**Academic Advancement Work Group**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, August 27, 2015 9:00am – 11:00am  
Meeting Location: ASC Cube

### Agenda:
- I. Charge from the Provost
- II. Components of Scholarship
- III. Table Group Discussion
- IV. Report Out from Tables
- V. Next Steps

### Materials:
- Kick-Off Meeting Scholarship Highlights
- Scholarship Definitions and Metrics
- Components of Scholarship

### Members:
- Luanne Thorndyke
- Neil Aronin*
- Bob Baldor*
- Joanna Cain*
- Michael Czech*
- Roger Davis*
- Robert Finberg*
- Michael Green*
- Bob Jenal*
- Catarina Kiefe*
- Jean King*
- Mark Klempner*
- Anne Larkin*
- Pranoti Mandrekar*
- Robert Milner*
- Judith Ockene*
- Linda Pape*
- David Paydarfar
- David Polakoff*
- Anthony Rothschild*
- Mitchell Sokoloff*
- Jill Zitzewitz*

### INVITEES/ATTENDEES: (*= attendees)

### Item # | Owner | Comments/Minutes | Action/Status
--- | --- | --- | ---
1. | L. Thorndyke | Welcome  
Dr. Thorndyke welcomed work group members, reviewed the membership and how members were selected, and gave a summary of the APP Revision Kick-Off Retreat. She thanked the committee for their willingness to participate. | Members were advised of their role to represent various faculty stakeholders.

2. | T. Flotte | I. Charge from the Provost  
Dr. Flotte thanked work group members for agreeing to serve on this committee and taking the time to attend the meetings.  
Dr. Flotte charged the work group with initiating the process for the revision of the APP and to determine ranks, tracks and recognitions for tenure and non-tenure faculty, in order to achieve the goals of the institution. | Charge:  
Create a definition of scholarship  
Review/recommend:  
* Pathways/criteria for promotion  
* Pathways/criteria for tenure  
* Guarantees of tenure

3. | L. Thorndyke | II. Components of Scholarship/III. Table Discussion  
Dr. Thorndyke asked each of the three tables to review the materials that were provided, discuss and recommend various components of scholarship and identify key elements that should be included in the UMMS definition of scholarship. |

4. | L. Thorndyke | IV. Report out from the Tables  
Major elements of the discussion included the following:  
Three major parts of scholarship:  
- Create/advance new knowledge (broad sense- generalizability  
- Dissemination  
- Impact  
- Definition should be broad and ‘recognize different activities in each of the mission areas’  
- Creating curriculum needs to be measured/impact demonstrated for it to be considered scholarship  
- Metrics may be different on different tracks, for example on the education track, etc.  
- Team science/contribution to a team needs to be included in the definition |
Scholarship advances research, education or practice through discovery, transmission, integration or application of knowledge. Scholarship is more than just discovery of new knowledge. It’s also what you do with that knowledge.

- Should be a rigorous and structured activity/approach
- Novel and Innovative
- Should have an impact- how much impact would inform the metrics (currently entry, established and senior).
- Definition of scholarship should be broad to allow more opportunities for faculty
- Community service related to the field should be considered as scholarship, with defined criteria met.

Components of Scholarship:
- Creating and advancing knowledge
- Discovery and innovation- but think broadly about what this means
- Impact
- Dissemination

Metrics:
- Peer review
- Breadth of work
- External review
- Policy
- Should ask faculty to write a scholarship statement that describes their contribution to science
- Metrics should include contributions either as an individual or as part of a team.
- Narrative statements should be required.
- If working as part of a team, there should be a unique contribution to the team

**Question:** Discovery and innovation- is it encapsulated in the concept of creating new knowledge, or are they separate and different? As we draft the definition, do we need discovery, innovation, creating new knowledge... or does the act of discovery and innovation result in new knowledge?

**Discussion:** Including all of the terms makes it broader.

**Question:** Does everyone know what is meant by generalizability?

**Discussion:**
- The ability to take a finding that was arrived upon in specific a group to a much larger, well-defined group. Knowledge has to be generalizable to be considered knowledge.
- The research is rigorous enough that it’s generalizable and not antidotal.
- A case report that results in something which changes practice might be considered scholarship but a case report that is an antidotal observation would not.
- Dissemination needs to be in a recognized way, or in a professional way.
- Dissemination should be recognized by a community of scholars

5. L. Thorndyke

**V. Next Steps**
- The next step is to put the components into a paragraph. Dr. Thorndyke asked the group if they would like to create a smaller group to create the descriptor, or if they would like OFA to tackle it.
- At the next meeting we will finalize the definition and drive further into metrics.
- A SharePoint site has been created for resources, minutes, presentations, etc. [https://sp.umassmed.edu/sites/Provost/ofa/SitePages/Academic%20Advancement%20Work%20Group.aspx](https://sp.umassmed.edu/sites/Provost/ofa/SitePages/Academic%20Advancement%20Work%20Group.aspx)
- Future meetings will be scheduled to accommodate the greatest number of attendees.

- The committee agreed to let the OFA to create a draft definition.

Next meeting 9/8/2015 @ 12:00n in S2-351, University Campus