

Editorial:

**Scholarship of Teaching Creating an enabling environment-
Its evaluation, rewards and recognition**

Avinash Supe

Dean, Sheth G S Medical College & KEM Hospital, Mumbai, Director (ME & MH) of Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai

Author for correspondence: Avinash Supe, Dean, Sheth G S Medical College & Kem Hospital, Mumbai, Director (Me & Mh) Of Municipal Corporation Of Greater Mumbai . E-Mail: avisupe@gmail.com

Introduction: and Ernest Boyer¹ in his landmark monograph titled “Scholarship Reconsidered” wrote main professorial functions are

1. **Discovery** (advancement of the frontier of knowledge in a discipline)
2. **Integration** (putting research discoveries in broader contexts, making connections across disciplines)
3. **Application** (applying the outcomes of discovery and integration to socially consequential problems) and
4. **Teaching**(helping students to acquire specified knowledge develop specified skills and attitudes).

Boyer recommended that all these academic functions must be recognized and rewarded.

Shulman, proposed the following **criteria (three “P” s)** for the work of a teacher to be recognized as ‘**Scholarship of Teaching**’ for differentiation from just scholarly teaching:

- A) **Publicly disseminated:** The work must be made public and archived to be retrievable.
- B) **Peer Reviewed:** The work must be available for peer review and critique to accepted standards
- C) **Platform to build on:** The work must be able to be reproduced and built on by other scholars².

Scholarship of teaching is mastery of the subject being taught, knowledge of pedagogical methods that have been proven effective at promoting learning and skill development, and commitment to continuing personal growth as an educator. It also includes educational research and development. **Scholarship of Teaching is an enduring educational product of new knowledge or its presentation that was peer reviewed or publicly disseminated** and thereby contributes to the development of the field and impacts the whole fraternity and the discipline of teaching. Scholarly and creative work of the teacher leading to scholarly product must be used for recognition and career advancement.

Scholarly teaching to Scholarship of Teaching: Fincher & Work (2006)² conceptualized “Scholarly Teaching” to “Scholarship of Teaching” as mentioned above and this scholarship of teaching itself can take the path of either Scholarship of Discovery , Integration or Application. Promoting scholarship of teaching and its publication in peer reviewed journals, the evidence based good teaching practices will be disseminated and adopted across institutions and thereby bring credit and recognition to the institutions supporting scholarship of teaching-learning.

Glassick et al.³ suggested the following standards for evaluating educational innovations. A) **Clear goals:** Is research question clearly stated and important, and the objectives realistic and achievable? B) **Adequate preparation:** Does the scholar display an understanding of existing scholarship in the field and the skills needed to assemble the necessary resources and do the work? C) **Appropriate methods:** Were the methods used appropriate for the goals, applied effectively, and suitably modified when necessary? D) **Significant results:** Were the goals achieved? Did the work contribute significantly to the field? E) **Effective presentation:** Was the work presented effectively and with integrity in appropriate forums? F) **Reflective critique:** Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work, bringing an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique and using the critique to improve the quality of future work? Quality of scholarship of Teaching can be determined following these criterion.

Scholarship of Teaching must be evaluated:

Evaluation should entail answering three questions:

1. To what extent did the teaching qualify as a scholarly activity?
2. How effective was the teaching? and
3. How effective was the educational research and development?

Data source used for evaluation of scholarship of teaching should include i) Archival data (lists of

courses developed and taught, representative instructional materials and student products, numbers of undergraduate and graduate students advised and faculty colleagues mentored, disciplinary and education-related conferences and workshops attended, education journals subscribed to, articles and books and courseware published); ii) Learning outcomes assessment data(test results, evaluations of written and oral project reports and other student products, student self-assessments); iii) Subjective evaluations by others (student end-of-course ratings, retrospective student and alumni ratings, peer ratings, awards and recognition received, reference letters); and iv) Self-assessment data(statement of teaching philosophy and goals, self- evaluation of progress toward achieving the goals).

Recognition, Rewards and Promotions : Faculty members doing educational research that meets these standards are clearly contributing to the scholarly mission of academic institutions. They merit advancement up the faculty ladder— tenure, promotion, and merit raises—no less than faculty members who meet institutional standards for frontier research in discipline. Many academic institutions have begun to recognize, reward and acknowledge the scholarship of teaching as a valid component of tenure and promotion (T/P) criterion. There should be Formulation and announcement of an assessment & evaluation plan and training should be provided to portfolio raters. Scholarship of teaching depends on multiple components and should have 360-degree evaluation data. Scholarship of Teaching judged by consensus grading of teaching portfolio should be vital component for rewards, recognitions and promotions.

References

1. E. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, NJ, 1990.
2. Fincher RE, Work JA. 2006. Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching. *Med Educ* 40:293-295.
3. C.E. Glassick, M.T. Huber, and G.I. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1997.

Conflict of interest: None
Funding: None
Cite this Article as: A Supe. Scholarship of Teaching Creating an enabling environment: its evaluation, rewards and recognition. <i>Natl J Integr Res Med</i> 2018; 9(2):1-2