

# Teacher Effectiveness Scores

**From POWER Steering Committee:**

**1. Inclusion of Frequency Distribution, Mean, Median and Mode on Teacher's Effectiveness Screen:**

- Request for a Frequency Distribution screen (similar to the screen in MedSIS ) and inclusion of the Mean, Median and Mode. The inclusion of these components will produce more meaningful data for instructors.

**2. Changing TES Base Calculated from a Five Point Likert Scale:**

- TES settings for programs were surveyed. It was discovered that the majority of programs calculate their teacher's overall TES scores out of 10, even though the scales for each question are on a 5-point scale.
- During the March 28<sup>th</sup> POWER Steering Committee meeting, Dr. Imrie asked that a group convene to discuss the impact of TES base score scales being different from the Likert scales.
- The Working Group on Teaching and Rotation Effectiveness Reporting examined this issue at their April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. This group recommends that the TES base scores be changed to a 5-point scale to reflect the Likert scales.

PGMEAC, May 25, 2012



# Medicine

## UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

### Post-Graduate Education 2011-2012: Teacher Effectiveness Summary

**C O N F I D E N T I A L**

August, 2012

**Teacher:**

Division:

Hospital Affiliation:

	1*	2	3	4	5	Mean	Median	Mode
Q2 Support	0	20	130	90	50	3.59	3	3
%	0	6.9	44.8	31	17.2			
City-Wide	0.1	1.1	7.2	31.1	60.6			
Q3 Encouraged	0	20	60	90	110	4.04	4	5
%	0	7.1	21.4	32.1	39.3			
City-Wide	.1	1.0	7.9	33.6	57.4			
Q4 Meaningful feedback	10	40	60	120	60	3.62	4	4
%	3.4	13.8	20.7	41.4	20.7			
City-Wide	.4	1.8	11.2	33.3	53.3			
Q5 Demonstrated respect	0	0	50	100	140	4.31	4	5
%	0	0	17.2	34.5	48.3			
City-Wide	.4	1.2	5.9	25.3	67.3			
Q6 Demonstrated respect for others	0	0	50	70	170	4.41	5	5
%	0	0	17.2	24.1	58.6			
City-Wide	.2	.8	5.8	26.2	67.1			
Q7 Stimulated learning	0	0	70	130	90	4.07	4	4
%	0	0	24.1	44.8	31			
City-Wide	.3	1.1	7.3	28.3	63.0			
Q8 Good role model	0	10	60	110	110	4.1	4	
%	0	3.4	20.7	37.9	37.9			
City-Wide	.3	1.1	6.9	27.7	64.0			
Q9 Overall Evaluation	0	20	80	110	80	3.86	4	4
%	0	6.9	27.6	37.9	27.6			
City-Wide	.3	.8	8.8	32.7	57.4			

\* For Q2 to Q8: 1= never or very poor – (this teacher needs help with this); 2= occasionally or needs improvement; 3= frequently and adequately; 4= usually and skillfully; 5= always and exemplary – (should be a role model for all teachers).

\* For Q9, 1=Terrible learning experience and/or learned nothing useful; 2=Unpleasant experience and/or learned very little; 3=Good experience and/or learned an adequate amount; 4=Very good experience and/or learned more than expected; 5=Exceptional experience and/or learned a tremendous amount.

Faculty Evaluation 2010-2011 Year 3

Number of evaluations completed: 12  
 Number of students in your group: 12

Your TES score is 7.93 (base 10)  
 The TES Score is computed from the questions marked with \*\*\*.

**Question Score Summary:**

The following table indicates your distribution of responses, i.e. the NUMBER of students who selected each rating option for each question. The Mean Values section indicates the mean score you obtained on each question, as well as the mean value for other teachers (if applicable).

- "Same Hosp Department" = All teachers of the same activity at the same site and same hospital department

Questions	Rating Scales					Mean Values	
	Poor 1/5	Fair 2/5	Average 3/5	Good 4/5	Excellent 5/5	This teacher	Same Hosp Department
* Enthusiasm for teaching medical students	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	4.29
* Challenges thinking	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	4.39
* Teaching in the OR	0	0	4	8	0	3.67	4.35
* Provides constructive feedback	0	0	7	2	3	3.67	4.17
* Overall rating of teacher	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	4.36

**TES ± 1 Standard Deviation**

