Evaluating Educators for Academic Advancement
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During this session you will:

• Discuss evaluation criteria for the promotion and advancement of educators

• Analyze the usefulness of a toolbox being created by the Task Force to facilitate performance appraisal of educators

• Critique and provide feedback about the assets & challenges to adoption of the toolbox
Today: Learn through review

• Materials being shared today are the work products of the Task Force.

• They are in draft form.

• Your feedback during today’s session will inform our continued work to enhance the tools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agenda</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong> Educational scholarship and the systematic evaluation of educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview:</strong> The Toolbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitated Small group discussion:</strong> Review and provide feedback on introduction &amp; assigned domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitated Large Group Discussion:</strong> Opportunities and challenges for using the Toolbox at your institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background: Educational Scholarship and the Systematic Evaluation of Educators
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
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
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
Documentation standards for educators explored in 2006 in a AAMC Consensus Conference on Educational Scholarship

Simpson D et al. Available at: www.aamc.org

Affirmation of the domains of educator activity

Five Domains

- Teaching Activities
- Learner Assessment
- Curriculum Development
- Educ Leadership & Administration
- Mentoring & Advising

What Educators Do
Assessment of Educational Activities

Q²+ Engagement Model

Educational Activity
Teaching, Curriculum, Assessment, Mentoring/Advising, Leadership/Administration

Engagement with Education Community

Scholarly Approach to Educational Activity

Educational Scholarship

Quality and Quantity

Draws from Existing Resources

Contributes to Resources
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
   • Hosted key informant discussion at 2010 AAMC which included CoD, CAS, COTH, Academies, Journal editors, & AAMC leaders
   • Conducted a national survey to identify how stakeholders acknowledge educational contributions in recognition and reward processes.

2. Developing toolbox
   • Used accepted frameworks, evidence from the literature
   • Obtained feedback from stakeholder groups at regional/national meetings to modify toolbox
   • Presenting toolbox for feedback at annual AAMC meeting
Introduction to the Toolbox
Format of the Toolbox

Introduction

Evaluating the Five Educational Domains

1. Teaching
2. Learner Assessment
3. Curriculum Development
4. Mentoring and Advising
5. Educational Leadership & 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

1. Introduction: Defines educator’s role

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

3. 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)

4. 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
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
Your Turn: Small group discussion

• Review and analyze your assigned component of the toolbox
  • strengths/needed improvements
  • what stands out

Table assignments
  1-3  Introduction
  4-6  Curriculum Development
  7-9  Learner Assessment
  10-12 Teaching
  13-15 Mentoring/Advising
  16-18 Educational Leadership and Administration
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?
Next Steps for the Task Force

• Continue to revise/refine the tools to incorporate your feedback
  • *Please remember to turn in our feedback worksheets*

Target date for dissemination: 2012

• Manuscript
• Web-based repository
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