

# **Establishing a National Board for the Peer Review of Scholarly Teaching: A Proposal for the Society of Park and Recreation Educators**

Cheryl A. Stevens, Associate Professor  
Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies  
East Carolina University

J. Douglas Wellman, Professor and Head  
Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management  
North Carolina State University

## *Biographical Sketches:*

Cheryl A. Stevens has been a faculty member at East Carolina University for eight years. During this time she has received four teaching awards from the university, college and the Society of Park and Recreation Educators. She has provided leadership in her department for the development and assessment of a leisure studies general education course and is the author/co-author of five peer-reviewed works on teaching and engagement.

J. Douglas Wellman was a member of the faculty at Virginia Tech from 1976-1990, during which time he led a college-wide writing-across-the-curriculum program. At NC State, he has served as associate dean for academic affairs (1990-1997), founding director of the university's teaching improvement center (1998-2003), and department head (2003-present). In these administrative positions, he has provided leadership for initiatives to enhance inquiry-guided learning, curriculum diversity, and peer review of teaching. He is author/co-author of eight peer-reviewed works on teaching and learning.

## **Abstract**

This proposal calls for SPRE to establish a National Board for the Peer Review of Scholarly Teaching in Park, Recreation, and Tourism Management. The goal is to establish a mechanism for increasing the weight given to scholarly teaching in major personnel decisions. Scholarly teaching is differentiated from "good teaching" in that the faculty member has conscientiously applied the process of scholarship to improve learning outcomes. Participation in this review process would be voluntary. A review

is recommended only for those faculty members who engage in scholarly teaching and are employed at an institution that will value the review. The Board would be comprised of award-winning instructors who have an established record of scholarly teaching and represent the varied sub-fields in PRTM. Upon request by an individual faculty member anticipating a significant performance review (e.g. reappointment/promotion/tenure, major teaching award), members of the Board would review the instructor's teaching portfolio and provide an official response. The response would not identify reviewers, thereby approximating the blind review process followed in research publications. The process would begin with review of a pre-proposal that would provide the faculty member with feedback on the probability of success and guidance on preparing the full portfolio. In the proposal, potential problems with a national board are identified, challenges interpreting "scholarship" in teaching are discussed, and processes for implementation are suggested.

### *SPRE WANTS YOUR INPUT*

The SPRE Board has endorsed this proposal to create a board for blind peer review of scholarly teaching for faculty in RLS in concept. However, SPRE wants feedback from educators and administrators before deciding whether to invest resources in this undertaking. Please send your comments on:

- need for a peer review board for scholarly teachers in RLS
- comments on feasibility
- suggestions for operational guidelines, such as how would reviewers be selected?

SPRE Committee for Peer Review of Scholarly Teaching Contacts:

Cheryl Stevens, Chair email: [stevensc@ecu.edu](mailto:stevensc@ecu.edu) phone: (252) 328-4638

Craig Ross, Vice Chair email: [cmross@indiana.edu](mailto:cmross@indiana.edu) phone: 812-855-3102

Over the past several decades, there has been a great deal of emphasis on the importance of college teaching and learning. Howard Shapiro (2006) depicted these positive trends as the "glass half-full" side of the story. Unfortunately, the thrust of his article concerned how little progress we've made in honoring faculty members' teaching accomplishments as we do their research.

While colleges and universities have changed promotion and tenure policies, created teaching centers, focused on assessing student learning, and in other ways raised the attention paid to good instruction, evaluating teaching remains a knotty challenge. In part because evaluating faculty members' work as teachers is seen as more difficult than evaluating their work as researchers, faculty reward systems continue to favor research over teaching.

In this article, the authors propose that the Society of Park and Recreation Educators (SPRE) create a national board that provides blind peer review of scholarly teaching for qualified teachers in park, recreation and leisure studies. We believe such a board can play an important role in strengthening faculty teaching and student learning in our profession, and potentially across other disciplines as well.

### Origins of Proposal

The idea for national boards emerged from the first author's five-year experience as founding director of a campus-wide instructional development center at NC State University. In addition to developing various teaching improvement programs, he worked with others to make the faculty reward system more supportive of teaching, reasoning that the center would fulfill its potential only if instructors believed their efforts to improve their teaching in scholarly ways would be rewarded through merit pay, re-appointment and tenure and promotion.

In the past 10 years, NC State has taken many steps to strengthen the reward system for teaching. Nevertheless, many faculty remain skeptical that excellence in teaching will be rewarded in the same way research is rewarded in merit pay and reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. In this, NC State University is in the same position as many research universities (Shapiro, 2006). As one university executive explained when tenure and promotion decisions were challenged, "You can't measure teaching like you can measure research" (approximate wording). However, as another executive stated, "We should measure what we value, not value what we can measure." In our proposal for a national board for the blind peer review of teaching, we seek to enhance the prospects for measuring what we value—excellent teaching.

### Scholarship Redefined

The following definitions are offered to clarify the terms scholarship and research as they are used in this paper. Boyer's 1990 *Scholarship Reconsidered* was one of the first publications to propose that colleges and universities make fundamental changes in how scholarship is defined in order to tap the full range of faculty talents and align missions with faculty reward systems. In *Scholarship Assessed*, Glassick et al. (1997) offer the following definitions, which continued from Boyer's line of thought:

*The scholarship of discovery* "...comes the closest to what academics mean when they speak of research. This type of scholarship includes the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing arts. It can be described as the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, a fierce determination to give free rein to fair and honest inquiry, wherever it may lead" (p. 9). In this paper, the term research is used interchangeably with scholarship of discovery.

The *scholarship of integration* "...makes connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge and offsetting the inclinations to split knowledge into ever more esoteric bits and pieces. Often, integrative scholarship educates nonspecialists by giving meaning to isolated facts and putting them in perspective. The scholarship of integration is serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together and bring new insight to bear on original research" (p. 9).

The *scholarship of application* "...moves towards engagement as the scholar asks, 'How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?' Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understandings can arise from the very act of application..." (p. 9). In later publications Boyer spoke not of scholarship of application, but rather scholarship of engagement (Huber, 1999). Thus, the more recent term, scholarship of engagement, is utilized in this paper.

The *scholarship of teaching* is the final type of scholarship defined. "Scholarly teaching initiates students into the best values of the academy, enabling them to comprehend better and participate more fully in the larger culture. Teaching also entices future scholars, and reciprocal benefits flow as well to the faculty members who enrich their teaching by building on what they learn in exchanges with students" (p. 9-10). In this paper, we refer to "scholarly teaching," as explained below under "Measuring Teaching Quality."

Boyer argued convincingly that the academy needs to both recognize and reward all four categories of scholarship in order to meet their commitments (Glassick et al. 1997). In the 16 years following Boyer's expansion of the concept of scholarship we believe the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement and the scholarship of teaching are now recognized by many universities to the degree that scholarly efforts expand the knowledge base and are published in recognized peer review forums.

Following Boyer's lead, increasing numbers of institutions are also adopting the model of differentiated workload assignments. As Jon Wergin (2003) explains, quality academic programs are an outgrowth of strong faculty engagement, and faculty differ in their passions and skills both across individuals and within individuals over the course of a career. To gain the most from those passions and skills, workloads must be differentiated, with some faculty focused on research while others focus on teaching and service. If we fail to measure and reward all forms of faculty work well and fairly, we defeat the model of differentiated faculty workload assignments and lose the synergy that can arise from diverse but complementary contributions to the good of the order.

### Measuring Teaching Quality

Measuring the quality of teaching is certainly not easy, but if we don't accept the challenge we remove teaching from rational evaluation. Faculty work that is not subject to rational evaluation tends not to be valued in terms of the most meaningful reward system: review for promotion and tenure (RPT). To a great extent, research is considered measurable and is, therefore, valued by the university because of the system of blind peer review that has been developed to objectively evaluate this scholarship. This is especially clear in research universities, but conversations with faculty who work at institutions with other missions indicate that there, too, research may be favored over teaching and other faculty work.

Does the growing recognition of scholarly teaching refute the authors' claim that teaching is devalued relative to research? Our sense is that scholarly teaching is increasingly considered equivalent to traditional research *to the degree* that this work creatively expands the field's knowledge base *and* is published in peer-reviewed journals. Faculty who are interested in teaching and learning and who publish in accepted, traditional venues are already treated as scholars. The more difficult problems arise with less innovative and public forms of teaching, the kind of teaching most faculty members do. Lee Shulman and his colleagues at the Carnegie Foundation described scholarly teaching as teaching that is creative and informed by the pedagogical literature while not necessarily being publishable. Scholarly teaching should be expected of any faculty member seeking tenure and promotion on the basis of his/her teaching, or anyone vying for a major teaching award. Since universities need to be able to measure what they value, and universities value scholarly work, we must make a serious effort to measure the quality of scholarly teaching.

Too often, universities rely largely on student course evaluations to evaluate teaching. Extensive research has shown that, contrary to conventional wisdom, course evaluations do provide valid information (McKeachie, 1999). However, while students can know some aspects of their classes well—e.g. how clear, interesting, available, responsive, and fair the course instructor is—they cannot be expected to know other aspects—e.g. whether the course material is accurate and current, assignments and tests are appropriately challenging and valid, and the content and learning objectives are consistent with the course's intended role in the curriculum. The only people who can evaluate those aspects of our teaching are our peers. And so, most institutions now have systems for peer review of teaching. However, intra-departmental peer reviews may vary from penetrating to perfunctory. While best practice includes multiple reviewers observing multiple classes and reviewing a range of instructional materials (Chism, 1999), in many cases peer review consists of little more than Professor X "dropping in on" Professor Y's class meeting and recording impressions of his/her lecturing style and rapport with students. Even when peer review protocols follow best practice, the potential exists for superficial and inappropriately positive or negative reviews by departmental friends or enemies, and that potential may undercut the credibility of local peer reviews.

### National Review Board for Scholarship of Engagement

Some years ago the National Board for the Scholarship of Engagement was established through the National Association of Higher Education (see Diamond & Adam, 1995; Diamond & Adam, 2000; Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Lynton, 1995). At that time, this peer-review board consisted of sixteen leading faculty members working in extension/outreach/engagement. Requests for blind reviews were assigned to one or more review board members, and in 6-8 weeks they provided a written appraisal of the portfolio describing the person's work in engagement. The appraisal was written on official review board stationery but with the reviewer(s) names withheld.

We believe there is great potential for improving collegiate teaching and learning by creating national review peer review processes for scholarly teaching along these lines. This line of thought includes the important observation that any effort to broaden the definition of scholarship must be done along disciplinary lines because faculty's professional identities are deeply embedded in their disciplines (Rice, 2005). The content of one's teaching matters, and that content can be evaluated fairly only by someone with expertise in the specific discipline. In addition, content should relate to pedagogy—courses should be taught in ways appropriate to the field. Parker Palmer reports the opening comment of a participant at one of his teaching workshops: "I'm an organic chemist. Are we going to spend two days learning how to use role playing to teach organic chemistry?" (Palmer, 1997). For these reasons, we propose that a national board for the peer review of teaching in park, recreation and leisure studies be formed, and we suggest that the Society of Park and Recreation Educators is the logical group to take the lead.

In sum, our professional peers are in the best position to judge the quality of our work as teachers, just as they are for our work as researchers. A national board providing blind peer review by outstanding, scholarly teachers would offer convincing evidence of instructional quality that would complement—not replace—other sources of information. We would like to see park, recreation and leisure studies take a leadership role in this endeavor to strengthen college teaching and learning.

### Presentations and Responses

In 2005, the first author presented the idea for a national board for the peer review of teaching in park, recreation and leisure studies at the SPRE Teaching Institute and at the national meeting of department chairs and heads. In both cases, he introduced the concept and participants worked in groups to identify arguments for and against it. In addition, a number of instructional development experts provided constructive criticism of a draft paper on the concept.

In these workshops and reviews, a number of concerns about the proposal have been raised. In what follows, we state the dominant concerns and offer brief responses.

- **“A national board would not respect the diversity of institutional expectations.”** The key element of the review process is the teaching portfolio, and the portfolio provides the answer to this concern, since each faculty member seeking review can make sure the expectations of his/her institution are articulated. Faculty members seeking blind reviews would need to make certain the context of their teaching is clearly expressed in the portfolio. Reviewers could be selected who represent that context, and all reviewers could be trained to take context into account.

Peter Seldin (1997) and others have produced an extensive literature on teaching portfolios that substantiates their value, especially if triangulated with other sources of assessment, including students, peers, and the department head. Portfolios are flexible media; for example, on-line teaching/course portfolios could be used to facilitate access to such evidence as video clips of actual classes supplemented by instructors' comments, links to student learning portfolios, and the like.

- **“A national board would not be evaluating student learning.”** In our current practices with respect to evaluating teaching, we do not typically present evidence of student learning, although clearly that would be desirable. The key, again, is the teaching portfolio. Portfolios can include evidence of student learning, more of which is becoming available all the time because of pressure from regional and national accrediting bodies. For example, many faculty members are now using the classroom assessment techniques first recommended by Patricia Cross (Angelo & Cross, 1993). It is important to note that student learning is one of the outcomes a scholarly teacher measures as a “significant result.” A scholarly teacher utilizes the process of reflective critique to improve his or her teaching and then discovers if the changes are working by re-examining student learning.
- **“Teaching contexts are too variable for a standardized approach.”** Research contexts are varied, too, yet we manage there. Using a teaching portfolio provides faculty members the opportunity to describe and interpret the context of their teaching. The approach would be standardized only with regard to the format of the teaching portfolio; the faculty member being reviewed would determine what and how data are presented in the portfolio.
- **“You can't truly capture a dynamic process in a one-shot portfolio.”** Any effort to capture work as variable as teaching will fail to represent some of its nuances. However, if we are to value teaching we must try to assess it, and we certainly don't capture its nuances well now. A carefully constructed teaching portfolio can provide longitudinal data on teaching that captures the dynamism of that work across time, courses, and student level (e.g. undergraduate and graduate).

- **“This would be redundant...we’re already doing it.”** Although most institutions require some form of peer review, the rigor and comprehensiveness of the reviews vary widely, and even strong review systems may be unconvincing for the reasons given above. The national board review would complement, not replace, evaluations by students, self, department chairs/heads, and local peers, and it would be used only for special occasions, as explained below.
- **“Criteria for good teaching are too hard to develop.”** There is a large and growing literature on the characteristics of excellent teaching; it is not as mysterious as some think. Charles Glassick and his colleagues (Glassick et al., 1997), whose work built on Ernest Boyer’s landmark report on faculty roles, argued that the criteria for good scholarship, in whatever venue it is expressed, are the same. Whether someone is pursuing the scholarship of teaching, discovery, integration, or application, good scholarship exhibits:
  - clear goals
  - adequate preparation
  - appropriate methods
  - significant results
  - effective presentation
  - reflective critique
- **“It will take too much time.”** This objection to the proposal—the first and most vigorously expressed objection in the 1995 workshops—reflects the increasing pressure felt by faculty and department heads to do more with less. With so much to do, faculty and administrators will have to be convinced this is a wise investment of their time. On the other hand, if we truly believe teaching is undervalued, are we willing to live with the situation simply because it would take too much time and energy to change it?

One way to respond to this concern would be to limit eligibility for national board reviews. For example, portfolio reviews might be available only to faculty members who are facing tenure and promotion decisions, those wishing to be considered for major awards, or those with a teaching load of at least 50 percent. The burden on reviewers might also be limited by having peer review board members screen pre-proposals, requiring letters of support from the department chair and dean (if these cannot be obtained, the likelihood of the institution’s taking the peer review seriously are limited), or by attaching a fee to the service (analogous to page charges for journals).

In addition to the time of reviewers, the time of the faculty seeking review must be considered. Guidelines should be developed to help faculty and



their relevant administrators decide whether or not to pursue review by the national board. For example, in most cases, faculty facing major decisions within a year should not be encouraged to seek review by the national board. Unless they have begun the portfolio-generation process some time earlier, it is unlikely they will have the evidence necessary to substantiate claims of excellence and their portfolio will be too weak. The process of preparing the portfolio, getting “friendly,” formative review, and obtaining supportive letters from their chair and dean will take time, perhaps as much as six months to a year. Faculty who have received good student and local peer evaluations but have not engaged in the assessment of “significant results” and “reflective critique” of their teaching will not be strong candidates, since all teachers know their work can always be improved. In either case, preparing a scholarly teaching portfolio is frequently a constructive, creative process that will benefit any faculty preparing such a portfolio.

### Lessons from Assessing Scholarship of Engagement

Lynton (1995) and Driscoll and Lynton (1997) prepared two monographs describing the process whereby individual faculty members engaged in scholarly professional service activities could make a case for the quality of their work. These monographs also contain information to assist those peers charged with the review and evaluation of scholarly teaching. The information contained in this section of the paper draws from their expertise and experience.

The first lesson a peer review board for scholarly teaching could learn from the scholarship of engagement concerns the need for focusing on significant intellectual work. The first step in evaluating faculty work in engagement is distinguishing between “on-going conscientious but repetitive activities, on the one hand, and instances of significantly creative work, on the other” (Lynton, 1995, p. 22). A professor’s portfolio for the scholarship of engagement “requires a focus on projects of sufficient substance and duration as to provide an adequate unit of assessment” (p. 22). Focusing on distinct, significant projects is particularly important when assessing a faculty activity like engagement, because it takes so many forms. If all engagement activities are lumped together, this trivializes the entire category of the scholarship of engagement and hides the intellectual challenge the professor faced and resolved in a scholarly manner (Lynton 1995). The lesson to be learned here is that teaching portfolios should focus not on a collection of evidence of minor activities but rather on specific substantive projects that can serve as principal units of assessment.

The second lesson concerns attention to the criteria for scholarly work. The project(s) a faculty member chooses to highlight in his or her portfolio need to be presented so as to illustrate how the teacher has followed the process of scholarship described by Glassick et al. (1997), demonstrating clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective cri-

tique. It is important to note that the process of scholarship is not an after-the-fact reflection by the teacher that “I think I just did something good, I should share that with others” but rather a scholarly process where the problem has been defined a priori and where scholarly expertise has been brought bear on the problem.

Others have described the process that guides scholarship and scholarly service, and we suggest a similar process is applicable to describing scholarly teaching activities (Clearinghouse & National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement, n.d.); Glassick et al., 1997; Lynton, 1995). We have combined and altered their suggestions to reflect specifically on scholarship of teaching.

- The *context* of the activity indicates there is a good fit between the teacher’s role and the departmental and university mission;
- Scholarly *expertise* is brought to the project, by demonstrating an understanding of relevant existing literature, necessary skills, and how the work is intellectually compelling and relevant.
- The *goals* of the teaching activity are clearly defined and there is a good fit between the purpose of the work and its anticipated value to improving student learning. The objectives of the project are realistic and achievable as well as significant within the discipline and academic community.
- *Methods and resources* selected to carry out the teaching activity, follow its progress, and assess its outcomes (e.g. student learning) should be appropriate to context and used effectively.
- During the teaching process, the scholar-teacher engages in on-going *reflection*, describing what unexpected features were encountered, what adaptations were made, what inferences were drawn, and what lessons were learned.
- The *impact* of the work on the scholar’s subsequent teaching are described, and the scholar communicates/disseminates his or her work through appropriate forums to reach others in the discipline and teaching community.
- A *self-evaluation* of the outcomes indicates that the scholar critically evaluated and learned from their work. Evidence is used to effectively support the critique and the scholar demonstrates application of lessons learned in their future work. He or she may be involved in local, state or national dialogue related to the work.

As Lynton noted: “In this last item, it is particularly important that self-evaluation be a critical analysis of the project and include, where appropriate, descriptions of any false starts and mistakes and what was learned from them. Such missteps often provide excellent evidence of the faculty member’s understanding and creativity” (p. 29).

Lynton (1995) and Driscoll and Lynton (1999) provided examples of final reports and portfolio-quality items for scholarship of engagement portfolios. They also discussed how portfolios can be used, criteria for evaluation, coming to consensus, content organization and guidelines. The interested reader should review those documents.

It is important to note that the emphasis of the portfolio should be on quality, not quantity. It cannot be over-stated that the purpose of these peer reviews is not to establish quantity (that is, numbers of events and patterns that occurred over time as is already done through the RPT process), but rather to carefully document and convey evidence of the quality and impact of the professor's scholarly teaching activities for the purpose of peer evaluation.

### A Suggested Model for Process

Those leading national efforts aimed at reforming faculty-reward systems have discovered that while all scholarship fits definable key standards, context-specificity is essential (Diamond, 1994; Driscoll & Lynton, 1999). In practice, this means professional associations need to create discipline specific standards, such as those for scholarship of engagement published by the Association of College and Research Libraries Task Force on Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards (1998) and in Diamond and Adam's (1995, 2000) collections. We propose that SPRE create the specific standards for evaluating teaching in park, recreation and leisure studies, as part of its leadership in creating a national board for peer review.

Assuming responsibility for a national board for the peer review of teaching would be an additional burden for any disciplinary or professional association. However, with the burden come several important potential benefits. If national boards enhanced the position of faculty teaching in the discipline or professional area, more faculty might be willing to invest in improving their teaching, expanding participation in association-sponsored events. More significantly, greater faculty investment in their teaching should improve student learning and eventual career success, in turn strengthening the association.

The following questions and answers are intended as a model SPRE could utilize to develop, implement and evaluate a peer review system for teaching.

• **How would peer reviewers be identified?**

Reviewers should be selected and approved by the SPRE board of directors based on evidence that they are scholars of teaching. Criteria such as teaching awards and peer reviewed publications that follow the scholarship of teaching model could be utilized.

- **What would be needed to encourage board members' service?**

Establishing a national reputation is an important criterion for advancement in faculty rank, and being selected as a member of the SPRE national board would be a strong indication of the individual board member's stature in the field. Further, peer reviewers would need assurance that their time would be respected, such as being asked to review only a limited number of portfolios per year, analogous to the number of journal manuscripts active research scientists might review annually.

- **How should board members be prepared for evaluating portfolios?**

We suggest that the peer reviewers should be familiar with Boyer's (1995) conceptualization of scholarship, Glassick et al.'s statement on assessing scholarship (1997), and the processes in place for evaluation of scholarship of engagement. Before peer review for teaching could begin, the peer review board would need to develop portfolio requirements and measures of quality. They could draw heavily on existing documents on scholarship of engagement published by the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE). A brief workshop might be held at NRPA Congress, or a SPRE Teaching Institute, to prepare new members of the national peer review board.

- **How might teaching portfolios be structured for efficiency as well as validity?**

A teaching portfolio should consist of a brief narrative statement, with appendices that provide support for the claims made in the narrative. An effective portfolio is a strong argument, not a haphazard collection of materials. The "project approach" that emphasizes quality over quantity, as described in the previous section, is a good way to address this important concern.

- **What criteria and standards should guide reviews?**

The peer review board would need to establish clear portfolio guidelines and criteria for evaluation. As stated earlier, this has already been accomplished by AAHE for engagement, so SPRE can clearly benefit from these models.

- **How can we maximize the likelihood that the board's reviews will be given careful consideration by the faculty member's home institution?**

It would be important for the faculty member seeking review to establish that his/her institution will value the review by providing a letter of support from administrators to that effect. It would be best if this letter of support accompanied the faculty member's pre-proposal and request for peer review.

- **Should arrangements be made for formative as well as summative reviews?**

We recommend that provisions for formative review be built into the national board's procedures by requiring initial proposals and providing feedback from members of the peer review board before giving a go-ahead for faculty to prepare a full teaching portfolio. The peer review board should provide objective reasons as to why a faculty member should not proceed with a portfolio in cases where the board felt this was warranted. Rationale for decisions should always be explained lest the home university perceive the board's decision as a negative review.

- **What would be an ideal situation for a review by the national board?**

Ideally, candidates for peer reviews of their teaching by national boards in their areas of study should allow two years' preparation time. For example, at the time a faculty member has been reappointed, he/she would be well advised to begin working toward the blind peer review of scholarly teaching. Steps might involve:

- pre-planning (e.g. discussions with the chair and departmental mentors, reading the pedagogical literature);
- reviewing examples of others' scholarship of engagement or teaching portfolio items;
- amassing evidence needed to back up claims (e.g. revisions in course materials based on experience and literature, attendance at teaching workshops, papers presented at teaching improvement meetings, students' learning progress as shown in successive paper drafts and portfolios);
- drafting narratives of distinct, substantive projects that illustrate the faculty member's scholarly teaching activities;
- preparation of a pre-proposal for formative review by the national board for peer review of teaching in his/her discipline;
- obtaining letters from the chair and dean in support of both the candidate's work and the national review process; and
- revisions, revisions, revisions.

### Conclusions

In *The Creation of the Future: The Role of the American University*, former Cornell University President Frank Rhodes (2001) discussed the many demands research universities place on individual faculty members and the inevitable choices that are forced upon them:

“...he or she must be a successful investigator, a scholar of originality, a successful entrepreneur and fund-raiser, a substantial author, an effective mentor of graduate and professional students, a challenging and inspiring undergraduate teacher and adviser, an effective participant in the life of the department, an informed citizen in the affairs of the college and university, and a responsible public servant contributing the benefits of professional insight to the continuing needs of the local community, the larger society, and the professional guild. Given this lengthy list of expectations, it is not surprising that the faculty member is challenged to cover all the bases, devoting the most attention to those areas that provide the most direct support. High on the list come research, grant seeking, and the professional guild. Research is the basis of public recognition, grants support that research, and the various professional guilds provide rewards and recognition. In contrast, great teaching and effective mentoring are more private, less easy to evaluate; they receive less recognition, less acclaim...perhaps the greatest surprise is that, given these competing distractions, so many faculty members continue to exhibit such devotion to their students...” (pages 24-25)

Our proposal for the creation of a national board for the blind peer review of teaching in park, recreation and leisure studies is grounded in the conviction that higher education cannot rely on teachers' self-sacrifice. The future of our disciplines and professions, and the realization of their many potential societal contributions, depend on finding ways to assure that those who are devoted, scholarly, creative teachers are not disadvantaged in comparison with their research-oriented colleagues. If succeeding generations are to be well-equipped by their educations for the challenges they will face, we must find ways to measure and reward, as best we can, the good work of those who teach them. We must find ways to “measure what we value, not value what we can measure.” National boards for the blind peer review of teaching in the disciplines and professional areas offer a promising way to measure what we value. Recreation and leisure professions have many dedicated, scholarly teachers, and our professional association should support them by creating this mechanism for evaluating their good work.

## References

Angelo, T.A., & Cross, K.P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Association of College and Research Libraries Task Force on Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards (1998). *Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project*. Retrieved April 19, 2005, from <http://www.ala.org/>

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chism, N. V. N. (1999). *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Clearinghouse & National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement (n.d.). *Evaluation criteria for the scholarship of engagement*. Retrieved October 31, 2004, from <http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/about/Faqs.html>

Diamond, R. M. (1994, May 11). The tough task of reforming the faculty-rewards system. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 40(36), pp. B1-B3.

Diamond, R. M. & Adam, B. E. (Eds.), (1995). *The disciplines speak I: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Diamond, R. M. & Adam, B. E. (Eds.), (2000). *The disciplines speak II: More statements on rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Driscoll, A. & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2004). How to evaluate teaching. *Chemical Engineering Education*, 38(3), pp. 200-202.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T. & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Huber, M. T. (1999). *Evaluating outreach: Scholarship assessed's approach*. Retrieved May 26, 2005, from The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching eLibrary Web site: <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/elibrary/index.htm>

Hutchings, P., & Schulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments, *Change*, 31(5), pp. 10-15.

Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

McKeachie, W. J. (1999). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), pp. 1218-1225.

Palmer, Parker (1997). The heart of a teacher: identity and integrity in teaching. <http://www.newhorizons.org/strategies/character.palmer.htm>

Rhodes, F. H. T. (2001). *The creation of the future: The role of the American university*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rice, R. E. (2003). *Rethinking scholarship and new practice: A central AAHE priority*. Retrieved April 21, 2005, from <http://www.aahe.org/specialreports/part4.htm>

Seldin, P. (1997) *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decision* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Shapiro, H. N., (2006). Promotion & tenure & the scholarship of teaching & learning. *Change*, 39(2), pp. 39-43.

Wellman, D. J. (2004). The scholarship of teaching and learning. *Scholarship: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 19, 1-9.

Wergin, J.F. (2003). *Departments that work: Building and sustaining cultures of excellence in academic programs*. Bolton, MA: Anker.