

Evaluation Committee of the Curriculum Renewal Project Meeting Notes
May 28, 2009

In attendance: Cheryl Al-Mateen, Diane Biskobing, Ravinder Brar, Paul Mazmanian, Co-Chairman, Sherif Meguid, Azhar Rafiq, Co-Chairman, Elizabeth Waterhouse, Isaac Wood

1. Notes were read from the Evaluation Committee meeting of April 23, 2009, Evaluation Committee Meeting. There were no suggested revisions. Paul Mazmanian thanked Dr. Azhar Rafiq for leading the April 23 session, and he thanked Ms. Kathy Kreutzer for her leadership of the April 23 small group sessions on Immunology and Endocrinology.
2. The agenda for the Evaluation Committee Meeting of May 28, 2009, was reviewed. It included:
 - a) an update on reliability and validity testing of the Jefferson Scale of Physician Lifelong Learning, Medical Student Version,
 - b) a review of recent actions of the Curriculum Planning Committee, and
 - c) a discussion of shifting responsibilities of the Evaluation Committee of the Curriculum Renewal Project.
3. Dr. Azhar Rafiq reported progress of the VCU School of Medicine, use of the JEFFSPLL—Medical Student Version. He mentioned that every student received a paper copy of the questionnaire, and staff assisted in collection of the instruments, but useable responses vary, especially from M1 and M2 students. Current efforts include manual entry of data into an SPSS worksheet that was set up by Ms. Angela Wetzel. Dr. Rafiq noted that some of the M1 and M2 responses do not have identifiers and Ms. Wetzel's staff is working to solve the problem, as much as possible.
4. Paul Mazmanian distributed the evaluation questionnaires (attached) currently being considered for use in Curriculum Renewal. The Curriculum Planning Committee already completed a cursory review: Curriculum Council is scheduled to review the forms during the late afternoon of May 28, 2009. The questionnaires included:
 - a) Student evaluation of educators in courses,
 - b) Peer evaluation of educators in courses,
 - c) course director's evaluation of course, and
 - d) student evaluation of courses.

There were questions and suggestions regarding the peer evaluation of educators in courses. It was suggested that the instruments might collect information on faculty presentations but also be used to prompt teachers for clues on how best to teach. For example, one questionnaire item asks whether the teacher provides the learner with immediate feedback about the quality of learning. Adding examples to the questionnaire item, e.g., "the use of clickers,

and the frequent raising of hands in response to class wide questions,” would prompt reviewers and teachers. For several items, “Not Applicable” appears to be an appropriate addition. Suggested examples for the stem, “The educator incorporated evidence-based practices into the lesson(s) and modeled the use of resources for lifelong learning,” included clinical guidelines, Up to Date, and 5 Minute Clinical Consult. Displaying their use from the front of the room and including opportunities to discuss the levels of evidence would feature evidence-based medicine, it was agreed.

There was a wide-ranging discussion of the questionnaire, Peer Evaluation of Educators in Courses. Issues included the definition of peer, the relationship of content to teaching techniques, and the relationship of clinical experience to teaching technique and content. It was generally understood that: a) a cadre of educators loosely associated with the Curriculum Office and involved in Curriculum Renewal would provide a valuable resource for evaluation of faculty, b) faculty and others involved in peer visits of classrooms or other teaching activities would require training, and c) the availability of clinical faculty time would be limited and possibly restrictive to the evaluation and improvement efforts.

It was agreed that: a) a working group should be recruited to develop a conceptual framework for an evaluation design, and b) current curriculum efforts including validation of the JEFFSPLL and evaluation of the fast track courses should continue apace. Paul Mazmanian agreed to follow-up with Dr. Isaac Wood to discuss appointment of a working group.

The group adjourned at 1:05 PM.



Paul Mazmanian, Co-Chairman
Evaluation Committee