

TUCSON EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
July 19, 2017
4:30pm, 3230

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

*X = present

MEETING NOTES

1. Announcements/Reminders:

a. Introduction of two new TEPC members

2. Voting Items:

a. Minutes from June 7, 2017 TEPC Meeting

Minutes will be sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote.

07-24-17 update: Vote to approve the minutes from June 7, 2017 (see attachment)

b. Retake and remediation schedule

This schedule is for AY 17-18. The retake dates, per policy changes, will be the Monday following the final exam except for the DMH block which that Monday happens to fall on a holiday; therefore, their retake day will be the Tuesday following the holiday. Remediation is 6 weeks per policy. For the class of 2021 the remediation date will be July 11th and for the class of 2020 it will be June 8th. The schedule has been distributed to all Block Directors and so far the dates have been okay'd by those directors who have responded back to Sonia. The schedule is consistent with the policy and policy changes that have been discussed previously.

Retake and remediation schedule will be sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote.

07-24-17 update: Vote to approve the retake and remediation schedule for this calendar year (see attachment)

c. The use of post-graduation data in the Level 3 Report

Essentially up until now, when the Level 3 report is done, it does not generally have a lot of post-graduation data in it and this is a problem because it would be useful to have this information. In addition, the LCME requires we monitor post-graduation outcomes. There have been previous discussions regarding the use of the Missions Management Tool (AAMC) and the Arizona Medical Board report and including it in the next Level 3 report which is due later this year. As a reminder, the Level 3 report looks at the curriculum as a whole, the Level 1 report looks at the blocks and clerkships and the Level 2 report looks at the preclinical years. The MMT provides data on our students in terms of the diversity of the physicians, specialty choice, whether or not a graduate decides to stay and practice in our community. These are just a few examples of what the tool provides. This is just some of the data that makes sense for us to be using in our Level 3 report. The AAMC collects this data using a variety of propriety databases. The bottom line is that the COM is required to monitor graduate outcomes; what are our graduates doing? The COM decides what the goals of our graduates are therefore we need to show that the outcomes are aligned with our goals. The committee members voiced no objection to using the data in the Level 3 report.

A vote to use the Missions Management Tool and the Arizona Medical Board report in the Level 3 report will be sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote.

07-24-17 update: Vote to approve the use of Missions Management Tool and Arizona Medical Board report data in the Level 3 report

d. CPR “Quick Feedback” Block Evaluation

The goal of these experimental sessions is to gain quick feedback from the students on the blocks instead of waiting for the two year block review. The CPR block is the second session done this year with the Life Cycle block being the first one. Paul has been looking for the feasibility of continuing these sessions through this upcoming academic year specifically for the year one students going through the new curriculum. For this particular session he used one student focus group, he attended all three Block Advisory group meetings and he used the block survey results, in addition to looking at the exam scores for all three components of the CPR block. A post block meeting was held on June 26th that included Dr. Bloom, Jennifer Yelich and Dr. Tejal Parikh in addition to Paul. They reviewed all of the data collected. In this particular case Paul also looked at Step 1 scores from 2016 which is not typically done for these sessions. The scores on the test were pretty much the same as to be expected for the block. One interesting finding from the student surveys and the focus groups was that the students had a lot of praise for the renal and pulmonary components but more mixed feelings about the cardiovascular component of the block. The feedback heard was even though this was a different class; some of the problems were longstanding. Students had a lot of praise for Drs. Sussman, Bloom and Rappaport. Overall, they were very happy with the block. Of note, there was follow-up with Dr. Bloom regarding the issues within the cardiovascular component and Dr. Bloom has made changes. The only other issue was a scheduling issue of which Dr. Bloom is also working on.

Another issue that arose was what to do when a lecturer is providing information that doesn't align with the block. For example, the information may not be the most current. It might be worth bringing this issue up with TCMS so that the Block Directors can come up with diplomatic ways of setting the record straight during the lecture and while the students are there listening without creating an awkward moment. Other issues include how to handle lecturers who consistently receive negative evaluations from the students but continue to lecture in the block. Overall, it was a very positive review of the block and the main issue that did arise, Dr. Bloom was already aware of and even more aware of it after the meeting and he's taking specific steps to make corrections.

There was discussion on the feasibility of continuing these feedback sessions into the new academic year and what resources would be needed in order to continue. Paul felt it was possible to do all five

blocks in the coming year. Again, a priority should be placed on the class of 2021 due to the new curriculum. There was some discussion regarding the need to re-do our evaluation process with the start of the new curriculum. For example, the Level 1 report would no longer be necessary due to the fact it's designed based on the way blocks were before the new curriculum. Probably doesn't make sense to continue with Level 1 reports. Curricular Affairs will be recommending to TEPC that they be allowed to stop doing Level 1 reports as they continue with the Quick Feedback sessions. Question of whether the LCME would allow this or not was raised however the group was reminded that the LCME doesn't dictate this kind of granularity. With the help of the Accreditation Director, the college will need to make sure it's collecting the kind of data that the LCME wants. It was suggested that Curricular Affairs continue to collect the data, in the form of the Quick Feedback sessions, as we start the new curriculum. In 24 months the college will have data for two classes (class of 2021 and 2022) and then we can develop a Level 1 report. With this in mind, the committee had two items to vote on: 1) Approval of the "Quick Feedback" block evaluation for the CPR block and 2) Approval to use the "Quick Feedback" system of providing block evaluations for the new curriculum.

The CPR "Quick Feedback" Block Evaluation report will be sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote.

07-24-17 update: Vote to approve the "Quick Feedback" block evaluation for CPR (see attachment)

Approval to use the "Quick Feedback" system of providing block evaluations for the new curriculum will be sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote.

07-24-17 update: Vote to approve the use of the "Quick Feedback" block evaluations for the upcoming year for the new curriculum.

3. Discussion items:

a. TEPC Processes and Procedures – Proposed Changes

One of the topics regarding this proposal is changing the name of the committee. Should the name continue to be TEPC (Tucson Educational Policy Committee) or should it be EPC (Educational Policy Committee). Final decision on naming the committee falls under the purview of TEPC; it was decided to leave the name as is (TEPC). Of note, Phoenix has also decided to stay with PEPC.

There are two policies to consider, one is the bylaws which the medical staff has to vote on; the other is the change to the TEPC policies and these do not have to be approved by the general faculty. Approval from the Dean/COM is all that is needed. Dr. Sanders has submitted these changes to Anne Cress in Faculty Affairs who will be following up on this. The major change dealt with membership terms (3 year term with a renewable term), and this was suggested in order to be consistent with other COM committees. During the last meeting of TEPC, it was decided to leave general language regarding the student composition in that we want to have 4 students representing each year but to also allow Student Government the ability to elect another student should a current student member have the need to be away for an extended period of time. Finally, separating this committee from Phoenix was included in the changes.

Dr. Lebensohn would like to postpone vice-chair elections until the end of the semester. This would allow full incorporation of new committee member before asking them to vote.

There was concern over the wording used to describe the election process for the vice-chair and chair positions. The way the document is currently written, it reads as if the vice-chair automatically becomes chair however the first paragraph states "The Chair of the Educational Policy Subcommittee will be elected from the membership to serve for 2 years." This sounds like there are two processes happening in which case the description for vice-chair should not state "A Vice Chair will be elected from the membership and serve one year as Vice Chair before **assuming** the Chair position for the 2-year term." Some suggested rewording included: "A Chair Elect will be elected from the membership and serve for up to 2 years fulfilling the duties of Vice Chair for the same period; the Chair Elect will

serve as Vice Chair during the Chairs term. This makes it clear that if the Chair isn't available then the Vice Chair can fill in. Dr. Lebensohn will make some changes and bring it back for the committee to review.

Another issue regarding membership included mandatory requirements on attending meetings and whether or not the college has general rules for committee membership attendance. It becomes an issue when there is no quorum and voting is needed. Dr. Lebensohn will look into whether or not general rules exist in the COM.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm. The next meeting is August 2, 2017.

Of note, all five items voted electronically were passed with nine "yes" votes and zero "no" votes.

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