Curriculum and Instruction Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 3, 2011

Attendees:

David Burtner, MD
Grady Carter, MD
Marie Dent, PhD
Robert Donner, MD
Wayne Glasgow, PhD
Ashley Horner, PhD
Jeff Ignatoff, MD
Klugh Kennedy, PharmD
Carolyn Klatt, MLIS
Edward Klatt, MD
Blanca Lopez, MD
Erin Meehan, MSII
Umangi Patel, MSIII
Allison Scheetz, MD
Michael Smith, PhD
Tina Thompson, PhD, Chair

Absent:

Wade Fletcher, MD
Joseph Harmon, MSI
Patrick Roche, MD
Abhi Saxena, MSIV
McKinley Thomas, EdD
McKinley Thomas, EdD

Call to order

Dr. Tina Thompson, Chair of the CIC Committee, called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 17, 2011 meeting were presented for the approval of the committee. The following additions (italicized) were recommended to the minutes:

- What is required of students is impacting performance in other disciplines. Evidence – #1 discipline remediation in the school; this has impacted clerkship scheduling. Students spend tremendous amount of time to learn to be success (pass) in histology. Do students then become “strategic learners” who focus just on trying to pass the next exam?
- NBME Step 1 scores for MUSM classes are historically similar across basic science disciplines, with no statistically significant differences, regardless of the emphasis placed on a discipline. Students remediating histology with an NBME shelf exam may score above the national mean (do we have actual numbers?).
- Resource sessions are recommended, should not be required. Students feel they must attend the resource sessions and then review recordings of resource sessions, often multiple times, in order to be successful in this discipline.

The minutes were approved with the above mentioned additions.

Old Business

Histology Review

It was the consensus of the CIC committee to ask Dr. Kacsoh to come to a future meeting to discuss the issues and to identify a workable solution. Dr. Kacsoh was contacted and has agreed to attend the April 7, 2011 CIC meeting.

The Committee expressed concern over the seeming arbitrary use of the term ‘Academic Freedom’ whenever the CIC initiates curricular review and/or reform. Dr. Thompson contacted Mr. Bill Solomon and invited him to a CIC meeting to discuss this issue. Mr. Solomon will send a written summary to Dr. Thompson regarding how academic freedom relates/does not relate to this issue. She will forward that statement to the CIC members. Mr. Solomon is available to attend the 3/17/11 meeting should the CIC still want him to discuss the information.

Remediation Policy

Back in the fall, a task force of the CIC was charged with drafting a remediation policy for the BMP program. The policy was created and approved by the CIC in September, 2010. The policy was then presented to the Basic Science discipline faculty for comments. Those comments were to be considered by the task force and a final draft of the policy was to be presented to the CIC. Dr. Thompson presented the information in person to the Basic Science faculty in Macon at their request. Their comments were taken back to the task force and the policy was amended. Today, Dr. Thompson presented a compromise policy for approval of the CIC so it may be instituted next month.

Highlights of the presentation are:

Recommendations on Process: If, at the end of Year II, a student's average in any discipline is below 65%, the student must remediate that discipline.

The task force proposed that the discipline faculty responsible for the remediation will schedule a meeting with the student as soon as year-end discipline grades have been finalized. The purpose of this meeting is to determine an approach for study and learning.

The task force found that there was no remediation policy, just a re-examination policy.
At this meeting the following will occur:

- A review of the student’s performance in the discipline including an assessment of areas (Topics) of weakness
- A recommendation by the faculty member of appropriate resources the student should use in his/her remediation and in preparation for their re-assessment.
- The student, in consultation with the Discipline faculty will prepare a study plan. This plan must include scheduled meeting(s) between the student and the discipline faculty to discuss remediation topics.
- The study plan will include the length of study, the date and format of the re-assessment examination. The date of the examination will be set with consideration of the student’s study plan.
- A signed copy of this study plan will be forwarded to the BMP Directors prior to the start of remediation activities.

Another concern of the task force was uniformity of assessment. The task force is upholding the current policy:

- When a student's score in a given discipline is less than 63%, a written, quantitative examination shall be administered to certify that remediation has been completed and that the student is satisfactory. A Discipline may choose between one of two types of written quantitative examinations:
  a. An in-house MDE examination. Format will be consistent with current BMP policies and at a level of difficulty consistent with that of the initial test(s). A passing score on this examination will be 65%. OR
  b. An NBME discipline specific shelf exam. A passing score on this examination will be the 25th percentile.

As it currently exists, the disciplines are able to set that passing score for the NBME shelf exam however they choose. Currently the passing score ranges from the 33rd to the 52nd percentile. The original proposal to the faculty was that it be set at the 10th percentile.

When a student’s score in a given discipline is unsatisfactory but not less than 63%, the nature of the examination (oral, MDE or shelf exam) used to certify successful remediation shall be at the discretion of the faculty of said discipline. The criteria for passing an MDE exam or shelf exam shall be the same as above.

Assessment Outcomes (this is the way the policy is currently written)

- Satisfactory: Discipline faculty certify that each student who successfully completes remediation is satisfactory for the Years I and II content in that discipline.
- Unsatisfactory: Students who fail a remediation exam will be referred to the SAPC for further remediation recommendations.
The amended proposal was open for discussion of the CIC. Being this is a proposal from a task force of the CIC, a second is not necessary. Dr. Thompson did ask for a vote, all members voted yes. This was presented to the executive council on Monday just for information, so not to lose a whole month. We will now have an e-mail ballot of the executive council on this proposal and hopefully be able to put it in play the upcoming academic year.

New Business

Pharmacology Review

The evaluation team met last week. The team consisted of 3 students from Macon and 3 students from Savannah with Dr. Donner leading the team. The review covered the period of 2008, 2009 and 2010.

A brief overview of the report was given by Dr. Donner. There are a total of 71 competencies that students are expected to acquire. Pharmacology created an all-encompassing competency, “Know the principles of pharmacology, therapeutics, and therapeutic decision-making”. The report broke down the participation by faculty in tutorial sessions.

Review Team Conclusions:

- The number of pages appears high. Over time students tend to by-pass the reading assignments and concentrate on review of resource presentations and flash cards.

- The number of questions on the MDEs is appropriate. The style of the questions differ from the USMLE Step 1 questions, which are integrated by discipline, e.g. Pharm plus Microbiology components in single question.

- Resource sessions by teleconference are satisfactory. Over time, students tend to rely on review of the presentations, rather than attendance at the live presentation.

- The Pharmacology discipline as far as education and student performance has no major issues.

Recommendations:

1. Continue to monitor the MDE performance in Phase A and Neurology.

2. Encourage discipline faculty to clearly indicate which of the cited readings are REVIEW.

3. Encourage all Pharmacology faculty to provide focused LARGE Group Resource Sessions to include all Pharmacology faculty.
4. For CIC: Establish a working group of clinical and basic science faculty to create a group of USMLE Step 1-like integrated questions for the exams.

Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:53 PM.

Minutes recorded by:
Debbie Brickner