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Session Objectives

- Discuss the history and purpose of peer-review
- Learn about the MedEdPORTAL peer-review process
- Familiarize you with the MedEdPORTAL reviewer form
- Discuss practical issues associated with the review of MedEdPORTAL submissions
Early Roots of Scholarship

1665: Journal de Scavans & Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society

Peer Review began during in the 18th century
Scholarship Reconsidered
PRIORITIES OF THE PROFESSORIATE

ERNEST L. BOYER

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

1990
Academia: A Culture of Credit

- Peer-reviewed publications are “the coin of the realm”
- Academic reward system is based on scholarly productivity

How should scholarship be assessed?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glassick’s Criterion</th>
<th>Submission Form Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Goals</td>
<td>• Educational Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate preparation</td>
<td>• List any references used to create this work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate methods</td>
<td>• Describe any special implementation requirements or guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant results</td>
<td>• Describe the effectiveness and significance of your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective presentation</td>
<td>• Describe the effectiveness and significance of your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective critique</td>
<td>• Describe any lessons learned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like print-based journals, MedEdPORTAL...

- Appoints an Editor and an Editorial Board
- Maintains a peer-review policy
- Follows a rigorous peer-review process
- Uses invited expert reviewers to conduct all reviews
MEP Peer Review Process

MedEdPORTAL reviewers ensure that submitted resources are accurate, clear, complete and relevant.

Reviewers have 3 weeks to perform a review.
Role of the Reviewer

• To provide feedback
• To provide a recommendation

While we do not ask reviewers to catch grammatical mistakes, we rely on reviewers to detect content that is inaccurate, obsolete, and irrelevant – please do not assume other will catch such errors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the author-supplied information contained within the Submission Form</td>
<td>Yes   No     Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both accurate and complete?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the author provide educational objectives which are both clear and</td>
<td>Yes   No     Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the educational approach or method appropriate for the stated</td>
<td>Yes   No     Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the content of the submission sufficiently accurate, clear, and usable</td>
<td>Yes   No     Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the author reference and/or build upon related work in this area?</td>
<td>Yes   No     Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the author provide evidence of the relative value or impact of this</td>
<td>Yes   No     Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submission for the intended audience?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the author offer critically reflective comments regarding this</td>
<td>Yes   No     Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Comments and Feedback to Editor and Author:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the space provided, please provide optional confidential feedback</td>
<td>Open Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the Editor regarding this submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Remember, the author will read this feedback.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Briefly summarize the resource in your own words and why it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would or would not be useful to other faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly describe the rationale for your publication recommendation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including significant strengths or weaknesses and any recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the space provided, please include the following: Confidential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to Editor Only In the space provided, please provide optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidential feedback to the Editor regarding this submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Text (Optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select a publication recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if you select Accept with Revisions be sure to provide a list of</td>
<td>• Accept with Acclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommended revisions in the narrative feedback section)</td>
<td>• Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accept with Revisions</td>
<td>• Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Review Instrument v2.0
2009 Publication Statistics

- Accepted: 19%
- Rejected: 35%
- Revisions Required:
  - Accepted: 46%
  - Rejected: 3%

Revisions Required - Accepted: 43%
Revisions Required - Rejected: 3%
Average Days to 1st Decision

Average days to first notification

Days

Be specific about...

- Learning objectives
- Prioritize changes that need to be made
- Were the authors successful in the application of the educational methodology?
Writing Discussions

• Address every key educational objective of the submission

• Presents the educational process in terms of what is known about the subject

• State what is unique about the lesson

• Justify variation from standard way of teaching the material

• Point out continued knowledge gaps
Conflict of Interest

Simply knowing one of the authors or having casual knowledge of the submitted resource does not necessarily mean that a conflict of interest exists. Conflicts of interest may include but are not limited to:

- Any situation where a reviewer could gain personally or financially as a result of reviewing the author’s submission.
- Knowledge of a similar submission under review in the same or another publication outlet.
- A close collaboration or competition with one of the authors.
- Reviewing a submission that would benefit a particular product, program, or resource that is related to the reviewer.
- Any situation that could limit an objective review of any submission.
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Changing the Culture

Solution = Educate

1. A guide for faculty to help them understand how to document their publication in a CV & promotion dossier

2. A guide for Promotion and Tenure Committees that helps them understand educational scholarship & peer review

3. Tools to help faculty self-assess their material before they submit
Top 10 Countries:
1. United States
2. Canada
3. United Kingdom
4. Australia
5. India
6. Egypt
7. Malaysia
8. Germany
9. Saudi Arabia
10. Philippines

177 Countries
Recognition

• Reviewer Thank-you letters
• Author Recognition letters sent to Dean and curriculum dean
• Highlight on AAMC website
• Outstanding Reviewer Award
Questions?

MedEdPORTAL Speed Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is MedEdPORTAL?</th>
<th>Marriott: Truman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy, Voice and Training</td>
<td>Marriott: Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright, Patient Privacy and Intellectual Property Today</td>
<td>Marriott: Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging Open Education Resources</td>
<td>Marriott: Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Scholarship for Teaching</td>
<td>Marriott: Jefferson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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