



Teaching and Learning in Medicine

An International Journal

ISSN: 1040-1334 (Print) 1532-8015 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/htlm20>

Presenting the Third Annual Editors' Choice Award

Anna T. Cianciolo

To cite this article: Anna T. Cianciolo (2017) Presenting the Third Annual Editors' Choice Award, *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 29:3, 235-236, DOI: [10.1080/10401334.2017.1348841](https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2017.1348841)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2017.1348841>



Published online: 20 Jul 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 452



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Presenting the Third Annual Editors' Choice Award

I am delighted to announce the winner of *Teaching & Learning in Medicine's* third annual Editors' Choice Award, made possible by the Terrill A. Mast TLM Foundation. The purpose of this award is to showcase *TLM* research articles of exemplary quality, innovation, and fit to our mission to "provide the theoretical foundations and practical analysis needed for effective educational decision making." The selection criteria were designed to represent the full scope of this mission, as follows:

- **Impact on Theory** – The perceived degree to which the article helps build explanations, illuminate the role of context, and/or promote the asking of new questions. Outstanding articles according to this criterion go beyond providing new knowledge to promote new *understanding*.
- **Impact on Practice** – The perceived degree to which the article enables educators to design or implement something with confidence that it will work in their setting. Outstanding articles according to this criterion go beyond providing insight on how to do something to fuel *capacity* to educate.
- **Innovativeness** – Not all that is new is innovative. Outstanding articles according to this criterion push the boundary, going past incremental improvements or change to shifting paradigms and turning established ideas on their head.
- **Accessibility** – Not all findings that are impactful or innovative are accessible to a wide audience. Outstanding articles according to this criterion present the material in a way that clearly indicates their utility to educational decision making and their importance to theoretical understanding.

As in previous years, I chose candidates based on my general impression of *TLM's* manuscript submissions and published articles. Excluding Educational Case Reports, Observations articles, and articles authored by a current board member, I selected articles that struck me as particularly high-quality, novel, and useful to medical educators. By Foundation stipulation, candidates must be reviewed by seven members of *TLM's* editorial board. The selection panels this year, to whom I am tremendously grateful, were:

- Christine A. Degnon, MD, MPH, *University of Texas Rio Grande Valley School of Medicine*
- Heeyoung Han, PhD, *Southern Illinois University School of Medicine*

- Debra Klamen, MD, MHPE, *Southern Illinois University School of Medicine*
- Sana Loue, JD, PhD, *Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine*
- Anneke Metz, PhD, *Southern Illinois University School of Medicine*
- Martin Pusic, MD, PhD, *New York University School of Medicine*
- Nicole Roberts, PhD, *Sophie Davis School for Biomedical Education, City University of New York*

The selection panel read each candidate article, rated it on the selection criteria using a scale of one to five, and provided brief remarks justifying their ratings. To select a winner, the candidate articles were ranked within each panelist according to the sum of their ratings on the four criteria. The best-ranking article across panelists was then selected as the Editors' Choice to receive recognition and a prize of no less than \$500 or no less than \$100 per author. Panelists who felt that rating a given article created a conflict of interest withheld their ratings on that article and the average of the remaining panelists' ranks was used.

Using this procedure, the 2017 Editors' Choice was awarded to:

Walter Tavares, Shiphra Ginsberg, & Kevin W. Eva. *Selecting and Simplifying: Rater Performance and Behavior When Considering Multiple Competencies. (Issue #1)*

In this study, Tavares et al. examined raters' strategy and reliability when asked to consider multiple competencies and to attend to multiple issues when assessing clinical performance. In four groups, 84 experienced faculty examiners rated three prerecorded clinical performances of a single case: (Group 1) 2 performance dimensions, no distractions; (Group 2) 7 performance dimensions, no distractions; (Group 3) 2 performance dimensions, distractor rating task; and (Group 4) 7 performance dimensions, distractor rating task. To explore raters' strategies when asked to broaden focus, semi-structured, post-task interviews were conducted with examiners who rated 7 performance dimensions. Tavares et al. found that, on average, inter-rater reliability was lower when examiners were asked to rate 7 versus 2 dimensions. In addition, raters of 7 dimensions commented on fewer behaviors demonstrated in the videos.

There was no effect of the distractor rating task. Examiners rating 7 dimensions experienced greater cognitive load and reported various, idiosyncratic coping strategies, including prioritizing or selecting among the 7 dimensions according to their perceived importance and simplifying the rating task by focusing on easy-to-identify behaviors. Examiners also reported ignoring the extraneous distractor rating task. This study extended findings from a previous, related study with novice clinicians as examiners.

Among the comments made by the selection panel upon reading this article were:

- "...it was a very well-designed and executed study with clear utility to medical education."
- "This study has important implications for planning rater-based assessment tools, especially as medical education moves towards more competency-based assessments and observable, entrustable professional activities."
- "The implications of this study are enormous, suggesting that asking raters to rate 'everything' is not likely to get educators an accurate understanding of performance."
- "Eye-opening. Needs to be required reading for competency and milestone advocates."

As can be inferred from the comments, this article was rated particularly highly on theoretical and practical impact, as well as on accessibility. It clearly conveyed a complex research design to a diverse group of panelists, and it demonstrated how incremental investigation within an existing experimental paradigm can achieve groundbreaking results that speak to educators. The topic of the study—observer-based clinical performance assessment—is of longstanding and widespread interest, making this an article of international value. This article also contributes to the larger exploration of rater cognition and provides clear implications for assessment design that takes the human factor into account. There remain several interesting directions in which to pursue this line of research and deepen our understanding of how cognitive demands affect raters' strategies. It is exciting to consider how

Tavares et al. and others will follow-up and translate this important study.

Tavares et al.'s article was chosen from among a set of excellent candidates, listed below, who made the selection task very difficult. Collectively, these candidates represent the best characteristics of *TLM's* research publications: conceptually based, timely, relevant, and of international interest. All of these articles are worthy of closer examination, and they are available—freely downloadable—via the Taylor & Francis Editor's Choice Campaign until January 1, 2018 at <http://explore.tandfonline.com/content/ed/education-in-medicine-2017-editors-choice>.

Blatt B, Plack M, Simmens S, Lopreiato J, Berg K, Klevan J, Lewis K. *Do Standardized Patients Have Concerns About Students Not Captured by Traditional Assessment Forms?*

Halman S, Dudek N, Wood TJ, Pugh D, Touchie C, McAleer S, Humphrey-Murto S. *Direct Observation of Clinical Skills Feedback Scale: Development and Validity Evidence*

Phillips JP, Wilbanks DM, Salinsa DF, Doberneck DM. *Educational Debt in the Context of Career Planning: A Qualitative Exploration of Medical Student Perceptions*

Thompson G, McBride RB, Hosford CC, Halaas G. *Resilience Among Medical Students: The Role of Coping Style and Social Support*

Veen M, de la Croix A. *Collaborative Reflection Under the Microscope: Using Conversation Analysis to Study the Transition From Case Presentation to Discussion in GP Residents' Experience Sharing Sessions*

Please join me in extending warm congratulations to Walter Tavares and colleagues. On behalf of the selection panel and the full editorial board, thank you to all of *TLM's* contributors and readers for another exciting year of scholarship.

Anna T. Cianciolo, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief