

Present: P. Kane, S. Taffet, P. Massa, K. Donovan, A. Botash, R. Wojcikiewicz, M. Maimone, G. Conners, J. Race, R. Garden, S. Mehlek, G. VanNortwick, J. Brenner

Excused: S. Glatt, C. Morley (but arrived anyway!)

1. Finalize proficiency and scholarship.
 - a. Definitions—agreement that the definition of scholarship clear and supporting examples are good (for now).
 - b. Examples of scholarship can be broken into suggested groups, associate/professor/tenure...or left as a list since they are just example. Leaving as is for now with suggestion for asterisks for tenure requirements (“scholarship for promotion vs scholarship for tenure” as suggested at a previous meeting.)
 - c. Attestations

An example revision regarding the attestation requirement (tenure documentation requirement on the scholarship definition page) was previously sent to the task force.

A question about why the chair has to ask for attestations (vs faculty obtain them) was asked and answered. COMFAPC reviewers look at “middle” author publications and question the role of the candidate, especially if there is a low number of publications (annual number of publications is borderline). Suggestion that the COMFAPC be educated regarding middle authors in cases where middle authorship is not as meaningful (alphabetical, for example). *Note: More information on this is in the November 27th minutes. Use of letters of support for this same purpose was discussed (could be an option for when work needs further support). There needs to be education to chairs about when further support might be necessary.*

Hesitation was raised regarding the implication that requiring attestations suggest the faculty member is not trusted to provide this information. It was also noted that many journals require that the author’s role be included in the information about the author’s section of publications.

It was noted: For publications, the measurement of scholarship is more cut and dried (even when middle author). When it is a pre-print or non-peer reviewed, some sort of evaluation is needed (this is where the letter from objective evaluators is important).

New revision regarding attestations within the scholarship definition is attached, with inclusion of “when and why” it is needed.

Note that these tenure documentation requirements may be updated once we review and update the tenure criteria.

- d. A suggestion was made for a research narrative/statement. Currently, we require educator and clinical portfolios; do we need to also require a research portfolio to better support promotion packets? We do not ask for a research statement / portfolio, but some basic science departments do ask for this. 2-3 pages would be enough.
 1. Purpose:
 1. Would assist with those who have various and/or unique forms of scholarship
 2. Helps in understanding for what does not fit in the “box.”
 3. Could help characterize a person’s research trajectory (something the committee looks for).
 4. Would be useful for someone going up for research distinction
 5. Someone going up with only proficiency in research when their research is not something the COMFAPC is not familiar with may also benefit from a research statement as well. Maybe need a threshold for when a research portfolio is expected? If greater than 20% scholarship in AAE?

The group agreed on requesting a research portfolio and/or statement. Dr. Botash asked the group to identify research narrative examples to help support. Note that personal statements have already been agreed upon as a requirement. Should we have a separate narrative for research, or just expect a narrative statement from everyone? See example #2 below.

Examples:

2. https://www.ouhsc.edu/portals/1068/assets/documents/Faculty%20Career%20Planning%20Resources/Portfolio_Research_AAP_2014_vwlf.pdf
3. <https://www.uab.edu/medicine/dom/images/files/aptc/Portfolio%20requirements%20description%20and%20sample.pdf>
4. Example narrative statement from UMass:
<https://www.umassmed.edu/globalassets/office-of-faculty-affairs/documents/narrative-associate-invest.pdf>

- e. Definition of proficiency:

Wording was added to the ‘criteria for proficiency’ document, see attached.

- f. The group agreed to leave service as written, since it highlights non-clinical service and clinicians who achieve excellence in non-clinical areas will also be required to have some civic duties (service). Service is “civic duty” types of activities, not education, not research, and not clinical work.

≥20% research on AAE changed to ≥20% scholarship (see attached). Using a specific number of publications discourages impact and can vary depending on the work that is being accomplished. However, with a high level of expectation for scholarship, there needs to be something to show for it (examples of scholarship go beyond publications).

2. Review of drafts for associate professor criteria

- a. How do we want to see examples (required number?) – agreed to leave this “open” with some room for flexibility depending on the quality of the accomplishments
- b. Consistency across areas of distinction—what are the differences?

Within each pathway, we have three subcategories of criteria:

1. Excellence: Excellence includes leadership roles because a faculty member is chosen to be a leader.
 2. Reputation
 3. Recognition (awards, invitations to review books, chapters, articles, people going up, etc., invitations to editorial boards and editorial roles
 4. How are these categories defined? If the categories are challenging for this task force, do we need to revert to a list format?
 5. Should create a tenure requirement section for each area of distinction.
- c. Paul Massa asked, “Is excellence the same as application of scholarship?” He volunteered to review the Associate professor criteria for research distinction and see if he could fit it into the three categories of scholarship.
 - d. Scholarship definition will likely work for research (since the scholarship is most clearly defined as publications) but may not work for education and healthcare delivery. What is a scholarly approach to clinical work (and educational work)?

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION CONSENSUS: “The worthiness of scholarship accomplishments is determined by the department committees, letters of support, and external evaluator letters.” Attestations can add to the support. Personal statements (and research narratives) can help to identify what those accomplishments are.

Overarching questions - Do the three subcategories of criteria for each area distinction work for our policy and will faculty understand?

3. Plan for the new year discussion of next steps (proposed).
 - a. Research portfolio/statement (narrative statement template?)
 - b. Framework for criteria within areas of distinction
 - c. Carve out for tenure criteria by area of distinction
 - d. Review all documentation requirements.

Note from Chat regarding service (and I have updated our proficiency criteria to reflect this):

Gregory Conners to Everyone 4:36 PM

The president's award for service counts service as:

- Service to the campus, the State University, the local community, or contributions at the regional, state-wide, national, or international levels
- Contributions to discipline or disciplinary and professional organizations and to leadership in local or system-wide faculty governance
- The nature of the work must exceed the work generally considered to be part of a candidate's basic professional obligation and must include service that exceeds that for which faculty are normally compensated. [NOTE: This is for an award and "exceeding" makes sense for an award, but for proficiency, I think we expect faculty to provide effective service—not above and beyond]
- There must be positive evidence of outstanding achievement and skill in providing leadership, outreach, or other University and/or community service or extraordinary service and leadership in the nominee's professional organizations. As above – extraordinary is not an expectation for effective.
- The scope of the service must extend over multiple years, must be geared toward effecting positive change and must involve the generous giving of personal time in service to areas previously described. As above – not an expectation for effective.

Components of Scholarship and Definition:

Scholarship is composed of three distinct components relevant to academic activities in your area of distinction considered for promotion and/or tenure. These components are 1) Advancement of knowledge, 2) Dissemination, and 3) Impact on a particular field of expertise. These components of scholarship are further defined as:

- **Advancement of knowledge:** This is represented by innovative and/or creative research, health care delivery, and/or education that utilizes processes of discovery, integration, application, and/or transmission of knowledge.
 - i. Discovery is the creation of new knowledge or ideas within a discipline or field.
 - ii. Integration is synthesis of existing knowledge or theories within one or more disciplines or fields to generate or promote a new understanding or direction in one’s field.
 - iii. Application is the utilization of knowledge to solve problems and/or generate novel methods.
 - iv. Transmission of knowledge (or teaching, per Boyer’s definition of scholarship) involves the development of novel means for the education of learners and often utilizes the three preceding forms of advancement of knowledge.

- **Dissemination:** Dissemination is the process of distributing, sharing, or publicizing one’s work by means appropriate to a particular field. Faculty have the primary responsibility for sharing and promoting their work. A faculty member’s work needs be effectively disseminated to the broader society and/or academic community, beyond the home institution.

- **Impact:** Impact is a measure of how advancement of knowledge and its dissemination has moved ~~a an academic (?)~~ field forward. Impact is measured by a holistic view gained from the examples below and should not be confused with impact factor.

Examples of Advancement of Knowledge:

Discovery includes, but is not limited to:

- Novel observations in the conduct of laboratory investigation and development of novel theories or ideas that are not necessarily based on prior knowledge
- Leadership in a clinical trial for new disease therapies, surveys, clinical data analysis, or equipment testing
- New technology, ways of collecting data, or advances in the use of technology

Definition of Scholarship--Updated
DRAFT 11.27.23 Revised 12.12.23

- Development of original ideas or concepts in the arts or sciences
- [Creating and testing new models of teaching, curriculum design, mentoring, or assessment](#)
- [Computational analysis of datasets that create new knowledge/understanding.](#)

Integration includes but is not limited to:

- Synthesis of ideas and concepts to create a new model or approach to research methodology
- Combining two surgical procedures or therapeutically altering two or more biological processes in novel ways that ameliorate a particular disease process in ways not previously considered
- Bringing together interprofessional concepts to create a novel learning environment
- Integration of the humanities into STEM coursework

Application includes, but is not limited to:

- Scientific approaches that lead to better treatment outcomes or scientific breakthroughs
- Improvement, refinement, or mastering of complex medical procedures; Innovative approaches that improve safety, quality, and/or efficacy of healthcare delivery
- Create a new remediation strategy to assist with student success

Transmission of knowledge includes but is not limited to:

- Novel inclusion of web-based media into courses that improve transmission of knowledge and support advancement of knowledge
- Improvement of evidence-based new and/or improved pedagogical practices

Examples of Dissemination include but are not limited to:

- peer-reviewed publications, books, book chapters, case reports, and reviews
- preprints and other interim research products
- innovative educational materials and products shared beyond the home institution
- co-authorships
- peer-reviewed local, regional, national or international, meeting abstracts and presentations at professional meetings
- patents
- new therapies and technologies shared beyond the home institution;
- evidence-based products such as national policy statements, safety and quality studies innovations in patient care utilized beyond the institution, and clinical guidelines
- Internet based publications such as blogs, interactive websites, maintenance of certification or other faculty created online modules or courses, Apps
- AR, VR projects shared or developed collaboratively beyond the home institution
- creative works such as performances, simulation programs, poetry, public art, other published forms of storytelling

Examples of Impact include but are not limited to:

- Professional Society recognition in the form of prizes, honorary degrees, etc
- Appearances in regional and national news networks as an expert in one's field.
- Digital analytics which may include quantitative measurements of the performance of online content, including news media mentions, social media, websites, and other online information
- Citation counts, h-indices, journal impact factor, and other metrics may be used as a measure as appropriate to the work being evaluated.
- Authorships and co-authorships (interdisciplinary or other)
- Productivity over time??

Examples of Documentation materials for Assessment of Scholarship include but are not limited to:

- External evaluator letters
- Personal statement
- Letters of support from individuals familiar with the candidate's work
- Chair's Letter
- Highlighted significant publications (4 for tenure, see below)
- Annotated bibliography of publications included in CV (see below for details)
- Attestations regarding role in scholarship from primary authors (see below for details)
- Documentation for Continuing Appointments (AKA Tenure):
- Four highlighted publications (continuing appointments, aka tenure, only)
 - The faculty candidate should identify four articles that represent work that influenced and/or impacted their field. This can be provided as links to PubMed or as PDFs of the publications.
- Annotated bibliography of publications (continuing appointments, aka tenure, only)

Required for tenure applications. An annotated bibliography of publications is primarily requested for candidates who need to document major annual contributions in the form of publications in their area of distinction (such as research) and for continuing appointments (tenure) and may not be necessary when the quantity or quality of publications is well above minimum criteria. Check with the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development for situations with unique scholarship.

 - Annotations should include brief (no more than 3 sentence) explanations of the candidate's role in the work produced.
 - Annotations are optional for most non-tenure applications.
 - In some specialty fields and journals where authorship roles are less well defined, such as where authors are listed alphabetically, annotation to clarify the candidate's role in the scholarship is recommended.
 - Annotations are only expected for "middle author" publications (not primary, senior or corresponding author) during the years being evaluated for promotion.

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted

Formatted: Not Highlight

Definition of Scholarship--Updated
DRAFT 11.27.23 Revised 12.12.23

- In some cases, annotations for publications may be grouped if more than one publication is related to a project.
 - (grouping)
- Written The candidate chair may should request attestations attestations from primary authors, including descriptions and clarifications regarding the candidate's role in scholarship production and the significance of the candidate's work toward project success, are recommended in certain instances. This is primarily recommended for candidates who need to document major annual contributions in the form of publications in their area of distinction (research) and for continuing appointments (tenure).
 - Requests for attestations by the Department Chair are recommended for those candidates applying for Distinction in Research (Associate or Professor), and/or who have greater than 20% FTE allocated to scholarship from the primary author(s) in certain instances as described below:
 - If the candidate's independent scholarship is at risk of being perceived as not meeting criteria due to the needs for clarification of quantity or quality of publications. For example, candidates for promotion with Distinction in Research who have a minimum number of publications and are identified as a "middle author" (not primary, senior or corresponding author) in some publications, should include primary author attestations in their documentation materials. of publication where the candidate is not a senior, primary or corresponding author regarding the candidates role in project/publications (continuing appointments, aka tenure, only). This is primarily recommended for candidate's who need to additional support to strengthen a promotion application. document major annual contribrition in the form of publications in their area of distinction.
 - Candidates who need to strengthen their promotion dossier in order to clarify their unique role in projects should consider inclusion of attestations and/or letters of support from collaborators.
 - The role of the candidate in work that represents team science may be most definitively presented by primary author attestations and/or letters of support from collaborators.

Formatted

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted