

**Report of the 2004 Member Survey Society of Directors of Research in Medical Education  
(SDRME) North American Units**

Prepared by Larry D. Gruppen, Ph.D.,

Department of Medical Education

University of Michigan Medical School

May, 2007

## **Response to Survey**

The SDRME Executive Committee conducted a membership survey covering the period from January 1, 2003-December 31, 2004. The survey was posted on the Internet. Of the units in North America to whom the survey was made available, 25 responded.

## **Purpose of Survey**

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the eighth bi-annual survey of SDRME members.

## **Composition of Survey**

The survey was composed of seven sections:

- Organizational Structure
- Unit Activities
- Unit Funding Structure
- Unit Director and Personnel
- Scholarship
- Unit Professional Service Activities at National Level
- Educational Programs

The results will be presented separately for each section.

## **Technical Notes:**

Percentages were calculated based on the number of units responding to a particular item, unless otherwise noted. Total percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding error or to the possibility of multiple answers within an item.

Currency: Monetary figures reported in Canadian dollars were converted to United States dollars for ease of comparison. The conversion rate used was: 1.00 Canadian dollars = 0.83 United States dollars. (Per historic currency conversion posted at [www.x-rates.com](http://www.x-rates.com) rates for 2004.12.31)

Salaries and full-time-equivalent (FTE): Salaries were calculated based on the projected salary for someone at 100% FTE. For example, if a staff member earned \$25,000 a year for working 50% time, we used \$50,000 (the FTE salary) as his/her salary.

## **Section I. Organizational Structure of the Unit**

The first question asked for the name of the unit. The categories and the percentage of units in each of five categories are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Unit Name

Name	N	Percentage
Office	14	59
Department	4	17
Center	2	8
Other or Not Specified	4	17

The next item requested the title of the lead person in each unit. The most frequent titles listed and the percentage of respondents reporting each are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Title of Lead Person

Title	N	Percentage
Director (at a Sub-Program level)	12	48
Associate or Vice Dean	7	28
Assistant Dean	1	4
Chair	4	16
Other	1	4

The next question asked for the titles of administrative subordinates in the unit. Fifteen respondents (63%) had at least one administrative subordinate within the office. The most frequently listed titles of administrative subordinates were Assistant/Associate Director and Administrative Assistant/Associate. Others were Systems Analyst, Standardized Patient Coordinator, Secretary, Research Scientist/Statistician, Instructional Technology Manager, Information Analyst, and Data Manager.

The last question in this section asked for the administrative title(s) of the individual to whom the lead person reports. Table 3 shows the results.

Table 3. Administrative Title of Person to Whom Lead Person Reports

Title	N	Percentage
Dean	8	33
Senior (or Executive) Associate Dean	5	21
Associate Dean	6	25
Vice Dean	2	8
Director (Executive, other)	1	4
Vice Chancellor (or equivalent)	1	4
Multiple titles (e.g., Sr. Assoc. Dean + Chair, or Assoc. Vice President + Assoc. Dean)	4	4

Unit heads most often reported to one of the Deans. Heads of 8 (33%) units report directly to the Dean, 5 (21%) to a Senior or Executive Associate Dean, 6 (25%) to an Associate Dean, and 2 (8%) to a Vice Dean.

## Section II. Educational Activities

This section listed 92 educational activities broken down into seven groups: research areas, service areas, evaluation areas, workshop audiences, consultation areas, teaching audiences, and teaching areas. Units were asked to indicate all activities in which they participate on a regular basis and to designate the activities they considered to be key roles they filled at their institutions. Table 4 shows the number and percentage of all respondents (N=25) who reported involvement in each activity.

Table 4. Activities in Which Unit had Primary Responsibility

Research Areas		N	(%)
1	None	--	--
2	Student selection	11	44
3	Instructional design	17	68
4	Curriculum	21	84
5	Institutional research	12	48
6	Medical informatics	6	24
7	Patient simulations	13	52
8	Faculty careers	6	24
9	Chronic diseases	3	12
10	Disease prevention	1	4
11	Patient education	6	24
12	Clinical decision making	7	28
13	Student assessment approaches	21	84
14	Computer-based education applications	17	68

2003-04 SDRME Member Survey Report

15	Assessment of competencies	23	92
16	Health economics	3	12
17	Standardized patients	18	72
18	Continuing education	6	24
19	Other	3	12
Service Areas			
20	None	0	0
21	Computer classroom/lab administration	5	2
22	Data analysis/statistics/data base	20	8
23	Computer support	4	16
24	Committees/task forces	24	96
25	Test scoring	16	64
26	Test administration	11	44
27	Performance based assessment	20	8
28	Media production	2	8
29	Printing/copying/duplication	7	28
30	Medical illustrations	2	8
31	Photography	0	0
32	Graphics production	2	8
33	Minority student recruitment	1	4
34	Curriculum planning/administration	22	88
35	Academic development and support	22	88
36	Administration of OSCEs	13	52
37	Standardized patient program administration	10	4
38	Other	7	28
Evaluation Areas			
39	None	1	4
40	Faculty	18	72
41	Students	23	92
42	Program	23	92
43	Curriculum	23	92
44	Other	1	4
Workshop Audiences			
45	None	2	8
46	On-campus faculty	22	88
47	Community faculty/preceptors	14	56
48	Students	10	4
49	Administration	11	44
50	Off-campus audiences	13	52
51	Other	3	12
Consultation Areas			
52	None	0	0
53	Research design	23	92
54	Curriculum design	18	72
55	Data analysis/statistics	23	92

2003-04 SDRME Member Survey Report

56	Instructional design/strategies	20	8
57	Testing & measurement	20	8
58	Computer-based education	16	64
59	Evaluation	25	1
60	Peer reviews (manuscripts, papers, grants, etc.)	19	76
61	Academic planning	14	56
62	Grant development and administration	18	72
63	Institutional retreats	5	2
64	Other	2	8
Teaching Audience			
65	None	2	8
66	Undergraduate college students	3	12
67	Medical students	21	84
68	Medical residents	16	64
69	Medical fellows	5	2
70	Graduate students	4	16
71	Non-medical health professions students	20	8
72	Clinical faculty	14	56
73	Preceptors	4	16
74	Other	2	8
Teaching Areas			
75	None	1	4
76	Medical humanities	6	24
77	Statistics	11	44
78	Computer applications	8	32
79	Educational methods	15	6
80	Basic sciences	3	12
81	Clinical education	8	32
82	Clinical decision making	6	24
83	Health economics/policy	2	8
84	Research skills	16	64
85	Disease prevention	1	4
86	Patient education	3	12
87	Enrichment programs	5	2
88	Academic skills	11	44
89	Faculty development	22	88
90	International medical education	6	24
91	Test taking/preparation	9	36
92	Other	2	8

The top 10 most frequently cited items were:

- Evaluation consultation (100%)
- Service on committees and task forces (96%)
- Curriculum evaluations (92%)
- Program evaluations (92%)

## 2003-04 SDRME Member Survey Report

Student Evaluation (92%)  
Statistical consultation (92%)  
Research design consultation (92%)  
Research on the assessment of competencies (92%)  
Faculty development (88%)  
Academic development and support (88%)

### Section III. Funding for Fiscal Year 2003-04

The first part of this section asked about funding mechanisms for the units. The unit lead person controlled the budget in 66% of the units. The budget was controlled by the person to whom the lead reports in the remaining 34%. Table 5 shows the total budget and the percentages of unit support that came from four different sources. (Budgets reported in Canadian dollars were converted to US dollars before being analyzed. See technical notes on page 2 for details. )

Table 5. Sources of Support (N=24)

	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
Total Budget *	100	473	642	1,223	3,986	1,059	998
Sources (%):							
'Hard' University funds	19	60	73	96	100	74	25
Grants & Contracts	0	0	8	20	65	14	19
Grants & Contracts awarded to other depts.	0	0	4	10	60	8	13
Recharge/Charge back	0	0	0	5	20	4	7

\* U.S. dollars x 1000

All but one of the reporting units were actively engaged in securing external support for their activities. While the level of unit activities supported by external funds varied greatly, the median amount accounted for was 12% of unit finances. This compares to 25% in 1998, 15% in 2000, and 16% in 2002. The median operating budget of units from all sources of funding is approximately \$642,000 (US).

### Section IV. Personnel

The personnel section begins with a profile of the unit director and then profiles unit faculty and professional and scientific staff. Table 6 shows the distribution of directors' characteristics including highest degree, administrative title, faculty title, and tenure status.

Table 6. Directors' Characteristics

Highest Degree	N	Percentage
Ph.D.	17	68
Ed.D.	2	8
M.D.	4	16
M.A./M.S.	2	8
Administrative Title		
Director	12	48
Associate Dean	7	28
Assistant Dean	2	8
Chair	4	16
Faculty Title		
Professor	10	40
Associate Professor	8	32
Assistant Professor	3	12
Instructor	0	0
Does not apply	4	16
Tenure		
Yes	9	36
No	16	64

Table 7 shows the distribution of directors' longevity in medical education, in their institution, and as director of their unit, and the distribution of directors' ages.

Table 7. Directors' Experience and Age (N=25)

Number of Years:	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
In Medical Education	2	12	19	26	33	19	9
In Institution	.5	8	12	20	33	13	9
As Director	.4	3	7	9	21	7	5
Age	41	48	51	58	71	53	7

The next part of the personnel section asked about the professional and support staff in the unit.

Table 8. Number of Unit Professional and Support Staff

Staff	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
Core Faculty & Professional Staff	1	2	4	9	13	5	4
Support Staff	1	1	3	5	10	3	2

Additional information was provided for 137 faculty/staff.



Table 9. Characteristics of Professional Staff

Highest Degree (N=97)	N	Percentage*
PhD or EdD	45	33
MD	4	3
M.A./M.S. (or equivalent)	26	19
Bachelor's (or less)	22	16
Faculty rank (N=50)		
Professor	4	8
Associate Professor	12	24
Assistant Professor	23	46
Instructor/Other	11	22
Tenure (N=118)		
Yes	17	14
No	101	86

\*Percentage based on the N provided for each category.

Table 10 shows the distribution of faculty and professional staff members' years of medical education experience and annual salary (presented as 100% FTE). There was one individual with a salary of \$200,00, which might skew the results, so the distribution is also presented without this outlier.

Table 10. Experience, Salary, and Ages of Professional Staff (N=115)

	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
Number of Years in Medical Education	1	3	5	10	30	7	6.7
Salary* (100% FTE)	20	40	50	66	200	57	27
Salary* (100% FTE) [outlier removed]	20	40	50	66	130	56	24

\*In U.S. dollars x 1000; rounded

Note: Salaries are reported in 100% FTE, regardless of the percent time worked

The remainder of this section examines staff members' salary by various characteristics. Please note the following:

- Salaries are always presented as 100% FTE, regardless of actual % FTE worked, to make them comparable.
- Salaries reported in Canadian dollars were converted to US dollars before being analyzed. (See technical notes on page 2 for details.)

Table 11 shows the distribution of salaries for the 58 staff members with an academic rank/title.

Table 11. Unit Professional Staff: Salary\* by Faculty/Professional Rank, Tenure Status, and Degree

Rank	N	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
Professor	4	78	114	126	127	130	115	25
Assoc Prof	12	63	79	81	95	100	84	13
Asst Prof	33	40	55	61	76	115	64	17
Other	9	40	43	45	54	65	48	8
<b>Tenure</b>								
Yes	18	57	73	80	87	126	84	20
No	33	40	55	65	85	131	70	24
<b>Degree</b>								
PhD or EdD similar	45	40	58	74	85	130	73	22
MD or MD/PhD	3	55	85	115	123	131	100	4
MA, MS, MSW, MBA	26	30	40	42	55	66	47	10
BA,BS,RN	22	20	35	41	44	60	41	9

\*In U.S. dollars x 1000; rounded

Note: Salaries are reported in 100% FTE, regardless of the percent time worked Note: This table only includes those with an academic title.

Table 12 shows the distribution of staff salaries by years of experience in medical education.

Table 12. Unit Professional Staff Salary\* by Years of Medical Education Experience

Years in Medical Education	N	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
0-5	67	22	40	42	60	115	50	19
6-10	24	20	40	53	75	131	59	26
11-15	10	32	43	55	78	130	68	36
16-20	4	27	51	72	87	94	66	30
>20	7	29	35	65	78	126	64	35

\*In u.s. dollars x 1000; rounded; Salaries are reported in 100% FTE, regardless of percent time worked

Table 13 gives a breakdown by years of medical education similar to Table 15 (above), but after breaking out staff by the highest degree they had earned. [Note that the number of groups into which "years in medical education" is divided varies somewhat across degree groupings. This was done to present the data in the clearest manner for each degree group (i.e., due to missing data, small n's, etc.)]

Table 13. Unit Professional Staff Salary\* by Highest Degree and Years of Medical Education Experience

Years in Medical Education	N	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
Only Personnel with PhD's or EdD's (or equivalent)								
0-5	22	40	56	63	80	100	66	16
6-10	12	44	56	70	81	100	71	18
>11-15	9	58	78	85	126	130	95	26
Only Personnel with Master's Degrees (or equivalent)								
0-5	17	30	39	40	43	66	43	10
>6	9	39	51	55	62	131	63	27
Only Personnel with Bachelor's Degree (or equivalent, or less)								
0-5	13	29	40	41	50	60	44	9
>6	9	20	33	40	42	50	37	9

## Section VII. Scholarship

Respondents were asked to indicate scholarly productivity for the unit in terms of publications, presentations and grants. Table 14 provides a description of this for the units as a whole, i.e., ignoring the number of faculty/staff in each unit.

Table 14. Scholarly Productivity for the Unit as a Whole

Scholarly Product	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
First-authored publications	0	1	2	5	15	4.1	5.0
Co-authored publications	0	2	6	12	33	9.0	9.4
First-authored books, chapters, etc.	0	0	0	1	5	0.8	1.4
Co-authored books, chapters, etc.	0	0	0	2	12	1.8	3.3
First-authored peer-reviewed presentations	0	3	4	9	30	7.9	9.1
Co-authored peer-reviewed presentations	1	3	4	9	30	7.9	9.1
# of faculty as PIs on grants	0	0	1	2	5	1.2	1.2
# of grants received	0	0	2	2	10	1.8	2.5
# of grants providing salary support, but held outside unit	0	2	4	6	18	4.7	4.5

Table 15. Scholarly Productivity by Faculty/Professional Staff

Scholarly Product	Min	25%	50%	75%	Max	Mean	SD
-------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	----

## 2003-04 SDRME Member Survey Report

First-authored publications	0	0.1	0.7	1.0	14.0	1.5	3.2
Co-authored publications	0	0.5	1.5	2.9	16.0	2.7	3.8
First-authored books, chapters, etc.	0	0	0	0.2	5.0	0.4	1.2
Co-authored books, chapters, etc.	0	0	0	1.0	3.5	0.7	1.1
First-authored peer-reviewed presentations	0	1.0	1.6	2.0	4.0	1.7	1.1
Co-authored peer-reviewed presentations	0.2	0.5	2.1	3.0	5.3	2.1	1.6
# of faculty as PIs on grants	0	0	0.2	0.5	2.0	0.4	0.5
# of grants received	0	0	0.2	0.5	5.0	0.5	1.2
# of grants providing salary support, but held outside unit	0	0.2	0.7	2.0	4.0	1.1	1.2

### Section VII. Degree Granting Programs

The final section asked for a description of the degree granting programs offered by units, as well as courses that contribute toward degrees, certificates, etc. Five units offered programs leading to a certificate, master's degree, MD/PhD, or other degree, often in conjunction with another department or school.

### Conclusions

These data provide many insights into the infra-structure of the offices of Medical Education in North America. The documentation of productivity indices such as extra mural funding secured and number of publications have proven to be useful information for the Society as it promotes the cause of its members. The information on the activities in which our units engage will be useful information in communicating with institutions who are considering establishing a unit. The salary data have been important for helping establish reasonable salary levels for newly created units and helping members argue for salaries in line with what unit personnel deserve.