



**PEAS Minutes**  
**July 25, 2017 (12:00 - 1:00 p.m.)**

**Voting Members in Attendance:**

Bill Wright, PhD  
Anna Blenda, PhD  
Allison Young, MD  
Jim Sullivan, M2

**Other Attendees:**

April Buchanan, MD  
Mendy Ingiaimo  
Gail Hardaway  
Maggie Wentzky  
Paul Catalana, MD  
Sheldon Herring, PhD

**Not in Attendance:**

Jennifer Trilk, PhD  
Mark Carithers, MD  
Jamie Zink, M3  
Ann Blair Kennedy, DrPh  
Rick Hodinka, PhD (ex-officio)

**I. Introduction & Welcome**

- a. Dr. Wright welcomed the newest members to the PEAS Subcommittee Meeting
- b. Dr. Wright let the committee know that because of the absence of a few voting members the approval of the meeting minutes from Tuesday, June 27, 2017, voting on a PEAS Chair, and proposal for an extension of meeting time would be tabled for the next meeting on Tuesday, August 22, 2017.

**II. IPM 2 Reflections Rubric 1 & 2 – Dr. Herring**

- a. Dr. Herring presented the IPM 2 Reflections Rubric 1 & 2 to the committee members.
- b. *This year the overarching purpose of the Reflection Process during IPM 2 is to support the development of conscious professionalism and application of core principles, examine yourself and your role as a future physician and actively identify and develop plans for personal development that will enhance your skills as a student and physician.*
- c. The required components of the reflection papers are the following: Scenario, Applying the Essential Commitments, Assessment, and Plan
- d. Dr. Wright noted a slight error in the rubric

- e. Dr. Herring let the committee know he would correct the error
- f. There was a motion to approve, the motion was seconded and all were in favor.

### **III. Policy for taking Step 1**

- a. Dr. Buchanan began a discussion on a proposed policy regarding taking the USMLE Step 1 exam and a time frame for when to assess students with a CBSE exam.
- b. Currently M2 students have their CBSE scheduled at the end of a heavy assessment week with little to no preparation. The scores from this CBSE have a strong correlation to Step 1 performance.
- c. Dr. Buchanan suggested for students to take the CBSE after 3-4 weeks of completion of their M2 year to allow for a little more study time instead of in a very compressed week of assessments. Students would be required to have a certain score on the CBSE to be able to take the USMLE Step 1.
- d. Dr. Buchanan mentioned she would like feedback on whether or not to add in a buffer with the scoring (i.e. have the CBSE score requirement be a little higher than a passing score to ensure that students are successful on the USMLE Step 1).
- e. Dr. Catalana agreed with creating a buffer by having the score requirement on the CBSE be a little higher than the passing score because he heard that the USMLE leaders are in discussion on raising the passing score of the USMLE.
- f. All committee members were in favor of this proposal
- g. Maggie Wentzky commented that the options for taking the CBSE remotely at an official proctor sight would be beneficial to know for students who may have plans to go home.
- h. Dr. Wright responded and let everyone know that he would look into the proctoring site options so that we know what is available.
- i. The final proposal from the PEAS Subcommittee regarding this policy is that the CBSE will take place 3-4 weeks out from the completion of the M2 year and that there will be a score requirement on the CBSE that will have to be met in order to take the USMLE Step 1 examination.

### **IV. Course and Faculty Evaluations/Core Faculty Member Discussion**

- a. Dr. Wright began the discussion on the course and faculty evaluations by pulling up the proposed course and faculty evaluation wording that Dr. Wiederman researched and presented to the PEAS Subcommittee meeting two years ago.
- b. Dr. Wright also asked the committee members to make a proposal on what parameters should determine a "Core" Faculty member and asked Dr. Allison Young if she could weigh in because her module utilizes a large number of clinicians who only teach a few hours.
- c. Dr. Young suggested that to be considered a core faculty member 4 or more hours should be taught.
- d. Dr. Wright also suggested that all BMS Faculty Members be assessed and everyone outside of BMS Faculty could be assessed if they teach 4 or more hours.
- e. All committee members were in agreement with this proposal

Based on the committee members recommendations the **Proposal for determining core faculty members is as follows:**

- i. All BMS Faculty members will be accessed with a Faculty Evaluation
  - ii. Faculty members and clinicians outside of BMS Faculty will be accessed with a Faculty Evaluation if they teach 4 or more hours within a module.
- 
- f. Dr. Wright also presented the course and faculty evaluation questions that were proposed from the last PEAS Subcommittee meeting on June 27, 2017
  - g. Dr. Wright asked the committee to take a close look at these to determine our final proposal for the Faculty Evaluation Questions.
  - h. Dr. Blenda suggested that items 1 & 2 be combined from the wording captured in the June 27, 2017 meeting.
  - i. All committee members were in favor

Based on the committee members recommendations the **Final Proposed Faculty Evaluation Questions AY 2017-2018 is as follows:**

For the following statements, please rate the instructor using the following response options: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral – Neither Agree or Disagree (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1), N/A (Null)

- 1. Was organized and well prepared for class and utilized effective learning materials in class (M/C)
- 2. Was able to effectively translate complex ideas. (M/C)
- 3. Effectively motivated students and demonstrated a commitment to student success. (M/C)
- 4. Was appropriately responsive to student questions and inquiries. (M/C)
- 5. Treated students with respect. (M/C)
- 6. Was an effective manager of instructional sessions. (M/C)

For the following statement, please rate the instructor using the following response options: outstanding (5), good (4), average (3), fair (2), poor (1), N/A (Null)

- 7. Overall rating of this instructor in this module Instructor Strengths: (M/C)
- 8. Instructor Strengths: (Short Answer)
- 9. Instructor Weaknesses: (Short Answer)

- j. Dr. Wright asked the committee to take a look at the Course evaluation questions that were proposed from the last PEAS Subcommittee meeting on June 27, 2017
- k. Dr. Blenda suggested that we eliminate question #2 because it is redundant to question #14 from the questions captured in the June 27, 2017 meeting.
- l. All committee members were in favor

Based on the committee members recommendations the **Final Proposed Course Evaluation Questions AY 2017-2018 is as follows:**

For the following statements, please rate the module using the following response options: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral – Neither Agree or Disagree (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1), N/A (Null)

1. Content and sessions were well organized.
2. Comments on GENERAL MODULE ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT (Short Answer)

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements addressing MODULE ASSESSMENT.

3. Formative assessments were useful in monitoring my own learning process.
4. Summative assessments accurately measured my understanding of the module material.
5. Comments on MODULE ASSESSMENT. (Short Answer)

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements addressing the OVERALL MODULE.

6. Overall, the clinical relevance of this module was made clear.
7. Overall, I am satisfied with this module.
8. Comments on the OVERALL MODULE. (Short Answer)

In the following sections, please provide your thoughts concerning the module strengths and weaknesses, along with your suggestions for module improvements.

9. Module STRENGTHS (Short Answer)
10. Module WEAKNESSES (Short Answer)
11. Suggested Module IMPROVEMENTS (Short Answer)
12. For what percentage of in-class activities did you attend?
13. For what percentage of module content did you rely on university-generated resources (i.e., Canvas, Panapto, SLM's)?
14. For what percentage of module content did you rely on non-university generated resources (i.e. Pathoma, YouTube, and UWorld)?
15. Please provide feedback on module resources. (Short Answer)

- m. Dr. Wright wrapped up the meeting by asking the committee members to send any further suggestions to him for the final recommendation to the Curriculum Committee next week regarding the course and faculty evaluation questions.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:00 p.m.