

TUCSON EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
October 4, 2017
4:30pm, 3220

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

*X = present

MEETING NOTES

1. **Announcements/Reminders:**
 - a. **Introduction of two new TEPC members**
2. **Voting Items:**
 - a. **Minutes from September 6, 2017 TEPC Meeting**

b. Electives Subcommittee proposal

This proposal would expand the membership and the responsibilities of the Electives Subcommittee. It was pointed out by one TEPC member that with the increased responsibilities, it may become necessary at some point to create a paid position for a Director of the subcommittee. There was some discussion of the membership of the subcommittee and it was decided that the members should include the Transition to Residency Course Director and the Back to Science Course Director, amongst others.

The Electives Subcommittee proposal will be sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote.

10-11-17 update: The proposal was passed with eight voting to approve and zero voting against.

c. Survey Completion proposal

The proposal would clarify that a student will lose 10% of their professionalism grade for each required survey that is not completed. Further, the proposal states that that loss of 10% occurs in the block in which the survey was required, not in the following block.

The Associate Dean of Student Affairs raised a concern with the wording of the proposal, noting that use of the term “remediation” would require that professional remediation be addressed in the MSPE. For that reason, the decision was made to delay the vote until after the wording could be adjusted to not include the term “remediation.”

A vote to approve the Survey Completion proposal will be sent via email to all committee members for an electronic vote.

10-11-17 update: The proposal was passed with eight voting to approve and zero voting against.

d. Grading Progression policy

Following the discussion and concerns raised at the September 6 meeting, the updates to the retake exam policy were changed so that they do not include the Foundations block and to remove the stipulation that students receiving scores below a certain level would not be permitted to do a retake exam. The policy as currently written states that:

For all blocks except **Foundations**, students who score less than 70.0% on **two (2)** or more high-stakes written exams with an overall MK score less than 70.0% are **NOT** eligible for a Retake Exam and will receive a grade of “F”. Students must (1) remediate the block/course or (2) repeat that course.

Much of the concern regarding this policy centered around two points: First, that it would take place within this academic year, which means that students who had been brought in under one set of rules would now be subject to different rules than they had originally been told. The second major point of concern is that this policy will most likely result in an increase in the number of remediations, yet it is uncertain what resources will be available with which to provide those remediations.

The main counter-argument is that the current retake exam system seems to be passing students through the curriculum even if they lack content mastery and that this is doing the students a tremendous disservice. They continue passing through the blocks and then are unable to pass the Step 1 exam. Those failures are far worse for them than if they had been required to remediate the blocks and helped to learn the content before taking Step 1.

One interesting point that arose was that the Class of 2019 were reported to generally support the proposed change while the Class of 2021 very strongly opposed it.

After much discussion, there appeared to be a general consensus among most members that the proposed policy is not ideal, but it is preferable to continuing with the existing retake exam policy, provided that the college put sufficient resources into remediation programs for students in time for the first expected wave of remediations in the summer of 2018.

The policy was passed. The final vote was 8 in favor and 2 opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00pm. The next meeting is October 18, 2017.