



## Curriculum Committee Minutes

July 12, 2017

12:00-1:30 p.m.

### Attendees:

John Emerson	Bill Wright	April Buchanan
Mendy Ingiaimo	Cami Pfennig	Thomas Nathaniel
Holly Pace	JeanMarc Ault-Riche	Matt Tucker
Rebecca Russ-Sellers	Rich Goodwin	Anne Green Buckner
Theresa Baultrippe	Ben Griffeth	Nanette Dendy
Phil Head	Tom Pace	Devin Evans
Renee Chosed	Tom Blackwell	Sheldon Herring
Rick Hodinka	Kirk Baston	

### 1. Introduction

- a. April Buchanan introduces the purpose and structure of the Curriculum Committee. We look at the curriculum as a whole, and trust the year-subcommittees to get into the detail. We look at what is delivered, how it is delivered, and the outcomes of that.
- b. Every one introduces themselves

### 2. Review of Minutes from June 6, 2017

- a. Motion to approve, seconded, all in favor approved

### 3. Course Proposal for Community Focus in OB/Gyn (Hema Brazell)

- a. Intended to provide real world experience for students in a community setting of ob/gyn. The students have sparked this, but now it will be an ongoing course.
- b. This is an elective expansion of the 1 week already in place
- c. Motion to approve, seconded, all in favor approved

### 4. IPM 2 change form (Blackwell)

- a. Blackwell recaps what the students are required to do with EMT shifts – 1 per month and is required in order to pass IPM.
- b. Beginning this year, students can do 2 educational teaching programs for credit for 1 EMT truck shift

- c. Griffeth asks how many they can substitute. Blackwell clarifies that only 1 ride can be substituted. This is because it is getting more difficult to do ride time.
  - d. Motion to approve, seconded, all in favor approved
- 5. EMT Administrative Documents (Head)
  - a. 6.5 weeks. No assessment changes. Nothing changed functionally with the curriculum. Just seeking to still improve the assessment.
  - b. April Buchanan mentions that nothing must be approved if nothing is changed.
- 6. Foundations (Chosed)
  - a. Change form a
    - i. 3 objectives are changing. 2 are just changing some wording. The other one was completely deleted.
  - b. Change form b
    - i. Changing the pedagogies. Lectures will be traditional lecture based with group problem solving, group components, etc.
  - c. Change form c
    - i. Assessment changes
      - 1. Got rid of the portfolio
      - 2. 1 summative exam
      - 3. 4 summative quizzes given in class. These are part group, part individual. 10% of the final grade comes from quizzes, 90% from the summative exam
  - d. Rich Goodwin tips his hat to the two new directors of this module. The entire M1 faculty is very excited about the reorganization of this module
  - e. Griffeth asks how the changing of the module came about (Chosed and Goodwin confirm it was in part from student feedback) and how we will assess if this is a beneficial change. This is also one of the low points of Step 1 that the students are not always prepared for this topic.
  - f. JeanMarc asks if biochem review will be reiterated throughout the two years, not just in the last week of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year.
    - i. Baston ensures that the biochem is being drawn out across all two years, especially in year 2. Blenda and Chosed are already scheduled.
    - ii. Goodwin says they have planned some redundancies to come about through the M2 year.
  - g. Motion to approve, seconded, all in favor approved
- 7. Biomedical Principles End of Module Report (Hodinka)
  - a. 4 week module with 64 sessions. 49 are primary content, 9 are case based, 6 are course review
  - b. 3 formatives, 1 summative. 100% of grade is summative exam. Good bell curve, skewed a bit to the right. Average is mid-80s.
  - c. Good average on organ systems too, nothing stands out as poorly taught
  - d. All objectives were met.
  - e. A successful module with good performance. Evaluations show the students enjoyed the module
- 8. Biomedical Principles Change Form (Hodinka)
  - a. No major changes other than perfecting and tweaking the content and questions
  - b. Serious change is the turnover of pharmacology faculty. Seeking out pharm d faculty at GHS who will deliver entire pharm content. Will filter in new pharm faculty to the year as we gain them
  - c. JeanMarc mentions that from a student perspective, it will be very beneficial to be taught from pharm ds as they have a more clinical focus. Does not anticipate student pushback

- i. Hodinka mentions that it still cannot be so clinical and so beyond the M2 year that it is not beneficial anymore
- d. 6 case based sessions will be removed and converted to self-learning activities, which are case based SLMs
- e. Motion to approve both the End of Module Report and the Change Form, seconded, all in favor approved
- 9. Evaluation Policy (Wright)
  - a. Bill Wright gives the background of the discussion of working on evaluations. This included changing the number of questions to increase student feedback. This was all discussion and was never passed through.
  - b. Last year, evaluations began at around 80% or 90% feedback and ended with about 5-10%. You cannot make any decisions on a module based on these numbers.
  - c. This document has passed through PEAS, which the wording is consistent with M3 M4
  - d. In PEAS next time, they will be looking at the wording of the questions and the amount of questions. They want to get the feedback they need, while being aware of the timeliness of the students.
    - i. Invited those who would like to attend to this meeting
  - e. Tom Pace asks if knowing which students have completed their evaluations disturbs the integrity of the evaluation. (The policy describes that there are consequences for students who do not complete the evaluations. Therefore, it can be found out who does and does not complete their evaluations)
    - i. Bill wright mentions that this is not anonymous, but it is confidential. This code will not be broken if there is no reason to. To his knowledge, they have only had to find out the student on 3 occasions.
    - ii. April Buchanan mentions that they tell their students their evaluations will be looked at in a lump. If a specific evaluation is a threat, they break it. If it is just unprofessional writing that is too harsh or just isn't feedback ... do they break it?
    - iii. Bill Wright mentions that the module director will not be sending out or looking into the system of evaluations. The curriculum coordinator will handle all of the system and the behind the scenes.
  - f. JeanMarc mentions that there is a lack of transparency. It looks like nothing has changed, even with their evaluations. He suggests perhaps going through the Change Form at the beginning of the module saying what is different from last year. Mentioning themes that we understood from last year's evaluations and this is what we are doing. Meaningful feedback comes from people who feel like their voice is being heard.
    - i. Baston mentions that we do have room for improvement, but changes do not occur from 1 or 2 people mentioning something in their evaluations. He likes the idea of mentioning what has changed in the first year.
    - ii. April mentions that in the first year, we do say what we do with the information. In the second year, it is probably lost and never reiterated.
  - g. We need to mention this in M1 and M2 orientation and have it all on the Syllabus. Student representatives that go to the curriculum committee can also act as the messenger. Though students should not be responsible for distribution of policy, but they can act as a clarifier if they hear someone mentioning that we do not do anything with their evaluations
  - h. Rich Goodwin is in favor of reformatting the evaluation.

- i. They get a warning reminding them to complete their evaluations. The number of evaluations is dependent on the number of faculty. Should there be a grace that if you do, say, 90% of evaluations in the module you do not get a knock on the MSPE.
    - i. It needs to be defined who gets an evaluation. Do they get one if they only teach 1 hour? It is understandable to evaluate the core faculty.
    - ii. The length of the evaluation need to be reformatted to ensure this policy is more reasonable
    - iii. Provide a proposal of who is core faculty in the module and how they qualify. Do this by compiling a list of faculty and how many hours they teach per module.
  - j. John Emerson suggests everyone evaluates the module, 50% evaluate 50% of the faculty and the other half evaluates the other half of faculty
  - k. Motion to approve this language in the policy, and we will see the new eval and language at the next meeting, seconded, all in favor approved
10. Pathology Course Change (Baston)
- a. Still pass fail, added a presentation and requirement to go to the tumor board
  - b. Motion to approve, seconded, all in favor approved
11. April Buchanan mentions it is time to think about a new Chair
- a. Chris Wright is currently the chair. So far Kirk Baston and Tom Pace are interested in being the new chair.
  - b. We can elect one now, or have them all say something next time. It is decided that we will do it next time.
  - c. It no longer has to go clinical and BMS in the rotation. It is now who has time and who wants to do it.
12. IPM 2 (Herring)
- a. This year, they have changed the rubric for the reflections to include the model of professionalism, including candor, allies, integrity and communication
  - b. A motion was made to approve this rubric change, seconded, all in favor approved

Meeting Adjourned at 1:16 p.m.