Academic Advancement Work Group
Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 21, 2015  8:00am – 9:30am
Meeting Location: AS3-2119 (the Cube)

Agenda:
I. Draft Definition of Scholarship
   - 9-8-15 Meeting Minutes
   - Key Components of Scholarship
   - Scholarship Definition

II. Group discussion
   - Key Components of Scholarship

III. Next Steps
   - Definition

Materials:

Item #  Owner          Comments/Minutes                                                                                   Action/Status
1.      L. Thorndyke  Dr. Thorndyke reviewed the revised definition of scholarship which had been revised based on feedback from the last meeting.
          Discussion included:
          • Proposed definition omits some products by clinical researcher. Recommend change to include “new therapies and technologies”.
          • Difficult to measure impact of educational materials. It might be hard for faculty to demonstrate impact. It was noted that impact may be measured through improvements demonstrated by learners, dissemination, publication, etc.
          Dr. Thorndyke then reviewed the Assessment of Scholarship section with the group.
          Discussion included:
          • Publications seem to be missing from the assessment. It was noted this is captured under “quality and quantity of a body of scholarly work”. All agreed the sentence should be bolded to emphasis this concept.
          • Clarify reputation as “The academic reputation”
          • Include publications in the bulleted list
          • Recommend adding “such as the following examples” to allow for future items that need to be included. Patents were raised in the discussion, but these are covered in the definition of scholarship.
          • Items that the faculty member feels are not covered in these categories can be discussed in their personal statement.

2.      R. Milner      Models for Academic Advancement (Promotion)
          Dr. Milner gave a presentation on different models of academic advancement.

3.      L. Thorndyke  Table Group Discussion of Models and Report Out
          Table discussion to identify the pros and cons of each of the three presented models.
          Each table then reported the main discussion items to the committee.

4.      L. Thorndyke  V. Next Steps: Agenda for Next Meeting
          • Further work on promotion models
          • Discussion topic: Should teaching be required of (all) faculty?
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Next meeting: 10/13/2015
8:00am in AS3-2119 (the Cube)