

**Abstract: If You Build It, Will They Come? Developing a New Process for Completion of the Annual Academic Performance Evaluation**

**Authors: David Musick, PhD, Shari Whicker, EdD, MEd, Daniel Harrington, MD, Cynda Johnson, MD, and Nicholas Torre, MA**

**BACKGROUND:** Academic productivity has been defined as “a measurable output of a faculty member related to clinical, research, education or administrative activities.”<sup>1</sup> The provision of feedback to faculty concerning their academic roles is not only an accreditation requirement,<sup>2</sup> but is also an good educational practice. There is a need for academic medical centers to “introduce strategies to assess the productivity of faculty as part of compensation schemes.”<sup>1</sup> Such strategies may include an assessment of the educational activities of a faculty member in addition to other activities. In academic medicine, there appears to be a paucity of information available concerning how the educational contributions of medical school faculty are assessed. Our goal was to establish an annual performance review process for medical school faculty that would focus on the assessment of educational productivity, contribute meaningfully to the school’s process for maintenance of faculty appointment, and prove to be useful for meeting accreditation requirements.

**METHODS:** We established an academic performance evaluation as an annual requirement for the approximately 800 faculty members at a new medical school. We implemented the requirement during the 2015-2016 academic year, and it has continued over the following four academic years. We purchased a commercially available database system and modified it to capture various academic activities of faculty, and to generate reports for various end-users. Teaching evaluations for each faculty member were uploaded into the system and available for review by the faculty member and the supervisor. Each faculty member was also required to list participation in professional development activities pertaining to teaching (which is a requirement for maintenance of faculty appointment at our school).

**RESULTS:** Completion of the annual evaluation via online platform was viewed as relatively easy, compared to paper-based previous versions of a similar process. During the first year of implementation, we achieved a compliance rate of 75%; for the most recent four years the rate increased to 95%-100%. In terms of ease of use and acceptability, the electronic method of data capture has proven superior to previous paper-based systems.

**CONCLUSION/DISCUSSION:** Medical school faculty as well as administrative users have positively received the use of a new database system to facilitate an annual academic performance review. The system has made the process of furnishing feedback to faculty on their education activities simpler, and has enabled the school to collect important data on faculty productivity and compliance with faculty development and maintenance of appointment requirements.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Akl EA; Meerpohl JJ; Raad D; et al. Effects of Assessing the Productivity of Faculty in Academic Medical Centres: A Systematic Review. Canadian Medical Association Journal 2012; 184 (11): E602-612.
2. Liaison Committee on Medical Education. Functions and Structure of a Medical School: Standards for Accreditation of Medical Education Programs Leading to the MD Degree (2018). Standard 4: Faculty Preparation, Productivity, Participation and Policies.