

**University of Florida College of Medicine  
Program Evaluation Committee  
August 27, 2021**

**Attendees**

Dr. Eric Black, Dr. Miguel Chuquilin, Dr. Shelley Collins, Dr. Joseph Fantone, Dr. Frank Genuardi, Dr. Heather Harrell, Dr. Lynne Meyer, Alyssa Nielsen, Dr. Peter Sayeski, Dr. Aaron Thompson, Dr. Ashleigh Wright

Recorded by: Sandra Reveille, Administrative Assistant III

Dr. Thompson said he would like to get up to speed on the evaluation subcommittee and talk about needs and opportunities.

**How would you judge the success of this committee?**

The committee is great at gathering details regarding the courses. The committee needs more instruction on interpreting the assessments.

**Are there are opportunities to improve communication of the finding to the stakeholders?**

Dr. Wright said she had a better understanding of evaluations of the course while on the committee than as a recipient of the feedback. Dr. Sayeski said that he thinks the committee does a great job of identifying strengths and weaknesses of the courses and pointing those out to the course directors or clerkship directors but that we could use some improvement. He would like to know to what extent the feedback was implemented. It is also an unknown who implemented the suggestions made by the committee.

Dr. Black said he doesn't see how the recommendations are documented in a way that allows us to revisit them. There is a disconnect between what's desired and what's acted on and there is no communication regarding that.

Student representative said that other debriefing chairs have said that they don't know if the recommendations by the students have been enacted. Students would like to see the results of their recommendations.

Dr. Meyer said she would like to see a standardized template for the syllabi for the course directors to use and for the committee to use to make sure all the syllabi are meeting the required elements. Dr. Sayeski mentioned that Dr. Aris has pushed the template very hard with the course directors.

**Is there any concern in terms of confidentiality of reporting?**

Dr. Sayeski said there was a unique circumstance with a single faculty member.

**Are the best practices identified by the committee shared with the faculty in anyway to fuel ideas and innovation across units or departments?**

Dr. Meyer suggested a session in which the course directors share with each other. Dr. Black said this is a balance between sharing the amount of appropriate amount of information versus too much. He asks what is realistic and feasible. Is it effective to put more things on the web.

Goals: Dr. Thompson would like to take all the evaluations and forms and provide an ongoing report that brings it all together. These are the recommendations that the director made. These are the thoughts of the evaluation committee. Document the changes that were implemented and changes in progress.

Dr. Fantone laid out the details of how the recommendations are currently distributed to the clerkship directors and course directors: Associate Dean to the course director to the individual faculty and learning activity.

### **Is the group involved in faculty development?**

Dr. Sayeski detailed how he works with new faculty to his courses. He said that he details the expectations to his faculty. After the course the MedEd office will send him the evaluations for all the teaching faculty. He then sent those evaluations to faculty.

### **Other Questions and Concerns**

Dr. Fantone said that UFCOM is concerned about the reliability and validity of our exams and how that's applied. He also asked if there are appropriate tools available that we could use to analyze narratives and extract common themes.

Dr. Thompson asked if we get reliability and validity analysis every year, is this something we've already developed. Dr. Fantone said that we get individual test items as well as the individual exams but that we're looking for something more comprehensive and systematic.

Dr. Black and Dr. Genuardi said they would like to see a better differentiation of evaluations/comments related to specific sites (Gainesville, Jacksonville, Villages, etc).

Dr. Meyer asked Dr. Harrell about the recommendations at blue printing. Dr. Harrell said that we are working to develop a process to implement those recommendations but that the point of that exercise was to drive the agenda for the next couple of years of how to improve.

Dr. Sayeski brought up student evaluations of faculty. That students can give myopic or monochromatic evaluations which can affect promotion and tenure.

Dr. Meyer asked if there is a flowchart showing where all data comes from and where it goes. Dr. Sayeski said he's seen a flow chart somewhere.

There was some clarification on what students use to evaluate the faculty. Alyssa said all students get the GatorEvals to evaluate the course but also a daily email from New Innovations to evaluate specific lectures.