



**PEAS Minutes**  
**June 27, 2017 (12:00 - 1:00 p.m.)**

**Voting Members in Attendance:**

Bill Wright, PhD  
Rick Hodinka, PhD  
Jennifer Trilk, PhD

**Other Attendees:**

Renee Chosed, PhD  
Anna Blenda, PhD  
James Fulcher, MD  
Mendy Ingiaino  
Gail Hardaway

**Not in Attendance:**

Bill Kelly, MD  
Mark Carithers, MD  
Jamie Zink, M2  
Dennis Wolff, PhD  
Brian Jones, M3

- I. **Review of 05.23.17 Meeting Minutes**
  - a. There was a motion to approve the minutes from the May 23, 2017 Meeting. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.
- II. **Foundations Detailed Assessment Report AY 2017-2018**
  - a. Drs. Chosed and Blenda presented the Foundations Detailed Assessment Report for Academic Year 2017-2018.
  - b. The assessment changes include the following:
    - i. Removal of the Portfolio (previously worth 10% of the final Foundations grade)
    - ii. iRat and tRAT quizzes will be worth 10% of the final Foundations grade (3% tRAT and 7% gRAT)
  - c. Dr. Wright commented that the core competency being used in the Foundations Module is *Medical Knowledge* where as in the past with the Portfolio Project, mapping occurred to other competencies (*Patient Care and Teaching and Learning*) in addition to Medical Knowledge
  - d. Dr. Hodinka asked about the Portfolio Project and wanted to know a little more about it
  - e. Dr. Blenda responded and let him know that the Portfolio Project had negative feedback from the students in the course evaluation.

- f. Dr. Wright commented that by taking the Portfolio Project away allows us to have an idea of low performing students earlier as student performance is usually only known in January once Structure and Function I is over.
- g. Dr. Wright asked if there were any concerns or further comments on the Foundations Detailed Assessment Report
- h. No other concerns were noted
- i. There was a motion to approve, the motion was seconded and all were in favor
- j. The Foundations DAR is approved and ready for Curriculum Committee in July

**III. GI End of Module Report AY 2016-2017**

- a. Dr. Fulcher began his discussion of the GI End of Module Report
- b. This document has already been reviewed by the Curriculum Committee
- c. Dr. Fulcher was pleased with this rendition of the GI Module and while the content was not as intellectually robust as it could have been he will be working on this by bringing in more clinicians
- d. Dr. Fulcher mentioned that he and Dr. Baston reviewed all the summative questions together. He also let the committee know that many of the sessions held within this module contained high-level discussions with clinicians and students seemed to really appreciate this.
- e. Dr. Trilk commented that the association of what we teach and what shows up on Step 1 is closely related

**IV. Musc/Derm/Rheum End of Module Report AY 2016-2017**

- a. Dr. Fulcher began his discussion of the Musc/Derm/Rheum End of Module Report.
- b. He commented that he worked diligently to make content harder this year
- c. This next academic year, Dr. Fulcher will be looking to take out a little bit of the Immunology and bring in some important topics that are often left out from the Robbins textbook. He thinks this will bring together a lot of concepts students have learned earlier in the year and it will be a nice review
- d. Dr. Fulcher commented that he felt that Dermatology went really well but that he had a very small turnout from his Dermatologists during review time. He hopes to have a better turnout this upcoming year.

**V. Module and Faculty Evaluations**

- a. Dr. Wright informed the committee of the new M3 Evaluation Process and the verbiage included with in the policy:
  - i. *Student feedback is essential for the continuous quality improvement of the medical education experience. Students are required to provide feedback in the form of faculty, **resident**, and course evaluations at the conclusion of each clerkship and elective. Students are required to complete evaluations within 2 weeks of the conclusion of the clerkship/elective. Students who fail to comply with the 2 week deadline will receive a reminder of the need to complete evaluations from the Office of Academic Affairs. Those who fail to comply within 6 weeks after the conclusion of the course will be referred to the Student Honor*

*and Professionalism committee. Students who consistently comply with the two week policy will receive a statement in the professionalism section of their MSPE stating that they “completed all evaluations in a timely manner.” Students who do not complete evaluations in a timely manner (beyond six weeks without an extenuating circumstance) will receive a statement that, “This student did not complete course evaluations in a timely manner and was referred to the Student Honor and Professionalism Council who . . . .”*

- b. Dr. Wright made a suggestion to the committee to adopt this same verbiage and policy for the M1-M2 Evaluations. He recommended to stay consistent with what the M3 policy says and hold M1-M2 to the same standard.
- c. Dr. Fulcher commented that Residency Directors truly want to have compliant Residents and compliance is just as important as other factors
- d. Mendy Ingiaimo asked if this policy would change the grade release policy
- e. Dr. Wright responded that it would not change the grade release policy and that grade release is independent of the evaluation policy.
- f. Mendy Ingiaimo suggested that we also add this verbiage to each course syllabus so that students are very aware of this policy.
- g. All committee members agreed that this was a good idea and should be implemented
- h. Dr. Wright asked the committee what office should be in charge of monitoring the progress of evaluations.
- i. Mendy Ingiaimo commented that the Curriculum Coordinators would take this on and would remind students of the deadlines.
- j. Dr. Blenda asked about the students that do not attend class and whether or not they would be able to fill out the evaluation
- k. Dr. Wright responded that students who do not attend class will still be able to fill out the evaluation and there will be an option to put “N/A” (not applicable) for the ratings.
- l. There was a motion to approve the new evaluation policy, the motion was seconded and all were in favor
- m. Dr. Wright asked the committee what they would like to do regarding the module and faculty evaluation questions
- n. The current questions were pulled up from the Faculty and Course Evaluations so the committee members could take a look at them.

The Faculty Evaluation Questions are as follows:

1. Is Knowledgeable (M/C)
2. Was organized and well prepared for class. (M/C)
3. Effectively aligned instruction with stated session objectives. (M/C)
4. Provided materials for effective learning outside of class. (M/C)
5. Utilized effective learning materials in class. (M/C)
6. Encouraged critical and/or independent thinking. (M/C)
7. Was able to effectively translate complex ideas. (M/C)

8. Effectively motivated students. (M/C)
9. Demonstrated a commitment to student success. (M/C)
10. Was appropriately responsive to student questions and inquiries. (M/C)
11. Treated students with respect. (M/C)
12. 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)

13. Overall rating of this instructor in this module (M/C)
14. Instructor Strengths: (Short Answer)
15. Instructor Weaknesses: (Short Answer)

Faculty Evaluation Questions Discussion:

- i. Many committee members felt that some of the questions could be consolidated but the committee members felt the following:
  1. Eliminate Questions: 1, 3, 4, 6
  2. Keep Questions: 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
  3. Combine #8 & #9

Based on the committee members recommendations the Proposed Faculty Evaluation Questions for AY 2017-2017 are 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. (M/C)
2. Utilized effective learning materials in class. (M/C)
3. Was able to effectively translate complex ideas. (M/C)
4. Effectively motivated students and demonstrated a commitment to student success. (M/C)
5. Was appropriately responsive to student questions and inquiries. (M/C)
6. Treated students with respect. (M/C)
7. 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)

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

The Course Evaluation Questions are as follows:

1. Learning objectives effectively guided my studying/learning. (M/C)
2. Content was clearly related to the stated learning objectives. (M/C)

3. Content was well organized. (M/C)
4. When required, preparatory materials (readings, Self-Learning Modules, etc.) were useful. (M/C)
5. In general, sessions/activities enhanced learning of module content. (M/C)
6. In general, laboratory sessions (anatomy, histology, etc.) enhanced learning of module content. (M/C)
7. Please indicate your satisfaction with the availability of the instructor outside the classroom by choosing one response from the scale below. (In selecting your rating, consider the instructor's availability via established office hours, appointments, and other opportunities for face-to-face interaction as well as via telephone, e-mail, fax and other means. (M/C)
8. In websites, Canvas, or other Internet resources were a part of this course, to what extent did they enhance or detract from your learning experience in this course? (M/C)
9. Comments on GENERAL MODULE ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT (Short Answer)

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

10. Formative assessments were useful in monitoring my own learning process. (M/C)
11. Summative assessments accurately measured my understanding of the module material. (M/C)
12. Comments on MODULE ASSESSMENT. (Short Answer)

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

13. Overall, the clinical relevance of this module was made clear. (M/C)
14. Overall, the required work (in and out of class) for this module was appropriate. (M/C)
15. Overall, the level of challenge for this module was appropriate. (M/C)
16. Overall, I am satisfied with this module. (M/C)
17. 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.

18. Module STRENGTHS (Short Answer)
19. Module WEAKNESSES (Short Answer)
20. Suggested Module IMPROVEMENTS (Short Answer)
21. For what percentage of in-class activities did you attend? (M/C)
22. For what percentage of module content did you rely on university-generated resources (i.e., Canvas, Panapto, SLM's)? (M/C)
23. For what percentage of module content did you rely on non-university generated resources (i.e. Pathoma, YouTube, and UWorld)? (M/C)
24. Please provide feedback on module resources. (Short Answer)

Course Evaluation Questions Discussion:

- i. Many committee members felt that some of the questions could be consolidated but the committee members felt the following:
  1. Eliminate Questions: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 14 & 15

2. Keep Questions: 3, 11 & 16

Based on the committee members recommendations the **Proposed Course Evaluation Questions for AY 2017-2018** are 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. Websites, Canvas, or other Internet resources were a part of this course, to what extent did they enhance or detract from your learning experience in this course?
3. Comments on GENERAL MODULE ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT (Short Answer)

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

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

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

7. Overall, the clinical relevance of this module was made clear.
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this module.
9. 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.

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

Meeting Adjourned at 1:02 p.m.