

## TUCSON EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

**Meeting Minutes**  
**August 16, 2017**  
**4:30pm, 3230**

MEETING ATTENDEES			
Voting Members		Resource Members	
Kristopher Abbate		Sonia De Leon	
Elle Campbell		George Fantry	
Maria Czuzak	X	Carlos Gonzales	
Zoe Cohen	X	Raquel Givens	X
Dawn Coletta	X	Kevin Moynahan	
Larry Moher	X	Diane Poskus	X
Patricia Lebensohn	X	Karen Spear Ellinwood	X
Lindsey Lepoidevin	X	Amy Waer	
Art Sanders		Paul Weissburg	X
Sydney Rice		Violet Siwik	
Jordana Smith		Travis Garner	X
Kathy Smith			
Jim Warneke	X	Special Guests	
Stephen Wright			
Chad Viscusi	X		

\*X = present

### MEETING NOTES

#### 1. Announcements and Reminders:

- a. All members as well as resource staff present introduced themselves. New members were welcomed, Drs. Zoe Cohen, Dawn Coletta and Larry Moher. Dr. Lebensohn reminded the committee that the schedule for meeting is twice a month (1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of every month). Over the next two years, due to the curriculum renewal, TEPC will play an important role with many of the changes planned for the curriculum. An orientation to the role of TEPC and its subcommittees was done and since it is anticipated that many voting items will be coming, it is important that all members understand the role this committee plays with regard to the medical education program.

#### 2. Voting Items:

##### a. Minutes from July 19, 2017 TEPC Meeting

Minutes were sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote; no objections or corrections were voiced. Motion to approve minutes.

##### b. Pediatric Clerkship Review

Dr. Warneke presented the report. Clerkship reviews are scheduled every two years. Overall, the committee gave the clerkship a satisfactory rating which is a change for this clerkship because in the past it has always received an excellent rating. They have often won the Clerkship of the Year Award as evaluated by 3<sup>rd</sup> year students during the Faculty Teaching Awards Ceremony. There

were not many issues that arose from the review except for adequacy of inpatients for students to see on the rotation. The learning environment received very positive ratings as noted on the summary. The instruction by the residents and attendings was excellent. Student feedback indicated that there are fewer patients so often there is down time in which the students do not have any patients to see or write notes on. Another concern is that residents were evaluating the students after only being with them a few days and the resident that the students spent the majority of time with was already off rotation and thus not evaluating the students. With regards to the learning environment, the committee decided to give a rating of satisfactory with just a few negative comments. The department is aware of the issues and has been monitoring the situations. Again, there were overwhelming positive comments with just a few negative comments but it's important to note the department is continuing to monitor things. Other recommendations included finding other ways to engage students during downtime if more patients could not be found for the students; utilizing community resources or developing independent learning opportunities for the students. The clerkship could consider requiring residents to evaluate students before they rotate off service to another rotation.

Of note, the clerkship has lost TMC as a site for sending students and this review of the clerkship shows a direct result of this loss. TMC was a high volume learning environment for the students and residents. A major concern will of course be the overlap of the classes of 2020 and 2021 expected in 2019 (February 25 – July 5, 2019). With regard to student performance assessment and feedback, recommendations were that the clerkship director should continue to monitor student performance across sites of similar size/category to address issues in grading discrepancies.

For a complete summary, please refer to the Clerkship Review Subcommittee (CRS) Report dated June 2017.

Followed by the review of the report was a discussion on the need to consider the "N" number when such reports are compiled. When recommendations are made, this is taken into consideration. It would also be helpful to give the "N" so when comments are included they are put into context. It is standard practice when reporting qualitative data. Changes to the evaluation process are underway by the Program Evaluation Team and this issue will be taken into consideration.

Members were asked to vote to accept the report. Motion approved; all in favor; no objections.

### **3. Discussion items:**

#### **a. Chair Succession model**

As a follow-up to the last meeting, the discussion regarding the roles of the chair and vice-chair continued. Dr. Lebensohn would like to develop a model that the committee can agree on. One model would be for an official chair to be elected and then someone else who could cover in the event the chair was not available. Shortening of terms from 5 to 3 years has caused some difficulty with the election process in that it limits the ability for a person to be available for more than 3 years. The idea is to always have 2 persons; one official chair and a back-up person. Currently, the committee has Dr. Lebensohn as chair and Dr. Sanders as the immediate past chair. For the following year, Patricia will continue as chair and with a chair elect who will serve as vice chair.

The idea being there is always a chair. The first year the chair works with the immediate past chair; the second year, the chair works with the elected chair; followed by the elected chair becoming chair and the immediate past chair works as a back-up. It is noted that with the decrease in term limits, this may cause problems in the future but this will be addressed at that time. The by-laws for TEPC will be updated to reflect the above model followed by a vote.

#### **b. Program Evaluation Overview:**

Work has been in progress since last year on how we are going to evaluate and provide quick

feedback with the new curriculum. The current program evaluation structure which served the *AZMED* curriculum worked well however the system does not work well for the new curriculum, for multiple reasons. TEPC, besides reviewing the curriculum is also charged with evaluation. There are several subcommittees that have different roles in terms of evaluation. A review of these committees was done.

CRS (Clerkship Review Subcommittee): Results were just presented on the Pediatric clerkship. The subcommittee is composed of 4 faculty, 2 students, 4 members from TEPC, 1 clinician at large and 1 basic scientist who is not teaching in a clerkship. Currently, it has only been Drs. Lebensohn and Warneke, plus a student, staff and the clinician at large who have been meeting. This structure is not working. The role of the CRS is to evaluate a clerkship every 2 years. This means that with the new curriculum and with the current schedule, data from two previous years is being reviewed and for obvious reasons, this system may not provide valid feedback to the Clerkship Directors.

TEVS (Tucson Evaluation Subcommittee): This committee is too large. Paul has been having problems with convening this committee. They have not met in the time Paul has been with the University. The responsibility of this committee is large. They look at 3 levels of evaluation: blocks or clerkships, the clinical/preclinical, which in the new curriculum will be phase 1 (18 months), the clerkship phase, and the Transition to Residency. Currently, there are only 2 phases (preclinical and clinical) which includes 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year to look at. Level 1 which evaluates the individual blocks and clerkships, and Level 2 with the new curriculum will have 3 sections. Level 3 is the report we are currently due to have one now and this would review the entire curriculum. The Level 2 and 3 reports are done by TEVS so it is an important committee to be functioning and currently it's not functioning properly.

TCMS (Tucson Curriculum Management Subcommittee): This is an active committee and is comprised of all Block, Discipline and Thread directors. They are active especially now with the curriculum renewal. They were tasked with doing two year block reviews but that has not occurred in a while in addition to the fact the reviews were put on hold due to the curriculum renewal. On the other hand, students have commented that there are two committees for the clerkships (an evaluation committee and a clerkship committee; and for the first two years we have one committee for curriculum and evaluation. It should be noted that this is legacy from being a combined campus with Phoenix. We had different tracks for years 1 and 2 but supposedly the same program for years 3 and 4.

TCCS (Tucson Clinical Curriculum Subcommittee): Parallel to what TCMS is for the 18 month curriculum, TCCS is for the clerkship year. This is a functioning and active committee.

Exam Review Committee: This committee meets after every Block exam and reviews the statistics with Mike Gura to make sure things are looking okay. Review of only in-house exams versus the NBME is done as a result of the members not having access to NBME results. This committee reviews exams for use of valid questions; objectives that are testable; why students chose an answer; could another answer also be correct; could a question be taken out. This committee is functioning. It should be noted that exam questions have been reviewed for 8 years now.

Electives Subcommittee: This is not a very active committee. Dr. Warneke commented that they mainly have been there to look at end of the year reports from evaluations; many of the electives are only taken by 1-2 students; few are taken by the whole class. Since this committee does not have curriculum oversight, they have only been monitoring their performance as an elective and reviewing/approving new elective proposals. Work is done by email only. The committee currently consists of Drs. Warneke, Ron Schiffman, and Shehab. This subcommittee might be able to fold into the Transition to Residency phase and 4<sup>th</sup> year electives could be part of that. We will need to have a body to look at whether we have enough electives or not; the quality of them, etc.

TEPC will need to decide which of these subcommittees will continue as we move into the new curriculum. For example, CRS could be dismantled since it existed because of Phoenix. It could work through TCCS like it works through TCMS. TEVS is something that will need to be looked into; the membership composition. Soon there will be much to review for each block and clerkship and to have immediate evaluation feedback will be important and informative as opposed to having it two years later. There still needs to be discussion about what is the best frequency for these reviews. Is it right after the block or clerkship is done? How often do we need the more in depth Level 1 report, especially in light of the quick formative feedback sessions? The committee was asked for input/ideas. These subcommittees would continue to report to TEPC.

It was agreed that consolidating is a good idea. It was also suggested that the new LCME standards that apply to the work of TEPC should be updated so the connections can be made when decisions are being considered by this committee.

Next steps will be to present a new program evaluation model to the committee which will include the frequency of conducting Level 1, 2 and 3 reviews; which committees will be dismantled and which will stay; what will be the responsibilities, etc. A full program evaluation proposal by Spring 2018 in terms of our new governance would be nice. As a reminder and please keep in mind, the minimum requirement from the LCME is that the program looks at the unit level (blocks, clerkships), looks at the segments (phases) and then the curriculum as a whole. How often is this done; how much is done; who looks at it, etc. Any more ideas from the members should be sent to Patricia and Paul.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm. The next meeting is September 6, 2017.

<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>			
	<b>Items(s)</b>	<b>Assigned to</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
<b>1.</b>	Further rewording of the elections process of the "TEPC Processes and Procedures" document	Patricia Lebensohn, MD	8/16/17
<b>2.</b>	Research on whether or not the COM has general rules regarding mandatory committee attendance	Patricia Lebensohn, MD	8/16/17