## Name Department of Summary Table of Evaluation Results (see documents for full details)

## Instructions:

- 1. Table is pre-populated with major headings for each table (department, local, regional/nation, and professional activities).
- 2. Table is pre-populated examples; faculty should review examples, remove examples, and type directly into the table.
- 3. Add extra rows as needed.
- 4. Remove rows that are empty.
- 5. There should be data entered into the table for every set of evaluations provided in the dossier (set=single collated report for a given activity in given academic year).

Dates	Department of [department name]	Evaluation Scores [Average]	SD, if available	# of students	Scale used
2018-19	Annual Evaluation by Residents	2.78			(1-3 scale)
2017-18	Annual Evaluation by Residents	2.7			(1-3 scale)
2016-17	Annual Evaluation by Residents	2.45			(1-3 scale)
2015-16	Annual Evaluation by Residents	4.14			(1-5 scale)
2016-17	Annual Evaluation by Medical Students	3.5			(1-5 scale)
2018-19	Evaluation of Resident/Fellow Didactics	4.5			(1-5 scale)

Dates	UVM/UVMMC Courses	Session Title	Evaluation Scores [Average]	SD, if available	# of students	Scale used
Larner College of Medicine Teaching Academy						
2018	Teaching Academy Snow Season Education Retreat	Advancing Medical Education Through Technology	4.57			(1-5 scale)

Name Department of Summary Table of Evaluation Results (see documents for full details)

2016	Teaching Academy Snow Season Education Retreat	Mentoring the Challenging Learner	4.14	(1-5 scale)
2017	Teaching Academy Essentials of Teaching and Assessment Course	Feedback Essentials	4.38	(1-5 scale)
	UVMM	C Quality Improvement & Patient	Safety Essentials Course	
2018	Quality Improvement & Safety Essentials for Residents/Fellows	Course Director (Overall course evaluation)	4.5	(1-5 Scale)
2018	Quality Improvement & Safety Essentials for Residents/Fellows	"The Root Cause Analysis" (Workshop Presenter/Facilitator)	4.52	(1-5 Scale)
2017	Quality Improvement & Safety Essentials for Advanced Practice Providers	Course Director (Overall course evaluation)	4.61	(1-5 Scale)
		[Insert Additional Course	Name]	

Dates	Regional & National	Session Title	Evaluation Score [Average]	SD, if available	# of students	Scale used
2018	Northern New England Chapter of the American College of Cardiology Annual Meeting	Course Co-Director (Overall course evaluation)	4.63			(1-5 scale)
2018	Northern New England Chapter of the American College of Cardiology Annual Meeting	"Heart Failure in Sepsis: A Reappraisal"	4.9			(1-5 scale)
2017	American College of Surgeons Annual Meeting	"Management of High Impact Trauma in Pediatrics"	4.4			(1-5 scale)
2/2/18	Visiting Professor, Tulane University Department of Medicine	"Heart Failure in Sepsis: A Reappraisal"	4.8			(1-5 scale)

## **Professional Activities**

Department of
Summary Table of Evaluation Results (see documents for full details)

American Board of Pediatrics (In-Training Exam Question Writer)	Feedback	Item Quality [based on Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor]
Question Author Feedback	Very Responsive	Excellent
	A few items required reworking due to failing the cover-up test, but responses to my suggestions were immediate. Used novel ways to ask blueprint areas. That creativity was quite welcome.	Item content was appropriate for the assigned content area. References were current, complete, and appropriate
Question Author Feedback	Very Responsive	Good
	Actively participated in dialogue about the questions and demonstrated understanding of how suggested edits would improve the items.	Items demonstrated adherence to formatting guidelines.
Journal of General Internal Medicine (peer reviewer)	Feedback	Average Score
3 reviews	Outstanding critique that is comprehensive, insightful, and well-written, addresses both content and pedagogy, and serves as an exemplar for other reviews.	7.9 (scale 1-9)
	Question Author Feedback  Question Author Feedback  Question Author Feedback  Journal of General Internal Medicine (peer reviewer)	Question Author Feedback   Very Responsive     A few items required reworking due to failing the cover-up test, but responses to my suggestions were immediate. Used novel ways to ask blueprint areas. That creativity was quite welcome.    Question Author Feedback   Very Responsive     Actively participated in dialogue about the questions and demonstrated understanding of how suggested edits would improve the items.    Journal of General Internal Medicine (peer reviewer)     3 reviews   Outstanding critique that is comprehensive, insightful, and wellwritten, addresses both content and pedagogy, and serves as an exemplar

Name

Department of Summary Table of Evaluation Results (see documents for full details)

[Insert additional activity]	[Qualitative data]	[Quantitative data]