



31 May 2019

Professor Klaus Puschel MD, MPH, MSc
Director
Centre for Medical and Health Professions Education
Faculty of Medicine
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Dear Dean Heusser, Director Puschel and Vice Director Sirhan

On behalf of the panel/ASPIRE we thank the Centre for Medical and Health Professions Education, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile for its interest in receiving internationally recognised for faculty development through the ASPIRE Awards. We acknowledge and appreciate the effort and investment of time to develop and submit an application. After carefully considering all the evidence provided by the application against each of the Award's criteria, the panel/ASPIRE regrets that the Award cannot be offered to the Centre at this point in time. However, the reviewers identified a member of categories that merit commendation in your application.

The ASPIRE program for Faculty Development utilizes peer reviewers from around the world who have distinguished themselves for their experience and understanding of Faculty Development. Each application is sent to three independent panellist members who review a school's application and separately record their observations. They then interact with each other and arrive at a consensus recommendation related to both individual components of the application and an overall recommendation of whether to award the ASPIRE recognition. This recommendation is then reviewed by the ASPIRE board and only then is the decision made for each of the applications. It is important to remember that while recognition for exemplary status is an understandable goal for each applicant, the underlying reason for the existence of ASPIRE is to promote peer review and encourage improvement especially for schools not yet judged as achieving exemplary status in the various sub-categories of the ASPIRE application. It is with this goal in mind that the feedback to you has been gleaned from this peer review process and offered to you for your consideration.

This letter provides specific feedback on the application with the intent to inform further development of this important area of academic work at your school, with the potential for a future re-application for this category of ASPIRE award.

Several of the criteria may have been misinterpreted and answered with information provided that did not address criteria. In an attempt to supplement the information provided, the panel also reviewed publicly available information on PUC, Faculty and Centre websites, and searched for relevant publications authored by Centre staff.

Several of the Centre's strengths were clear in the application, which the Panel/ASPIRE would like to commend. These are:

- *A well-established program of formal courses in health professions education, including the AMEE affiliated ESME, Diploma, Masters and more recently, the FAIMER affiliated Fellowship. Until recently there has been steady growth in the numbers and range of participants who now predominantly are external participants enrolling in the online option.*
- *Efforts to increase the accessibility and reach of courses by developing an online option, opening the course to all health professions and institutions in the region, and offering some scholarships or fee subsidies.*
- *Comprehensive program evaluation services for all Faculty courses with an enviable student response rate providing longitudinal as well as cross sectional reports to track improvements.*
- *Some evidence of*
 - *regional leadership through*
 - *collaborations on current topics in health professions education, and*
 - *publications and conference presentations, as well as*
 - *delivery of internationally endorsed faculty development courses*
 - *impact of faculty development activities by the mandatory requirement for all new Faculty academic staff to complete the diploma since 2016*

It should be noted that the Award's scoring system requires that application meets each and all criteria, with scores then being averaged across all criteria and sub-criteria to reach a final score. So we provide specific feedback on the rating form and below highlight key points with the aim of assisting the Centre to consider another application.

Criterion 1.1

While the Centre's goals were clearly stated, there was no indication of how they aligned with wider Faculty goals and priorities.

Criterion 1.2

This section would be stronger with a description of the processes that the Centre uses to purposefully identify learning needs, set goals, design, implement and evaluates its faculty development activities. The published evaluations cited are from 2012 and 2014. The criterion requires evidence of recent and ongoing improvement activities.

Criterion 1.3

This section could be much stronger. The main evidence cited is renewal of the medical curriculum, but the Centre's role in this is not specified. There was no information about the impact of the course on graduates, whether they had subsequently initiated educational innovations, conducted scholarly activities in teaching and learning, taken up leadership roles in the Faculty or been promoted. It is likely too early to judge the impact of the 2018 FAIMER Fellowship.

Criterion 2.1

This section was relatively strong, although the Panel wondered about the extent to which the Centre had adapted or provided original contributions to the international AMEE and FAIMER offerings. There was no mention of informal activities such as mentoring, coaching, meetings and interest groups to build a community of practice in the Faculty.

Criterion 2.2

The information provided did not address the criterion, although the Panel was able to locate this information (eg the move to online delivery, inclusion of other health professions, and scholarships) in other sections. Typically applications will use this section to show how they have actively targeted under-represented groups in university leadership such as females and minority ethnic groups.

Criterion 2.3

This section largely relied on inter-institutional collaborations on specific topics. Other possibilities could be how graduates of the courses sustain connections and interactions, regular events and meetings of Faculty staff with interests in teaching and learning etc.

Criterion 3.1

This section was relatively strong, and the Centre seemed well resourced with staff growth following inclusion of other health professions. It was noted that the funding model had recently changed to be more reliant on income. It was not clear whether staff are released from regular duties to attend courses, or whether they must pay fees if not supported by a scholarship, despite the basic level course being compulsory.

Criterion 3.2

This section was only partly answered. It was not clear what credentials or qualifications are expected for employment in the Centre.

Criterion 3.3

This criterion asks for systematic strategies to develop future faculty developers. Evaluation of course outcomes and impact would partly address this criterion.

Criterion 4.1

This section described the Centres extensive work in evaluating the medical undergraduate program, not the Centre's faculty development activities.

Criterion 4.2

This section would be much stronger with examples of a systematic approach to reflecting on feedback and evaluation of faculty development activities, how emerging issues are identified and acted upon, and the impact such improvements. For example the Panel noted the relatively low completion rate of some courses.

Criterion 5.1

The main innovation cited appears to be online delivery. Other possibilities include workplace based delivery and the impact of any Masters projects, which typically require an innovation or empirical work.

Criterion 5.2

This was a strong section with many examples cited of work in national forums. It would be much easier for reviewers to read Table 4 if a separate list of full citations of publications authored by Centre staff were provided, rather than requiring reviewers to constantly refer to a numbered references in a combined reference list to see where and when they were published.

Finally, as a suggestion to consider, other applications have successfully combined all health professions faculty development activities across their institutions to craft strong submissions. For example, the Panel noted that the PUC Faculty also offers a comprehensive program of surgical skills training through a separate simulation centre, and a “Diploma in Innovative Trends in Teaching Health” through the nursing school. These could be combined as a comprehensive suite of faculty development activities in health professions education. However, the essential issue is that convincing evidence of the continuing impact and continuing improvement of faculty development activities needs to be provided to meet Award criteria.

Thank you for your application and interest in ASPIRE initiative. We send our best wishes for future development of Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile.

Sincerely,



Patricia S. O'Sullivan, EdD

Panel Chair, ASPIRE to Excellence in Faculty Development

Professor of Medicine and Surgery, University of California San Francisco

Attachment: Consolidated Review Form for Centre for Medical and Health Professions Education, Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile