# Instructions
# for Applying to
# AU's Academy of Health Sciences Educators
# (The Academy)

## Table of Contents

# Overview of the Academy

The AU Academy of Health Sciences Educators (The Academy) is an organization of distinguished health sciences educators who have demonstrated sustained excellence in educational activities and scholarship within and beyond Augusta University. Membership in The Academy is open faculty with a health sciences college appointment at Augusta University.

The Academy's mission is:
- To recognize faculty who have made outstanding contributions to health sciences education.
- To establish a forum for faculty with recognized accomplishments in health sciences education to facilitate the exchange of ideas, career development, and collaboration institution-wide.
- To improve the quality of health sciences education by fostering faculty development, curricular innovation, creating products that will advance the fields, and developing educational leaders for the future.

# Application Timeline

| Important Dates | |
| --- | --- |
| **July 1, 2018** | Call for applications |
| **August 1, 2018** | Deadline to submit draft application for administrative review (optional) |
| **October 1, 2018** | Deadline to submit final application |
| **October 1, 2018** | Deadline for referees to email letters of support for Academy |
| **January 2019** | Notification of applicants |
| **March 2019** | Induction of New Members |

**Eligibility:** Applicants must have a faculty appointment in an Augusta University Health Sciences College and have been at AU for at least two years. All applicants should be recognized as outstanding teachers of health professions students OR have significant impact on health professional student education through their educational activities with residents, fellows, or graduate students.

The application should only include the applicant's educational accomplishments for the last 5 years. Credit for educational accomplishments at another health sciences institution will be considered, but the applicant must document accomplishments for a minimum of the last 2 years at Augusta University. Strongest applicants demonstrate scope beyond their own department, in addition to direct impact on AU learners.

Applicants must provide evidence of excellence in the area of Teaching and one of four other educator domains (below). Applicants who hold a significant leadership role (e.g. course, clerkship or residency director) must apply in Educational Leadership.

Educator Domains
1. Teaching and one of the following:
2. Mentoring and Advising
3. Curriculum Development, Instructional Design, and Technology
4. Educational Leadership
5. Learner Assessment

# Preparing and Submitting the Application

A strong membership application requires thoughtful advance planning and several iterations of review. Key steps to applying:
1. Draft your application using the template worksheets provided;
2. Email the final <u>draft</u> application by <u>August 1, 2018</u> to Ralph Gillies, [rgillies@augusta.edu](mailto:rgillies@augusta.edu) who will forward to the Chair of the Academy selection committee for administrative review.
3. Following a satisfactory administrative review, submit the final application by <u>September 15, 2018</u>.

## Application Coaching: To support applicants through this process and maximize successful applications, we offer a coaching program that pairs an applicant with an Academy member. Experience indicates that applicants who submit their applications for administrative review submit stronger applications.

## Final Review: Applications are initially reviewed by the AU Academy Membership Committee for completeness; complete applications are forwarded to external reviewers who are Academy members at other institutions.  External reviewers recommend "accept," "decline," or "discuss," based their review of the application.  Next, the AU Academy Membership Committee makes final determination os membership.  The committee chair informs applicants of their acceptance or provides suggestions for declined applications.  NOTE: Do not use jargon or abbreviations (e.g., "ECM course") that external reviewers may not understand.

## Components of a complete application:

1. **Checklist:** specifies the applicant's educational focus(es) and roles in which s/he is applying. [PDF link found here](#)

2. **Personal statement:** One page maximum; should thoughtfully describe the applicant's educational philosophy, trajectory, future direction, and intended contributions to the Academy and the Augusta University education community.

    a. [Example 1](#)
    b. [Example 2](#)
    c. [Example 3](#)

3. **Educator's Portfolio:**   A maximum of 7 pages, the EP contains:
    1. A one-page **executive summary** that briefly describes up to 5 significant contributions to education, organized by domain, with Teaching as the first domain.
        a. There may be more than one highlighted contribution in a given domain (e.g. Teaching and 2 examples of Educational Leadership).
        b. The Detailed Domain Descriptions must elaborate on 1-3 contributions highlighted in the Executive Summary.

    2. Up to 3 **Detailed Domain Description** (maximum 2-pages each)

a. Teaching is required, plus 1-2 other contributions highlighted in the executive summary.
b. Applicants with significant leadership responsibilities (e.g. clerkship, or residency directors) must apply in Educational Leadership.
   - [Example 1](#)
   - [Example 2](#)
c. NOTE:  A common mistake is listing a third or fourth domain in application and insufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate excellence.

3. **Including Student and Peer-Review Data:**  Individual and normative (i.e., group mean of other faculty teaching similar course) student and peer-review data MUST be provided in Teaching domain ; the strongest applications include individual and benchmark evaluative data in other roles as well. It is always time-consuming to gather; applicants should start early. Office of Evaluation Services for each college should be helpful in preparing these reports.  Applicants are encouraged  work through their departmental residency or course administrator, or their course or program director, to obtain benchmark data wherever possible.

   If activities have not been formally evaluated, they are less strong, and this should be addressed in the detailed role description. If all of one's teaching has been in courses/activities that are not formally evaluated, consider formally evaluating the activities over the coming years to strengthen a future application.

4. **Letters of support:** Letters of support (maximum of 3) are required for the final application to be considered complete. Letters must be requested by the applicant and transmitted directly to the Academy Application Chair (provide name/contact information here) in the body of an email from the author. Letters may be addressed to the Academy Membership Committee and emailed to Dr. Ralph Gillies, [rgillies@augusta.edu](mailto:rgillies@augusta.edu). Letters should address the applicant's successes and ability to meet criteria for membership, across the educational domains in which the applicant is applying.

   Criteria for letters of support:
   1. Department chair letter: may be written by a division chief, but must be transmitted to the selection committee by the department chair with endorsement of the content.
   2. Up to 2 additional letters that specifically address impact of the applicant's work in the educational domains in which applicant is applying.

5. **Current CV**:  AU template can be found [here](#).

6. **Anticipated Academy Contributions** : PDF found [here](#).

# APPENDIX 1 - EDUCATOR'S PORTFOLIO

## Executive Summary

The purpose of the Executive Summary is to concisely describe your 1-3 most significant contributions to teaching/education at all levels (student, resident, fellows, faculty, practitioners) in <u>one page</u>, using the template provided. There are two sections to the Executive Summary:
1. Overall faculty roles
2. Most significant contributions to teaching and education

**Directions**:
1. Description of **overall faculty roles**.

   a. Describe your major commitments of time to various faculty responsibilities in one sentence. For example, 60% clinical, 20% teaching and 20% research; or 80% clinical and teaching, 20% administration.
   b. Describe any changes in this mix of responsibilities over the past 3 years. For example, over the past three years I have taken over as residency program director (20%) and decreased my patient care responsibilities by 20%.

2. Description of **most significant contributions** to teaching and education.
   a. List 1-3 significant contributions you have made in any of the following roles: 1) Teaching, 2) Mentoring and Advising, 3) Curriculum Development, Instructional Design and Technology, 4) Educational Leadership, and 5) Learner Assessment. **The first contribution listed must be Teaching.** (Applications to the Academy require Teaching plus at least one other Detailed Role Description.)

   b. For each significant contribution, identify educator role in parentheses and list contribution in a phrase. For example: (Teaching) Lecturer, small group instructor and clinical preceptor; or (Educational Leadership) Clerkship director.

   c. Using no more than two or three additional sentences under each contribution, describe what was done, how well it was done and its impact. For example,

   "This is the core 2nd-year medical student course for immunology, microbiology and infectious diseases. I gave eight hours of lecture, eight hours of small group, and 20 hours of lab instruction in 2013. Since 2010 I have received high student ratings for overall teaching effectiveness for both lecture (2013, 4.7/5.0 [N=44, mean 4.2]) and lab/small group (2013, 4.8/5.0 [N=62, mean 4.4]). In 2013, I received the Commitment to Teaching Award from the second-year medical students."

# Criteria and Indicators for Excellence

Using the templates provided, describe in detail up to three roles highlighted in the executive summary. <u>Teaching is required and should be provided first</u>. Each detailed description should be two pages or less. Detailed Role Descriptions must elaborate on 1-3 contributions highlighted in the Executive Summary. Definitions, criteria and indicators of excellence for each role follow.

# APPENDIX 2 – EDUCATOR DOMAINS

## DOMAIN 1 - Criteria and Indicators of Excellence for <u>Teaching</u>

Teaching is defined as any organized activity that fosters learning and the creation of associated instructional materials. Teaching targets learners at all levels of health sciences education including students, residents, fellows, postdocs, faculty members and practitioners. It involves learners in activities such as lectures, workshops, case discussions, patient-centered teaching and various settings (e.g., classroom, clinical, laboratory, and virtual environments). Development of curricula is considered under the role of curriculum development.

Evaluation of sustained contributions in teaching requires judgment about **quantity** (number, duration and scope of teaching activities), **quality** (teaching has been effective with positive reviews), and **scholarly approach** (application of literature and best practice models). **Scholarship** (peer reviewed publications, presentations and products and/or evidence of adoption by others) and **Dissemination outside of institution** are desired, but not required. Broad indicators below serve as criteria to judge contributions to teaching. *These criteria are illustrative, and not all criteria must be met.*

| Criteria | Examples of Broad Indicators |
|---|---|
| **Builds on best practice/ evidence** | • Documentation of the use of best practices and evidence, where available, from the literature<br>• Professional development activities and personal experience<br>• Congruence with national, institutional and/or program goals and integration with other components of curriculum |
| **Goals and learning objectives** | Learning objectives for the teaching session(s) are:<br>• Stated clearly<br>• Specified to measure learners' performance<br>• At appropriate level for targeted learners |
| **Methods** | • Teaching methods aligned with learning objectives<br>• Methods are feasible, practical, ethical<br>• Innovative teaching methods used to achieve objectives<br>• Rationale for choices |
| **Results and impact within institution** | • Teaching evaluations: documentation must include individual evaluation scores with normative data provided through **One45** or other evaluation system. For small programs, normative data may be sought from similar small programs in a similar or the same department. All evaluation data must show the number of responses.<br>• Learning: Measures of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and/or behaviors<br>• Application: Desired performance demonstrated in other settings<br>• Impact: On educational programs and processes within institution<br>• Teaching awards locally |
| **Dissemination outside of institution** | Recognized as valuable by others outside the institution through:<br>• Peer review or letters of reference<br>• Dissemination (presentations, workshops, publications) and/or<br>• Invited presentations and visiting professorships elsewhere<br>• Use of teaching models or materials by others<br>• Teaching awards nationally |
| **Reflective critique** | • Uses evaluation to guide improvement<br>• Reflection used to develop a specific plan for improvement |

# DOMAIN 2 - Criteria and Indicators of Excellence for <u>**Mentoring and Advising**</u>

Mentoring is a process in which an experienced professional gives a person with relatively less experience guidance, teaching and development to achieve broad professional goals. Advising differs from mentoring in that it is specific to a circumscribed goal, as in career guidance or course selection. Ideally, mentoring and advising relationships are active and reciprocal, providing the mentee/advisee with developmentally and contextually appropriate guidance and the mentor/advisor with personal and professional satisfaction.

Evaluation of sustained contributions in mentoring and advising requires judgment about **quantity** (number, duration and scope of relationships, breadth of the faculty member's effort), **quality** (effectiveness of mentor/advisor and demonstrated effectiveness with positive reviews and positive outcomes emerging from relationship), **scholarly approach** (application of literature and best practice models). **Scholarship** (peer reviewed publications, presentations and products and/or evidence of adoption by others) and **Dissemination outside of institution** are desired, but not required. Broad indicators below serve as criteria to judge mentoring/advising contributions. *These criteria are illustrative, and not all criteria must be met. In particular, the dissemination category is aspirational.*

| Criteria | Examples of Broad Indicators |
|---|---|
| **Builds on best practice/ evidence** | • Bases mentoring on an understanding of:<br>  o Stages of mentee's/advisee's career trajectory<br>  o Milestones required for mentee's/advisee's professional advancement<br>  o Available and needed resources to meet vision and associated goals<br>  o Use of best practices from the literature, professional development activities and personal experience |
| **Goals and Objectives** | • Clear and contextually appropriate vision for mentee's/advisee's career<br>• Mutually agreed-upon goals for the relationship<br>• Evolution of goals over time |
| **Methods** | • Methods aligned with mentee's/advisee's needs and goals<br>• Methods aligned with goals for relationship<br>• Methods are ethical and evolve as mentee/advisee advances professionally<br>• Innovative methods used to achieve goals for relationship and to assist mentee/advisee in meeting goals |
| **Results and impact within the institution** | • Satisfaction/reaction of mentees/advisees<br>• Learning: Measures knowledge, skills, attitudes and/or behaviors of mentee/advisee<br>• Application: Relationship with mentor/advisor contributes to accomplishments and evolving professional identity of mentee/advisee<br>• Impact: Accomplishments of mentee/advisee have impact within and/or beyond the institution<br>• Honors and awards for mentoring within institution |
| **Dissemination outside of institution** | Recognized as valuable by others externally through:<br>• Peer review<br>• Dissemination (Presentations, workshops, publications)<br>• Use by others<br>• Honors and awards for mentoring nationally |
| **Reflective critique** | • Uses evaluation to guide improvement<br>• Reflection and results of evaluations used for ongoing improvement |

# DOMAIN 3 - Criteria and Indicators of Excellence for <u>Curriculum Development, Instructional Design and Technology</u>

Curriculum is defined as a longitudinal set of systematically designed, sequenced and evaluated educational activities. A curriculum can target learners at any level from undergraduate through continuing professional development and may be delivered in many formats.

Evaluation of sustained contributions in curriculum development requires judgment about **quantity** (number, duration and scope of each curriculum, breadth of the faculty member's role and effort), **quality** (curriculum has demonstrated effectiveness with positive reviews), and **scholarly approach** (application of literature and best practice models)**. Scholarship** (peer reviewed publications, presentations and products and/or evidence of adoption by others) and **Dissemination outside of institution** are desired, but not required. Broad indicators below serve as criteria to judge contributions to curriculum development, instructional design and technology. *These criteria are illustrative, and not all criteria must be met. In particular, the dissemination category is aspirational.*

| Criteria | Examples of Broad Indicators |
|---|---|
| **Builds on best practice/ evidence** | • Needs assessment completed, if required<br>• Use of best practices and approaches from the literature, professional development activities and personal experience<br>• Congruence with institutional/program goals and integration with other components of the curriculum<br>• Systematic approach to identifying and acquiring resources needed to implement the curriculum |
| **Goals and learning objectives** | Learning objectives for the curriculum are:<br>• Stated clearly<br>• Specified to measure learners' performance<br>• At appropriate level for targeted learners |
| **Methods** | • Teaching, learner assessment, and curriculum evaluation methods are aligned with curriculum objectives<br>• Methods are feasible, practical, ethical<br>• Innovative teaching and assessment methods are used and aligned with objectives |
| **Results and impact within institution** | • Learner evaluations of recently developed teaching/course/curriculum/ technology; when possible, documentation should include evaluation ratings with normative data. For small programs, normative data may be sought from similar small programs in a similar or the same department. All evaluation data must show the number of responses (N).<br>• Learning: Measures of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and/or behaviors<br>• Application: Desired performance demonstrated in other settings<br>• Impact: On education programs and processes within institution |
| **Dissemination outside of institution** | Recognized as valuable by others outside of institution through:<br>• Peer review<br>• Dissemination (presentations/publications) and/or<br>• Invited presentations elsewhere<br>• Use by others<br>• Awards nationally |
| **Reflective critique** | • Uses evaluation to guide improvement<br>• Reflection used to develop a specific plan for improvement |

# DOMAIN 4 - Criteria and Indicators of Excellence for __Educational Leadership__

Educational leaders achieve transformative results by leading others to advance educational programs, initiatives, and/or groups. Examples include leaders of education committees, clerkships and courses, training and professional development programs, and Assistant/Associate Dean positions. Leaders in medical education must be evaluated for leadership and administrative skills, in addition to program outcomes.

Evaluation of sustained contributions in educational leadership requires judgment about **quantity** (number, duration and scope of leadership roles), **quality** (leader and program have demonstrated effectiveness with positive reviews), and **scholarly approach** (application of literature and best practice models)**. Scholarship** (peer reviewed publications, presentations, and products and/or evidence of adoption by others) and **Dissemination outside of institution** are desired, but not required. Broad indicators below serve as criteria to judge leadership contributions. *These criteria are illustrative, and not all criteria must be met. In particular, the dissemination category is aspirational.*

| Criteria | Examples of Broad Indicators |
|---|---|
| **Builds on best practice/evidence** | • Use of best practices and approaches from the literature, professional development activities and personal experience<br>• Systematic approach to identifying and acquiring resources needed to implement projects<br>• Development of timeline with milestones and deliverables<br>• Selection and development of team<br>• Motivating stakeholders to collaborate in realizing the vision |
| **Goals and objectives** | • Articulated vision<br>• Goal setting aligned with vision<br>• Goals congruent with institutional goals |
| **Methods** | • Development and management of resources and processes<br>• Methods that are feasible, practical, and ethical<br>• Creative and innovative solutions used to achieve goals<br>• Evaluation aligned with goals |
| **Results and impact within institution** | • Evaluation of initiative/activities (satisfaction/reaction); for on-going courses, clerkships, or programs with learner evaluations, when possible documentation should include evaluation ratings with normative data. For small programs, normative data may be sought from similar small programs in a similar or the same department. All evaluation data must show the number of responses (N).<br>• Impact on participants/stakeholders and on educational programs and initiatives within institution |
| **Dissemination outside of institution** | Recognized as valuable by others (internally/externally) through:<br>• Peer review<br>• Dissemination (Presentations, workshops, publications)<br>• Visiting professorships<br>• Use by others<br>• Honors and awards nationally |
| **Reflective critique** | • Uses evaluation to guide improvement<br>• Reflection and results used for ongoing improvement of self, participants, and programs/initiatives |

# DOMAIN 5 - Criteria and Indicators of Excellence for <u>Learner Assessment</u>

Learner assessment is defined as all activities associated with measuring knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors of learners so that judgments can be made about their performance. The information from assessments indicates how well the learner has achieved pre-specified expectations for performance. This information has impact on the learner and also serves important administrative purposes, such as making progress decisions about the learner.

Evaluation of sustained contributions in learner assessment requires judgment about **quantity** (number of assessments and breadth of the faculty member's role and effort in the development and implementation of the assessment), **quality** (assessments measure what they are supposed to measure, include sufficient relevant samples of a learner's performance, and information gained has impact on the learner and the institution) and **scholarly approach** (application of literature and best practice models). **Scholarship** (peer reviewed publications, presentations, and products, and/or evidence of adoption by others) and **Dissemination outside of institution** are desired, but not required. Broad indicators below serve as criteria to judge contributions to learner assessment. *These criteria are illustrative, and not all criteria must be met. In particular, the dissemination category is aspirational.*

| Criteria | Examples of Broad Indicators |
|---|---|
| **Builds on best practice/ evidence** | • Use of best practices and evidence, where available, from the literature, professional development activities and personal experience <br> • Congruence with institutional/program goals and integration with institution's system of assessment <br> • Resource planning (facilities, faculty, schedules) |
| **Goals and objectives** | Learner Assessments: <br> • Are appropriate for the content and level of learning objectives/competencies <br> • Define expectations for learner's performance in blueprint |
| **Methods** | • Assessment format aligned with learning objectives <br> • Assessment process is consistent and uses accurate scoring methods <br> • Assessment occurs in setting suitable for demonstration of relevant learning <br> • Sufficient sample of the learner's performance collected to assure accurate capture of real ability/competency <br> • Methods are useful, feasible, practical, ethical <br> • Use of innovative assessment methods to measure performance |
| **Results and impact within institution** | • Satisfaction/reaction: Assessment evidence provides meaningful feedback about quality and implementation of assessment <br> • Learning: Measures knowledge, skills, attitudes, and/or behaviors <br> • Application: Desired performance demonstrated in other settings <br> • Impact: On progress decisions about learners and on educational programs and/or programs of assessment within institution <br> • Honors and awards within institution |
| **Dissemination outside of institution** | Recognized as valuable by others externally through: <br> • Peer review <br> • Dissemination (Presentations, workshops, publications) <br> • Use by others <br> • Honors and awards nationally |
| **Reflective critique** | • Uses evaluation to guide improvement <br> • Reflection and results used for ongoing improvement of the assessment itself and/or the program of assessment |