Subject:

Fellow group evaluation of faculty members

Thursday, March 29, 2018 at 10:14:41 AM Eastern Daylight Time

McCartney, Christopher (cm2hq) <cm2hq@hscmail.mcc.virginia.edu>

To:

CC:

Attachments:

Evaluation Worksheet 2017-2018.pdf

Names in this example have been redacted

As you know, one of the ACGME requirements is "Evaluation of faculty teaching & supervision through internal evaluation." We have altered our approach a bit in the past couple of years. Part of our strategy is to have a fellow-only meeting once a year so that fellows can discuss each faculty member and provide a group summary evaluation for each faculty member. I attach your group evaluation to this email. Your evaluations are very good as expected.

A more detailed description of our plan for faculty evaluation is described below. Please let me know if questions?

Chris

Written fellow evaluations of faculty each year suggest that faculty teaching and supervision is generally very good. However, it has been a bit unclear to me how useful and/or reliable such formal written evaluations are. In particular, fellows have worried that it may be very easy for faculty to determine who wrote a particular evaluation, which may limit the utility of feedback. Moreover, there is a sense that individual fellows may be reluctant to provide negative feedback of faculty in writing, even if it were completely anonymous. To help address these issues, the fellows and I had discussed (a couple of years ago) having a fellow-only meeting once a year so that fellows can discuss each faculty member and provide a group summary evaluation for each faculty member. A formal written summary would be submitted to me, and the group evaluations would be shared with the faculty member and the Division Chief. While the fellows did something like this in the 2016-2017 academic year, we implemented this plan formally in the 2017-2018 academic year. Specifically, in December I asked fellows to meet as a group and provide a group evaluation of each faculty member. We didn't include to meet as a group and provide a given limited exposure to date (they will be included next year).

As another strategy to enhance the confidentiality/anonymity of written evaluations, we started holding all individual fellow evaluations of faculty such that they are only released to faculty members periodically as a batch; this will make it harder for faculty members to divine which fellow submitted a given evaluation. (Note that anonymity may be jeopardized if specific situations are described in the evaluation.) This was started toward the end of the 2016-2017 academic year. I will release these to individual faculty members soon (i.e., over a year's worth of evaluations released at one time).

Faculty evaluation form

KEY: NA = cannot assess, 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent

Possesses expertise in field of practice (clinic)	4
Possesses expertise in general endocrinology (consults)	4
Applies basic and clinical sciences relevant to patient care	4
Allows you to independent formulate your own clinical opinion and allow for academic discussions	4
Aids in your critical assessment of patients	4
Helps to develop and implement patient management plans	4
Establishes and models an environment of professionalism	4
Apparent degree to which faculty member values fellows and their education	4

For each faculty member, describe areas where the attending is performing well and areas where the attending could improve

: Fellows feel overwhelmingly positive about their experiences working with her. Clinic is very helpful in learning about management of endocrine conditions in pregnancy. Fellows appreciate that she allows autonomy both in clinic and on consults; she allows fellows to explain the management plan to OB patients. She is regarded as being very efficient.

NOTE: Dr. was one of 4 faculty members identified by fellows as an excellent potential choice for continuity clinic attending