Kuwait Institute for Medical Specialization
Clinical Faculty (Tutor) Evaluation

Section I: Intoruction

The structured training program at Kuwait Institute for Medical Specialization is based on acheivment of milestones and rotation goals and objectives. The goals and objectives are based on CanMEDS physician competencies. The role of Clinical Tutor in the program is essential to achieve the learning and educational goals of the program. Hence, continouos faculty development in the area of medical education is part of KIMS strategic goals.

The Office of Accreditation and Quality Affairs had developed an ongoing quality indicators for KIMS activities including admission, clinical rotation and examination. This policy guide the residents in the evaluation of clinical tutors based on their learning experience of CanMEDS focusing on the area of teaching, supervision and role modeling.

This policy outline the process of completing the form, collectiong the data and utilizing the data by the program directors, postgraduate training committees and The Scientific Council to make decision regarding the faculty development and estalishing the outcome.

Section II:

Definitions

Site Coordinator: a member of the postgraduate training committee responsible for residents in each training site.

Clinical Tutor: a physician with a rank of *senior registrar or above* with a responsibility to oversight the training of resident in the training site.

Postgraduate training committee: the educational committee of the specialty training program established as per KIMS bylaws.

Issued 2015
Revised 2018
Revised 2021
Revised Feb. 2025

Kuwait Institute for Medical Specialization
Clinical Faculty (Tutor) Evaluation

The Scientific Council: the Institutional Postgraduate Education Committee of KIMS and is established as per KIMS bylaws.

Section III: Scope
This policy apply to all faculty tutors who hold a faculty position at Kuwait Institute for Medical Specialization, responsible for teaching, assessing, and/or supervising learners.

It is recognized that information about faculty teaching, supervision and behaviour in the learning environment can be obtained from learners in a variety of formats including but not limited to: written evaluation reports, meetings with program director, survey and PGME internal reviews

Section IV: The Policy
1. The faculty evaluation process adheres to the principles of transparency, confidentiality, and procedural fairness.

2. The program director or delegate must inform all faculty members about the program processes for faculty evaluations, including but not limited to:
   - Activities which must be formally evaluated.
   - Impact of teaching evaluations in renewal of contract processes.
   - Frequency of receipt of collated evaluations.
   - Individuals who will have access to the information.
   - Individual(s) who will debrief with faculty members on evaluations.
   - Process to be followed if concerns are raised by collated faculty evaluation and/or other sources of documented feedback.
   - Relevant policies, including but not limited University process for appeals.

3. Inherent and recognized power differentials exist between faculty members and learners. The process of faculty evaluations must be designed to protect the identity of individual learners.

4. In a formal complaint process and/or investigation, while the anonymity of learners cannot be maintained, confidentiality will be provided.

Issued 2015
Revised 2018
Revised 2021
Revised Feb. 2025

5. Learners must be protected from reprisal in the evaluation of faculty members for teaching and supervision in educational programs.

6. Each educational program will assess faculty members academic activities using and/or developing tools. The methods of data collection and frequency may vary.

7. Evaluation data will be collected and confidentially stored for a minimum of seven years.

8. Faculty members should be recognized for excellence in teaching and supervision.

9. Concerns regarding faculty teaching, supervision and/or behavior must be addressed in a timely, procedurally fair, and consistent manner.

10. If there is a substantial perceived risk or safety concern to one or more parties, the matter may be escalated to the proper authorities internal or external to KIMS, as appropriate.

11. The site coordinators are the most responsible persons to ensure residents complete the clinical tutor evaluation.

12. The residents are responsible for completing the **"Tutor Evaluation Form"** at the end of the rotation and submit the completed forms to the program director or program assisstant.

13. The program director or designee reviews data regularly as received and report immediate concern to the PGTC and/ or PGME Office.

14. The program director will inform the PGTC of the collected data on tutor evaluations.

15. Each program will analyze the data annually and submit the report to the PGTC, and the PGE Office.

Issued 2015
Revised 2018
Revised 2021
Revised Feb. 2025

16. The Faculty Development will utilize the data to develop the educational and training programs to improve faculties' competencies.

Section V: The Procedure

1. <u>Collection and Distribution:</u> Each residency program is responsible to ensure the completion and distribution of faculty evaluations from learners who complete educational experiences with faculty within their own program
   - At the end of each rotation the resident shall complete the "Tutor Evaluation Form" for each clinical tutor in the rotation.

   - The completed form will be delivered to the program director or program assisstant.

   - The resident might request a meeting with the site coordinator or the program director to address any concern or emerging issues.

   - Each program ensures faculty evaluations are available for review by program disgnated person.

   - Faculty evaluations will remain within the faculty member's primary program.

2. <u>Review of Evaluation Reports</u>
   Please note this is a general outline and program processes may vary. Each program must define their process for review of faculty evaluations and ensure that it is clearly communicated to faculty members.

   - The program director or designee will review the forms in timely manner and inform the PGTC and/ or PGE Office of any concern or emerging issues reported by the resident.

   - The Program Director or defined delegate must review aggregated faculty performance data when available

Issued 2015
Revised 2018
Revised 2021
Revised Feb. 2025

- The responsible person in the program will review and analyze the data annually by September of the academic year.

- The review of evaluations with faculty tutors by the program director should define areas of strength and potential areas requiring improvement.

- The final report and evaluation shall be one of the following
  - Satisfactory
  - Satisfactory with areas to improve
    The program director will offer advice to the clinical tutor or refer the matter to postgraduate office.
  - Unsatisfactory
    The program director will meet the residents and clinical tutor for feedback and refer the matter to Postgraduate Education Office if needed.

- The report will be delivered to:
  - The **Clinical Tutor** for professional development and feedback
  - The **Program Director** for each program to be discussed at the PGTC of the program and take necessary actions.
  - The **Office of Postgradute Education** for storage and to address concerns and issues requiring administrative intervention.

3. The clinical tutor shall appeal the final evaluation of the report to the appeal committee of KIMS with 30 days of receiving the report.

Section VI: Process for Reviewing Concerns identified about faculty tutor:

1. Concern(s) may arise from the evaluation report and/or other modes of documented feedback about faculty teaching and/or supervision of learners and/or professionalism.

2. The program director will inform the PGTC or PGME office at KIMS if significant concerns are raised on the evaluation report or other sources of documented feedback from learners.

Issued 2015
Revised 2018
Revised 2021
Revised Feb. 2025

3. Once the information is received and reviewed by the program director, the process to be followed will be determined based on the nature of concerns and previous performance evaluation data (e.g., repeated concerns, previous interventions etc.).

4. Following review of the concerns, including previous performance information, the program representative should identify the areas requiring support including but not limited to
   - Creation of a positive learning environment
   - Effective teaching and assessment strategies
   - Appropriate supervision
   - Professionalism

5. If the concerns are considered egregious in nature, including but not limited to:
   - Serious professionalism breaches
   - Issues with supervision, resulting in potential risks to patients or learners.
   - Concerns with clinical competence

   The Program director should seek input from others, including but not limited to the Chair/Division Head, and PGME office.

6. Concerns of faculty tutor performance raised outside of the written faculty evaluation process requiring further action must be shared with the PGME, depending on the nature of the concerns.
   - Concerns brought forward by learners outside the written evaluation process must consider confidentiality if maintenance of anonymity is not possible.
   - Where appropriate, consent should be sought from the learner to extend the circle of confidentiality.

7. Discussion with faculty members by program director should include the following:
   - Relay the concerns outlined by the documentation and/or verbal feedback from learners and the impact on the learners.

Issued 2015
Revised 2018
Revised 2021
Revised Feb. 2025

- Discuss the faculty member's interpretation of the concerns and give opportunity for selfreflection and sharing of contributing factors that may influence performance.
- Shared development of an individualized educational plan and identification of required resources and support.
- Shared plan for monitoring for improvement and timelines for review.
- Discussion of consequences if no significant improvement.