Overview/Goals

- Review process for SoTL and SoDR conference abstracts
- Identifying information, conflict of interest, and recusals
- Revised SoTL and SoDR rubrics
- Importance of comments
- Let YOU know who to contact if you have any questions
- Allow YOU to feel comfortable with the review process
Review Process

Email ~ June 14
• 8-12 abstracts

• Online portal
• Login / password provided

July 22 deadline

Identifying Information

• Check abstract
• Check appendix
  • Author name or university
  • File name

Do NOT recuse yourself – close out the session
• Email Lori lcummings@idec.org
Rubric Overview

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)
- Scholarship of Design Research (SoDR)
  - Relevance
  - Issue/Problem
  - Context
  - Methods
  - Outcomes
  - Significance

Rubric: SOTL

Relevance
- “Currently, we are amidst yet another revolution that is reinventing the way we approach design from its conceptualization to realization (Jones & Bryan, 2017).”

Teaching Issue/Problem
- “The objective was to provide a research-based understanding of how such processes occur in nature and find their translation in the design of interior strategies.”
Rubric: SOTL

Context

- “Not only are today’s students’ consumers of video content through a multitude of platforms but the ubiquity of personal digital devices with embedded video sensors have also enabled them to become producers with the means to distribute content through social media and video platforms such as YouTube, Vine, Vimeo, and others. The inclusion of these newly democratized technologies in the classroom bolsters students’ enthusiasm and engagement with the curriculum (Kabadayi & Kruesmann, 2014).”

Rubric: SOTL

Instructional Methods

- “Weekly meetings with designers and research strategists from four influential retail agencies provided students with collaborative ideation, interactive workshops, and project feedback. One firm hosted a gallery-style mid-term review…”

Teaching / Learning Outcomes

- “Collaboration with local retail design agencies created meaningful impact on both students and professionals…One student said: ‘I’ve struggled to find an emotional engagement in my projects, this studio was the perfect opportunity to practice serving a purpose more than just crafting another product.’”
- “Learning outcomes demonstrated that student projects were enhanced by the exploration and representation of their designs using video especially when the richness and immediacy of their work resembles the mediums they are familiar with and routinely experience outside the academic environment (see Figures 4 and 5).”
Rubric: SOTL

Significance

• “As video technologies and time-based media tools such as motion-capture and virtual reality become ever more accessible and affordable, it is inevitable that these will disrupt the current paradigm of design pedagogy. Continued experimentation and analysis of the use of video production in the studio will leverage these ubiquitous technologies with increased sophistication and self-awareness.”

Rubric: SODR

Relevance

• “As interior designers continue to adopt social media technologies such as Pinterest as a part of the design process (Scolere & Humphreys, 2016), it is important to understand the ways in which interior designers are using Pinterest as a collaborative tool for designing interior environments.”

Problem

• “With such extraordinary growth the authors proposed the following research questions: What were the primary motivators of incoming students to choose interior design as a major? And…”
Rubric: SODR

Context
• “The role of technology in collaborative design process has been studied through communication technologies (Dudek, Kim, & Paik, 2017) and software for creative production such as BIM (Miller, 2017). Less explored is the increasing role of social media technologies in reconfiguring work practices of designers.”

• “Despite these trends, little research has been conducted that evaluates the effectiveness of the cancer treatment environment. To illustrate, some centers advocate open-treatment areas that administer chemotherapy to allow for visual access by nurses and interaction among patients. While comradely among patients is admirable, private conversations, individuals who are sick or who have been diagnosed with Stage 4 cancer are clearly visible which may induce stress. On the other hand, private treatment areas could lead to isolation. Theodorson, Thomas, and Vaux (2014) state the importance of building a sense of community in cancer care, but no one has examined which is the better alternative through research.”

Rubric: SODR

Method of investigation
• “The authors asked students enrolled in an Introduction to Interior Design Course to complete a 25-question survey, administered through Qualtrics. A total of 54 first-year interior design students participated in the study, which was conducted during the first week of the semester prior to any course content being introduced…The questionnaire included ranking, multiple-choice, and open-ended questions (see appendix). Open-ended questions were divided into definition and image response, the latter measuring students' ability to describe the visual character of interior environments.”
Rubric: SODR

Outcomes
• “Findings indicated that intuitive individuals generally showed the highest creativity at the initial design phase, but individuals possessing an adaptive information processing style showed the highest increase in…”

• “The results from this research study suggest that open teaming areas, impromptu meeting nooks, and visual connection are effective ways to facilitate collaboration in the open office environment.”

Rubric: SODR

Significance
• “Although this study is limited in that it only used the combinational ideation method, the result of this research will provide design educators with meaningful insight into the instructional methods based on students’ information processing styles, especially in helping students struggling in the ideation process.”

• “While research on interior environments for cancer treatment centers is lacking, this study advances the body of knowledge by providing design suggestions that reduce anxiety and stress among individuals diagnosed with cancer.”
Reviewer Comments

Point out inconsistencies

- “The stated problem and the focus on the study don’t match up clearly.”
- “No method for examining the research question has been outlined. Not clear how author arrived at conclusions.”
- “There are gaps in the connections between the experience of the users and the built environment. For example, the outcomes do not clarify if the experiences and changes to the ‘environment’ are in…”
- The abstract briefly mentions conclusions. However, they seem to be antidotal as information on how the conclusions were drawn is missing.”

Reviewer Comments

Use rubric as prompt

- “No findings or conclusions are presented in the abstract, therefore it is difficult to determine the significance.”
- “Only one reference cited, work is not grounded in the known literature on this topic.”
- “The abstract discusses anticipated results. No findings and conclusions were presented.”
- “The abstract is generally well written and outlines a clear research presentation. The presentation should be of interest to conference attendees interested in design, human experience, social justice, and other issues.”
- “Nice idea to use exhibition design in the curriculum but …conclusions are just we did this and it was good.”
Reviewer Comments

Areas of improvement

- “Why is this a fit for IDEC. What is the role of Interior Design? You did a good job describing the problem, but lacked connecting it back to the profession of interior design.”
- “Stating how the pedagogical style has been adopted in a class does not confirm and otherwise communicate objectively the findings of the study. It reads as only a statement. If the new method has impact on the classroom, positive or negative, it should be reported.”
- “Grammar errors in the abstract make it difficult to understand.”
- “The need for the study is evident but what would designers or professors do with this information? The ‘so what?’ is missing.”
- “Topic worthy of investigation! More information regarding the method would be helpful (i.e., how was the sample selected, how many participants were in the focus groups, how were the outcomes determined (transcription, coding,...)).”
- “How data was analyzed needs to be explained further. Interesting topic. Author needs to proofread.”