

STATEMENT 1.1.3 – PRINCIPLES AND EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT COMPLETION OF INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE EVALUATIONS IN UNDERGRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION

Undergraduate Medical Education

Approved by:

Curriculum Committee

I. PURPOSE

Programmatic evaluation is a critical tool used to audit, report and improve on the quality and outcomes of all components of the Doctor of Medicine Program (the Program) at the Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry in Western University. Through student feedback using a methodology endorsed by the Curriculum Committee, the Program will gather and analyse necessary data for the formentioned purposes to monitor curricular quality and drive ongoing continual course and student learning improvements.

It is the professional responsibility of all Program students to participate in this process.

II. STATEMENT

a. Rationale

- i. Students in the Program should understand that the Program relies on effective programmatic evaluations for continuous improvement and quality control.
- ii. Giving and accepting feedback effectively are essential competencies of a physician.
- iii. The Curriculum Committee (CC) and governing or operational bodies of the Program understand the imperative nature of a centralized, mandatory internal review process under the auspices of the Curriculum Committee through the staff in the Undergraduate Medical Education (UME) office.
- iv. Students and faculty will contribute to the planning, implementation and review of Program evaluation data through the UME Quality Committee (QC) who shall report to the CC.
- v. There are two streams of program evaluation analysed in the Program.

b. Processes

- i. The formal Program evaluation process data shall be the official tool for overall Program decision-making. This is discussed below.
- ii. Students in the Program have traditionally owned an independent evaluation process that has qualitative and quantitative measures termed: the “Best Curriculum on Earth” (BCOE) program.
 - a. The Curriculum Committee of the Program value the feedback students provide through the BCOE course evaluation system.
 - b. The Curriculum Committee similarly encourages students to maintain their ongoing commitment to BCOE.
 - c. The BCOE data will be reported to PIC and CEC in addition to the Course Chairs and be made available for course reviews at QC.
 - d. BCOE data will not at any time be seen as an official UME Program metric.

c. Expectations

- i. Students will all engage fully in the evaluation process.
- ii. Participation in the evaluation process is seen as an issue of student professionalism.

- iii. Students who fail to participate in the evaluation process will be contacted by the Coordinator, Evaluation, Data and Project Management. A final deadline for completion will be provided.
 - iv. Students who fail to complete evaluations after being contacted by the Undergraduate Medical Education Office may be required to meet with the Associate Dean UME. Documentation of unprofessional behavior will be added to the student's file and may be included on the MSPR letter.
 - v. Egregious, ongoing failure to comply with the evaluation process will be referred to the Committee to Support Student Professionalism. Documentation of unprofessional behavior will be added to the student's file and will be included on the MSPR letter.
 - vi. If a student encounters a technical difficulty that hinders the completion of an evaluation form, it is their responsibility to bring this issue to the attention of the Course Curriculum Support Administrator, the Coordinator, Evaluation, Data and Project Management or the Manager, Undergraduate Medical Education in a timely manner.
- d. Western and Program formal evaluation forms
- i. Instructor Evaluation Forms
 - Students will each receive one of two possible instructor evaluations forms:
 - a. Basic Science Faculty instructor evaluations
 - b. Clinical Faculty instructor evaluation form
 - ii. The Basic Science Instructor evaluation form is a modified version of standard Western University course Instructor evaluation Form (Appendix A). This form retains all 15 questions as the standard corporate version but questions have been modified to be relevant to UME.
 - iii. The Clinical Faculty Instructor Evaluation form is a refreshed version of the Western University course Instructor evaluation Form (Appendix B). This form is shorter and asks questions relevant to UME clinical faculty teaching.
- e. Instructor Evaluation One45 Process
- i. Instructor evaluations will be sent weekly each Thursday to UME students for instructors who have finished their lecture-based teaching responsibilities for a course.
 - One45 will be configured so that packages are sent at approximately 8:00 am.
 - All surveys will be set up to remain open until the Friday evening two (2) weeks following their distribution.
 - ii. To reduce the overall number of evaluations students are asked to complete, each Year 1 & 2 class will be divided into 10 "evaluation groups".
 - Each week, three (3) of the ten groups will be sent instructor evaluations for faculty who have finished their lecture-based teaching responsibilities for the course.
 - To ensure equitable distribution and fairness, each week three (3) different groups will be sent evaluation packages.
 - a. Week 1 – Groups 1, 2, 3
 - b. Week 2 – Groups 4, 5, 6
 - c. Week 3 – Groups 7, 8, 9
 - d. Week 4 – Groups 10, 11, 12
 - Instructor evaluations for Child Health, Pathology, and Anatomy Lab teaching will be distributed as part of the package sent to students in the last week of a course. All of the above described small group facilitators will be evaluated by the students whom they taught.
 - PCCIA facilitator evaluations will be sent as a package to students at the end of each term only.
 - Instructor evaluations for PCCM will be sent to students in a package at the end of each PCCM module.
 - Clerkship has a separate evaluation process that requires 100% compliance for a "Pass".
- f. End-of-Course Survey One45 Process

- i. An End-of-Course Survey will be distributed to **all** UME Program students, with a distinct form distributed to students at the London and Windsor campus sites, following the end of each course.
 - ii. All students must complete the End-of-Course survey.
 - iii. Lack of student compliance with this process will be addressed by the AD UME as a breach of Professionalism.
 - g. Survey Notification and Reminders
 - i. Email survey completion notifications and reminders from one45 are part of the official curriculum, are not subject to opt out, and not considered spam under Canada's anti-spam legislation (CASL)
 - h. Faculty Reports
 - i. Faculty reports will be distributed through a standardized centralized manner according to the guidelines and / or Policies set out in the Academic Calendar of Western University.
 - i. UME Resource Requirements
 - i. For each course, the UME Program office will provide the Evaluation Specialist:
 - a list of clinical and basic-science faculty
 - the dates of their lecture-based or small group teaching within the course
 - ii. UME Program staff may be required to follow-up with non-compliant students to prompt them after survey close dates.
 - iii. A pattern of a UME Program student requiring ongoing formative prompting will be addressed as a breach of Professionalism.
 - j. Completion Rates Tracking
 - i. Overall student compliance will be tracked, analyzed and reported through the UME Quality Committee to CC.
 - ii. Students will be provided with a semi-annual personal "status report". This will be an output of one45's Evaluation Tracking module (Send-outs --> Outstanding Forms --> Data Export --> overall counts of outstanding forms: student).
 - iii. UME will use the 'status report' as an opportunity to provide students with feedback on what changes have/will be made (if any) as a result of their compliance with the process.

Section 2:

	N/A	1 = Very Poor	2 = Unsatisfactory	3 = Borderline	4 = Satisfactory	5 = Good	6 = Very Good	7 = Outstanding
Overall, how would you rate the sessions for which this instructor was responsible as a learning experience?								

Section 4:

Supplementary Comments for the Instructor

Section 5:

Supplementary Comments on the Sessions for which this Instructor was responsible

Appendix B

Clinical Instructor Form
Western University
Instructor Evaluation

Your answers to the following questions will be used as feedback to the instructor and as one of several sources of information considered in decisions regarding promotion and tenure. Please consider your responses carefully. Statistical summaries of this survey will not be released to the instructor until the final grades have been submitted to the Registrar.

We also ask that any written comments you provide are fair, constructive, useful and relevant.

Section 1:

	N/A	1 = Very Poor	2 = Unsatisfactory	3 = Borderline	4 = Satisfactory	5 = Good	6 = Very Good	7 = Outstanding
1. Conducts class sessions in an organized, well planned manner								
2. Clearly states the relevance of specific session objectives								
3. Maintains close agreement between stated session objectives and what is actually taught								
4. Makes it clear how the instruction for which they are responsible fits into the course as a whole								
5. Teaches using a patient-centred approach								
6. All things considered, is effective as a university teacher								

Section 2:

	N/A	1 = Very Poor	2 = Unsatisfactory	3 = Borderline	4 = Satisfactory	5 = Good	6 = Very Good	7 = Outstanding
Overall, how would you rate this instructor's sessions?								

Section 3:

Supplementary Comments for the Instructor