

Year 1 Curriculum Advisory Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 13, 2018

Present: B. Bany, S. Bhaumik, J. Cheatwood, K. Cecil, R. Clough, J. Daniels, J. Davie, L. DiLalla, R. Gupta, B. Hales, A. Johnson, J. MacLean, S. Merideth, P. Narayan, E. Niederhoffer S. Shea, A. Sutphin, K. Whittington

Guest: N. Henry

S. Shea called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

Minutes

The January 9, 2018 minutes were approved as distributed.

Announcements

J. Cheatwood shared there were eight MPEE applications. They are currently being reviewed, and decisions should be made by the end of February. S. Shea noted the Dean plans to attend the presentations this year.

S. Merideth announced that the PDL is back in use.

J. Daniels announced that admissions is nearly done for the year.

J. Daniels shared that advisor assignments have been distributed. He reminded advisors of University confidentiality rules and recommended that advisors play the role of “good cop” in their interactions with students and refer problems to S. Shea or him. L. DiLalla asked whether students are required to meet once with their advisors. It was agreed that this will be the plan starting with the new academic year, but it should be optional for students in the current class.

J. Daniels reported that mentors cannot receive discounts on campus, but they can use the Medical Library. They can have an appointment via the department of Family and Community Medicine, and they can be promoted. S. Merideth clarified that all mentors, physicians providing clinical field experiences, and those who work with students in the PDL already have volunteer faculty appointments. A. Sutphin noted that volunteer faculty may also use the MRC.

J. Daniels announced that W. El-Amin will be in Carbondale on March 7. He is still trying to identify a time when she can work with advisors and other faculty on how to provide academic coaching to students.

N. Henry shared that all tutor groups received bags of treats for Random Acts of Kindness Week, which was greatly appreciated. S. Shea indicated one of the medical students was responsible for this.

S. Shea announced that the EPC approved the Year 1 calendar for 2018-19 as well as the four-year calendar for 2018-19. The EPC also discussed what constitutes a pure problem-based curriculum. In Year 2, not all faculty are showing up to resource sessions. The Medical Informatics committee is the process of purchasing ExamSoft software. It might be available for the ERG exam.

S. Shea announced that the Symposium on Teaching & Learning has been moved to Friday, April 20, which causes a number of conflicts in Year 1.

Doctoring Report

S. Shea reported for C. Anderson that doctoring is going reasonably well in NMB. An average number of students failed the mid-unit CCX, which was done in virtual patient format. Write-ups are being graded, SPs are being recruited for the end-of-unit exam, and she is working with students on documentation skills.

Student Report

K. Whittington noted all students appreciated the session with Parkinson patients. The class will be sending thank you notes to the patients.

Multiple students have requested that E. Niederhoffer provide explanations for more of the biochemistry SAQs in NMB. E. Niederhoffer skimmed the last four last of SAQs noting that most of the biochemistry questions have explanations;

he wonders if the students are confusing the genetics/cell cycle questions and requested they send a specific list of questions for which they would like feedback.

One student shared a strong request to have the end-of-unit exam on paper. S. Shea indicated the exam will be done using PDF files, in part because of the utilization of color and/or hi-resolution images.

Because Echo is not available, a couple of students requested that E. Niederhoffer annotate his PowerPoint slides so they can more easily follow along with the audio recording. K. Cecil added a request that the muscle metabolism RS be held prior to the mid-unit exam, as it would be more beneficial. E. Niederhoffer encouraged students who are having problems with topics to contact faculty directly or to use the Discussions forum.

K. Cecil requested a wrap for the vision mini cases and noted that the vision sessions all seemed to be in a rush prior to the mid-unit exam. S. Shea noted that part of the reason the vision mini cases are not wrapped is because there are so many pre-sessions. In addition, if the day is already busy, adding a case wrap would make things worse. To decompress the vision materials, K. Cecil suggested that the vision day lab be moved to after the exam. K. Whittington shared mixed feedback about the vision day lab. Some students liked it while others found it a poor use of their time.

Students would find it helpful if R. Clough posted his pre-lab handouts earlier.

Students did not find the cortex lab helpful because there were too many students for the two faculty who were present. K. Cecil recommended scheduling the lab for half the class at a time. R. Clough indicated this has not been a problem in the past, as more students left early for the winter ball.

Students feel that doctoring does not communicate well with the Year 1 curriculum. They find it unfair that half the class had H&P I the day before the mid-unit exam, while the rest of the class had the day off to study. S. Shea noted this is not a communication issue; we do not have other scheduling options. If students have suggestions, they are encouraged to share them.

Students challenged questions on the mid-unit exam using the query sheets but have not received any feedback. S. Shea did send an e-mail with feedback, from her home computer, and will resend it.

Students have found recent case wraps to be very helpful. They recommend CRR utilize more physicians for wraps as well.

R. Clough asked for feedback about R. Barr's hip arthroplasty demonstration. The student representatives have not heard much about this, but what they did hear was positive.

K. Whittington asked where online evaluations of faculty go. A report is compiled that is distributed to D. Klamen, S. Shea, and unit coordinators while individual faculty receive the portions that pertain to them. All responses are anonymous.

NMB Report

R. Clough reported that the unit is "cruising at breakneck speed." There is one case left. Reviews will be starting soon. Students are encouraged to contact R. Clough, N. Viscomi, and D. Sarko to request additional help sessions as needed; these are available to all students. The test is under development. R. Clough is pleased there have been no major issues with the unit.

S. Shea distributed a breakdown of NMB SAQs by discipline. Faculty were encouraged to review the distribution of questions across cases. The data should not be shared with incoming students.

ERG Preview Report

The draft report circulated with the agenda will be taken to the EPC. It is essentially a request to continue doing what has been done in ERG in the past. The NMB report was used as a template. R. Gupta highlighted the various portions of the report.

B. Hales shared that aligning LIs with SAQs and exam questions is a work in progress. It suffers from faculty fatigue, and he suggested we may want to have different faculty reviewing the MCQs.

J. MacLean moved to approve the ERG plan and send it to the EPC. J. Davie seconded the motion, which carried with one abstention.

Other Business

R. Clough questioned the purpose of the preview report going to the EPC, given that it is highly repetitive of the longitudinal report that is prepared at the end of each unit. He feels the additional administrative burden detracts from time available to teach students. R. Gupta explained the report is in response to a new directive from the LCME.

E. Niederhoffer asked when the CRR preview report must get to the EPC. They would like to have them two months in advance, but will accept them as soon as possible before each unit begins. Two months was found to be impossible by all unit coordinators. S. Shea noted that the calendar is not a required portion of the report; she chose to add the calendar to the NMB report to visually emphasize how Year 1 differs from Year 2. If the calendar is not necessary, J. Cheatwood noted it should not be difficult to update future preview reports, as units do not change significantly from year to year. In addition, he suggested we continue to question the need for preview and longitudinal reports that are highly redundant. S. Shea added that the EPC does want the “external review” mentioned in the report, with Year 1 and Year 2 faculty working together to review each other’s units.

Several faculty expressed their disappointment in the tutor refresher training that has been done in the CRR and NMB units. They feel that it was more of an evaluation than a refresher. It was agreed to discuss the format at the annual retreat with the goal of using only Year 1 faculty.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held Tuesday, March 20, at 8:30 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 a.m.