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To Maximize Resident Input/Feedback

1. Shorter forms (<10 items) with text options
2. Frequent sampling to capture all teaching activities (clinical, didactic, procedural)
3. Multiple avenues for Resident input
	* Rotation Evals
	* Short experience Evals (i.e. end of shift; procedure)
	* Real time immediately following didactic experience
	* A feedback mechanism mentioned by both programs and residents as a particular best practice involved using a “stoplight” system to collect informal feedback during resident meetings. Chief residents would spend time during regular resident meetings asking about “green,” “yellow,” and “red” teaching behaviors. Green means highly effective techniques to continue utilizing, yellow means teaching behaviors to monitor or utilize with caution, and red means teaching behaviors that should be discontinued. The chief residents would ask about 2-3 faculty members each meeting so that all departmental faculty members had been discussed by the end of the year. This informal feedback would be relayed to the Program Director after each resident meeting, and the Program Director would then pass feedback along to faculty. Residents reported feeling like this form of feedback was routinely acted upon and had weight, and faculty appreciated having more immediate feedback on their teaching.
4. Residents should be provided regular (at least annual) education regarding evaluation confidentiality, how NI aggregates data and what an aggregate faculty feedback report looks like, preferably with a blinded report as a direct example.

To Maximize Feedback to Faculty

1. Programs should ensure that aggregate resident evaluations of faculty are distributed regularly to faculty.
	1. The work group will be meeting with a New Innovations content expert to determine if there might be ways to automate this process or more easily provide access to aggregate reports to faculty.
2. Along with Chairs, Program Directors should be involved in delivery of feedback to faculty, as their content expertise appears likely to contribute to higher faculty satisfaction with feedback. In order to further enhance content expertise in this area, a Program Director development session on providing feedback to peers will be provided in spring of 2023.
3. Departments should utilize a template for annual faculty reviews and involve faculty in the process of completing this template to encourage self-assessment. Teaching and educational activities should be built into performance/value metrics and reflected in the template
4. cHOP was mentioned multiple times as a particularly valuable resource for faculty development, both for group and individual faculty development.