

Evaluation Committee Meeting Notes
December 18, 2008

In attendance: Kimberly Ancheta, Diane Biskobing, Melissa Bradner, Radha Chirumamilla, Robert Downs, Carol Hampton, Scott Harrison, Brian Kaplan, Kedar Lavingia, Paul Mazmanian, Co-Chairman, Roberta McKnight, Sherif Meguid, John Pierce, Azhar Rafiq, Co-Chairman, Hani Seoudi, Kiila Tollerson, Angela Wetzel

1. Paul Mazmanian introduced the agenda for the day.

Notes from the November 20, 2008, meeting of the Evaluation Committee of the Curriculum Renewal Project and member assignments to sub-committees were reviewed.

There were no suggested revisions to the notes.

2. Ms. Carol Hampton, Associate Dean for Faculty & Instructional Development, distributed two documents: 1) the mission and general direction of the Faculty & Instructional Development Committee of the Curriculum Renewal Project, and 2) the neon green announcement of a January 29-30, 2009 workshop, Faculty Development for the Medical Science Teacher (See attached.) Ms. Hampton described progress of the Faculty & Instructional Development (FID) Committee of the Curriculum Renewal Project. She focused on teaching competencies adopted by the FID Committee. The competencies include: 1) control of session, 2) communication of goals, 3) promoting understanding and retention, 4) evaluation, 5) feedback, and 6) self-directed learning. Ms. Hampton pointed out that integration, active learning, and professionalism were "...included within the competencies."

Paul Mazmanian recalled that the Evaluation Committee adopted a six level scheme for measuring outcomes; he asked which levels would be measured in evaluating the January 29-30, 2009 sessions, and he volunteered to consult with Ms. Hampton and Ms. Kathy Kreutzer to help plan the evaluation.

Dr. John Pierce asked whether those who complete the two-day instruction might receive support during the practice of teaching, as opposed to only during the face-to-face training, January 29-30, 2009. Dr. Diane Biskobing added that evaluation and training remote from the actual teaching experience often are insufficient to assure success at instruction. Carol Hampton suggested that mentors or master teachers might be helpful. Dr. Brian Kaplan described a system at Washington University in St. Louis: two or three faculty in each department are assigned mentoring responsibilities to help assure excellence in teaching.

3. Paul Mazmanian asked Ms. Hampton to describe the role that Ms. Kreutzer will play in providing services to the fast-track courses. It was recognized generally that Ms. Kreutzer will provide administrative, consultative, and coordinative support to the fast-track courses, Endocrinology and Immunology. Dr. Sherif Meguid asked about logistics, how people from INOVA would participate and how the Curriculum Committee would work. Paul Mazmanian remarked that the

sub-committees would work independently, on differing schedules and according to the needs of the course directors, Drs. Diane Biskobing and Deb Lebman. For example, Ms. Kreutzer might coordinate sessions with Dr. Biskobing to assure that the resources of the medical school (e.g., the Simulation Center) would be available to Dr. Biskobing, as she leads redesign of the Endocrinology course. Representatives of the Simulation Center might be asked to attend or to contribute otherwise to planning and instructional design. Leaders of the sub-committees of the Evaluation Committee (see attached) would address evaluation with each fast-track course director, consulting and providing service according to suggested changes. Dr. Roberta McKnight will lead evaluation for Endocrine; Dr. Azhar Rafiq for Immunology.

It was generally understood that a formidable challenge might involve the availability of faculty time to engage in redevelopment of courses and instruction.

Ms. Kimberly Ancheta asked whether student evaluations might be coordinated with the teacher evaluations or course directors' evaluations. Ms. Kiila Tollerson suggested many students question the value of course evaluations. Mr. Kedar Lavingia and Ms. Radha Chirumamilla added that there is limited opportunity to see courses change, as a result of student evaluations. Ms. Angela Wetzel described the current process: meetings occur after courses whereby student evaluations are shared with faculty. She suggested that current on-line evaluation services offer increased opportunities for more meaningful evaluation.

4. There was a question regarding LCME Standard ED5A and measurement. Dr. Rafiq mentioned that he would provide a list of competencies for self-assessment and/or lifelong learning from the literature of adult education. Ms. Wetzel offered to pull select data from the SOM database and work with Ms. Kreutzer to enable benchmarking of our current performance. Paul Mazmanian offered to look into a recently published assessment tool from Jefferson.
5. Dr. Roberta McKnight reported that she reviewed select literature that might relate to competencies. She agreed to: 1) distribute the information electronically to all committee members, and 2) discuss implications during the next Evaluation Committee meeting, tentatively scheduled for January 28, 2009.
6. Paul Mazmanian was reminded to send out dates for the Evaluation Committee meetings of 2009.



Paul Mazmanian, Co-Chairman
Evaluation Committee
December 18, 2008