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 domains, 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. 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.

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 Maeroff 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.
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Evaluating Educational Scholarship
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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.
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