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Objectives

• Identify key PD leadership and administrative attributes
• Design a PD administrative and leadership assessment tool and process
• Assess PD administrative and leadership abilities
• Describe methodologies for PD feedback
• Illustrate how assessment data can be used for sponsoring institutional oversight
Mayo School of GME

- Founded by Mayo Brothers 1915
- 280 total programs (164 ACGME)
- 1,620 trainees (1,430 ACGME)
- Fully integrated system
- Separately accredited programs
Mayo School of GME Structure

Graduate Medical Education Committee (GMEC)

Five Graduate Education Committee (GECs)

- Mayo Clinic in Arizona
  - 39 Programs
  - 172 Trainees

- Mayo Clinic in Florida
  - 42 Programs
  - 211 Trainees

- Mayo Clinic in Rochester Medicine & Pediatrics
  - 51 Programs
  - 473 Trainees

- Mayo Clinic in Rochester Medical & Laboratory
  - 74 Programs
  - 395 Trainees

- Mayo Clinic in Rochester Surgery & Surgical
  - 50 Programs
  - 437 Trainees
Education

• Basics of education constitute a continuous improvement cycle

http://www.leanleader.org/2012/02/you-better-make-sure-continuous.html
http://www.dreamstime.com
Assessments

• Assessment and feedback form the foundation of learning in GME
Who Assesses Whom?

• Faculty of resident
• Resident of faculty
• Allied health staff of resident
• Peer of peer
• Residents of program
• Faculty of program
• ACGME of program
Less Formal, but Critical

- Applicants of program
- Applicants of trainees
- Faculty of department/division
- Faculty of institution
ACGME Requirements

30 “Evaluation” References in Common Program Requirements
ACGME Required Assessments

- Annual Program Evaluation
- Annual Institutional Review
- Competencies
- Milestones
- Entrustable Professional Activities
- ACGME toolbox for evaluation types
- Self-studies
Identified Gap

http://www.thecanyon.com/
What about the Program Director?

• Critical Role
• No requirement for assessment
Program Director Responsibilities

http://www.entrepreneur.com/article/225865
http://simpledaze.com/tag/multitasking/
http://preventdisease.com/images13/multitaskingfff4980_n.jpg
What’s been published?

Search terms:
- Program director assessment
- Program director evaluation
- Residency program director assessment
- Residency program director evaluation
- Program director development
- Residency program director development
PD Characteristics
Mayo Clinic PD Expectations

• Commitment and dedication to program
• Concern, interest and respect for trainees
• Education/practice (service) balance
• Formal, at least semi-annual, review of trainee performance
Mayo Clinic PD Expectations

- Use feedback to improve program
- Encourage trainees to participate in quality improvement and patient safety projects
- Encourage trainees to complete scholarly projects for presentation/publication
Mayo Clinic PD Expectations

• Monitor and ensure appropriate faculty supervision
• Ensure trainee concerns are managed in a timely and fair manner
• Demonstrate integrity and accountability
• Inspire
Assessment Tool Development

- Workgroup of GME staff and PDs
- Develop an instrument to assess PD effectiveness as administrators and leaders
- Develop guidelines for confidential PD feedback
- Track experience to refine the process moving forward

Mayo Clinic in Florida Initiative

- Idea generated by Florida colleagues
- Initiated pilot in 2013
- 3 ACGME-accredited residencies
- 62% response rate (18 of 29)
Dissemination

• 2014
  • Trainees in 64 ACGME-accredited programs with more than 5 trainees
  • 66% response rate (831 of 1,255)

• 2015
  • Trainees in all 238 programs surveyed
  • 64% response rate (1,021 of 1,599)
Process

- Survey administered by GME office
- PD informed of assessment (critical)
- Two-week survey period
- Data reviewed by GME office
Now You Have It, What Do You Do With It?
How would you handle…

• Negative feedback in small program?
• Polarized feedback in a large program?
• Consistent negative feedback in a large program?
Scenario 1
Negative Feedback in a Small Program

PD assessment in your new clinical cardiac electrophysiology program (single fellow program) is poor, comments include:

• Program director does not treat me with respect
• I feel belittled
• Conferences have little faculty participation
• When I bring up problems, the program director refers to me as “high maintenance”
Scenario 1: Key Points

• Gather additional information
• Ensure confidentiality
• Strategies to address
  • Pool evaluations
  • Seek additional sources
Scenario 2
Mixed Feedback in a Large Program

PD assessment in surgery is polarized. About 2/3 of the residents are enthusiastically positive and make comments like:

- Great resident advocate
- Fun to work with
- Role model
- Great guy who interacts with us beyond the workplace
Scenario 2
Mixed Feedback in a Large Program

However, about 1/3 of the residents are negative. Their comments include:

- Clear “favorites” who get best assignments
- Relationships outside of work (city league soccer team) provide some residents with preferred access
- Not overtly sexist, but borderline humor at times makes me uncomfortable
- Counseled me to not display emotion after a patient death
Scenario 2: Key Points

- Gather additional information
- Must address:
  - Perception of favoritism
  - Concerns regarding sexism
  - Disproportional access to PD
- Prevent retaliation
- Clear discussion and feedback
Scenario 3
Negative Feedback in a Large Program

Program director assessment in internal medicine is mostly negative, comments include:

• Ineffective advocate for program, meek and not listened to by department leadership

• Tries to do well, but unable to implement change

• I am not always able to attend didactic sessions and told “practice comes first”

• Very, very nice person who means well
Scenario 3: Key Points

• Gather additional information
• Identify mentor(s)
• Engage department/division leadership
• GME office support
• Consider alternative options
Survey Results

• Results shared with DIO, associate deans and administrators

• Feedback provided during annual associate dean and PD meetings (protecting confidentiality)

• Data not shared directly
2015 Survey Results

- Programs with responses: 200
- Average Score: 4.75
- Minimum: 2.17
- Maximum: 5.00
- Median: 4.92
- Std. Deviation: 0.42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># Responded</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Survey Results

- No PD less than 2.0
- 2 PDs less than 3.0 (in one person programs)
- 9 PDs less than 4.0
- 113 PDs less than 5.0
- 76 PDs rated 5.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th># of Programs</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 to 1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 to 2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 to 3.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 to 4.9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>1021</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Survey Results

- Program size did not significantly impact average response rate or average score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th># of Programs</th>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Avg Response Rate</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Were Results Consistent Across Questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education / service balance</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to program</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee concern &amp; respect</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal feedback</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate feedback</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly projects</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty hour compliance</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty supervision</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee concerns</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity &amp; accountability</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Slightly satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Selected Questions
### By Graduate Education Committee

### Education / Service Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med-Peds</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Lab</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commitment to Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med-Peds</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Lab</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

• 52% of respondents included comments
Summary

• Pleased with response rate
• Trainees, like faculty, are generous graders
• Identified clear outliers
• Comments required for meaningful feedback
• Relatively consistent across specialties
• Confidentiality limitations in small programs
How Were Data Used to Improve?

• Initiated special review
• Mentorship assignments for program directors
• Composite results used for Sponsoring Institution PD development program
• PD recognition
Program Director Award 2016

Susan Wilansky, M.D.
Arizona

W. David Freeman, M.D.
Florida

Beth Schueler, Ph.D.
Medical & Laboratory Specialties

Kyle Klarich, M.D.
Medicine-Pediatrics

Stephanie Heller, M.D.
Surgery & Surgical Specialties
What’s Next?

• Realization PD development was sporadic and program-specific

• Learning by doing no longer an option
  • “…does not possess the requisite administrative experience acceptable to the Review Committee…”
  • “…proposed program director has been…at the current institution for almost 3.5 years, and is still a junior faculty member…”
PD Development

- Recognized need for standardized PD training and development in topics of:
  - Administrative skills
  - Accreditation
  - Evaluation
  - Mentorship
  - Curriculum development
  - Recruitment
  - Resident with a problem
Aspirational

• Extend similar assessment, feedback and development for core faculty and education program coordinators/administrators
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