Development of Enduring Educational Materials

Portfolio Template

(Rev. 11.20.11)

**We expect that the portfolio for the Development of Enduring Educational Materials Category will contain the following sections:**

**Name:**Last, First, Middle Initial

**Title:**Professor, Assistant Dean, etc.

**Department:**Anatomy, Family Medicine, etc.

**Section I: Match to Standard-Setting Example(s)**

In SECTION 1.1, below, identify the standard-setting examples (which are found on the introductory page of material of this category) that most closely mirror your work in the development of enduring educational materials and are included in your mini-portfolio. In SECTION 1.2, ***briefly*** identify major similarities and differences in the type of enduring materials between your mini-portfolio and the example(s).

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 1.1** |
| [Example 1](http://www.bcm.edu/fac-ed/awards/distinguished/enduring%20materials/Example%201%20-%20PhD%20in%20Clinical.doc): Faculty member or possessing a terminal degree in a clinical department  [Example 2](http://www.bcm.edu/fac-ed/awards/distinguished/enduring%20materials/Example%202%20-%20MD%20in%20Basic%20Science.doc): Physician in a basic science department  [Example 3](http://www.bcm.edu/fac-ed/awards/distinguished/enduring%20materials/Example%203%20-%20PhD%20in%20Basic%20Science%20Department.doc): Faculty member or possessing a terminal degree in a basic science department  [Example 4](http://www.bcm.edu/fac-ed/awards/distinguished/enduring%20materials/Example%204%20-%20MD%20in%20Clinical%20Department%20vs%202.doc): Physician in a clinical department |
| **SECTION 1.2** |
| e.g., Like the standard setting example, I…; Unlike the example, however, I do more of…; and less of… |

**Section II: Structured Summary**

|  |
| --- |
| *Similar to the structured summary required in the other Award categories, this part of the mini-portfolio is used to provide a “bird’s eye" view of accomplishments the applicant desires the review panel to compare to the published standard. The format, however, is slightly different than that of the other categories (see examples 1-4 from the enduring educational materials web page). The structured summary should serve as a Table of Contents for the personal statement and structured abstracts (both described below). This means that the structured summary should include bulleted information taken from your personal statement about your goals, preparation, and ongoing self-reflection related to developing enduring materials and it should list the enduring materials you include in your structured abstracts. The structured summary will be sent to all reviewers.* |
| Enter your ‘Structured Summary’ text here. |

**Section III: Personal Statement**

|  |
| --- |
| *As with the other award categories, the personal statement presents the individual’s goals, preparation, and ongoing personal development related to educational activities specific to the enduring materials award category. The personal statement will be sent to all reviewers. It should answer such questions as: Why have you dedicated part of your career to creating enduring materials? What do you hope to gain by having created the materials? What do you hope others will gain as a result of using the materials? What qualifies you to create materials?* |
| Enter your ‘Personal Statement’ text here. |

**Section IV: Structured Abstracts**

|  |
| --- |
| *This component is unique to the category of Development of Enduring Educational Materials and Educational Research. The structured abstracts will be sent to all reviewers. A separate structured abstract should be included for each distinct type of enduring material that is included in the structured summary. Abstracts should not exceed 750 words (less than 500 words is preferred) and should include as many of the following sections as possible. Use the underlined words to label the sections. (See samples of structured abstracts).*   * *Title* * *Reference Citation if formally published, or Publication Data (i.e., date, location) if self-published* * *Format and/or type of material (i.e., media used, organization)* * *Goals and/or Learning Objectives of the material (i.e., needs addressed; expected learning outcomes)* * *Content area(s) covered* * *Learner Population(s) for which material was developed (could include a primary and secondary population)* * *Size and/or Scope (i.e., contact time, pages, number of components)* * *My Role(s) (i.e., candidate’s role/level of involvement in the design, faculty preparation time, production/programming, implementation, and/or evaluation of the material)* * *Methods employed in the design, production/programming, implementation, and/or evaluation of the material* * *Peer Review process employed to ensure adequacy of content.* * *Usage Statistics (e.g., number of users, copies sold)* * *Impact on learners’ knowledge, skills and/or attitudes* * *Ratings of peers, learners and/or others* |
| Enter your ‘Structured Abstract(s)’ text here. |

**Section V: Appendices**

|  |
| --- |
| *As with the other award categories, it is important to include documentation that clarifies and substantiates the claims made about quantity and quality in the structured summary and/or abstracts. This section must not exceed 25 pages. Only the primary and secondary reviewers will receive the appendices.* |
| Enter your ‘Appendices’ text here. |

**A Sample Structured Abstract 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **Title/Citation: *Improving Glycemic Management In Type 2 Diabetes: Case Studies***  www.XXX.XXX.edu/improvingglycemicmanagement  **Format** web-based CME program with multiple components.  **Goals/Learning Objectives** To stress the importance of timely therapeutic intervention for the patient with Type 2 diabetes. At the conclusion of the activity, the participant should be able to describe and identify: the clinical data including laboratory results as they relate to pathophysiologic processes; the pathophysiologic defects underlying the development of Type 2 diabetes; and the temporal progression of the disease.  **Content** Highlights the importance of timely therapeutic intervention for the patient with Type 2 diabetes. Activity uses a case study approach to demonstrate the importance of aggressive glycemic control and risk complication management. Appropriate therapeutic interventions are also presented. This activity was originally presented live in New York City in May 2003.  **Audience** Endocrinologists, primary care physicians and diabetologists, including nurses and pharmacists, who treat patients with Type 2 diabetes.  **Size** Components: A pre-test evaluation, 3 lecture presentations, a question-answer session, online references, and a post-test evaluation. Contact time: approximately 1.75 hours required to complete entire program.  **My Roles** (1) course director and a speaker at the original CME activity, (2) developing the content for presentation, (3) requested that the presentations be made into an online resource, (4) advised in the development of the website, and (5) key player in the publicity effort to let the diabetes community know about this educational resource. Other contributors included 2 speakers, an evaluation expert, a peer reviewer, programmers, graphic designers, and database managers.  **Methods** Modified original conference presentations into interactive online educational activity.  **Peer Review** Prior to its launch in June 2003, this educational activity was reviewed by: John Doe, DO, Assistant Professor, XXX. Content will be reviewed again in June 2004.  **Usage Statistics** Since it went live online in June of 2003, this site has had 816 visitors. Of these, 523 people have worked through the entire site and 244 doctors have completed and submitted the post-test evaluation form necessary to receive CME credit.  **Ratings of Learners** 10 questions incorporated into the online post-test to assess learners’ perceptions of the educational activity. (e.g.: How [if at all] has your mastery of the content changed as a result of this activity?) Results indicate positive learner perception (i.e., >4.2 on a 5 point scale). See Appendix A for details.  **Ratings of Peers** As part of the evaluation process, feedback was solicited from two members of the Baylor faculty who were typical of the user audience and not involved in the development of this program. Letters written by these faculty that include their qualitative assessment of the website have been included in Appendix B. |