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After participating in this session, you will be able to:

• Define evaluation criteria for educator activities
• Analyze the quality of contributions using a systematic approach to evaluation
• Develop strategies to incorporate elements of the Toolbox into existing processes of recognition and reward

Please note: the materials being shared today are the work products of the Task Force. They are in draft form and we hope to receive feedback during this session that will inform our continued work to enhance the tools.
Challenges Exist in the Evaluation of Educators

There is a lack of accepted standards for documentation and evaluation of Educator Portfolios

- Increased use of portfolios in promotion process
- Variability evident in formats used for documentation and in types of evidence provided to establish excellence
  - Primary source of evidence: evaluations by learners
  - Limited use of outcomes


Judgments must be based on explicit criteria

- Faculty and decision-makers may have differing definitions of excellence
- In addition, there may be differing opinion/perception of the relative value of educational contributions in the P&T process
- Work often discounted because it is not documented adequately or not understood by decision-makers

Large Group Discussion

- You are evaluating a candidate to receive a junior faculty teaching award (see attached sample portion of the teaching domain of the candidate’s EP)
- What criteria would you use to evaluate what is documented?

A first step was expanding the accepted definition of scholarship

- Boyer challenged the concept that teaching is simply an expected task performed by all academic physicians
- Expanded definition of scholarship to include teaching, application, integration and discovery

There are benefits of applying an accepted set of standards that value the work of educators

- Faculty would better understand expectations for performance
- Educational programs would improve
  - Development, implementation and evaluation of the programs would consider guidelines for excellence and a scholarly approach
- Faculty and evaluators would share a common language

Affirmation of the domains of educator activity

Clear and consistent application of evaluation criteria requires:

- High quality documentation by educators
- Quantitative and qualitative measures
- A balance between comprehensive and efficient evaluation

The challenge is how to bring rigor to the process

AAMC Task Force on Educator Evaluation

- Convened in 2010
- The Charge: To provide resources that will aid decision-makers in developing clear, consistent and efficient evaluation processes for faculty with a career focus in education.
We have used a multi-method approach

1. Obtained Stakeholder Perspectives
   - Host key informant discussion at AAMC including CoD, CAS, COTH, Academies, Journal editors, and AAMC leaders
   - Conducted a national survey to identify how stakeholders acknowledge educational contributions in recognition and reward processes.

2. Developing toolbox
   - Use accepted frameworks, evidence from the literature
   - Obtain feedback from stakeholder groups at regional/national meetings to modify toolbox
   - Present toolbox for feedback at annual AAMC meeting

Introduction to the Toolbox

Format of the Toolbox

- Introduction

- Evaluating the Five Educational Domains
  - Teaching
  - Learner Assessment
  - Curriculum Development
  - Mentoring and Advising
  - Educational Leadership and Administration

- Bibliography

Potential users of the toolbox include multiple stakeholders

- The primary audience is decision makers: for P/T, awards, selection for educator academy
- Additional users may include:
  - Experts/peers who author letters of support
  - Mentors/Faculty Affairs leaders who counsel educators
  - Faculty Educators preparing materials for advancement

The introduction describes the framework for evaluation and guiding principles

- Supports institutional specificity with respect to what is valued
- Provides flexible resources for incorporation into existing processes including annual performance reviews

Format of Toolbox in Each Domain

Introduction: Defines educator’s role

Suggested Indicators for Evaluation: Measure quality, scholarly approach and scholarship (organized using Glassick’s criteria)

Elaborated Indicators: Provide more detailed examples of high quality performance

Designed for use by those who study an educator’s portfolio in detail (letter of support/summary for decision-making committee)

References: Resources for users who wish to broaden their understanding of evaluation in each domain.
Glassick’s criteria provide a structure to assess quality, scholarly approach and scholarship

• Clear goals
• Adequate preparation
• Appropriate methods
• Significant results
• Effective presentation
• Reflective critique

A scholarly approach is proactive and reflective

• Evidence of a systematic approach using best practices or information from the literature
• Reflective practice: using self assessment and information from others to enhance future educational efforts

Evaluating “Significant Results”

• Adaptation of Kirkpatrick’s model for evaluation of educational/training programs
  – Satisfaction/reaction: of learners/participants
  – Learning: measures of change in knowledge, skills, attitudes and/or behaviors
  – Application: desired performance in other settings
  – Impact: within/outside the institution

Effective presentation requires peer review and dissemination

• Peer review uses accepted criteria of evaluation
  – To be considered scholarship, products must be presented in a peer reviewed venue or repository
    • Allows use of product by others
    • Allows to build upon the work of the scholar

Dissemination of scholarly products = scholarship

• Publications and Presentations
  – Peer reviewed publications
  – Peer reviewed/Invited presentations and workshops
  – Peer reviewed books or book chapters
  – Non-peer-reviewed publication or presentation
  – Educational product dissemination
• Educational Grants

Your Turn: Small group application exercise

• Analyze the indicators for an assigned domain
• Identify:
  • strengths/needed improvements
  • what stands out
• Report out
Large Group Discussion

• What are the opportunities and challenges to incorporating this framework into your existing processes for recognition and reward of educators?
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Next Steps for the Task Force

• Continue to revise/refine – incorporate your feedback
• Presentation at the annual AAMC meeting
• Target date for dissemination: 2012
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