

Evaluation Committee of the Curriculum Renewal Project Meeting Notes
June 25, 2009

In attendance: Diane Biskobing, Craig Chiefetz, Robert Downs, Kathy Kreutzer, Paul Mazmanian, Co-Chairman, Azhar Rafiq, Co-Chairman, Elizabeth Waterhouse, Angela Wetzel

Guests: Jessica Ketchum, Assistant Professor, Biostatistics, and two doctoral students, Adam Sima and Caroline Carr.

1. Paul Mazmanian presented notes from the May 28, 2009, meeting of the Evaluation Committee of the Curriculum Renewal Project. There were no suggested revisions.
2. Ms. Angela Wetzel reviewed data acquired from administering VCU's version of the Jefferson Scale of Physician Lifelong Learning, undergraduate medical education. Data from graduating classes of 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 were described, with the mean differences between M1/M2 and M3/M4 significant at 0.05. There was a question of whether the responses should be divided into two groups: M1 & M2 and M3 & M4, for comparisons. The effect sizes were small.

It was generally understood that negative items probably should be inserted to help assure that the 5 or so respondents who marked down the page, strongly agree or disagree, for example, would be selected out.

It was generally understood that Ms. Wetzel would continue to lead a working subcommittee (Kreutzer, Rafiq, Mazmanian) that would continue to consult with colleagues at Jefferson, Mohammadreza Hojat and Jon Veloski. Dr. Jessica Ketchum, Assistant Professor, Department of Biostatistics agreed to run an exploratory factor analysis and a confirmatory factor analysis on the data. Ms. Wetzel agreed to send the data to Dr. Ketchum.

3. There was a discussion of expectations regarding faculty evaluation. Dr. Craig Cheifetz reminded the committee that faculty evaluation should be coordinated with the competencies already identified by the Curriculum Renewal Committee on Faculty Development that is led by Ms. Carol Hampton, Associate Dean, Faculty and Instructional Development.

The discussion of faculty competencies also included a suggestion to develop an electronic file, a portfolio for faculty that might include an opportunity for faculty to record comments and to respond directly to students assuring that reflection on learning is recorded by evidence of the faculty response. There were three fundamental understandings: 1) there should be faculty competencies included in faculty evaluation, 2) evaluation of faculty performance in total should not be confused with evaluation of a faculty member's teaching, and 3) an electronic portfolio for faculty should include: a) a reflective component, and b) the

opportunity to track responses to students. There was a discussion of caveats, e.g., engaging in active learning does not mean that active learning is being done well.

4. There was discussion of the role and value of tests such as JEFFSPLL. It was generally understood that the VCU School of Medicine project led by Ms. Wetzel would require theoretical underpinnings to test hypotheses. Alternative explanations might include adult development, personality, or theories of motivation. It was concluded that: 1) ties of the test to the curriculum must be clear, 2) expectations of the curriculum -- expressed as form and content -- must be clearly stated, so that stakeholders may track the progress of students along a measure of lifelong learning, and 3) objectives, standards, and criteria for measuring performance must be clear.

The group adjourned at

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paul E. Mazmanian".

Paul Mazmanian, Co-Chairman
Evaluation Committee