

Educational Scholarship Guides



www.mededportal.org

Educational Scholarship Guides

www.mededportal.org

Educational Scholarship Guides Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Educational Scholarship Guide for Faculty.....	3
Educational Resources as Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure.....	5
Evaluating Educational Scholarship.....	7
Author Check List.....	9

Educational Scholarship Guides Overview

(Updated March 2013)

An Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Educational Working Group on Educational Scholarship was established in 2005 and charged to develop a series of educational documents that describe the definition, peer review, publication, and recognition of educational scholarship in medical and dental education. Drawing on the educational scholarship literature, the documents illustrate how published educational works are comparable to other forms of scholarship that are commonly used for promotion and tenure purposes. The working group developed the following four documents which are included in this publication.

Educational Scholarship Guide for Faculty - A document developed to guide faculty who are considering publishing their educational resources. It presents the fundamentals of educational scholarship and illustrates how educational resource publications as a form of scholarship are comparable to manuscripts that are published in traditional journals.

Educational Resources as Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure - A fact sheet created for all faculty and administrators, particularly those who serve on promotion and tenure committees. This fact sheet describes the principles of educational scholarship and how peer-reviewed educational resources may be considered compelling scholarly contributions to support promotion and tenure.

Evaluating Educational Scholarship - A worksheet designed to help users evaluate virtually any educational resource based on accepted standards of scholarship.

Author Checklist - A practical checklist developed to help authors prepare their educational materials for submission to MedEdPORTAL *Publications*.

The AAMC would like to recognize the following individuals who served on the AAMC Educational Scholarship Working Group and created this publication:

Janet Hafler, EdD
Harvard Medical School

Deborah Simpson, PhD
Medical College of Wisconsin

Sheila Chauvin, PhD
Louisiana State University School of Medicine of
New Orleans

Kevin Souza, MS
University of California San Francisco School of
Medicine

George Nowacek, PhD
Wake Forest University School of Medicine

Chris Candler, MD
Association of American Medical Colleges

Educational Scholarship Guide for Faculty (Updated March 2013)

This document was developed to guide faculty who are considering publishing their educational resources within MedEdPORTAL Publications. It introduces the principles of educational scholarship and illustrates how MedEdPORTAL publications, as a form of scholarship, are comparable to print publications. This document was developed by the 2005 Association of American Medical and dental Colleges (AAMC) Working Group on Educational Scholarship.

What is Educational Scholarship?

Educational scholarship refers to any material, product or resource originally developed to fulfill a specific educational purpose that has been successfully peer-reviewed and is subsequently made public through appropriate dissemination for use by others.

In what ways are MedEdPORTAL publications similar to publications in traditional print journals?

New forms of digital publishing have provided unprecedented opportunities for peer review and publication of scholarly works online. From its conception within the AAMC Group on Educational Affairs, MedEdPORTAL *Publications* was designed to serve as a prestigious publishing venue through which faculty may disseminate their educational works. Structured like a traditional print journal, MedEdPORTAL *Publications*:

- Maintains an editor and an editorial board.
- Follows a peer review policy that mirrors practices employed by established biomedical and dental print journals.
- Employs a rigorous peer review process based on accepted standards of scholarship using invited expert reviewers to conduct all reviews.

An educational resource successfully peer-reviewed and published through MedEdPORTAL *Publications* is comparable to a peer-reviewed research paper published through a reputable print-based journal. Authors who publish through MedEdPORTAL *Publications* benefit from the Association of American Medical and dental Colleges' authority and credibility and have access to a critical audience drawn from its broad membership. Publications in MedEdPORTAL *Publications* should be considered compelling scholarly contributions suitable for use to support promotion and tenure decisions.

How do Promotion and Tenure Committees view educational works – as distinct from works of research – that are published?

As early as 1992 several medical and dental schools were encouraging their faculty members to provide evidence of their educational work in portfolio-like documents that could be sources of teacher recognition.¹ As of 2000, at least half of all medical and dental schools showed evidence that they valued the educational activities of their faculty with an emphasis on peer review and dissemination, with many schools providing detailed advice about how faculty members could assemble their best educational materials for promotion packets.²

How do I cite my MedEdPORTAL publication?

There are established conventions for citing various types of digital, database, and other online resources. MedEdPORTAL *Publications* citations may be presented in one of two common styles:

International Committee of Medical and dental Journal Editors style (NLM):

Smith A. Assessing Professionalism. MedEdPORTAL; 2005. Available from:
<http://www.aamc.org/mededportal>, ID = 9814.

APA style:

Smith, M. (2005) Assessing Professionalism. MedEdPORTAL: [_http://www.aamc.org/mededportal](http://www.aamc.org/mededportal), ID = 9543.

I am up for promotion. Specifically, where might I document my MedEdPORTAL publication in my CV or promotion dossier/packet?

Many institutions have standardized formats for faculty CVs; some institutions offer the following subsection headings within the Bibliography section:

- Peer Reviewed Educational Materials
- Enduring Materials (Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed)
- Other Forms of Educational Scholarship

Authors may also include documentation of their work within their educational portfolio. To support portfolio documentation, MedEdPORTAL *Publications* provides faculty with information regarding the number of times their published resource has been downloaded and used by others via a usage report. Published authors have access to real-time usage reports by logging into their account and visiting their [My MedEdPORTAL](#) page.

As a faculty member with numerous research, teaching and service responsibilities, why should I take the time to complete the submission form and submit my educational material to MedEdPORTAL *Publications*?

The benefits for including your work in MedEdPORTAL *Publications* may be realized at multiple levels:

- You receive recognition for peer-review of scholarly work that may be considered by promotion & tenure committees. In addition, all successfully reviewed materials are provided with the AAMC Peer Reviewed Logo, a special mark of distinction.
- You may obtain feedback of your work from the peer-review for enhancement or expansion of the resource.
- The MedEdPORTAL *Publications* process allows you to select and codify the specific conditions under which the work may be used by others (i.e., MedEdPORTAL *Publications* allows faculty to create a genuine copyright license).
- You are able to expand the audience of potential users of your work beyond your own discipline.
- You can communicate your professional expertise and interests to faculty at other medical and dental schools.

Bibliography

- 1 Simpson DE, Hafler J, Brown D, Wilkerson L. Documentation Systems for Educators Seeking Academic Promotion in U.S. Medical and dental Schools. *Acad Med.* 2004;79(8):783-90.
- 2 Hafler JP, Lovejoy FH Jr. Scholarly Activities Recorded in the Portfolios of Teacher-Clinician Faculty. *Acad Med.* 2000; 75(6):649-52.

Educational Resources as Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure

(Updated March 2013)

This document was developed by the 2005 Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Working Group on Educational Scholarship. All faculty and administrators, particularly those who serve on promotion and tenure committees, need to be aware of the principles of educational scholarship and how peer-reviewed educational resources can be considered as compelling scholarly contributions to support applications for promotion and tenure. The following short summary may suffice.

The History of Educational Scholarship:

In 1990, Ernest Boyer, then President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, called for a radical realignment of emphasis among the scholarly functions that make up the full scope of academic work. He argued that the term “scholarship” correctly applies to four domains¹, or areas of academic endeavor. They are:

- 1 The scholarship of **discovery**, which is consistent with traditional research;
- 2 The scholarship of **integration**, which makes connections across disciplines and places specialties in a larger context;
- 3 The scholarship of **application**, which demonstrates the vital interaction between research and practice, wherein the one continuously informs the other; and
- 4 The scholarship of **teaching** (educational scholarship), which emphasizes the creation of new knowledge about teaching and learning in the presence of learners.

By 1992 several medical and dental schools had signaled their acceptance of the validity of educational scholarship by encouraging faculty members to provide evidence of their educational work in portfolio-like documents used in conjunction with teacher recognition.² As of 2000, at least half of all medical and dental schools affirmed the value of their faculty’s educational activities, with many schools providing detailed advice to faculty members as they assembled their best educational materials for promotion packets.³

Scholarship Defined:

Once the concept of scholarship was expanded, a new concern quickly arose regarding how one could determine if work done in a domain other than discovery/research was suitable to be called scholarship. Building on Boyer’s work, Glassick, Huber and Maeroff⁴ identified six characteristics that all works of scholarship, including educational scholarship, have in common. They are:

- 1) **Clear goals** – the educator explicitly states the basic purposes for the work, and defines realistic, achievable objectives, including desired goals and outcomes.
- 2) **Adequate preparation** – the educator shows an understanding of existing scholarship relevant to the endeavor and has skills and resources drawn from this research and from prior experience to advance the project.
- 3) **Appropriate methods** – in conjunction with the material and the context, the educator chooses, applies and, if necessary, modifies methods wisely.
- 4) **Significant results** – the educator achieves the goals, and contributes notably to the field in a manner that invites further exploration.

- 5) **Effective presentation** – the educator uses a suitable style and organization to present the work with clarity and integrity in appropriate forums to reach the intended audience.
- 6) **Reflective critique** – the educator thoughtfully assesses the work him/herself and uses the resulting perceptions, along with reviews and critique from others, to refine, enhance or expand the original concept.

Peer Review and Dissemination:

The expansion of the concept of scholarship to include other kinds of academic work besides traditional research and the widespread acceptance of the six *Scholarship Assessed* criteria for scholarship only compliments the roles that peer review and dissemination continue to play in all higher education, including medical and dental education. Peer review has always been a systematic evaluation tool in assessing research and now, given the *Scholarship Assessed* criteria, peer reviewers are readily able to judge whether work in any domain meets the quality and standards of scholarship in the academic community.⁵

In addition to traditional forums of disseminating scholarship (for example, journals) a number of new venues are available to support peer review and dissemination in medical and dental education across the country. Faculty members may submit educational products such as syllabi, videotapes, e-learning courses, PBL cases, OSCE tools among others for peer review. As suggested above, these products are reviewed using a peer review process that closely parallels that which journals use, with standards for acceptance consistent with the *Scholarship Assessed* established criteria for scholarship. Rather than publishing in a journal these products are published in educational repositories.

The advent of online publishing venues has increased the ability for medical and dental educators to offer their work for peer review and dissemination without diminishing the intellectual rigor long associated with such a process. Moreover, the impact factor (e.g. breadth and size and type of audience) associated with the new repositories should be judged as with any traditional form of dissemination.

In summary, educational scholarship has emerged as a valid domain in which medical and dental educators may produce meaningful work suitable for rigorous peer review using processes and criteria that parallel traditional academic models. Furthermore, the peer-reviewed and disseminated products of educational scholarship can rightly be counted as evidence of scholarly worth in academic promotion decisions.

Bibliography

- 1 Boyer EL. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the Professoriate* 1990; The Carnegie Foundation the Advancement of Teaching; Princeton, NJ.
- 2 Simpson DE, Hafler J, Brown D, Wilkerson L. Documentation Systems for Educators Seeking Academic Promotion in U.S. Medical Schools. *Acad Med.* 2004; 79(8): 783-90.
- 3 Hafler JP, Lovejoy FH Jr. Scholarly Activities Recorded in the Portfolios of Teacher-Clinician Faculty. *Acad Med.* 2000; 75(6): 649-52.
- 4 Glassick CE, Huber MR, Maeroff GI. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate.* 1997; San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 5 Shapiro ED, Coleman DL. The Scholarship of Application. *Acad Med.* 2000; 75(9): 895-8.

Evaluating Educational Scholarship

(Updated March 2013)

This worksheet is designed to guide users in evaluating educational materials in light of criteria established for all scholarship, including educational products in medical and dental education. The intent is to determine whether the materials meet the criteria and thus discern the degree to which they are ready for dissemination. It was originally developed by Dr. Sheila Chauvin and subsequently adapted by MedEdPORTAL by the 2005 Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Working Group on Educational Scholarship.

For what specific educational activity was this material originally created? In the context of a particular teaching/learning situation, what was this material supposed to achieve? Define the educational activity.

Glassick¹, et al. (1997) defined six Criteria for Assessing Scholarship:

Clear Goals: The scholar explicitly states the basic purposes for the work and defines realistic, achievable objectives, including desired goals and outcomes. Important questions regarding teaching and learning have been taken into account.

Adequate Preparation: The scholar has a solid understanding of existing scholarship relevant to the endeavor (generic and discipline-specific) as well as adequate skills and resources drawn from this research and from prior experience to advance this specific project.

Appropriate methods: In conjunction with the material and the teaching/learning context, the scholar's selections of educational methods fit the goals and are used effectively; the methods are modified as necessary to accommodate situational changes.

Significant results: The scholar achieves or exceeds the original goals; the scholar's work contributes substantially to others (e.g., learners and colleagues) and to the field; the scholar's work is open to further exploration (e.g., by self, by others, collaboratively with others).

Effective presentation: The reviewer can discern that appropriate style and methods of presentation are used and that the resulting communication to the intended audience is clear and unambiguous.

Reflective critique: The scholar thoughtfully assesses the work him/herself and uses the resulting perceptions along with reviews and critique from others, to refine, enhance, or expand the original concept.

Bibliography

1 Glassick CE, Huber MR, Maeroff GI. *Scholarship Assessed-Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Author Check List

(Updated March 2013)

This checklist was created to help authors prepare their educational materials for submission within MedEdPORTAL Publications. Use it on your own or with your co-authors, making notes as you go along. You may wish to consult an educational or faculty development consultant who may be available on your campus to enhance not only the success of your current work for MedEdPORTAL Publications, but all your future works of educational scholarship. This checklist was developed by the 2005 Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Working Group on Educational Scholarship.

1. Identify the material you wish to prepare for submission and peer review.

Describe it briefly:

Write a short, descriptive title:

If there are co-authors from whom you need agreement to pursue publication and for whom attribution is appropriate, have you contacted them?

2. Click on the link provided to review MedEdPORTAL *Publications'* purpose, policies, procedures for submission, peer-review, and publication (e.g., ownership and copyright):

<https://www.mededportal.org/submit/policies/>

Having informed yourself, do you wish to pursue publishing your educational material?

Is MedEdPORTAL *Publications* the most appropriate venue for publishing the educational material you have selected?

If yes, proceed to the next check box.

If no, seek other venues for publication.

3. Determine if your educational material is ready for publication in MedEdPORTAL *Publications*:
- Is it an enduring material?** That is, after using it, are you satisfied that it will be useful over time?
 - Can you provide simple, clear information to guide others in using the material as you intend?** Often prospective instructors considering adopting your material appreciate receiving the following information as a kind of instructor's guide: Why was it originally developed? What was the conceptual background? For whom was the material originally intended? What was the purpose or goal? When and where did you use it?
 - Is it complete?** Are the various parts assembled in a way that will be easy for the person receiving them to use the material appropriately?
 - Is it effective?** How do you know your material achieved your intended purpose? Can you summarize the results regarding its effectiveness?
 - Is it generalizable?** That is, does the material reflect content, practices, and/or applications that would be beneficial to other users in similar and/or different situations?
 - Is it transferable?** Are any elements copyrighted to other entities from which you would first have to acquire written permission? What are technical requirements of the material? Can these be reasonably addressed by other users?
 - Is it reproducible?** Can you present your material clearly enough that other users could implement/use it as you have intended and achieve similar results?
 - Is it sufficiently clear and complete so that others could build upon your original work?** Can you present your educational material in a way that could facilitate others' adaptation to similar or different situations or applications?
 - Can you provide insights or guidance for other users of your material?** For example, based on your development, use, and refinement of the material, can you communicate clearly your insights or lessons learned, suggestions and/or cautions to facilitate others' effective use and/or adaptation of the material?
4. If your responses are positive to the above items and/or you can effectively address aspects that are not present, then proceed with preparing your material for submission: <https://www.mededportal.org/submit/>
5. Obtain the Peer Review rating form and review the expectations used in peer review: <https://www.mededportal.org/peerreview/reviewerinstructions/>
6. Prepare your material to address the attributes from above and the peer review criteria. Use the notes you have written.
7. Complete the MedEdPORTAL *Publications* submission form through Manuscript Central from Scholar One™ – our external peer review management system: <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/mededportal>
8. Follow directions on the MedEdPORTAL *Publications* website to submit your material: <https://www.mededportal.org/submit/>

For more information regarding this publication contact:

Sara Hunt
Managing Editor, MedEdPORTAL
Association of American Medical Colleges
655 K Street, N.W., Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20001

Phone: 202-862-6208
Email: shunt@aamc.org
MedEdPORTAL: www.mededportal.org

©2013 by the Association of American Medical Colleges. All rights reserved.



Association of American Medical Colleges
655 K Street, N.W., Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20001
T 202 828 0400 F 202 828 1125
www.aamc.org