

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

## DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Industrial and Management Systems  
Engineering Faculty Publications

Industrial and Management Systems  
Engineering

---

11-2009

### Developing Processes and Criteria for External Reviews of Scholarly Teaching

Paul Savory

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, psavory2@gmail.com

Amy M. Goodburn

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, agoodburn1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/imsefacpub>



Part of the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Operations Research, Systems Engineering and Industrial Engineering Commons](#), and the [Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

Savory, Paul and Goodburn, Amy M., "Developing Processes and Criteria for External Reviews of Scholarly Teaching" (2009). *Industrial and Management Systems Engineering Faculty Publications*. 44.  
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/imsefacpub/44>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Industrial and Management Systems Engineering at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Industrial and Management Systems Engineering Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

## ISSOTL 2009 Proposal

Theme: Shared Futures

### Names of the Facilitators

Paul Savory, University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Amy Goodburn, University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Dan Bernstein, University of Kansas

### Leaders' Experience

Amy Goodburn is Associate Dean for Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln where she oversees promotion and tenure processes, faculty development.

Dan Bernstein is the director at the University of Kansas Center for Research and Teaching Excellence (get exact title)

Paul Savory is the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Extended Education and Outreach at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln where he directs the distance educational programs for the university.

All three leaders have extensive experience in developing and directing faculty development efforts which aid faculty in documenting inquiry into their teaching.

### Learning Goals and Outcomes

Participants will have had the opportunity to 1) discuss and reflect upon the challenges of externally reviewing and assessing the intellectual work of teaching; 2) review and suggest revisions for the institutional guidelines and 3) share effective strategies for how they have developed faculty communities or approaches who can peer review the intellectual work of teaching.

### Participant Engagement Plan

Reading Tables  
Small Group Discussion  
Large-group discussion regarding rubrics

### Summary (75 words)

This workshop explores theoretical questions and practical strategies for how to develop peer reviewers for faculty required to document their scholarly teaching. After reading two mini case-studies of how faculty have documented the intellectual work of their teaching, participants will engage in guided discussion about reviewing and assessing such work and about developing faculty communities equipped to do such work. Presenter(s) also will seek feedback on guidelines that they have developed for external reviewers of SOTL work.

### Abstract (500 words)

This workshop explores theoretical questions and practical strategies for how to develop peer reviewers for faculty required to document their scholarly teaching. After reading two mini case-studies of how faculty have documented the intellectual work of their teaching, participants will engage in guided discussion about reviewing and assessing such work and about

developing faculty communities equipped to do such work. Presenter(s) also will seek feedback on guidelines that they have developed for external reviewers of SOTL work.

The exigency for developing models for the external review of scholarly teaching is especially clear given changing faculty work profiles within higher education. Gappa, Austin, and Trice's *Rethinking Faculty Work* (2007) outlines how the changing nature of faculty appointments has impacted academics' sense of community. As Turner and Hamilton (2007) further suggest, "...universities have created faculties made up of colleagues who may not be peers, and who cannot evaluate the work and the promise of each other because they lack experience and/or training in the work to be evaluated." In response, Turner and Hamilton argue that universities must "...find ways for faculty with varied responsibilities and training to act as peers in all aspects of faculty work."

At research one institutions, new faculty appointments, such as "professors of practice" or endowed professorships in teaching, require external peer reviews of teaching for purposes of promotion and merit review. Yet little discussion has focused on issues entailed in drawing upon models of peer review for documenting these faculty members' work. This workshop session addresses this "next stage" for promoting scholarly teaching by focusing on theoretical questions and practical strategies for building larger communities of faculty readers with the expertise to review, evaluate, and reward teaching as intellectual work.

After a brief introduction to the topic, participants will read two examples of how faculty have documented their work as scholarly teachers for the purposes of external peer review. Participants also will be provided guidelines from two institutions which outline categories for the external review of teaching. Discussion will focus on some of the following questions: What are the challenges in providing an external review of one's teaching? What parallels with Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (*Scholarship Assessed*, 1997) are useful? Where are their differences?

Participants also will examine the two institutional guidelines to discuss their usefulness in guiding peer reviewers - which categories are essential, which are not? are there categories/elements missing that one would include? what types of external reviews would be most valuable to institutional committees that assess and reward teaching?

By the end of the session, participants will have had the opportunity to 1) discuss and reflect upon the challenges of externally reviewing and assessing the intellectual work of teaching; 2) review and suggest revisions for the institutional guidelines and 3) share effective strategies for how they have developed faculty communities or approaches who can peer review the intellectual work of teaching.