

BACKGROUND: When faculty with primary research appointments are evaluated for promotion, there are a number of broadly accepted and relatively simple metrics that can be used to evaluate the quantity, quality, and impact of their work. Most of these metrics have intrinsically embedded information that is useful in the assessment. Examples include reputation of the journals an applicant has published in, an article's citation numbers, and knowledge of the competition required to successfully garner funding from a particular extramural source. Importantly, these metrics also involve rigorous peer review, which for the most part is **outsourced** as part of publication and proposal review processes.

Evaluation of faculty with significant teaching appointments, however, has traditionally been a much more subjective process. At most institutions, evaluating teaching (including both didactic and clinical supervision/precepting) and educational leadership has traditionally come down to teaching quantity, student evaluations, and (sometimes) mostly casual observation by local peers that often read like testimonials. We believe teaching-intensive faculty play essential roles in our colleges. Their teaching, mentoring & advising, educational innovations, and educational leadership are crucial to the continued success and growth of our programs. However, the traditional metrics of faculty success described above are too simplistic and incomplete to assess their impact. As described below, while the WSU Teaching Portfolio provides some additional opportunities to showcase one's teaching philosophy, individual instruction and mentoring, and student successes and outcomes, the five-page restriction does not allow our valued faculty members to showcase their professional activities and impact.

In medical education, the last few decades have seen an extraordinary movement to change existing paradigms relative to the teaching and learning mission. Part of that movement has included efforts to raise the status of health sciences educators, recognize excellence and innovation, reward educational leadership, and (in general) develop systems by which faculty with large teaching responsibilities can be promoted. As an example, [the AAMC \(Association of American Medical Colleges\) has developed the Toolbox for Medical Educators](#), an evidence-based method by which instructional faculty can organize, describe, and report activities and outcomes using a defined set of broadly applicable educational domains.^{Ref 1-8} Among the products of the AAMC Toolbox is an Educator's Curriculum Vitae and a structured "reflective document" or Teaching Portfolio. The AAMC Toolbox has become the model which is being increasingly adopted (with or without modifications) at medical schools across North America. The Consortium of West Region Colleges of Veterinary Medicine (of which WSU is one of 5 founding members) recently published [a modified version of the AAMC Toolbox](#) as part of an initiative to develop a shared and concise process for external peer review of promotion packets. The process is targeted at veterinary medical school faculty with extensive responsibilities in teaching & learning, and/or educational leadership.

THE PROBLEM: As the 4 WSU health science colleges have sought to tap into these new processes, we've come up against the current requirements for promotion packets that are described in the WSU Faculty Manual. Specifically, current language does not allow for a Teaching Portfolio that exceeds 5 pages. This limitation does not accommodate the new toolboxes, nor does it otherwise allow teaching-intensive faculty to persuasively present their cases for promotion and/or tenure (see provided letters from each college).

THE PROPOSAL: After consultation with members of the WSU Faculty Senate, Faculty Affairs Committee, and other WSU leadership, **we are proposing a 4-year pilot experiment** during which the 4

health sciences colleges would be released from the 5 page limitation on the Teaching Portfolio. At the end of the trial period, each college will report back on their experiences and, depending on outcomes, request continuation, modification, and/or expansion. At that time, outcomes can be used to discuss whether the new Teaching Portfolio guidelines should be extended to other colleges and/or across campuses.

Details: Pilot to begin with the fall promotion cycle in 2019. 4 year outcomes reported in spring semester, 2023. Pilot ended or extended; or new university standards proposed and adopted – Spring semester, 2023

DOCUMENT FORMAT:

- For the purposes of promotion and tenure review, each of the 4 colleges will determine their own Teaching Portfolio page limit – up to 25 pages max during the trial (most are likely to be significantly shorter).
- Each college will determine their own goals, select an appropriate Teaching Portfolio format (e.g. subsections, educational domains, etc.), and design an assessment plan.

For example, the ESF College of Medicine is likely to use or modify the AAMC Toolbox for Medical Educators to allow its departments, both those directly involved in the MD curriculum and those that are not (e.g., Speech and Hearing Sciences and Nutrition & Exercise Physiology) to more effectively document their teaching activities and outcomes. The College of Veterinary Medicine is likely to use a modification of the AAMC Toolbox format as published on the Consortium of West Region CVM Teaching Academy (RTA) [website](#). The latter is based on the [UCSF School of Medicine's templated EP 2.0 revision of the AAMC Toolbox](#) and results in a Teaching Portfolio of up to 16 pages.^{Ref 9} The vetmed format consists of a position description, teaching philosophy, 5-year goals statement, executive overview, and 2 page templated descriptions/reflections highlighting up to 5 selected teaching related activities. Importantly, the design prevents applicants from providing multiple pages of uninterrupted text and instead creates a structured, easily reviewable document. If the pilot is approved, the WSU College of Nursing and the WSU College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences will determine independently which Teaching Portfolio format they will use. Formats may be further modified during the pilot period as each college gains experience and gathers data on how well each format meets college and university goals.

After promotion decisions are announced in the spring semester of 2023, the 4 colleges will report back to the WSU Faculty Affairs Committee and request extension, modification, or expansion - or agree to terminate the pilot and return to the current 5-page limit. Outcomes to be reported include:

- a. the number of faculty who applied for promotion and/or tenure using the expanded format,
- b. success rates,
- c. the qualitative experience/assessment of faculty who utilized the format,
- d. the qualitative experience/assessment of senior faculty and college leaders who reviewed promotion packets with expanded Teaching Portfolios,

- e. collated comments or survey results from external reviewers, and
- f. any available qualitative information (feedback) on the experience/assessment of the University Tenure & Promotion Committee and the WSU Provost.

These data will be provided to the Faculty Affairs Committee and WSU Faculty Senate as part of the outcomes report and request (or not) for continuation.

Proposal Leader:

Stephen A. Hines, DVM, PhD, DACVP
Professor of Veterinary Microbiology & Pathology
Berger Keatts Distinguished Professor (Teaching)
Director, [WSU CVM Teaching Academy](http://www.wsu.edu/~cvm/teaching)
WSU College of Veterinary Medicine
sahines@wsu.edu 509-335-6069

The format of the AAMC Toolbox is based on the literature and builds on the findings of the 2006 AAMC GEA Consensus Conference on Educational Scholarship and educator evaluation tools developed by leaders of the Academic Pediatric Association's Educational Scholars Program.

1. Simpson D, Fincher RM, Hafler JP, Irby DM, Richards BF, Rosenfeld GC, Viggiano TR. Advancing educators and education by defining the components and evidence associated with educational scholarship. *Med Educ*. 2007;41:1002-1009. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17822412>
2. Chandran L, Gusic M, Baldwin C, Turner T, Zenni E, Lane JL, Balmer D, Bar-On M, Rauch DA, Indyk D, Gruppen LD. Evaluating the performance of medical educators: a novel analysis tool to demonstrate the quality and impact of educational activities. *Acad Med*. 2009; 84(1):58-66. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19116479>
3. Baldwin C, Chandran L, Gusic M. Guidelines for evaluating the educational performance of medical school faculty: priming a national conversation. *Teach Learn Med*. 2011; 23(3):285-97. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21745065>
4. Gusic ME, Baldwin CD, Chandran L, Rose S, Simpson D, Strobel HW, Timm C, Fincher RM. Evaluating educators using a novel toolbox: applying rigorous criteria flexibly across institutions. *Acad Med*. 2014 Jul;89(7):1006-11. doi: 10.1097/ACM.000000000000233. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24662201>
5. Gusic M, Chandran L, Balmer D, D'Alessandro D, Baldwin C. Educator portfolio template of the academic pediatric association's educational scholars program. *MedEdPORTAL Publications*. 2007;3:626. http://doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.626
6. Chandran L, Gusic M, Baldwin C, et al. APA educator portfolio analysis tool. *MedEdPORTAL Publications*. 2009;5:1659. http://doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.1659
7. Baldwin C, Chandran L, Gusic M. Educator evaluation guidelines. *MedEdPORTAL Publications*. 2012;8:9072. http://dx.doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.9072
8. Gusic M, Amiel J, Baldwin C, et al. Using the AAMC toolbox for evaluating educators: you be the judge!. *MedEdPORTAL Publications*. 2013;9:9313. http://dx.doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.9313
9. Shinkai K, Chen CA, Schwartz BS, Loeser H, Ashe C, Irby DM. Rethinking the Educator Portfolio: An Innovative Criteria-Based Model. *Acad. Med*. 2018; 93:1024-1028. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29116980>