



PEAS Minutes
May 23, 2017 (12:00 - 1:00 p.m.)

Voting Members in Attendance:

Bill Wright, PhD
Rick Hodinka, PhD
Dennis Wolff, PhD
Brian Jones, M3 (via Google Hangout)

Other Attendees:

Tom Pace, MD
Sheldon Herring, PhD
Gail Hardaway
Mendy Ingiaimo

Not in Attendance:

Jennifer Trilk, PhD
Bill Kelly, MD
Mark Carithers, MD
Jamie Zink, M2

I. Review of 03.28.17 Meeting Minutes

- a. There was a motion to approve the minutes from the March 28, 2017 Meeting. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.

II. IPM 1 Detailed Assessment Report AY 2017-2018

- a. Dr. Pace went over the IPM 1 Detailed Assessment Report for AY 2017-2018. The changes that are occurring this academic year that differ from the previous year are as follows:
 - i. Honors goes from 15%-30%
 - ii. Minor wording changes to the Description/Mission and a few objectives were changed to include bedside ultrasound and conscious professionalism.

III. Process of student evaluations of faculty and module

- a. Dr. Wright began the discussion of faculty and student evaluations and participation over this past academic year. We need to deliver a policy to help ensure that we receive student feedback. We ask students to fill out many evaluations over the course of a year and we hope they will participate but right now there is no incentive

for students to do so. M3 students are unable to see their grade in OASIS until they fill out their evaluation. Maybe we could fill it out and turn them into SEPC for professionalism.

- b. Dr. Pace brought up the question of why we ask students to fill out the evaluation after the exam instead of beforehand.
- c. Dr. Wright responded that there are questions regarding assessment on the evaluation.
- d. Brian Jones suggested that students have to fill out the evaluation from the previous module before taking the next module's test. He thinks that if we do it the M3 way we will get more responses.
- e. Dr. Pace commented that he held an in-class clicker evaluation (12 questions) about specific content before IPM2. We then used this data to modify the next module and the same module for the coming year. For the evaluation to be meaningful, it needs to be closely associated. This way was particularly helpful in knowing right away what modifications needed to be made. Response rate was 80-90%
- f. Dr. Wright commented that this was a great idea but that the attendance is greater for IPM instead of BMS courses
- g. Dr. Hodinka suggested that if we make it mandatory we should make it as short as humanly possible. He shared with the committee the evaluation from University of Pennsylvania.
- h. Dr. Wright will report back to the CC that we are still working on this item.

IV. Step I & II Results – Systematic review of low performing content

- a. Dr. Wright presented the USMLE Step 1 Category Results Comparison spreadsheet
- b. Dr. Wright let the committee know that Gail Hardaway would send an email out to the committee members with this document and for them to come up with 1-2 proposed recommendations to take to the Curriculum Committee.
- c. Please bring these recommendations to our next PEAS meeting in June.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:50 p.m.