

**Medical Education Scholarship Awards
(MESA)**

**Created for the
AAMC-Southern Group on Educational Affairs
(Established 2003)**

by

Sheila W. Chauvin, M. Ed., Ph. D.
SGEA Member-at-Large (2002-2004)
Director, Office of Medical Education Research and Development
Director, Academy for the Advancement of Educational Scholarship
Professor, Department of Internal Medicine and School of Public Health
Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center at New Orleans

Program Description posted at the AAMC-SGEA website:

<http://www.som.tulane.edu/sgea/mesa.htm>

Correspondence to Dr. Chauvin via email (schauv@lsuhsc.edu) and telephone (504-568-2140).

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Introduction and Background	2
General Procedures	3
Composition and Function of the MESA Program Committee.....	3
Identification of Award Recipients	4
Promising Medical Education Scholar Award	5
Outstanding Presentation Award	7
Medical Education Scholarship Career Award.....	8
Evaluation of Program Effectiveness	9
Appendix A: What is the Educational Scholarship?	10
Appendix B: SGEA Medical Education Scholarship Awards (MESA) Program Reviewer’s Instructions	13
Appendix C: AAMC-SGEA Medical Education Scholarship Career Award Nomination Packet.....	18
Appendix D: Medical Education Scholarship Awards (MESA) Program Reviewer’s Feedback Questionnaire	20

**AAMC-Southern Group on Education Affairs
Medical Education Scholarship Awards (MESA)**

. . . Today, scholars are considered to be those academics who conduct research, publish, and then perhaps convey their knowledge to students or apply what they have learned. What is urgently needed today is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar - a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research (discovery), through synthesis (integration), through practice (application) and through teaching.

E. L. Boyer
Scholarship Reconsidered, Priorities for the
Professorate
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of
Teaching
Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1990

Introduction and Background

Medical Education Scholarship Awards (MESA) is a comprehensive professional development program established in 2003 by the AAMC-Southern Group on Educational Affairs and supported by its member institutions. The primary goal of the MESA is to encourage, recognize, and reward promising teaching scholars, achievements in educational scholarship, and distinguished careers in medical education scholarship within the active membership of the SGEA¹. The MESA program includes a criterion-based and peer-review process to facilitate ongoing professional development and involvement in medical education scholarship throughout medical educators' academic careers. Educational scholarship should not be defined narrowly, as it can be represented in a variety of ways other than traditional methods of research and dissemination (e.g., peer-reviewed presentation and publication). The conceptual basis for the program design and the specific criteria used to assess educational scholarship are grounded in the professional literature summarized in Appendix A.

Three award components comprise the MESA program:

1. Promising Medical Education Scholar Award (annual award)
2. Outstanding Presentation Award (annual award)
3. Medical Education Scholarship Career Award (biennial award)

¹ SGEA members include medical educators/faculty members who reside within and are affiliated with one or more of the 42 medical schools located in the SGEA region and who have attended at least one of the SGEA meetings in the previous three years. Students, residents, and fellows affiliated with SGEA member schools are eligible to apply for the Promising Medical Education Scholar Award.

Each award includes the following recognition components:

1. recognition at the annual SGEA business meeting (plaque/certificate of distinction) in the following year;
2. a one-time cash award and a SGEA meeting registration waiver for the annual meeting in the following year, as described for the specific award component (award recipient notified following the annual meeting);
3. a recognition letter from the SGEA Chair to the award recipient's Department Chair and Dean (sent immediately following notification to the award recipient);
4. recognition in the SGEA report of the GEA Update publication and on the SGEA website.

General Procedures

At the time that notifications of acceptance for presentation are sent to first authors, information soliciting self-identification for consideration of the *Promising Medical Education Scholar* and the *Outstanding Presentation* awards will be solicited for these two annual awards. The *Medical Education Scholarship Career Award* is selected based upon peer nominations that shall be due by the deadline for proposal submissions on alternate years, beginning in 2005. A MESA Program Committee is designated by the SGEA Steering Committee to implement the program and identify award recipients. Pre-established criteria and specific procedures that are used for each award purpose are described in this document. For the Promising Medical Education Scholar and for the Outstanding Presentation awards, three phases of peer review are used: 1) proposal reviewers provide recommendations for proposals that merit consideration for one of the MESAs, 2) accepted proposals to the annual meeting and proposal reviewers' recommendations are reviewed by the MESA Program Committee to identify presentations for final consideration, and 3) presentations under final consideration are observed and judged by at least two observers/reviewers during the annual meeting. Results are compiled and used by the MESA Program Committee to identify award recipients for the MESA program. An award recipient for the Medical Education Scholarship Career Award is determined by the MESA Program Committee's review of nomination packets. Up to three finalists are identified and the Committee conducts a semi-structured interview with each of the finalist. Results are used to identify the award recipient. Announcement of award recipients occurs soon after the close of the annual meeting. Awardees are notified at this time and the formal presentation of awards occurs at the annual SGEA Business meeting in the following year. The MESA program is further supported by other activities of the SGEA, such as the Mentoring Program and professional development resources and activities offered by the SGEA RIME section and Faculty Development special interest group.

Composition and Function of the MESA Program Committee

The SGEA RIME Section Chair will serve as Chair of the MESA Program Committee and direct the implementation of the MESA program. During the initial years of implementation, all SGEA Steering Committee members shall serve as members of the MESA Program Committee to ensure broad representation of the membership (e.g., UGME, GME, and CME, Members-at-Large). At the discretion of the SGEA Steering Committee the MESA Program Committee membership may be further defined and revised to ensure continuing success of the MESA program (e.g., establish a Call for volunteers to serve on the MESA committee). However, the RIME Section Chair shall be retained as the Chair of the MESA Program Committee for the duration of his/her term as RIME Section

Chair. Upon completion of his/her term as Chair of the MESA Program Committee, this individual should serve as a member of the MESA Program Committee in the following year (i.e., Past MESA Committee Chair) to advise the new Chair and facilitate continuity and quality of the overall implementation of the MESA program. If the membership of the MESA Program Committee is revised by the SGEA Steering Committee, adequate representation across the SGEA sections (UGME, GME, CME, RIME) and leadership from within the RIME section must be maintained.

When additional peer reviewers are needed, the Committee should involve SGEA members who are already actively engaged in the activities of the RIME section and the Faculty Development SIG and those who have demonstrated a record of educational scholarship (e.g., previous award recipients) to ensure effective support, high-quality implementation, and fair review and assessment of eligible candidates.

Annually, the MESA Program Committee should evaluate and review all aspects of the MESA program structure and operations, and recommend to the Steering Committee areas of refinement and/or expansion. In this way, the SGEA can ensure high quality implementation and continuing value-addedness of the MESA program.

Identification of Award Recipients

Identification of award recipients will be achieved by consensus. In instances where unanimous decisions are not achieved, a majority vote of 2/3 of the MESA Program committee membership shall be required. All deliberations are strictly confidential. Only one award recipient may be selected for each program component. However, the MESA Committee is not required to select an award recipient for every eligible year. Rather, the MESA Committee is responsible for ensuring that the integrity of each award component is maintained by the selection of award recipients. Consequently, decisions about each award will be made within the context of the award criteria and the number and quality of applications/nominations available for consideration. The award recipients are recognized at the annual business meeting in the year following their selection, since final determination for all awards are not complete until the end of an annual meeting (e.g., 2003 recipients are recognized at the 2004 business meeting). Cash awards and plaques are also presented at the annual business meeting. However, recipients of the awards are notified by letter from the SGEA Chair as soon as the MESA Committee has notified the Steering Committee of its decisions -- soon after the close of the annual meeting. All authors are recognized by name in the letter and each co-author receives a copy of the notification and congratulatory letter. A copy of the letter is sent to the first author's school Dean.

Each award component is described in the sections that follow. For each award, a brief description of the purpose and eligible candidates is followed by the application/nomination process, selection criteria, award schedule, and a list of the award features. Questions and requests for additional information should be directed to the MESA Program Committee Chair. During initial implementation of the MESA (i.e., 2003-2005), such questions should be directed to Dr. Sheila Chauvin at schauv@lsuhsc.edu or via telephone at 504-568-2140.

Promising Medical Education Scholar Award

Goal: This annual award is designed to attract and encourage faculty members, fellows, residents, and students to become and remain actively engaged in medical education scholarship and professional collaboration in the SGEA.

Eligibility: Receipt of this award is limited to a single or first author of an accepted proposal presentation. First time SGEA presenters (must be first authors) who are engaged in medical education within the SGEA region² and who meet the member definition included in this document are eligible for this award. Eligible candidates have the option to accept or decline consideration/peer-review at the time they are notified of an accepted presentation proposal. The proposals under consideration must represent completed work that has not been presented or published previously. All presentation formats are eligible for consideration (e.g., poster, abstract presentation, workshop, etc.). Candidates (first authors) must not have been accepted presenters/first authors for any past SGEA annual meetings. Candidates may have been a co-presenter/co-author (e.g., second or third author) on SGEA presentation(s) at previous SGEA annual meetings. They may be currently first author or co-author on other presentations and these may also be under consideration for one of the MESA awards. Candidates (first authors) must be full- or part-time faculty members, fellows, residents, or medical students and must reside in the SGEA region and be affiliated with at least one of the SGEA member institutions. Co-authors may include colleagues who are not SGEA members.

Selection criteria: Criteria established by the annual meeting program planning committee for peer review of proposal submissions will be applied as appropriate to the presentation format during the first phase of peer-review (e.g., clarity, timeliness, review of relevant literature, appropriateness and rigor of research design and methods, results, and so on). A set of educational scholarship criteria will be used for reviewing accepted proposals to determine the final candidates for direct observation and peer review during the annual meeting. The educational scholarship criteria and a set of presentation effectiveness criteria will be used for direct observation, with the results used by the MESA Committee for determining an award recipient. The educational scholarship and presentation effectiveness criteria are listed below and further explained in the Reviewer's materials included as Appendix B.

Educational Scholarship Criteria:

Appropriate to the presentation venue, to what extent did the presenter(s) demonstrate each of the following?

1. Work was guided by clear goals.
2. Work was well-grounded in current knowledge of the field and/or prior research findings (e.g., literature review).
3. Work was based on adequate preparation (e.g., design and implementation).
4. Methods used were appropriate.
5. Significant results were obtained (e.g., positive and/or negative results, creative or innovative approach or design, new or expanded insights to guide future work).
6. Presenter(s) demonstrated reflective critique.
7. Presenter(s) encouraged peer comments/critique.
8. Work was presented in a way that others can build upon it (i.e., reproducible or applicable beyond a single context).

² Eligible applicants for this award are limited to faculty members (full- or part-time), fellows, residents, and medical students who reside within and are affiliated with one or more of the 42 accredited medical schools located in the SGEA region.

Presentation Effectiveness Criteria:

To what extent did the presentation represent the following features?

1. Purpose communicated clearly.
2. Organized and easy to follow.
3. Time for presentation used effectively.
4. Format enhanced sharing information.
5. Presenter(s) was/were well-prepared.
6. Media usage enhanced presentation.
7. Handouts enhanced presentation.
8. Presenter(s) responded effectively to audience questions and comments.
9. Presentation was done in a way that engaged audience.

Review process: Three phases of review are used: 1) proposal reviewers provide recommendations for proposals that merit consideration for one of the MESAs, 2) accepted proposals to the annual meeting and proposal reviewers' recommendations are reviewed by the MESA Program Committee to identify presentations for final consideration, and 3) presentations under final consideration are observed and judged by at least two observers/reviewers during the annual meeting. Results are compiled and used by the MESA Program Committee to identify award recipients for the MESA program.

Phase 1 begins with proposal reviews for the annual meeting. Proposal reviewers are asked to indicate on review forms their recommendations for consideration of the presentation for one of the MESA awards. Once accepted presentations for the annual meeting has been decided, the MESA Program Committee will receive copies of the presentation proposals and results of peer reviewers. All accepted proposals will be reviewed by the MESA Committee and consideration will be given to reviewer's recommendations for inclusion in those presentations considered for the award. Using the scholarship criteria, the MESA Committee will identify a final set of accepted presentations to be observed during the meeting and considered for the award. No minimum or maximum number of presentations is set for the observation phase of peer review. Rather, the quality of submissions and the extent to which the scholarship criteria has been met by the proposal shall be the determining factor. As the program develops, a maximum number of presentations for final consideration may be established. However, determination will be done as part of the annual program evaluation and improvement process, with SGEA Steering Committee approval of such a recommendation from the MESA Program Committee.

Phase 2 involves direct observation of presentations under consideration for the award. At least two peer reviewers will attend each presentation and complete the Reviewer's Form (Appendix B). If the number of applicants exceeds the capacity of the Steering Committee to conduct quality reviews of all eligible applicants, volunteer SGEA members will be solicited to assist in this regard. Close collaboration with the RIME section will facilitate effective review processes. In such instances, one MESA Committee member will observe and assess the proposal presentation to ensure equitable representation in the consensus deliberations leading to the award decisions.

Phase 3 is the MESA Program Committee's use of peer review results for decision-making, identification, and announcement of an award recipient. Peer reviewers will be encouraged to provide narrative feedback that can be shared with award candidates for the purposes of fostering professional development.

Award features: In addition to the general recognition elements listed at the beginning of this document, the *Promising Medical Education Scholar* (first author) will receive a monetary award of \$250

and a registration fee waiver for the SGEA annual meeting of the following year (value = ~\$200). Each author will be recognized at the SGEA annual business meeting and receive a plaque representing the presentation and author contributions. Co-authors are also recognized in any other public recognition statements (e.g., website, annual meeting program).

Outstanding Presentation Award

Goal: This award recognizes the most outstanding medical education presentation at an annual meeting. Identification of the award recipient (individual or multiple authors) is determined using the same review process and set of educational scholarship and presentation effectiveness criteria listed above for the Promising Medical Education Scholar award. The award recipient may not be the recipient of any other SGEA recognition awards in the same year (e.g., Promising Medical Educator Scholar). Only one award may be given annually.

Eligibility: SGEA members (as defined in this document) who are engaged in medical education within the SGEA region³ and who meet the member definition included in this document are eligible for this award. Eligible candidates have the option to accept or decline consideration/peer-review at the time they are notified of an accepted presentation proposal. Only accepted proposals that are presented by the submitting author/co-authors may be considered. The proposal under consideration must represent completed work that has not been presented or published previously. All presentation formats are eligible for consideration (e.g., poster, abstract presentation, workshop, etc.). Candidates may be first author or co-author for other SGEA presentations and these may be under consideration for an award. Candidates (first authors) must be full- or part-time faculty members, fellows, residents, or medical students and must reside in the SGEA region and be affiliated with at least one of the SGEA member institutions. Co-authors may include colleagues who are not SGEA members.

Selection criteria: The selection criteria used for the Outstanding Presentation Award is the same as described above for the Promising Medical Education Scholar award.

Review process: Applicants who are first authors of accepted proposals will be peer-reviewed and considered by the MESA Committee. The same review process described above for the Promising Medical Education Scholar is used for this award.

Award features: In addition to the general recognition elements listed at the beginning of this document, the Outstanding Presentation Award will receive a monetary award (\$250) and a registration fee waiver for the SGEA annual meeting of the following year (value = ~\$200). Each author will be recognized at the SGEA annual business meeting and receive a plaque representing the presentation and author contributions. Co-authors are also recognized in any other public recognition statements (e.g., website, annual meeting program).

³ Eligible applicants for this award are limited to faculty members (full- or part-time), fellows, residents, and medical students who reside within and are affiliated with one or more of the 42 accredited medical schools located in the SGEA region.

Medical Education Scholarship Career Award

Goal: This biennial award recognizes full- or part-time faculty members in the SGEA who have achieved a distinguished level and significant record of educational scholarship, medical education accomplishments and contributions, and continuing commitments to enhancing medical education in the SGEA through activities such as, but not limited to, educational research, highly effective teaching and learning, enduring educational materials, program and/or curriculum development, faculty development, and/or demonstrating educational leadership. In addition, the award is intended to recognize individuals who demonstrate ongoing collaboration within and beyond the SGEA region to achieve increasing levels of educational excellence and to promote educational scholarship. Nominations and selection of award recipients, and announcement of award recipients, occur during odd-number years. Award recipients are invited to present an Invited Address at the annual meeting of the immediately following year (even numbered years). NOTE: This award has been initiated with the 2005 annual meeting Call for Proposals.

Eligibility and Nomination Process: Active members of SGEA (as defined in this document) who are full- or part-time faculty members must be nominated by at least three individuals: one must be from the nominee's affiliated institution and two must be affiliated with other SGEA member institutions. All nominators must demonstrate first-hand knowledge of the nominee's involvement in medical education and achievement of educational scholarship. While it is not required, nominators are encouraged to communicate their intentions to the nominee, prior to submitting the nomination packet (shown as Appendix C). Nominators and nominees are responsible for assembling and submitting all documentation supporting the nomination as outlined in the program procedures. In considering potential nominees, individuals are encouraged to consider carefully the selection criteria listed below.

Selection Criteria: The MESA Program Committee shall use the conceptualization of educational scholarship as it is described in Appendix A as a core set of educational scholarship criteria (e.g., attributes identified by Shulman (1999), Hutchings and Shulman (1999), and Glassick (1997, 2000)). In addition to the attributes of educational scholarship, the following criteria will be used to guide the MESA Committee's decision-making:

1. active SGEA participant in the organization and annual regional meeting for at least six of the past ten consecutive years;
2. evidence of a sustained and compelling record of educational scholarship for at least the past five years;
3. evidence of ongoing educational leadership and significant involvement in enhancing educational programs at his/her academic institution (e.g., regular sharing and dissemination of work, innovation);
4. evidence of collaboration with others (e.g., faculty colleagues, students, residents, clinicians, and other professionals in the field) at his/her academic institution and beyond (e.g., regional, national, and/or international) to enhance teaching effectiveness, the quality of educational programs, professional development of self and others, and/or the advancement of educational scholarship; and
5. evidence of strong professionalism values.

Review process: A Call for Nominations for this biennial award will be solicited via the SGEA annual meeting announcement at the time of the Call for Proposals (via printed mailings and website). The

deadline for receipt of nomination packets will coincide with the deadline for submitting presentation proposals. No extensions of the deadline will be allowed, except in extreme, extenuating circumstances and only upon recommendation of the MESA Program Committee and approval by the SGEA Steering Committee. The MESA Program Committee shall review all qualified nomination packets to identify no more than three finalists. The MESA Program Committee will conduct an interview with each finalist for the purpose of enhancing their understanding of the achievements in educational scholarship of the candidate. The Committee will plan a semi-structured interview protocol based on the selection criteria and the nomination packets for use during the interviews to ensure clarity, consistency, and fairness in these processes. The results of the nomination packets and interviews will be used by the Committee to determine an award recipient. Identification of award recipients will be achieved by consensus. In instances where unanimous decisions are not achieved, a majority vote of 2/3 of the committee membership will be required. All deliberations are strictly confidential. Only one award recipient may be selected for this award. However, the MESA Committee is not required to select an award recipient for every eligible year. Rather, the Steering Committee is responsible for ensuring that the integrity of each award component is maintained by the selection of award recipients. Consequently, decisions about each award will be made within the context of the award criteria and the number and quality of nominations available for consideration. For this award, the MESA Program Committee will submit with their decision a statement summarizing the distinguishing achievements and contributions of the award recipient for which their decision was based. This statement will be used as part of the recognition/award features.

Award features: In addition to the general recognition elements listed at the beginning of this document, the *Medical Education Scholarship Career Award* recipients are recognized at the SGEA business meeting, receive a \$500 cash award and a recognition plaque in the year of the award announcement. Biennial award recipients will be selected and announced during odd numbered years and they will be invited to present an Invited Address at the annual meeting in the immediately following year (even-numbered years). A registration fee waiver will be awarded to the recipient for the SGEA annual meeting during which the Invited Address is given (value = ~\$200).

Evaluation of Program Effectiveness

Initial development of the program description was subjected to reviews and comments by the SGEA Steering Committee. The general consensus was that the program model was conceptualized well and that the document was clear and easy to use. A few suggestions for wording and phrasing were provided and these were incorporated into the final version that was then posted on the AAMC-SGEA website and used for the initial implementation at the 2004 annual meeting. Based on the experiences and feedback during initial implementation, minor refinements were made to produce this updated version of the MESA program description. A similar process of draft-review-comment-revision was used for developing the Reviewer's materials (Appendix B).

A questionnaire was developed to obtain peer reviewer's perceptions of the program implementation effectiveness, and suggestions for improvement or further development. The questionnaire consisted of 15 items for which a 5-point Likert response scale was used (A(1) = Definitely No to E(5) = Definitely Yes). Four open-ended questions were included to obtain narrative (qualitative) responses. A debriefing session is also used by the MESA Program Committee immediately following the annual meeting to review and evaluate the effectiveness of the program implementation. Recommendations for improvements and/or expansion of the MESA program are forward to the Steering Committee for approval. The MESA Program Committee Chair directs the inclusion of approved improvements, so these are in place prior to the subsequent annual meeting.

Appendix A: What is the Educational Scholarship?

Based on a Brief Overview of the Professional Literature
Written by Sheila W. Chauvin, M. Ed., Ph. D. (1997)

In 1989, Ernest Boyer and Eugene Rice, at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, conducted a large-scale, national survey of faculty members in higher education (responses received from 5,000 faculty members). Since then and encouraged by the work of this group, a debate regarding faculty roles and rewards in higher education has been fueled, and it continues even today. Boyer (1990) proposed new conceptions of scholarship that included four types: discover (research), synthesis (integration), practice (application), and teaching. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997), Shulman (1999) have expanded on these conceptions, specifically the scholarship of teaching and how it might be validly and reliably assessed. These contributions to the professional literature have shed new light and prompted rich discussions regarding what constitutes teaching scholarship.

In 1999, the Association of American Medical Colleges sponsored, as one of its national working projects, further inquiry regarding the scholarship of teaching in medical education contexts. The SGEA was well represented in this project by members Rhee Fincher, MD (Medical College of Georgia) and Gary Rosenfeld, PhD (University of Texas at Houston). This collaborative project resulted in a series of publications regarding the scholarship of teaching that appeared in the September 2000 issue of *Academic Medicine*. Several SGEA members have developed and implemented models promoting the advancement of educational scholarship in medical education and have presented at the SGEA, national, and international meetings. These presentations and publications summarize and extend the early work by Boyer and others mentioned previously and they provide multiple perspectives of educational scholarship, consistent with the intentions of the SGEA Medical Education Scholarship Awards (MESA) program. While professionals continue to struggle with identifying and measuring educational scholarship, contributions in the literature and initiatives such as the one undertaken by the SGEA refine the attributes associated with educational scholarship and differentiation from simply being a highly effective teacher or educational administrator.

So, what defines educational scholarship and how can it be represented and assessed? Several contemporary researchers have contributed significantly to defining the scholarship of teaching. While continued efforts facilitate consensus on a set of clearly articulated attributes, a variety of authors can help us conceptualized and operationalize educational scholarship for the SGEA MESA program and for guiding our own professional development. Brief summaries, mostly in the form of bullet lists, are shared below. Additional details and explanations can be found in the selected citations of the reference list located at the end of this Appendix.

Shulman (1999) states that scholarship must represent the following attributes:

- The work must be made public
- The work must be available for peer review and critique according to accepted standards
- The work must be able to be reproduced and built upon by other scholars

Hutchings and Shulman (1999) argue that teaching becomes scholarship when the following attributes are observed:

- Teaching demonstrates current knowledge of the field and findings about teaching
- Peer review is invited and encouraged
- Teaching includes attention to and inquiry about the nature of students' learning
- Teaching is public and open to evaluation
- Teaching is presented in ways that others can build upon it

Glassick (1997, 2000) builds upon Boyer's work (1990) and offers six standards of excellence that can be applied to examining and determining the extent to which teaching has been pursued as scholarship. They are summarized in terms of teaching as follows:

- Clear goals – purpose of teaching and learning is defined clearly; goals are clear, realistic, and achievable; important questions are identified about teaching and learning
- Adequate preparation – understanding of existing scholarship in the education field (generic and discipline-specific); adequate skills and resources are demonstrated relative to the specific teaching and learning endeavor
- Appropriate methods – educational methods fit goals and are used effectively; methods are modified as necessary to accommodate situational changes
- Significant results – goals are achieved; the scholar's work contributes substantially to others (e.g., learners and colleagues) and to the field; the scholar's work is open to further exploration (e.g., self, by others, collaboratively with others)
- Effective presentation – appropriate style and methods are used to communicate teaching conceptions and practices to others; communication about teaching, learning, assessment, and other aspects of professions education are clear and accurate
- Reflective critique – scholar engages in self-reflection and critique and uses insights to enhance and/or expand on prior work (e.g., teaching, understanding of learning processes, assessment and evaluation, advising, curriculum and program development); evidence of one's work is shared publicly and critique is welcomed; critique and evaluation results are used to improve the quality of future work

References

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Fincher, R. E., Simpson, D. E., Mennin, S. P., Rosenfeld, G. C., Rothman, A., McGrew, M. C., Hansen, P. A., Mazmanian, P. E., Turnbull, J. M. (2000). Scholarship in teaching: An imperative for the 21st century. *Academic Medicine*, 75(9), 887-894.
- Glassick, C. E. (2000). Boyer's expanded definitions of scholarship, the standards for assessing scholarship, and the elusiveness of the scholarship of teaching. *Academic Medicine*, 75(9), 877-880.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*, An Ernest L. Boyer Project of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hafler, J. P., & Lovejoy, Jr., F. H. (2000). Scholarly activities recorded in the portfolios of teacher-clinician faculty. *Academic Medicine*, 75(6), 649-652.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations and developments. *Change*.
- Shulman, L., (1999). The scholarship of teaching. *Change*, 31(5), 11.
- Simpson, D. E., Marcdante, K. W., Duthie, Jr., E. H., Sheehan, K. M., Holloway, R. L., & Towne, J. B. (2000). Valuing educational scholarship at the Medical College of Wisconsin. *Academic Medicine*, 75(9), 930-934.

Appendix B: SGEA Medical Education Scholarship Awards (MESA) Program Reviewer's Instructions

<Month, Year>

Dear Reviewer:

Thank you for participating as a peer reviewer for the initial implementation of the MESA program. Criterion-based peer review is a major component of this program and your commitment to educational scholarship is appreciated very much. Specific instructions for reviewers have been included on the next page. Please read these carefully now to ensure that presentation reviews are completed consistently across reviewers. Of course, please let me know if you have any questions.

Your input and suggestions are very important to refining the process and materials for future development of the MESA. Additional materials have been given to you for the purpose of obtaining your specific assessment and input for improving this program. Please be sure to return these after you have completed all of your reviews and definitely before leaving the SGEA meeting. We need to hear from each reviewer.

Please check now to be sure that you have all of the materials listed below:

1. MESA program description document
2. Presentation review packets (includes reviewer's form, copy of presentation proposal, proposal reviewer's ratings and comments)
3. Reviewer's Instruction Sheet for conducting the presentation reviews and completing the reviewer's form
4. Peer reviewer's evaluation and feedback materials

If you are missing anything, please see <Name of On-site Coordinator> immediately. S/he, will be available throughout the meeting to support your efforts for the MESA. Please contact her at the registration desk if you need assistance or any additional information. As soon as you have completed the presentation reviews in this packet, please return them to <Name of On-site Coordinator>, so she may enter the results into the program database. Of course, please let me know at any time if you have questions or if I may assist you in any way.

Again, thank you very much for your involvement in the initial implementation of the SGEA MESA program.

Sheila W. Chauvin, Ph. D.

**2004 SGEA Medical Education Scholarship (MESA) Program
Reviewer's Instructions**

General Guidelines:

1. Reviews are completed independently.
2. At least two reviewers have been assigned to each presentation under consideration.
3. Reviewers are asked to maintain confidentiality. Please do not identify yourself as a reviewer to the authors/presenters or disclose to other reviewers any information about the specific presentation reviews that you have been assigned or the results of your assessments of these.
4. Please maintain the confidentiality and security of review materials.
5. Reviewers must attend the full duration of each presentation for which they have been asked to complete a review.
6. Return your completed presentation reviews in the labeled envelope to <Name of On-site Coordinator> at the registration desk. Your cooperation in returning these as soon as possible following the session will be greatly appreciated.
7. Please contact either <Name of MESA Program Committee Chair> or <Name of On-Site Coordinator> at any time you have a question or need assistance.

Prior to Observing Presentations:

1. Read the MESA program description to refresh your familiarity with the intention and criteria for the Promising Medical Educator and Outstanding Presentation awards. Pay particular attention to the explanation of Educational Scholarship included in this document (Appendix A).
2. Familiarize yourself with the Reviewer's Form and complete the top of each form with the presentation information (i.e., Reviewer's Name and Signature, Presentation Title, First Author/Presenter's name, Session in which the presentation was observed), if this has not already been provided.. Please print clearly and make sure that the Award Consideration and Presentation Format sections have been marked correctly.
3. Read each presentation proposal and accompanying proposal reviewer's assessments.

Completing Presentation Reviews:

1. Take brief notes during each presentation that reflect the criteria shown on the Reviewer's Form and provide narrative feedback. Please do not complete the Reviewer's Form during the actual presentation, as it is important for you to observe the entire presentation (including presenter interactions with the audience members that may occur near the end of the session) before making your assessments. Consider all available opportunities that the first author/presenter had to demonstrate the criteria and the extent to which these were used effectively. Remember to be reasonable in your assessments. For example, there is considerably less time and opportunity to share information about one's work during a 14 minute oral presentation than during a one-hour poster presentation or a 90-minute workshop.
2. Immediately following the session during which you have observed presentations for the MESA program, please complete a Reviewer's form for each presentation you have been assigned in that session. Please be sure to use your notes to facilitate accurate recollection and assessments. The following points for each set of criteria are provided to assist you in your assessments:
 - a. ***Eligibility Criteria:*** Based on the presentation and accompanying proposal abstract, please mark an X in the appropriate cell (YES/NO) for each criterion. Please be sure to include any specific comments or observations that you would like the MESA Program Committee to consider.

[Please continue on the back of this sheet.]

- b. **Scholarship Criteria:** Items 3 – 10 represent key features of educational scholarship that may be reflected in research or the development of enduring educational materials, programs, or processes that is presented by an author/presenter. For each item, please mark an X in the cell corresponding to the one response that best reflects your view. These criteria are applicable to educational scholarship of various forms, and not just research. Therefore, if a criterion is applicable, then mark your assessment using the *Definitely No – Definitely Yes* scale. However, if you did not observe evidence of the criterion either because it was not applicable, in your judgment, or there was no opportunity to observe it during the presentation, then mark *Did Not Observe*.
- c. **Presentation Criteria:** Items 11 – 19 represent aspects of the effectiveness with which the presenter communicated his/her work to the audience members and the extent to which interactions enhanced sharing this work with colleagues. Please mark an X in the cell corresponding to the one response that best reflects your view. Please follow the same approach as described above for the Scholarship Criteria for using the *Definitely No – Definitely Yes* and *Did Not Observe* response choices.
- d. **Narrative Comments/Feedback:** Your comments will be used by the selection committee in determining award recipients. Following completion of the award determinations, your verbatim comments will also be shared with the first author/presenter. Please focus on relating your comments to the specific criterion ratings and be as specific as possible in terms of what you saw and heard during the presentation. Suggestions for enhancing educational scholarship and/or presentation effectiveness are encouraged, and these should also be specific and based on the criteria and observed presentation. Please do not make global judgments or statements comparing one presentation to another or indicating your personal recommendations for award selections. The committee will use the combined ratings and comments provided by reviewers in making these determinations. NOTE: Reviewer's names will be removed prior to sharing your feedback to first authors/presenters.

Submitting Your Completed Reviews:

1. For each completed review, please clip your completed Reviewer's Form on top of the presentation proposal abstract and proposal reviewer's rating form. Double check to make sure you have completed all sections and signed the top of the Reviewer's Form.
2. Place all review packets in the manila envelope provided.
3. Seal the envelope and sign your name across the back of the seal.
4. Return your envelope directly to <Name of MESA On-site Coordinator> at the registration desk.
5. Please be sure to return your reviews as soon as possible following the presentation. <On-site coordinator> will be compiling these data throughout the meeting, so results will be available to the MESA Selection Committee immediately following conclusion of the annual meeting. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Reviewer's Feedback:

Please be sure to complete and return your Reviewer's Feedback packet when you submit your last set of presentation reviews. Your assessment and feedback is very important to the future success of the MESA program.

Thank you!

<MESA Program Committee Chair>.

**SGEA MEDICAL EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIP AWARD PROGRAM
REVIEWER'S FORM**

Presentation Title: _____
 First Author/Presenter: _____
 Session: _____

<p>Award Consideration (check one):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Promising Medical Educator Scholarship Award</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding Presentation Award</p>	<p>Presentation Format (check one):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Oral Presentation/Discussion Session (check type below) ___ Research/Evaluation/Educational Development ___ Position Paper ___ Review of the Literature</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Poster/Display</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Workshop</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
--	--

Eligibility Criteria	Yes	No	Comments
9. Presentation represented completed work			
10. First author presented the work			

Scholarship Criteria	Definitely No (1)	No (2)	Not Sure (3)	Yes (4)	Definitely Yes (5)	Did Not Observe
<i>Appropriate to the presentation venue, to what extent did the presenter(s) demonstrate each of the following?</i>						
11. Work was guided by clear goals.						
12. Work was well-grounded in current knowledge of the field and/or prior research findings (e.g., literature review).						
13. Work was based on adequate preparation (e.g., design and implementation).						
14. Methods used were appropriate.						
15. Significant results were obtained (e.g., positive and/or negative results, creative or innovative approach or design, new or expanded insights to guide future work).						
16. Presenter(s) demonstrated reflective critique.						
17. Presenter(s) encouraged peer comments/critique.						
18. Work was presented in a way that others can build upon it (i.e., reproducible or applicable beyond a single context).						

Presentation Effectiveness Criteria	Definitely No (1)	No (2)	Not Sure (3)	Yes (4)	Definitely Yes (5)	Did Not Observe
<i>To what extent did the presentation represent the following features?</i>						
19. Purpose communicated clearly.						
20. Organized and easy to follow.						
21. Time for presentation used effectively.						
22. Format enhanced sharing information.						
23. Presenter(s) was/were well-prepared.						
24. Media usage enhanced presentation.						
25. Handouts enhanced presentation.						
26. Presenter(s) responded effectively to audience questions and comments.						
27. Presentation was done in a way that engaged audience.						

Please write your comments on the back of this form.

Appendix C: AAMC-SGEA Medical Education Scholarship Career Award Nomination Packet

NOTE: This award will be initiated with the 2005 annual meeting. Nomination packets must be complete and comply with guidelines set forth in this document to be considered by the selection committee. Please be sure to read this document carefully, and if questions arise, contact Dr. Sheila Chauvin for clarification (Telephone: 504-568-2140 ; Email: schauv@lsuhsc.edu).

The nomination packet must contain the following materials:

1. ***Nomination Form*** - a standard form completed by the nominators that includes a brief narrative developed by the group of nominators highlight the achievements and contributions of the nominee and explaining why this individual should receive the award. Nominators should be clearly identified on this form using the spaces provided. (Remember, one nominator must be from the Nominee's institution and the others must be affiliated with other SGEA member institutions.) NOTE: In instances where obtaining original nominator signatures on the form may be problematic, a single page letter of nomination from each nominator with an original signature may be attached to the form.
2. ***Educational Scholarship Vita*** - similar to the format of a curriculum vita, this document is typically developed by the nominee, but may be developed by the nominators as well. This special vita should outlines the nominee's teaching and educational activities, accomplishments, and contributions that are indicative of educational scholarship. It may include sections, as applicable to the candidate's focus of achievements and scholarship, such as teaching, course and curriculum developments, program development, instructional design, educational technology, enduring educational materials and assessment/evaluation developments, educational research, advising and mentoring, leadership and service). Entries in this vita may include short descriptive passages or appended materials that provide evidence of scholarship, exemplary achievement, and/or significant contributions in medical education. Care should be taken in selecting such appended materials to ensure that the purpose for inclusion is clear and that it significantly enhances what is already communicated in the body of the vita.

SGEA Medical Education Scholarship Career Award Nomination Form

We, the undersigned, believe _____ is most deserving of the SGEA Medical Education Scholarship Career Award. The statement below summarizes the basis for our nomination, including a summary of the strength of evidence included in the Educational Scholarship Vita.

(Word limit = 500 words)

Nominators:

Name: _____ Date: _____

Department/Position: _____

Academic Institution: _____

Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____ Date: _____

Department/Position: _____

Academic Institution: _____

Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____ Date: _____

Department/Position: _____

Academic Institution: _____

Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____ Date: _____

Department/Position: _____

Academic Institution: _____

Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Appendix D: Medical Education Scholarship Awards (MESA) Program Reviewer's Feedback Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: For each item, please use the scale below and circle the letter that corresponds best to your response.

Definitely No < A-----B-----C-----D-----E > Definitely Yes

Regarding your participation as a MESA reviewer, to what extent did you experience each of the following:

1. I had sufficient information in advance of completing presentation reviewsA B C D E
2. Materials provided about the peer review process facilitated my effectiveness
as a reviewerA B C D E
3. I had sufficient time to prepare for completing my assigned presentation reviews.....A B C D E
4. I had sufficient time to complete my presentation reviews.....A B C D E
5. I felt confident in my ability to perform presentation reviews effectivelyA B C D E
6. The MESA program implementation was well organizedA B C D E
7. Administrative support was available when I needed assistance.....A B C D E
8. The MESA peer review process was implemented in a way that enhanced fairness.....A B C D E
9. Two reviewers for each presentation was sufficient for determining award recognitionA B C D E
10. MESA reviewers should complete a face-to-face orientation/training (e.g., as a
pre-conference session).....A B C D E
11. Participating as a MESA reviewer was worth my timeA B C D E
12. I would serve again as a MESA reviewerA B C D E
13. The criteria established for assessing presentations fit well with the intention of
14. the *Promising Medical Educator Scholarship Award*A B C D E
15. The criteria established for assessing presentations fit well with the intention of
- the *Outstanding Presentation Award*A B C D E
16. Overall, the MESA program promotes educational scholarship among SGEA members.....A B C D E

[Please continue on the back of this form.]

Please provide specific narrative responses to each of the following questions:

17. What were strengths and/or features that worked particularly well for the initial implementation of the MESA program?

18. What are targets or areas in need of improvement for future implementation?

19. What specific suggestions do you have for finalizing the MESA program description, reviewer's forms and instructions? (Feel free to write your suggestions directly on a copy of the materials and include with this questionnaire.)

THANK YOU!

[Please be sure to return this completed form to <On-Site Coordinator> at the registration desk
before you leave this meeting.]