THE STANDARDS-BASED APPROACH TO FELLOWS SELECTION

Procedures for selecting Academy Fellows have systematically developed from year to year toward the goal of implementing a rigorous, non-competitive process of peer review. Last year, the process took one more step toward this goal. Any faculty member submitting a portfolio that a peer review panel judges to meet the published standard will be selected for the Academy.

Modeled after standard-based selection procedures at other institutions (e.g., Baylor College of Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch), the standard for selection is defined by five ‘standard-setting’ examples. These examples are loosely based on actual CUMC faculty. They indicate the amount of evidence needed and they also illustrate the diversity of the types of evidence that can be included.

The peer review panel will compare each submitted portfolio to the published standard. Reviewers will individually compare, for each of the three criteria, the “weight of evidence” in each submitted portfolio to the “weight of evidence” in the standard-setting example(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>% of weight</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of activities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Quantity evidence includes duration, time commitment, number of learners, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of activities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Quality evidence includes peer and/or student evaluations, awards, invitations to contribute outside one’s school, learner/mentee outcomes etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scholarship associated with activities | 20%        | Six nationally recognized criteria of scholarship will be used: 
  • clear goals, 
  • adequate preparation, 
  • effective methods, 
  • meaningful results, 
  • engagement (i.e., sharing results with peers, invited presentations or workshops, publications, etc 
  • reflective critique for continuous improvement. |

DISCLAIMER ABOUT CHANGES FROM ORIGINAL PERSON

All standard-setting portfolios are based on one or more CUMC faculty, but have been altered in the standard-setting process. As you consider the “weight of the evidence” included in each portfolio, focus on the actual evidence included. Avoid focusing on what you may know about the actual person(s).

Remember that your goal in preparing your portfolio is to make the case that the weight of evidence you submit is at least as much as the weight included the individual examples. In other words, remember that the comparison will be between the submitted evidence (yours and the example), not between you and the real person(s).
Consistent with the recommendations of the 2006 Consensus Conference on Defining Educational Scholarship, the Glenda Garvey Teaching Academy recognizes that faculty educational contributions can be classified into multiple categories:

- Teaching
- Evaluation
- Mentoring
- Leadership/Curriculum Design
- Research

In the first three categories faculty are directly involved in promoting or assessing learning. The other two categories represent important supportive activities but in which faculty are only indirectly involved with learning and assessing.

All educational activities are important to the CUMC. All are vital to the educational mission. Nevertheless, this year, faculty interested in being considered for membership in the Glenda Garvey Teaching Academy, should focus their portfolio on teaching, evaluating, mentoring and/advising activities only. This is an interim limitation due to the complexity of preparing standard-setting examples in multiple categories. The selection committee anticipates having these standard-setting examples ready in other categories in the future.