

## TUCSON EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

**Meeting Minutes**  
**November 1, 2017**  
**4:30pm, 3220**

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

\*X = present

**MEETING NOTES****1. Announcements/Reminders:**

- a. **Introduction of new Associate Dean of Curricular Affairs, Dr. Sean Elliott**

**2. Voting Items:**

- a. **Minutes from October 4, 2017 TEPC Meeting**

The minutes were passed, with 11 voting in favor and no one voting against.

- b. **Program Evaluation Proposal (Weissburg)**

Dr. Paul Weissburg presented a proposal to revamp the program evaluation process. One facet of the proposal is streamlining two existing subcommittees, CRS and TEVS, into a single subcommittee with a membership consisting of the following:

- ⊙ **No less than three faculty representatives**
  - Appointed to 3 year terms
- ⊙ **Two student representatives**
  - Appointed
- ⊙ **Director of Program Evaluation and Student Assessment**
- ⊙ **Director of Accreditation**

- ◎ **Manager, Preclinical Education**
- ◎ **Manager, Clerkship Education**
- ◎ **Manager, Assessment and/or a representative from the Exam Review Subcommittee**

The rationale for doing is that the current subcommittees have been having difficulty meeting regularly and that the proposed membership would make use of relevant expertise (e.g., the Manager, Clerkship Education, the Manager, Preclinical Education, and the Director of Accreditation) that is currently not being utilized by these subcommittees. The existence of two distinct subcommittees, one for reviewing the blocks and one for reviewing the clerkships, is an historical artifact from when the Tucson campus and the Phoenix campus shared accreditation status.

Dr. Weissburg proposed that the new Evaluation Subcommittee should meet regularly throughout the academic year and, in particular, re-think the format, content, and use of the Level 3 report (which should be completed by the end of AY2017-18 ) and, in the process of so doing, also re-think the format, content and use of the two Level 2 reports. Additionally, they will be tasked with completing one pilot of the new “Self-Directed Study” which was proposed as a new approach toward Level 1 program evaluation. The Self-Directed Study would be conducted triennially for each course. There was some discussion regarding whether or not this process would also be applied to Surgery sub-I’s and Emergency Medicine. It was pointed out that Surgery Sub-I’s may be included in the Surgery clerkship review but that Emergency Medicine may be considered under the purview of the new Evaluation Subcommittee and evaluated through the same “Self-Directed Study” process if the pilot is successful and if the decision is made to continue using it following AY 2017-18.

The “Self-Directed Study” consists of the following process: Once every three years, the Evaluation Subcommittee reviews the past three years’ data for a course and identifies questions and concerns for the Course Director. The Course Director then addresses that data and the subcommittee’s questions and concerns within a self-study which concludes with “next-steps” and long-term planning to improve the course going forward. That self-study and the proposal for upcoming years is then sent back to the Evaluation Subcommittee, which has the option of accepting the plan, endorsing it with modifications, or rejecting it. The final step in the process occurs when the course director presents her/his self-study and plan to TEPC. Immediately following that presentation, a representative of the Evaluation Subcommittee presents their response to the plan. If that response includes modifications or changes, the TEPC members will then discuss and ultimately vote either to approve one of the two plans or else to reject both plans and to send the course director and the Evaluation Subcommittee back to address whatever problems remain.

One of the purposes of this process is to provide TEPC with options from which to choose and to facilitate discussion and debate. Another purpose of the “Self-Directed Study” is to put the course director in the driver’s seat for the program evaluation. The idea is that recommendations that have been developed by the course director may be more feasible than recommendations developed by a subcommittee with limited knowledge of the course. However, the process also increases accountability because the course director must present their plan to TEPC and make a compelling case that it will address any concerns that have been identified by the Evaluation Subcommittee.

These “Self-Directed Studies” would be conducted in addition to the “quick feedback reviews” that are currently being conducted for the blocks. Dr. Weissburg noted that the original plan was to also conduct these “quick feedback reviews” for the clerkships once the new curriculum reaches the clerkships, but that current resource limitations may make that difficult. A couple of different options were suggested but this question has been put on hold for the time being, as the final decision may be impacted by upcoming decisions.

During the discussion of this proposal, one suggestion was that there be increased student involvement in the program evaluation process. Although this suggestion did not result in a change to the proposed membership of the Evaluation Subcommittee, it is something that will be considered by the Evaluation Subcommittee when they prepare their recommendation to TEPC for the long-term composition of the subcommittee. A question was also raised about the time commitment for members of the Evaluation Subcommittee. Again, this will need to be addressed by the subcommittee when they come before TEPC

next summer to make their recommendations regarding the long-term composition of the group.

Following the explanation of the “Self Directed Study” and the new Evaluation Subcommittee and the subsequent discussion, the TEPC members voted on the following two motions:

**Motion #1:** To replace TEVS and CRS with a single subcommittee, the Evaluation Subcommittee, which would be responsible for the program evaluation of blocks, clerkships, and other courses as well as the Level 2 and Level 3 reports. The membership of the Evaluation Subcommittee would include:

- ⊙ **No less than three faculty representatives**
  - Appointed to 3 year terms
- ⊙ **Two student representatives**
  - Appointed
- ⊙ **Director of Program Evaluation and Student Assessment**
- ⊙ **Director of Accreditation**
- ⊙ **Manager, Preclinical Education**
- ⊙ **Manager, Clerkship Education**
- ⊙ **Manager, Assessment and/or a representative from the Exam Review Subcommittee**

**Motion #2:** To place the biennial block and clerkship program evaluations on hold for AY 2017-2018 while a new process is piloted: The Self-Directed Study

**Details:** Quick Feedback Evaluations of all blocks in the new curriculum will continue throughout AY 2017-18, but biennial block and clerkship evaluations will be put on hold (with the possible exception of Medicine, which is already in progress) while the Evaluation Subcommittee focuses on the Level 3 Report and one pilot clerkship evaluation.

After the completion of the pilot clerkship evaluation and the Level 3 Report, TEPC will revisit this issue to decide whether or not to replace the biennial evaluations with the Self-Directed Study.

Both motions were passed, with 11 voting in favor and no one voting against.

### 3. Discussion items:

#### a. Foundations “Quick Feedback” Program Evaluation Report

Dr. Weissburg presented the Foundations “Quick Feedback” Program Evaluation Report. He began by noting that the general feedback for the block was largely negative, which is unusual for the Foundations block. It was noted that many of the reasons for that negative reaction by students lay outside the control of the block director. Foundations was the first block in the new, shortened preclinical curriculum and the block was reduced from 10 weeks to 8 weeks. Dr. Weissburg noted that the challenges inherent in the structure of the block, which has been described as “patchwork,” appear to have been exacerbated by the reduced time. For incoming students trying to adapt to the pace of medical school, it was extremely challenging to be taught a variety of different subjects in a short period of time. Further, aspects of the block that previously seemed to work well, such as the extensive use of ILMs, became problematic in the condensed schedule as students had less unscheduled time to absorb that material.

The data show a slight increase in the number of students who scored below 70 for the MK competency in the block and an increase in the number of students scoring below 75 (which has historically been treated as the cut-off for students being “at-risk” to fail Step 1) and in the number of students scoring below 83 (currently being cited by Curricular Affairs as the more realistic “at-risk” cut-off).

Student survey feedback also shows a marked decrease in “amount of unscheduled time” (from 3.05 for the Class of 2020 to 2.37 for the Class of 2021), the “overall organization of the block” (from 3.71 for the Class of 2020 to 2.76 for the Class of 2021) and for “overall teaching of this block” (from 4.16 for the Class

of 2020 to 3.40 for the Class of 2021).

There was much discussion of the challenges facing the block and an agreement that there needs to be serious discussion of how the block can be modified in the future to address some of these concerns.

Toward the end of the discussion, Dr. Larry Moher drew attention to a remark in the report that had been made by two focus group participants. The two students had stated that they felt the College of Medicine had claimed to be inclusive when they were being recruited by they felt that, now that they were enrolled, there was no consideration of how the condensed curriculum might be impacting them, particularly considering their traditionally poor performance on standardized exams. One of the two students, when asked to rate her stress level on a scale of 1 to 10, had answered “20” and then had stated that she “wasn’t kidding.” Dr. Moher expressed his concern that more needs to be done to help some of the students who are struggling with the new curriculum.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00pm. The next meeting is scheduled for November 15, 2017.