

## Supplemental Digital Appendix 1

### Association of American Medical Colleges Group on Educational Affairs/Group on Faculty Affairs/Group on Women in Medicine and Science Educator Task Force Survey, 2011

The goal of the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Task Force on Educator Evaluation is to establish consensus guidelines to be used in the evaluation and advancement of faculty whose major career focus is education in academic health centers and teaching hospitals. The questions on this survey focus on the promotion and tenure process for educators at your medical school. You are receiving this survey because of your faculty affairs related leadership role in your institution. We ask that you please forward this brief survey to the person who is currently serving as the chair/leader of the body charged at your medical school with responsibility for evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure.

The survey will take <10 minutes to complete and results will be kept confidential. All responses will be pooled with individual identifiers excluded during the analysis and dissemination with comments identified only by role/type of institutional affiliation. By completing this survey, it is understood that you have consented to have your responses included in the summarized survey results and disseminated. As one of a limited number of key informants, *your response to this survey is critical and will* inform our work.

1. Your medical school level rank and tenure committee/group related title (e.g., Chair, Rank and Tenure Committee)
2. Type of institution ( Check all that apply)
  - a. School of Medicine (SoM) affiliated with a Public University
  - b. School of Medicine (SoM) affiliated with a Private University
  - c. Teaching hospital affiliated with a SoM
  - d. Teaching Hospital not formally affiliated with a SoM
  - e. Other - Please specify
3. At your institution, are any individuals promoted primarily on their achievement as educators?  
Yes                      No
4. From your perspective, are faculty members seeking promotion primarily as educators appropriately successful at your institution or affiliated SoM? (CIRCLE ONE)  
  
Highly Unsuccessful    Unsuccessful    Neutral    Successful    Highly successful
5. Are educators eligible for tenure at your institution?  
Yes                      No

6. From your perspective, are faculty seeking tenure primarily as educators appropriately successful at your institution or affiliated SoM? (CIRCLE ONE)

Highly Unsuccessful   Unsuccessful   Neutral   Successful   Highly successful

7. How many educator tracks exist at your institution?

None   One   Two   Three   More than three

8. Does your institution have a “teaching academy” or society for educators?

Yes   No

9. Is the submission of an educator portfolio like document required or recommended for promotion packages?

- a. Yes, required for all packets
- b. Yes, recommended for all packets
- c. Yes, required but only for packets in the “educator” track
- d. Yes, recommended but only for packet in educator track
- e. No, not required for any packet
- f. No, not recommended for any packet
- g. I am unaware of what this document is

10. How much do you agree with the following statement:

“Educator tracks” at your institution or affiliated SoM are valued (e.g.: academic rights/privileges/stature) at par with traditional promotion pathways. (CIRCLE ONE)

Strongly disagree   Disagree   Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

11. On a scale On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being very important, please indicate the importance of the following elements in *promotion and advancement* determinations at your institution as it is practiced now and as it should be ideally.

**Enter a 1-5 rating in both right-hand columns.**

ELEMENT ↓	IMPORTANCE →	NOW	SHOULD BE
a. Teaching hours per year			
b. Breadth of audiences taught (e.g. UGME, GME, CME, Other Health Professionalism, community)			
c. Evidence of quality of teaching			
d. Impact of faculty member’s teaching ( institutional, regional, national, international)			
e. Development of new/improved curricula/educational materials			
f. Evidence of quality of curriculum/educational materials			
g. Evidence of impact of curriculum/educational materials			

<b>ELEMENT ↓</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE →</b>	<b>NOW</b>	<b>SHOULD BE</b>
h. Development of new/improved learner assessment methods/tools			
i. Evidence of quality of new/improved learner assessment methods/tools			
j. Evidence of impact of learner assessment methods			
k. Mentoring/Advising of Trainees/Junior Faculty			
l. Evidence of Quality of Mentoring/Advising of Trainees/Junior Faculty			
m. Evidence of impact of mentoring/advising trainees or junior faculty			
n. Role as an Educational Leader ( course/ clerkship director, residency director etc)			
o. Evidence of quality as an educational leader ( administrative improvements)			
p. Evidence of impact as an educational leader			
q. Survey results from outside agencies ( ACGME, LCME etc)			
r. Grants/Contracts for Education			
s. Collaborative work with other educators (dept/school)			
t. Induction into a teaching academy/society ( write N/A if not applicable)			
u. Active involvement/leadership in the teaching academy/society (write N/A if not applicable)			
v. Attendance at regional/national educational meetings			
w. Active Involvement in regional/national educational committees/workgroups			
x. Leadership in regional/national educational committees/work groups			
y. Active Involvement in regional/national educational organizations			
z. Leadership in regional/national educational organizations			
aa. Involvement as reviewer/editorial board member for medical education journal/portal (e.g., AAMC MedEdPORTAL, POGOe)			
bb. Evidence of educational scholarship emanating from work ( presentations, publications, grants, patents)			
cc. Other ( please specify)			

12. In determining the quality of an individual educator's work, rate the importance of the following at your institution.

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Not Used
a. Student ratings/feedback					
b. Peer ratings/feedback					
c. Comparative ratings (candidate relative to a peer group)					
d. Local service to education-related committees, working groups					
e. Induction into a teaching academy or society					
f. Evidence of adoption of the educator's work outside the institution					
g. Evidence of peer reviewed scholarship (national/regional presentations, publications, MedEdPORTAL)					
h. Evidence of national recognition (awards, appointment/election to national committees, editorial boards)					
i. Evidence of educational grants/funding					
j. Evidence of regional/national service/citizenship (e.g., reviewer/editorial board of journal, portal; medical education organization involvement/leadership)					
k. Other (please specify)					

13. Additional thoughts (FREE TEXT)