AAG Chair: Luanne Thorndyke

Meeting Location: S2-351

## Agenda:
1. Draft Definition of Scholarship
2. Group discussion
3. Next Steps

### Materials:
- 08-27-15 Meeting Minutes
- Key Components of Scholarship
- Scholarship Definition

### Members:
- Mark Klempner*
- Neil Aronin*
- Bob Baldor*
- Joanna Cain*
- Michael Czech
- Roger Davis*
- Robert Finberg*
- Michael Green*
- Bob Jenal*
- Catarina Kiefe*
- Jean King
- Judy Ockene*
- Linda Pape*
- David Paydarfar
- Anthony Rothschild*
- Mitchell Sokoloff*
- Jill Zitzewitz*

### Action/Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Comments/Minutes</th>
<th>Action/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.     | L. Thorndyke | Review of the Minutes: Dr. Thorndyke gave a summary of the meeting on August 27th.  
- Reviewed the Charge from the Provost  
- Drafted list of essential components of scholarship  
- Discussed metrics of scholarship (how is scholarship assessed?)  
- Summarized a list of key components of scholarship  
- OFA was tasked to develop a draft definition of scholarship for the next meeting. | Minutes accepted. |
| 2.     | L. Thorndyke | Draft Definition of Scholarship  
Dr. Thorndyke reviewed the draft definition of scholarship and the assessment of scholarship prepared by OFA.  
Group discussion of the draft definition of scholarship included the following points:  
- The words “novel”, “innovative” & “creative” were removed from the draft definition.  
  We want to ensure that replication studies could still be considered scholarship. Bottom line: scholarship needs to advance knowledge, which also includes creation of new knowledge.  
- It might be helpful to have a clarifying sentence to explain ‘integration and application’ components of the statement “Scholarship advances knowledge in research, education or practice through discovery, integration or application.”  
- Generalizability, as it was intended when brought up at the last meeting, means when you discover something in one context, the same new knowledge applies to different contexts. Either the word “generalizability” or the statement “use of the work by others” could/should be removed from the definition.  
- Discussion/debate regarding the stated examples of scholarly products—specifically blogs, editorials, clinical guidelines that are not part of a study, meeting abstracts and posters, educational materials, and assessment tools. It is not immediately evident how these items would qualify as scholarship.  
- The examples don’t identify what the scholarly product(s) would be for integration and application. Might think about expanding the examples because the products of those types of scholarship are less familiar and often unrecognized by promotion committees.  
- We should have some examples, particularly with the concepts of application and integration. |
Use the statement “such as, but not limited to” to indicate the list of scholarly products has flexibility. This flexibility will allow durability of the APP over time.

Even though blogs and peer reviewed publications might be listed as potential examples of scholarship, they do not carry the same weight with regard to promotion. Faculty will need education and mentoring to understand that blogs, for example, would not have the same weight as peer reviewed publications towards promotion.

The definition could be reduced to the bolded sentences with the descriptive sentences taken out and written as interpretively vague to allow for evaluating latitude as there are changes. [Debate/discussion ensued—as below.]

The examples of what would be accepted (or not) provides clarity so faculty would understand the options and opportunities. It will be helpful [for faculty as well as promotion committees] to have listed the scholarly products that are going to be accepted in evaluating a candidate for promotion. The examples should give a sense of the breadth of what’s acceptable, as well as what criteria define acceptability.

The examples are not needed in the definition, but should be listed in the criteria for each rank.

The full body of work/scholarly activity should be reviewed, and that is not limited to the items on the list.

**General Questions/Discussion**

- What problem in the current APP are we trying to solve? What gaps need to be addressed in the new policy?
- One of the problems is that the current policy is too abstract and is open to lots of different interpretation.
- Another problem is that the expectations for what it takes to be promoted vary by department. There is inconsistency in the application of the criteria for promotion by department. This is viewed as unfair and inequitable by faculty.
- Might this problem be solved by a promotions committee that has more departmental representation?
- There is a sense the current policy isn’t working for our entire faculty, which has become more diverse. Broaden the definitions and reexamine how all faculty might see a pathway to get promoted.
- The clinical faculty have little time to do scholarship of any kind. Need to have a mechanism to incorporate those efforts in some system that recognizes and values their contribution to the academic health center and its broad mission.
- We have valuable faculty whose principal output is not peer review publication of bench research. These faculty care for patients and educate medical students. These faculty seek ways to turn their work into scholarship that can be recognized by promotion boards for academic advancement through dissemination and impact.
- Many clinical non-tenure track faculty—85% of the faculty—feel disenfranchised because they are in positions where their accomplishments—excellent care of patients and outstanding education of students—are undervalued and not recognized for promotion.
- A growing trend is team science. We need to ensure documentation of individual expertise and ensure there is a clear understanding of that expertise in the creation of scholarship. In this way, each person in the team can be recognized for their contribution.
- Individual expertise/contributions can be identified in several ways: the faculty member’s research statement, the departmental chair letter, and/or from reference letters that address the individual faculty member’s expertise.
- Faculty dislike the modifiers before their academic rank. We should drop the clinical and research modifiers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>L. Thorndyke</th>
<th><strong>V. Next Steps</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Review a revised definition of scholarship (to include an assessment of scholarship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Review and discuss models for promotion pathways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action plan:**

OFA will revise the definition for review at the next meeting.

**Next meeting:** 9/21/2015 9:00am in AS3-2119 (the Cube)