

## ***Ad hoc Committee to Develop and Implement Methods for Evaluation of Faculty Member Teaching***

### *Faculty Teaching Evaluation Principles*

The Committee was charged by Dr. Koeppen with the tasks of developing processes and instruments for evaluating faculty member teaching performance by learners in accordance with the LCME ED47 accreditation guideline prior to the next LCME accreditation site visit during the 2009-2010 academic year. Strategies for implementation of these processes need to be incorporated into the accreditation self-study documents to be prepared during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Committee members are acutely aware of the need for valid data to evaluate teaching performance. The Teaching Assessment Program (TAP), which was in place from the late 1980s until 1994, never implemented the peer observation component due to an unwillingness of faculty members to evaluate peers. Additionally, concerns arose about the handling of isolated, inappropriate comments made by students in open-ended survey questions.

The Committee examined teaching evaluation philosophies, methods, and instruments described in the literature and used by other medical schools. Members of the committee spoke with a variety of individuals with interests, expertise and experience in evaluation of teaching. The Committee identified the following two principles that should guide the development of a faculty teaching evaluation system at UCHC.

1. While faculty teaching evaluation can and should be used for both formative (self-improvement) and summative (promotion and tenure decisions) purposes, these two purposes are distinct, and the processes by which faculty teaching evaluation contributes to each should be kept separate. The results of annual student and peer evaluations are intended strictly for formative purposes and should only be shared with the faculty member, the section and course leaders, and the appropriate department chair. For promotion and tenure review, the department chair should summarize the trends in a faculty member's annual student and peer evaluations and the faculty member should document her or his response to teaching evaluation results over time.
2. A bona fide faculty teaching evaluation system consists of the three following components. The lack of any one component severely compromises the over all integrity and effectiveness of a faculty teaching evaluation system.
  - a. **Student evaluations** – Students should evaluate each faculty member in a timely fashion using brief anonymous surveys composed of valid and reliable questions that reflect agreed-upon criteria for good teaching relative to the content and format of the course. Evaluation of faculty teaching is one aspect of each student's development as a professional and should be guided by the Honor Code. Student surveys are intended for formative evaluation purposes only, and they

should guide faculty members' self-improvement efforts. Dissemination of the results of student evaluation surveys should be restricted to the faculty member, section and course leaders, and the relevant department chair.

- b. **Peer observation** – On a periodic basis, but no less often than once a year, each faculty member's teaching should be observed and evaluated by a peer. Peer observations are conducted by trained observers using agreed upon criteria appropriate to the content and format of the course. Typically, the most appropriate peer evaluators will be section and course leaders. Peer evaluation consists of 30 to 60 minute pre-session to review the evaluation criteria, an observation period during which the peer evaluator remains as inconspicuous as possible, and a 30 to 60 minute post-session review. Results of peer observations are intended for formative evaluation only. Dissemination of the results of peer observations should be restricted to the faculty member, section and course leaders, and the relevant department chair.
- c. **Faculty development support** – Improving the quality of faculty teaching based on the feedback provided through student surveys and peer observations requires that adequate faculty development resources be available. We feel strongly that teaching faculty should have ready access to the appropriate pedagogic expertise relative to the particular courses and teaching formats used at UCHC.

### *Teaching Evaluation Pilot Survey*

The committee reviewed the literature to identify a small set of questions for inclusion in a pilot evaluation instrument to be tested during the lecture portion of the Organ Systems (OS) 2 section of the Human Systems Course, which will be taught during the period of February 7, 2008 to April 21, 2008. Survey instruments will be electronically administered approximately six times during the section. A faculty member will be evaluated within one week of her/his final lecture in the course. Survey format includes a picture of instructor along with dates and titles of her/his presentations. The survey instrument has separate questions that evaluate the instructor and attributes of the course. The evaluation of each faculty member should not take a student more than five to ten minutes to complete.

A copy of the proposed survey instrument is appended.

**Committee Members:** Cheryl Bilinski (first year medical student), Charles Huntington III, Mary Casey Jacob, Ronald Kadden, Gerald Maxwell, Sarah Morocco (second year medical student), Thomas Van Hoof, Stephen Wikel (chair), Richard Zeff