

### Statement on SCHOLARSHIP for reviewers

We define scholarship as creation of knowledge. This knowledge can be in any domain (e.g., education, administration, outreach, clinical, technical, leadership), not just research or "discovery" scholarship. It can be at the laboratory bench, at the bedside, on the computer, in the library, in nature, in the community, etc. It can be empirical or theoretical, hypothesis-driven or experiential. Making novel connections within pre-existing knowledge ("scholarship of integration") or between research and practice ("scholarship of application") receive credit. In any event, for the knowledge to become genuine scholarship, it needs to be public (i.e., shared with the candidate's peers), reviewed by the candidate's peers, and a platform on which others have built.

**Our sole concern, which is why we consult reviewers, is with the quality and significance of the scholarship, and not its type, domain, or format.**

We ask that you not apply the yardstick of one discipline to another when evaluating scholarship. For example, in some fields selection of a work for a platform presentation at a major meeting, even without peer-reviewed publication in a classical journal, is becoming customary for excellent scholarship. In others, the number of times a computer program is downloaded from online has become a metric of scholarship. Some forms of scholarship are not eligible for NIH funding, and so NIH funding cannot universally be used as a metric. We are consulting you because we believe you have the knowledge and insight to look beyond the numbers of publications, grants, citations, etc., and provide an expert evaluation of the underlying scholarship.

As you know, scholarship has become increasingly collaborative or team-based. We ask that you accord individual and collaborative/team scholarship equal weight -- *as long as the individual's contribution to collaborative/team scholarship can be established*. Please disregard the position of authorship as an indication of contribution to collaborative works unless YOU know it to be an accurate reflection. Internally we ask that candidates describe their own (and others') contribution to up to 5 exemplary works and, when these are collaborative, describe the contribution of each author; e.g., see the final section of:

Reference: N.A. Rosenkranz, M.J. Jordan, J.L. Martin, H.H. Cahn, D.D. Press, P.A. Jones and A.W. Freehold. 2015. The epigenetic structure of human populations. *Nature* 311: 238-245.

Major finding: This article examined epigenetic data from a sample of 1011 humans sampled from 48 populations around the world. Each individual was typed at a set of 377 loci spaced across the genome. We then applied the *Epigene* algorithm that I had developed previously as a tool for studying how members of a species are partitioned into groups. We found six main genetic clusters.

Roles of authors: I was not involved in the sample or data collection (led by A.W. Freehold). Rosenkranz and I did the initial data analysis together using the *Epigene* software that I had written previously; Rosenkranz then did more thorough analysis for publication; Rosenkranz and I wrote the paper jointly, with comments from the other authors. I did not contribute substantially to funding.

The department should supply you with this information.

Not every appointment or promotion case here involves tenure – but when it does our expectation is that the scholarship will be more than incremental and routine. Rather, it should be a significant departure or advancement from pre-existing knowledge in a field or area [the phrase "breaking new ground" is sometimes applied], and (b) significantly impact pre-existing knowledge or practice in a field or area [the phrase "transformational" is sometimes applied]. We also look for the likelihood of such scholarship on an ongoing basis in the future.

Our criteria for tenure do not formally include funding or extramural support, a minimum number of grants, renewal of funding, etc. However, if a faculty member's future progress is contingent on extramural support and such support is unlikely to be forthcoming even in normal times, this situation would be very concerning to us. We would welcome your comments on this.

We have no expectation that work appear in *Science*, *Nature*, etc. to be tenurable scholarship (although this is nice when it happens). We are consulting you because we believe that your opinion matters more than theirs.