors, reviewers, and users have been positive and generally demonstrate the value of this unique tool. By disseminating an array of products that have been reviewed and deemed to be high quality by community and academic peers, CES4Health.info provides individuals working to improve health in their communities with accessible, useful information they typically cannot find in journals. This tool also provides a mechanism for the rigorous peer review and online publication of innovative scholarly products, increasing the chances that these products will be counted in P&T decisions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CES4Health.info is one component of Faculty for the Engaged Campus (FEC), a national initiative of CCPH in partnership with the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. FEC aims to strengthen community-engaged career paths in the academy by developing innovative competency-based models of faculty development, facilitating peer review and dissemination of products of CES, and supporting community-engaged faculty through the P&T process. The FEC is funded in part by a comprehensive program grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education in the U.S. Department of Education. CES4Health.info was developed by a design team including Alex Allen, Eric Bass, Robert Hackett, Randy Jackson, Robby Reynolds, and Lorilee Sandmann who worked in collaboration with the leadership of Faculty for the Engaged Campus, Director Sarena D. Seifer, Deputy Director Piper McGinley, Co-Director Lynn Blanchard, Co-Director Cathy Jordan, and Evaluator Sherril Gelmon. CCPH staff members Suzette Svoboda-Newman, Jessie Tobin, and Alicia Witten provided knowledgeable and efficient technical coordination for CES4Health.info. Finally, we wish to thank the CES4Health.info authors, reviewers, and users whose feedback continues to improve our efforts.

Appendix. CES4Health.info Peer Review

This page provides background information about your task as a peer reviewer and contains the quantitative and qualitative review questions.

What You Will Review

Authors submit a product (such as a video, manual, policy brief, curriculum, or website), and an accompanying application, for review. Both the product and most sections of the product application will be available to users of CES4Health.info, if the product is accepted for publication. To provide a quality review, you must thoroughly review both the product and the product application. Questions on the product application essentially mirror sections of this review form, which should facilitate finding the information you need to provide ratings and critique according to the criteria described below. It is best to first read the application thoroughly, then look at the product, and then begin your review.

Some Important Distinctions

In the criteria described below, you will notice that we refer to the “product” and the “project that resulted in the product.” For example, in the case of a community-based participatory research (CBPR) study that produced a policy brief, the policy brief is the “product” and the CBPR study is the “project that resulted in the product.” Similarly, in the case of a service-learning course that produced a “how to” guide on service-learning, the guide is the “product” and the service-learning course is the “project that resulted in the product.” This distinction is important because some criteria apply only to the product (e.g., criteria related to appropriateness of the presentation format, usefulness of the content), but others apply more to the project that resulted in the product (e.g., adequate preparation, methodological rigor). You will be able to answer some questions by reviewing the product and others by reviewing the product application in which the project that resulted in the product is described. We ask questions about the project that resulted in the product because we aim to publish products of community-engaged scholarship. Sometimes the degree to which a product is scholarly is not evident unless it is placed in the context of the work that preceded it. Likewise, it can be difficult to discern the level of and quality of the community partnership from the product alone.

Review Form

Please consider both the product as well as the product application in determining your numerical ratings and open-ended comments. Both the product and the product application should be reviewed in their entirety before you complete the review form.

All reviewers, please rate the submission on all dimensions below. Academic reviewers, please pay special attention to methodological rigor. Community reviewers, please pay special attention to issues of community engagement and impact.

Note that the numerical ratings you provide in the review form will not be shared with the author.

For the following questions requiring numerical ratings, use the following scale of 1 to 5:

1 = definitely not 2 = probably not 3 = maybe 4 = probably yes 5 = definitely yes

1. *Appropriateness for CES4Health.* (Information available in Product Application Questions 3 and 4 and by reviewing the product.)

- 1a. Does the product’s topic relate to medical care, public health, the health of communities (broadly defined, including the social determinants of health), health sciences or health professions?
- 1b. Is the product appropriate for audiences/users beyond those involved in the project that led to the creation of the product?
- 1c. Is there sufficient context and guidance provided so that the product/application package can “stand on its own” and be understood and used without additional explanation or guidance?

Rating

2. *Clear Goals:* The degree to which the authors states the purpose of the product, its intended audience/users and clear goals and objectives. (Information available in Product Application Question 2 and 3.)

- 2a. Does the author clearly state the basic purpose of the product and its public value?
- 2b. Does the author clearly identify the intended audience/user of the product?

Rating	

3. *Adequate Preparation:* The degree to which the authors appropriately reference or build upon prior work in the area. (Information available in Product Application Question 5.)

- 3a. Does the author reference and/or build upon related work in the area? (This question is asking about the scholarly approach. Answers that cite literature or otherwise communicate an attempt to ground the work in an understanding of the conceptual, theoretical or empirical work that came before the author’s work should receive a higher rating than answers that communicate a rationale [next logical step in the author’s work] but not a grounding in work of others that came before. The “rationale” approach is minimally acceptable for CES4Health, but not as strong as the more scholarly approach).

Rating	

4. *Methodological Rigor:* The degree to which the author justifies the appropriateness of methods chosen with respect to the goals, questions and context of the work. The first part of this question applies to the project/work resulting in the product. (Information is available in Product Application Question 7.)

- 4a. Please indicate the category that best describes the project/work resulting in the product (check all that apply): Research, Education, Other.
- 4b. If answer to 4a is Research, does the author provide evidence for the appropriateness of the following aspects of research? (Any type of research is acceptable for CES4Health, not only quantitative or empirical):

Rating	

- Study aims
- Study design
- Study population
- Measurement approaches
- Analysis and interpretation

- 4b. If answer to 4a is Education, does the author provide evidence for the appropriateness of the following aspects of educational endeavors:

- Needs assessment
- Learning objectives
- Educational strategies
- Evaluation of learning
- Evaluation of community impact

- 4b. If answer to 4a is Other, does the author provide evidence for the appropriateness of choices made in the development of the project?
- 4c. Does the author effectively incorporate both community and academic/institutional expertise in the development and implementation of the project that resulted in this product?. In a later question you will be asked about the qualities of the community–academic/institutional collaboration. The current question is about the extent that the project was “with” the community as opposed to “for” or simply “in” the community.)

The second part of this question applies to the product. (Information is available in Product Application Question 8 and by reviewing the product.)

- 4d. Does the product seem to be developed with thoroughness, attention to detail, and professionalism?
- 4e. Does the author effectively incorporate both community and academic/institutional expertise in the development of the product? (Sometimes projects are collaborative efforts, but product development is not. Please make the distinction. Again, in a later question you will be asked about the qualities of the community-academic/institutional collaboration. The current question is about the extent that the product was developed “with” the community as opposed to “for” or simply “in” the community.)
- 5. *Significance:* The degree to which the product adds to existing knowledge and benefits communities. This question applies to the product. (Information is available in Product Application Question 9 and by reviewing the product.)

Rating

- 5a. Does the author present evidence that the product adds consequentially to existing knowledge?
- 5b. Does the author provide evidence of the value or impact of the product for or in the community?
- 5c. If significance or impact is not yet established, does this product have potential to add consequentially to existing knowledge or make positive community impact?

Rating

- 6. *Effective Presentation:* The clarity of the presentation style, the accuracy of the product content, and the appropriateness of language and visual aides for diverse audiences. This question applies to the product. (Information is available in Product Application Question 10 and by reviewing the product.)

- 6a. Does the author use a suitable style, clear communication, and effective organization to present the work?
- 6b. Are the language, format, or graphics contained in the product likely to be understood by others (avoidance of, jargon, unexplained acronyms, etc.)?
- 6c. Is the product’s presentation format appropriate for its stated aims and intended audience. (For example, if the author intends a 20-page, text-heavy document to be used by new immigrant community members, that would be an inappropriate presentation format.)

Rating

- 7. *Reflective Critique:* The degree to which authors provide critical reflection about the work, informed by both academic/institutional and community feedback. (Information is available in Product Application Question 11.)

- 7a. Does the author offer critically reflective comments (both strengths and limitations) regarding the product and/or the project that led to it?
- 7b. Does the author present evidence that both academic/institutional and community feedback informed the reflective critique?

Rating

- 8. *Ethical Behavior:* The degree to which authors provide evidence for a collaborative approach characterized by mutual respect, mutual benefit, shared work, and shared credit (and approval by an institutional review board and/or community-based review mechanism, if applicable). (Information is available in Product Application Questions 7, 8, 11, and 12 and by reviewing the product.)

Rating

- 8a. Does the author provide evidence of a genuine collaborative approach to development of the product (e.g., following principles of partnership such as mutual respect, mutual benefit, substantive contributions by all partners, shared power in decision making, and reciprocity)?
- 8b. Does the author provide evidence of a genuine collaborative approach to development of the work from which the product resulted (e.g., following principles of partnership such as mutual respect, mutual benefit, substantive contributions by all partners, shared power in decision making, and reciprocity)?
- 8c. Does the author give appropriate attribution to collaborators, community members, funders, and so on? This might be seen in co-authorship of the product or co-authors listed in the application or a clear articulation in the application of partners by name and their roles.
- 8d. If the project that resulted in the product was a research project, rate the degree to which the author provides appropriate documentation of IRB and/or community-based review. The name of the institution approving the protocol is sufficient. Reserve the highest rating for situations when both IRB and community review board approval were obtained.

9. Please use the space below to make any additional comments about the product or product application or further explanation of your ratings (these comments will be seen only by editorial staff):

10. Please use the space below to comment on the extent to which the product is likely to be useful to the intended audience/users and the extent to which it is likely to be used (these comments will be seen only by editorial staff):

11. Please indicate your “bottom-line” recommendation:

Check one: Accept Accept with Revisions Reject

When you recommend acceptance, you are suggesting that both the product and the application are appropriate for publication with no changes. When you suggest rejection, you are most likely making that judgment based on the appropriateness or quality of the product, because the application is usually easily revised. When you recommend that the submission be accepted with revisions, you may be focused on needed changes to the product, the application, or both.

You may recommend revisions to the product and/or the product application. Remember that the product application will be available to the CES4Health.info user and should be written professionally and accurately, and provide sufficient detail to allow the user to understand the genesis of the product, its scholarly basis, the nature of the community-academic/institutional collaboration, who it is intended for, its objectives, and how to use it.

Your numerical ratings will not be shared with the author. Rather, the author will receive a narrative summary of the strengths and limitations of the submission and recommendations for revisions if appropriate. The associate editor develops this narrative summary based on reviewers’ responses to question 12. Please respond in enough detail for both the associate editor to thoroughly understand your evaluation of the submission and for the author to be able to respond to areas of weakness and suggestions for revision.

12. Please use the space below to write a paragraph about the strengths of the submission and a paragraph describing the limitations of the submission. Please follow this with a list of suggested revisions to the product and/or the application. Even if you recommended acceptance or rejection of the submission (rather than accept with revisions) we would appreciate your ideas about potential improvements. Other reviewers may not make the same recommendation as you, and we may decide to accept the submission with revisions. In that case, it is helpful to have all reviewers make suggestions for revision to offer the most complete set of recommendations to the author as possible.
-
-
-

Please prioritize (categorize or rank order) your suggestions for revision if there are changes you feel are critical and suggestions that would be helpful, but are not necessary.

There are two situations in which revisions to the product would likely not be able to be made by the author. First, the product format may not be altered easily (such as a documentary). Second, the product may already be in distribution and it would be inappropriate to have multiple versions of the product in circulation. In these circumstances, it is often possible to recommend changes to the application that will address your concerns with the product.

Reminder—Address the four areas below in separate sections of your narrative:

- Strengths
- Limitations
- Suggested revisions for product
- Suggested revisions for product application

Thank you very much for your participation in this review. Please remember that you must keep information about the product, product application and review confidential.

REFERENCES

1. Jordan C, Seifer S, Sandmann L, Gelmon S. CES4Health.info: Development of a peer-reviewed mechanism for dissemination of innovative products of health-related community-engaged scholarship. *International Journal of Prevention Practice and Research*. 2009;1:21–8.
2. Glassick CE, Huber MT, Maeroff GI. *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1997.
3. Boyer EL. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Stanford (CA): The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; 1990.
4. Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. *Linking scholarship and communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions*. Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health; 2005.
5. Jordan CM, Wong KA, Jungnickel PW, Joosten YA, Leugers RC, Shields SL. The community-engaged scholarship review, promotion and tenure package: A guide for junior faculty and committee members. *Metropolitan Universities Journal*. 2009; 20:66–86.
6. Catalani C, Veneziale A, Campbell L, Herbst S, Wilson A, McCullough C, et al. In harmony: Reflections, thoughts, and hopes of Central City, New Orleans [online; last modified 2009 Sep 22]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=5P3GZ4HT>
7. Lutz M, Orantes D. Brooklyn community district 14 needs assessment [online; last modified 2009 Aug 25]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=FH4XFYL8>
8. Redondo F. (2008). Promotor(a) community health manual: Developing a community-based diabetes self-management program [online; last modified 2010 Sep 10]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=5P3GZ4HT>
9. George C, Krogh M, Watson D, Wittner J, Radner N, Wiens C. Homeless over 50: The greying of Chicago's homeless population [online; last modified 2009 Oct 23]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=5F3YT5CT>
10. Fletcher F. (2008). Community-based participatory research with indigenous people [online; last modified 2009 Aug 17]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=RDCKDMX3>
11. Zendell A, Riley-Jacome M. Toolkit to establish and sustain year-long walking in rural communities [online; last modified 2009]. Available from: CES4Health.info
12. Edwards L, Hawkins A, Sydnor K. Community approaches to mobilizing partnerships and service-learning: The practice experience/service learning guide [online; last modified 2009 Oct 23]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=ZJH5Z67J>
13. Edelson V, O'Leary J, Terry S. Does it run in the family? [online; last modified 2010 Aug 11]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=3BJM5DTG>
14. Lopez-Cevallos G, Braza J. Community-campus partnership in action: HE471 program planning [online; last modified 2010 May 3]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=4GLD5DJF>
15. The Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group. Developing and sustaining community-based participatory research partnerships: A skill-building curriculum [online; last modified 2009 Oct 23]. Available from: <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=R4RNKNYP>