Curriculum and Instruction Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 7, 2010

Attendees:
Grady Carter, MD
Marie Dent, Ph.D.
Wade Fletcher, MD
Wayne Glasgow, PhD
Ashley Horner, PhD
Carolyn Klatt, MLIS
Edward Klatt, MD
Blanca Lopez, MD
Patrick Roche, MD.
Allison Scheetz, MD
Tina Thompson, PhD, Chair
Jerry Tift, PhD
Erin Meehan, MSI
Joseph Harmon, MSI

Absent:
David Burtner, MD
Robert Donner, MD
Klugh Kennedy, PharmD
Michael Smith, PhD
McKinley Thomas, EdD
Umangi Patel, MSIII
Abhi Saxena, MSIV

Dr. Tina Thompson, Chair of the CIC Committee, called the meeting to order 4:35 PM.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 16, 2010 meeting were presented for the approval of the committee.

A motion to approve the minutes as presented was made, seconded and approved.

Old Business

Review Calendar

Dr. Thompson noted forms were sent out this week for the Clinical Skills, COP and Ethics reviews. The reports are scheduled to be back to the Committee in early November. Dr. Fletcher will be handling these reviews.

Forms were also sent out for the Pathology review. Dr. Scheetz will be completing the review of the Pathology report, which is due back to the CIC by the end of November.

Dr. Thompson will e-mail the reviewers approximately two weeks before the report is due from the component to let them know to expect the report and provide the reviewer with the list of
students tied to the discipline review and their e-mail addresses. She cautioned members to close the doors when doing the actual reviews as complaints have been received about the noise level.

The Anatomy Embryology review has been placed on hold for now. This review will be moved to sometime later on in the schedule.

The Emergency Medicine report is scheduled to be reviewed during the first week of November. The Histology review still has not been received.

Dr. Carter and his committee are in the process of their Family Medicine review. This report is set to present to the CIC the third week of October.

**New Business**

**Physiology Review**

The physiology review was forwarded to committee members for their review prior to today’s meeting. Dr. Klatt was the discipline reviewer and indicated this report was delayed for a couple of months. The last two sentences of the report were read and opened to Committee discussion. “Students continue to show respect and appreciation for the knowledge and efforts of discipline faculty who contribute to their education. Students are asking for more guidance to obtain relevant knowledge with assessments that reflect their effort, while discipline faculty emphasizes importance of upholding current standards of curriculum deliver and outcomes.”

Dr. Thompson questioned if the report was saying that there is a disconnect between the educational objections and the assessments for the discipline? This is one issue that keeps coming up in student evaluations. Students indicated exam questions had confusing language that left them wondering what the question was asking and felt the USMLE Step1 questions were easier by comparison. Student CIC members observed that even students who had a good grasp of the material were frustrated trying to understand the questions. Everything that is being said in the report has been said before.

Dr. Klatt indicated that the information in this report is essentially the same as the report completed by the CIC three years ago. Physiology and Histology were the only two disciplines that met the requirements for a special CIC review approximately 3-4 years ago. At that time, physiology was asked to complete a more thorough review of the discipline. The completion of those documents was prolonged over many months and when received were incomplete and fell short of providing a thoughtful analysis of the problem and recommendations for improvement.

Members questioned whether the CIC was going to continue to ‘spin-its wheels’ completing reviews with no follow through. Dr. Thompson reminded them that when the CIC came up with the review system about 1 year ago, they also provided a mechanism for a second level of review/implementation. It was the consensus of the committee that the CIC does have the authority and the responsibility to insure that recommended changes to a program, discipline or course occur in a timely manner.
A long discussion followed about the process of question generation and review. The role of the Phase Coordinator, tutors and peer-reviewer where all explained and discussed. Currently, the discipline faculty has total control of the questions except for the question format. This problem is not about individuals, it is about a system. For the discussion at hand, offers from various Phase coordinators, tutors, and the program directors to assist the physiology faculty in rewriting the questions has not been well received.

The plan being developed in the Phase Coordinator’s Committee to form question writing groups consisting of discipline faculty, clinical faculty and individuals with USMLE question writing experience was mentioned. While this plan will improve everyone’s question writing and in the long-run all the MDEs, this is not an immediate solution to the physiology problem.

Dr. Carter suggested a proposal to create a fairly objective panel consisting of CIC members, the physiology question writers and other selected individuals to review all the physiology MDE questions prior to each exam and edit for style and clarity, NOT content. The CIC has no desire to impinge on the academic freedom of the question writers to determine question content; they do have a desire to require that the questions are clear and well-written. This review panel would strive to work with the physiology discipline to improve the questions but would have ultimate authority to change the questions as necessary.

The CIC agreed that a physiology review panel with authority to mandate question improvement while providing assistance in the process was necessary and appropriate. The actual make-up of the panel and the process by which this would be accomplished was tabled until next meeting. Members were asked to return with specific ideas on the composition and process.

Dr. Roche suggested that in the future the CIC reviewers have a copy of the previous review to see if previous issues had been addressed.

SGE

Dr. Scheetz presented an SGE for Dimpu Patel, MSIV entitled “A Glimpse of Fellowships in Internal Medicine” which was approved by the 4th year Subcommittee. The CIC reviewed the SGE and agreed with the 4th year subcommittee’s approval with the inclusion that the student present a case study to Dr. Scheetz upon completion of the elective.

*The CIC affirmed the approval of the SGE by the 4th Year Subcommittee.*

**Adjournment**

There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:37PM.

Minutes recorded by:  
Debbie Brickner