

## **Evaluation of Faculty Providing Clinical Teaching Policy**

Approval Authority: Senate

Established On: 2012/03/01

Amendments: 2022/06/16

Category: Academic

---

### **1.0 OVERVIEW**

Faculty evaluation is critical to ensuring high-quality medical education and the continued professional development and growth of the Clinical Faculty members. NOSM University values its learners' ability to be reflective and is committed to continuous quality improvement. Through evaluation and feedback, greater individual insight may be attained thus advancing the professional growth of each Clinical Faculty member providing teaching.

NOSM University is committed to supporting diversity and inclusion among all members. We proactively strive to construct a safe and inclusive environment by respecting each other's dignity and privacy. The Faculty Affairs Portfolio also supports the culture of reflection and continuous quality improvement in faculty teaching including facilitating, lecturing, tutoring and clinical teaching. One of the ways in which Faculty Affairs accomplishes this goal is by promoting, supporting, and coordinating the evaluation of faculty by learners at all levels.

The evaluation and feedback tools used by Faculty Affairs are primarily but not exclusively based on the CanMeds competencies:

- Communicator,
- Leader,
- Collaborator,
- Scholar,
- Medical Expert,
- Professional, and
- Advocate.

The tools aim to measure faculty in the broad areas of supervision, teaching, and professional behaviour.

### **2.0 PURPOSE**

The purpose of the document is to outline the policy and procedures for evaluations and assessments. This Policy ensures that evaluations completed about Clinical Faculty are obtained in a confidential and consistent format. The evaluations should provide useful feedback to faculty, allow for identification of issues, be presented to Clinical Faculty in a consistent and productive manner and provide data that can be standardized across teaching and over time. In the case where advice or remedial assistance is required, this

policy will outline the necessary steps to be taken when disciplinary or other actions are required. When necessary, establish sanctions and report to the appropriate authority.

### 3.0 PROCEDURE FOR CLINICAL TEACHING EVALUATION FORMS

At the end of each clinical placement, each learner shall complete an electronic faculty evaluation form for their primary Clinical Faculty teacher(s).

Learners may include:

- Undergraduate learners in the Undergraduate Medical Education Program
- Residents in the Postgraduate Medical Education Programs
- Physician assistant trainees in the Physician Assistant Program
- Resident and undergraduate learners rotating from other training programs where the learners have a reasonable opportunity to evaluate the clinical teaching faculty member
- Other Health Sciences learners

### 4.0 CLINICAL TEACHING EVALUATION REPORTS

Faculty evaluation reports are created after receiving a minimum of three (3) completed evaluations. This, however, may be waived in exceptional circumstances. All faculty evaluation reports shall be sent to the faculty member being evaluated, and where available, the appropriate Section Chair. If no Section Chair exists, the report shall be forwarded to the Clinical Sciences Division Head. The Evaluation Coordinator shall have the responsibility of retaining the forms in a confidential electronic file.

The following individuals may request copies of **Anonymized\*\*** faculty evaluations or report at any time:

- The faculty member
- The Section Chair
  - Learning Environment Incident Report Lead
  - Program Directors/Phase Leads
- The Clinical Sciences Division Head
- Vice Dean(s) or Associate Dean(s) of each academic portfolio
- The President and Vice-Chancellor

### 5.0 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

NOSM University collects evaluation information for the purpose of program improvement. Evaluation information may be shared with the education programs as required to administer learner programs. Information will be protected in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

## 6.0 INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

NOSM University adopts what is known as the "Vanderbilt Model" (see Appendix A in the [Clinical Sciences Professionalism and Code of Conduct Policy and Procedures](#)) which is premised on the notion that the vast majority of faculty members will have no issues with professionalism, but in those instances where a professionalism concern arises, and where the circumstances permit, the Section Chairs will use a staged approach to investigate the situation.

- A. When assessing a Clinical Faculty member, the Section Chair, Learning Environment Incident Report Lead or the Clinical Sciences Division Head may consider any or all of the following:
  - i. Any prior faculty evaluation reports
  - ii. Reliable information which has been received by the President, Vice Deans and/or Associate Deans, Program Directors, or other Clinical Faculty leaders.
  - iii. Information received from or provided by the Clinical Faculty teacher.
- B. The Section Chair's, Learning Environment Incident Report Lead's or Clinical Sciences Division Head's report shall include information considered and the sources of such information. The results of the investigation including any remediation plan, disciplinary actions, and leaves of absence from academics shall be recorded in the faculty member's file. In situations where additional follow-up may be required from a specific program, the appropriate Associate Dean will be notified accordingly.
- C. The evaluation, feedback and any subsequent discussion are intended and expected to provide the Clinical Faculty teacher with greater insight into one or more of the broad instructional domains: supervision, teaching, and professional behaviour.
- D. After the Section Chair, Learning Environment Incident Report Lead or Clinical Sciences Division Head has met with the clinical teaching faculty member, or has provided the clinical teaching faculty member with a reasonable opportunity to meet, then the Section Chair or Division Head shall make a final decision.
- E. The final decision shall be one of the following:
  - i. Satisfactory – in all domains.
  - ii. Satisfactory with areas of weakness of one or more of the domains. In this case, the Section Chair (where available), the Learning Environment Incident Report Lead and/or the Clinical Sciences Division Head shall settle upon a remedial course with the faculty member and where elements of the remediation are completed or ongoing.

- iii. Unsatisfactory – where in the opinion of the Section Chair (where available), the Learning Environment Incident Report Lead or the Clinical Sciences Division Head substantial areas of weakness in one or more of the domains are present. In such cases, the Section Chair, Learning Environment Incident Report Lead or Clinical Sciences Division Head shall follow the Clinical Sciences Professionalism and Code of Conduct Policy and Procedures documents.
- iv. Unsatisfactory non-remediable - where in the opinion of the Section Chair (where available), the Learning Environment Incident Report Lead, the Clinical Sciences Division Head and/or the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs that the faculty member is non-remediable. In such cases, the Section Chair, the Learning Environment Incident Report Lead, Clinical Sciences Division Head or Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs shall proceed with the Clinical Sciences Professionalism and Code of Conduct Policy and Procedures documents
- v. Circumstances requiring immediate action - where the Section Chair, the Learning Environment Incident Report Lead or Clinical Sciences Division Head receives information which causes concern that interaction by a clinical teaching faculty member with a learner has resulted in serious misconduct then the Section Chair, the Learning Environment Incident Report Lead or Clinical Sciences Division Head shall follow the Clinical Sciences Professionalism and Code of Conduct Policy and Procedures documents.

### **7.0 EVALUATIONS OF CLINICAL TEACHING AND ELIGIBILITY FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION**

The Section Chair or the Clinical Sciences Division Head may choose to review evaluation reports when determining a faculty member's eligibility for reappointment and promotion but need to act with caution since learner evaluations are only one mechanism of measuring teaching effectiveness.

### **8.0 RELATED DOCUMENTS**

University Documents and Information

- [Clinical Sciences Professionalism and Code of Conduct Policy and Procedures](#)
- Feedback Template (Faculty Affairs internal document)

**AUTHORITIES AND OFFICERS**

The following is a list of authorities and officers for this policy:

- i. Approving Authority: Senate
- ii. Responsible Officer: Clinical Sciences Division Head
- iii. Procedural Authority: Clinical Sciences Division Head
- iv. Procedural Officer: Director of Faculty Affairs

**Review and Revision History**

**Review Period:** 5 years or as required

**Date for Next Review:** 2027

**\*\*Anonymized means no learner or faculty member is named.**

**Developmental History**

Date	Action
2012/03/01	Approved by Academic Council
2022/06/16	Senate Approval