

This Evaluation section is from a perfectly scored T32 application submitted by Dr Patrick Gallagher and is being shared as an example with his permission.

Your plan should be tailored to your specific program.

d. Training Program Evaluation

A major component of the Perinatal Medicine training program is evaluation. At the center of this component is a complete “360-degree” evaluation process and delineation of program participant expectations. Trainees will be evaluated by the program and the program/mentors will be evaluated by the trainees. As part of this process, specific expectations are detailed and trainee progress is matched against these benchmarks.

Trainee Evaluations

Trainee Goals and Expectations. The following expectations are in place for Perinatal Medicine trainees: 1. Publications: Each trainee is expected to generate at least one report related to their research per year. Emphasis will be placed on publishing in top-tier journals. 2. Grants: Third and fourth year trainees are expected to apply for one research award per year. 3. Presentations at national meetings. Each trainee is expected to submit abstracts to and present at one (or more) scientific meeting per year related to their research. 4. Independence. All trainees are expected to begin to perform as independent scientists during the last year of program support. Each trainee and mentor is expected to show how the trainee is performing independently. This template of expectations is provided to the SOCs. At the end of every academic year, faculty provide a written review of the fellows and the fellows complete a confidential written review of the faculty and the training program. The Program Director and Section Chief then meet with each trainee individually to discuss the reviews. As part of this process, the trainee is asked to provide oral feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. This feedback is part of a broader *360 degree* evaluation process whereby fellows evaluate their peers, the faculty, and the training program and faculty evaluate the fellows and the program. A final review and interview with each trainee is held prior to graduation from the program.

Scholarship Oversight Committees (SOC). As described above in Individual Trainee Mentor Committees, each trainee has a committee designed to monitor their research progress, at the same time satisfying requirements of the American Board of Pediatrics. SOCs act to evaluate the fellows’ progress twice a year. After each meeting, each fellow is given feedback verbally and in writing. Copies of each SOC report are then sent for review to the departmental Fellowship Oversight Committee. If problems are identified, meetings are held with the fellow, the mentor and the section Program Director.

Struggling Scholars. A high premium is placed on identifying trainees who are struggling. If expectations are not being met, per the above criteria, we will attempt to identify impediments. This evaluation will involve additional meetings with the trainee, the mentor, and the Program Director. At the completion of the process, we will determine what additional resources are needed for the trainee to help overcome problems. If a trainee does not demonstrate willingness to meet expectations or remediation, additional training grant support will be restricted.

Program and Mentor Evaluation

We will continue our current program of evaluation of the program and mentors. Using a web-based, anonymous survey, we assess trainee satisfaction with conferences, courses in our core didactic curriculum, research experience, project mentors, etc. (SurveyMonkey). In addition, fellows and junior faculty (former trainees from the past 5 years) are asked to rate their feeling of preparedness for different aspects of academic medicine, such as biostatistics, research design, grant and paper writing, and public presentation.

Each year, the Program Director meets with the fellows as a group to solicit positive and negative ideas related to the program, courses the fellows take, mentor attributes, etc. We have a long history of embracing and encouraging feedback from our fellows. Reflecting this, the current Fellows’ Conference template has been fellow-generated and changes each year to meet fellow requests.

Finally, all trainees confidentially evaluate their mentor every 6 months, corresponding to the time of SOC reports, in writing. If problems with a mentor are identified, the Program Director meets with the mentor to address and resolve the issues.

External Review

A Perinatal Medicine Fellow Research Day is held on a regular basis. Physician-investigators from other institutions are invited to attend as reviewers. Each trainee presents his/her work, followed by questions and critique. At the end of the session, the invited guests deliver a seminar in their area of expertise. After the research presentations, the guest reviewers meet with the Program Directors and training preceptors for a critique of the trainees and program, providing feedback and suggestions. Past reviewers have included Phil and Roberta Ballard from Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia. The most recent external reviewers (Spring 2010) were Jonathan Davis from Tufts and Jeffrey Reece (a former Perinatal Medicine trainee, now an RO1- funded Associate Professor) from Vanderbilt. Their written reports are included in the Appendix.