

Minutes

Present: Grace VanNortwick, Kelly Donovan, JoAnne Race, Paul Massa, Steve Taffet, Ann Botash, Richard Wojcikiewicz, Patty Kane, Rich Veenstra, Siphon Mbuqe, Susan Wojcik, Stacy Mehlek, Palma Shaw, Rebecca Garden, Peggy Turk, Paul Massa, Jay Brenner, Anthony Tracey

Agenda and Meeting Minutes

7.17.23

Recap from last meeting: Last time we met we ended with a vote, we really wanted to think about how we are moving forward and making decisions by consensus with discussion of back and forth and then a final decision. We made a consensus last time based on letters. We agreed that all requirements for extramural letters should be across the board for all faculty.

1. Minutes from 6.28.23

Minutes were approved as written; no adjustments brought to attention from committee.

2. Review and revision of ground rules

We went around last meeting and introduced all, we introduced Dr. Anthony Tracey in this meeting as he was unable to attend last meeting. Dr. Tracey is a UUP representative as well as Assistant Professor at Upstate. We want everyone to feel comfortable as we are making more difficult decisions as a committee.

- **Confidentiality** – we are not recording any of our discussions currently. There may be hot topics and hotter items, no discussion of faculty but in terms of what people are doing.
- **Attendance** – please keep letting us know if you are unable to attend, if smaller attendance, we will discuss rescheduling the meeting.
- **Decisions by consensus** – we want to end the meeting feeling good about what was discussed. If something needs to be changed and it's not happening, another meeting will be held to have a decision compromised and made and some may not always agree and that's okay. Dr. Morley mentioned taking a "non-binding" vote.
- **Participation in meetings** – this is expected, and we would like to hear from everyone on topics at hand. Dr. Garden mentioned avoiding "group think" and looking for people's individual opinions. We may not all get the thing that we agree on and that's okay. We want to avoid trying to have things "watered down" in the middle.
- **Respecting everyone** – please respect everyone's opinions and ideas.

3. Review and revision of guiding principles

We visited the guiding principles in our first meeting, we wanted to review them again here as Dr. Botash felt some needed to be edited.

1. The criteria should be applicable no matter what the mission area. The criteria equal a “bar” and are not flexible. The P&T Committee is responsible for making a decision regarding whether the accomplishments meet the bar.
2. Criteria should be clear and understandable. They should discourage bias and favoritism.
3. Every faculty member should be able to find a pathway and a mechanism for academic advancement.
4. Flexibility can exist so that faculty can move from one path to another as their passions and interest change within their career.
5. Use clear and inclusive definitions of scholarship for promotion and tenure, recognizing diverse forms of scholarship (e.g., digital, team science, other), and establish criteria that acknowledge the value of scholarship within the context of the faculty member’s area of expertise.

This task was started in our meeting on 7.18.23, we didn’t finish it at our meeting but have a good leeway into it.

6. Recognize efforts in DEI as a form of scholarship and supports promotion.
Original intentions in reviewing the policy are that we don’t follow what other university’s do with including efforts from DEI that will support promotion.
7. Examples of scholarship will offer a practical understanding of the criteria. There may be candidates for whom examples of scholarship are not able to be provided and the written document (policy) should allow for unique creation of scholarship within our definitions.
Examples which we have currently but not written in a way that is easily noted.
8. Consider documentation requirements and additional ways to enable identification of unique contributions.

4. Definition of scholarship

- a. Review NCOM current definition of scholarship

Think about what we have as our current definition and then discuss what might be better and how to change it. There are organizational items that starts with scholarship but then moves directly to tenure which could make it seem that it’s the same item when they are not. Patty Kane reflected that definition of scholarship was based on what tenure was in the past. Requirements of scholarship needs to be reviewed and potentially have specific examples included. Some of the included items may weigh more compared to others. Teaching doesn’t include the 5 domains which are spelled out in the educator portfolio, could be incorporated, and added into section. Funding needs to be thought about how we consider it and that it may not

Minutes

apply to everyone necessarily. (Dr. Botash noted different examples on original definition document)

- b. Review Milner scholarship definition; Boyer/Glassicks
- c. Create new draft definition of scholarship for NCOM

Examples:

Glassicks Criteria for Scholarship in Education: <https://www.academicpeds.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Glassicks.pdf>

Boyers expanded Criteria:

<https://sites.stedwards.edu/innovationfellowship/2014/05/28/scholarship-of-teaching-learning-sotl/>

Type	Purpose	Example Measures of Performance
Discovery	Build new knowledge through traditional research.	Publishing in peer-reviewed forums Producing and/or performing creative work within established field Creating infrastructure for future studies
Integration	Interpret the use of knowledge across disciplines.	Preparing a comprehensive literature review Writing a textbook for use in multiple disciplines Collaborating with colleagues to design and deliver a core course
Application	Aid society and professions in addressing problems.	Serving industry, government or the nonprofit sector as an external consultant Assuming leadership roles in professional organizations Advising student leaders, thereby fostering their professional growth
Teaching	Study teaching models and practices to achieve optimal learning.	Advancing learning theory through classroom research Developing and testing instructional materials Mentoring upper-level students in undergraduate research Designing and implementing a program-level assessment system

Example from Milner article:

TABLE 1.

Definition of Scholarship in the UMass Chan Academic Personnel Policy²³

Scholarship is a defining feature of academic excellence and is valued in each Area of Distinction. Scholarship has three essential components: advancement of knowledge, dissemination, and impact, defined as follows:

Advancement of knowledge. Scholarship advances research, education, or practice through discovery, integration, application, or transmission of knowledge. Scholarly activities include, but are not limited to, the discovery of new knowledge through investigation, the integration of knowledge to generate new understanding, the application of knowledge to provide new solutions for individuals or communities, and the development of novel educational approaches for the transmission of knowledge.

Dissemination. Scholarship must be in a form, ie, disseminated and evaluated, allowing critical review. Scholarly work results from a rigorous and structured approach and includes, but is not limited to, peer-reviewed publications; books, book chapters, and reviews; preprints and other interim research products; innovative educational materials; peer-reviewed meeting abstracts and presentations; patents, new therapies and technologies; and evidence-based products such as policy statements, safety and quality studies, innovations in patient care, and clinical guidelines.

Impact. Scholarship has a measurable impact at the local, regional, national, or international level on a discipline, practice, or community. For example, a research discovery influences the direction of a field or provides a platform for others to build on; a meta-analysis integrates an area of knowledge for new policies or guidelines; application of knowledge to clinical practice improves the health of individuals or communities; a novel educational approach enhances learning.

Previous Ground Rules:

Revised Guiding Principles, based on feedback:

1. Provide flexible pathways for faculty, including those with Interdisciplinary health research, education, and/or promotion academic backgrounds, to adapt to current and future types of academic work.
2. Simplify the structure of promotion pathways while maintaining high academic standards.
3. To avoid bias, use clear and inclusive definitions of scholarship for promotion and tenure, recognizing diverse forms of scholarship (e.g. digital, team science, other), and establish criteria that acknowledge the value of scholarship within the context of the faculty member's area of expertise.
4. Provide examples of scholarship to offer practical understanding of the criteria. There may be candidates for whom examples of scholarship are not able to be provided and the work of these candidates should be considered with equal care and value.

Minutes

5. Recognize the principles are meant to support the spirit and not the letter of the policy and the policy will ultimately require review by faculty governance, legal counsel, dean's office, and dean.

Revision after reflection and further feedback:

9. The criteria should be applicable no matter what the mission area. The criteria equal a "bar" and are not flexible. The P&T Committee is responsible for making a decision regarding whether the accomplishments meet the bar.
10. Criteria should be clear and understandable. They should discourage bias and favoritism.
11. Every faculty member should be able to find a pathway and a mechanism for academic advancement.
12. Flexibility can exist so that faculty can move from one path to another as their passions and interest change within their career.
13. Use clear and inclusive definitions of scholarship for promotion and tenure, recognizing diverse forms of scholarship (e.g. digital, team science, other), and establish criteria that acknowledge the value of scholarship within the context of the faculty member's area of expertise.
14. Recognize efforts in DEI as a form of scholarship and supports promotion.
15. Examples of scholarship will offer a practical understanding of the criteria. There may be candidates for whom examples of scholarship are not able to be provided and the written document (policy) should allow for unique creation of scholarship within our definitions.
16. Consider documentation requirements and additional ways to enable identification of unique contributions.

Example for the documentation guiding principle: for team science, each person's work needs to be acknowledged and mechanisms for identifying unique and essential contributions of each team scientist will need to be included. For example, an annotated publication list including identification of mentees helps to identify contributions to scholarship that might not be evident if not first or last author. Letters of support (not evaluative) written by the 'lead' team members (PI, for example), who states/verifies that the contributions of the team member were important to the success of the scholarly product (research methods or analysis, or publication).