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What is the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC)?

A not-for profit association, the AAMC is dedicated to transform health care by supporting the following mission areas:

Medical Education  Medical Research  Patient Care  Diversity and Inclusion

Established in 1846, the AAMC supports:

- 164 accredited U.S. and Canadian medical schools
- 400 major teaching hospitals and health systems
- 80+ academic societies
Learning, Leadership Development, and Evaluation at the AAMC

To support the AAMC’s multi-faceted mission areas, the new group Learning, Leadership Development, and Evaluation (LLE) was created.

Further enrich members’ learning and leadership development by offering more robust learning experiences by improving existing/newly developed programs.
Learning and leadership development programs are in-person learning opportunities like conferences, seminars, and workshops that support the multidisciplinary skill-building and professional networking needs of the AAMC's 23 affinity groups.
Challenges with Learning & Leadership Development Programs

**Consistent language**

Lacking a **consistent language** to distinguish the myriad of learning and leadership development **offerings across** the **organization**.

**Consistent quality**

Lacking **consistently high-quality** and cutting-edge learning and leadership development experiences for members **across all multidisciplinary** programs.
From Challenges to Solutions

Lacking a consistent language

Started socializing explicit definitions to differentiate learning offerings as conferences, seminars, or workshops.

Lacking consistent quality

Created a team of internal evaluators to develop a consolidated effort to monitor and evaluate the success across programs using both evaluation and instructional design best practices.
Measuring Consistent Quality

Initial efforts to measure consistency were to **standardize some** of our existing and newly developed post-program **evaluation survey questions** across all learning and leadership offerings.

**Survey questions focus on the program’s**

- Overall outcomes
- Peer-to-peer learning experiences
- Design and development
- Logistics

The quality rating was calculated by combining the scores of the three standard questions for overall outcomes (Where: 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree).
Achieve an overall quality rating of 4.00 on 85% of learning and leadership development offerings.

Consistent delivery of high-quality learning and leadership development programs will position the AAMC well with our members and constituents. This goal also speaks to the ongoing efforts to establish a culture of excellence in the design, development and delivery of learning and leadership development offerings across the AAMC.
Overall Quality Ratings for Learning and Leadership Development Programs in 2015 & 2016

Quality ratings were calculated for 56 programs (2015, n=28 & 2016, n=28).

Quality rating was calculated by combining the scores (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree) of the following standard questions: I gained valuable skills and knowledge; I will apply new knowledge and skills that I learned during this program in my professional role; Overall, I was completely satisfied with this program.

Each dot represents the quality rating for an individual program held in 2015 or 2016.

2015
- 89% above 4.00
- 32% above 4.50

2016
- 86% above 4.00
- 32% above 4.50
How can we *build* on the past to sustain and improve the quality of future meetings?
It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts.

Sherlock Holmes
The answers we seek lie within ... our evaluation data.

Learning from the past ... by taking a holistic examination of programs to learn of trending areas of opportunity / or the predominant recommendations for improvements across all programs.
Compiled the recommendations for improvement

• For each evaluation report of AAMC offerings from FY 2015 & 2016

Qualitatively analyzed a total of 57 recommendation sets separately

• FY 2014-15 (n=28)
• FY 2015-16 (n=29)

Conducted qualitative analyses to identify emerging themes on predominant recommendations

• Emerging themes were extracted from each and across recommendation sets by FY (i.e. using thematic and relational analyses)
• Findings were fused from both fiscal years into one master list of emerging themes

Categorized emerging themes in master list using the ADDIE model

Calculated how frequently those emerging themes were suggested

• For each phase of the ADDIE model
• And by offering type: conferences, seminars, and workshops

Methodology for Holistic Examination

Meta-Analysis on Evaluation Recommendations
Conferences, Seminars, and Workshops
What to Consider During Each Planning Phase of the ADDIE Model

**Conferences**
- Often features **keynote presentations** delivered to all attendees and **multiple break-out sessions**. Attendees often expect to receive information about **industry trends and developments**.
- **Larger** groups (compared to a Workshop, Certificate Program, or Seminar)
- **Networking** opportunities
  - Substantive interactions with peers / faculty
  - Spark conversations that are important to audience
- **Outstanding speakers** are key
- **New perspectives and ideas**
- **Variety / breadth** of content
- Usually content and sessions are **re-created every year** (little to no shelf life)
- May include **call for proposals / poster sessions**

**Seminars**
- **Educational** events featuring **subject matter experts** delivering information primarily via **lecture and discussion**.
- **Larger** groups (compared to a Workshop or Certificate Program)
- **Networking** opportunities
  - Substantive interactions with peers / faculty
  - Spark conversations that are important to audience
- **Outstanding speakers** are key
- **New perspectives and ideas**
- **Variety / breadth** of content (approximately 3-7 topics covered by different faculty)
- Often includes both **plenary sessions and breakout sessions**
- **Enduring content and design** (re-useable)

**Workshops**
- Tend to be **smaller** and more **intense** than seminars
- Participants practice **new skills**
- **Smaller groups**, more **intimate experience**
- **Expert** faculty
- **Expert process facilitation**
- **Deep dive**, one **overarching topic**
- **Organizing** framework or theory
- **Self or 360 Assessments** (related to the one overarching topic)
- **Skill building** and **skill transfer** is key
  - Level 3 assessments
  - Post-workshop follow-up and reinforcement

**Analysis**
- Needs assessments, audience analysis

**Design**
- Learning goals, delivery format, activities

**Development**
- Developing program, choosing speakers, scheduling sessions

**Implementation**
- Delivering sessions, activities

**Evaluation**
- Measuring effectiveness, assessing outcomes
**Audience’s Diversity**
Consider the audience’s diversity (ethnicities, academic and professional levels/roles, institution type, etc.) by varying the content of the sessions to align to their background.

**Program Organization**
Reconsider program organization (scheduling & timing) so that it aligns with audience’s learning goals/capabilities by including relevant activities (i.e. career fairs) and balancing didactic with interactive sessions (initiate with lectures - passive learning - conclude with interactive sessions - active learning).

**Engage Constituents**
Include and engage constituents during the planning by asking for their contributions (topic suggestions, learning needs, etc.)

**Interactive Activities**
Design more hands-on learning activities in workshops/sessions (i.e. round tables, case studies, applicable real-world examples, strategizing exercises).

**Session Tracks**
Organize the sessions into tracks to account for audience’s diverse interests and help them navigate the program.

**Keep Current**
Keep topics fresh with current and relevant information about emerging policies, trends and hot topics if expecting attendance recidivism.

**Multidisciplinary Activities**
Offer multidisciplinary professional activities and more helpful guidelines for career development.

**Self-Reflection**
Integrate more opportunities for self-reflection (i.e. self-assessments, writing activities, “off” time).

**Group Size**
Align the size of the discussion groups with the activities’ and sessions’ learning goals (i.e. more in-depth discussions in smaller groups).

**Takeaways**
Encourage speakers and program staff to offer more pragmatic and empirical takeaways so that constituents walk away with more actionable skills and tools (i.e. online and physical materials, evidence-based approaches, self-assessments, specific guidance, tangible solutions to challenges, real-world examples).

**Speaker Diversity**
Select diverse speakers who are more qualified/credible leaders in their fields who will also represent the audience’s diversity (i.e. role, affiliation, experience level, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc.) and their areas of interest/learning goals.

**Speaker Guidance**
Offer the speakers guidance on their presentation’s content and delivery (i.e. time management, having clearer goals, accounting for audience’s diverse learning goals, etc.).

**Decrease Session Overlap**
Decrease the overlap of sessions of interest in schedule.

**More Time**
Increase time to cover essential topics in more depth.

**Networking & Discussion**
Facilitate more formal and informal opportunities for networking and/or in-depth discussion across disciplinary fields and multi-level backgrounds (i.e. round tables, post-presentation Q&A, peer to peer sharing).

**Clarity on Goals**
Clearly communicate and reflect the goals of the meeting, target audience (affinity group distinctions) and agenda beforehand (i.e. send reminders, have an updated website, etc.).

**Preparation Tools**
Provide tools/reference materials/assignments pre- and post-meeting (virtual and in-person, power points, paper copies, information in advance, etc.) so that audience can be better prepared with questions/discussion points.

**Maximize Space**
Maximize space and arrangements capacity to meet and accommodate demand.

**Wider Marketing Net**
Market to a wider audience of professionals from a variety of fields and institutions in order to diversify learning capabilities from constituent to constituent.

**Clarity on Roles**
Be clearer about roles/responsibilities of group members.
The Impact of Evaluation on a Leadership Workshop
Being a Resilient Leader is an interactive two–day workshop with an aim to build medical professionals’ resiliency and teach them how to exercise leadership so that they can achieve desired results in spite of work-related stress, anxiety, and burnout.
From Learning to Action
Improvements Made to BRL from Evaluation Recommendations

**Analysis**
Continued focusing on self-reflection and working on “inner challenges” as a premise of the workshop.

**Design**
- **Shortened workshop, adjusted pace and flow.** Removed less relevant portions and tightened focus on leadership development content.
- **Redesigned sessions to be more interactive; shortened lectures** and illuminated foundational concepts.
- **Built in more time for personal reflection; provided support for self-reflection** (e.g., provocative questions).

**Development**
- **Lightened philosophical underpinnings of the course; made language more accessible.**
- **Provided handouts, or participant workbook,** to help organize note-taking and aid reflection.
- **Reconsidered composition of facilitation team;** the imbalances with respect to content expertise and status were distracting.

**Implementation**
- **Re-examined pre-course reading assignments,** reducing the number and density of articles.
- **Debriefed small group exercises** more robustly; guided, challenged and continued the discussion for the benefit of all.
- **More clearly articulated objectives of the course and made clear the connections among topics and with leadership development.**
Participant attitudes on BRL’s overall outcomes were more positive in 2017 than in 2015.

**Program Satisfaction**
- 2015: 3.29
- 2017: 4.72

**Inspired to Think in New Ways**
- 2015: 3.19
- 2017: 4.89

**Plan to Make Changes**
- 2015: 3.69
- 2017: 4.84

Where: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree
Participant attitudes on BRL’s sessions were more positive in **2017** than in **2015**.

Where: 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
From Learning to Action
Improvements Made to BRL from Evaluation Recommendations

**Analysis**
Continued focusing on self-reflection and working on "inner challenges" as a premise of the workshop.

**Design**
- Shortened workshop, adjusted pace and flow. Removed less relevant portions and tightened focus on leadership development content.
- Redesigned sessions to be more interactive; shortened lectures and illuminated foundational concepts.
- Built in more time for personal reflection; provided support for self-reflection (e.g., provocative questions).

**Development**
- Lightened philosophical underpinnings of the course; made language more accessible.
- Provided handouts, or participant workbook, to help organize note-taking and aid reflection.
- Reconsidered composition of facilitation team; the imbalances with respect to content expertise and status were distracting.

**Implementation**
- Re-examined pre-course reading assignments, reducing the number and density of articles.
- Debriefed small group exercises more robustly; guided, challenged and continued the discussion for the benefit of all.
- More clearly articulated objectives of the course and made clear the connections among topics and with leadership development.
And because we are evaluators, we want your feedback!

How can you use what you learned with us and from each other to continue to strengthen your programs?