

CEPC Meeting

12.05.2016 05:00 PM - 07:00 PM

Purpose:	
Presenters:	Blunk, Dan, Brower, Richard, Cashin, Laura, Francis, Maureen, Hogg, Tanis, Kassar, Darine, Lacy, Naomi, Perry, Cynthia, Pfarr, Curt
Note Taker:	Dankovich, Robin
Attendees:	De Lara, Veronica , Beinhoff, Lisa, Blunk, Dan , Brower, Richard, Cashin, Laura, Cervantes, Jorge, Dankovich, Robin, Francis, Mark, Francis, Maureen, Gest, Thomas, Hogg, Tanis, Horn, Kathryn , Htay, Thwe, Kassar, Darine, Lacy, Naomi, Lopez, Josev, Maldonado, Frankj, Padilla, Osvaldo, Peden, Lucy A, Perry, Cynthia , Pfarr, Curt, Uga , Aghaegbulam H
Guests:	brittany.harper@ttuhsc.edu, carolina.blotte@ttuhsc.edu, claire.zeorlin@ttuhsc.edu, daniel.welder@ttuhsc.edu, david.e.morris@ttuhsc.edu, douglas.weier@ttuhsc.edu, hilda.alarcon@ttuhsc.edu, justin.hartmann@ttuhsc.edu, laura.palmer@ttuhsc.edu, rima.r.patel@ttuhsc.edu
Location:	MEB 1140

TTUHSC EP Paul L. Foster School of Medicine
5001 El Paso Drive
El Paso, TX, 79905
USA

Approval of Meeting Minutes

I hereby approve the meeting minutes for CEPC Meeting of 12.05.2016

Brower, Richard, Associate
Professor

1. Review of Prior Minutes

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

Brower, Richard

Asked the committee to review past minutes. Notes that minutes pulled concepts from each power point presentation make up the bulk of the commentary.

Reported that a pre-clerkship and clerkship that summarizes CEPC review of courses over the past year is forthcoming. expect the reports in the spring from Dr. Hogg and Dr. Francis. Reports will provide closure to course and clerkship reviews while documenting the process tracking our curriculum review cycle.

Minutes approved as recorded.

2. Announcements

Brower, Richard

Overview of upcoming meetings and general announcements.

- CEPC meeting held next week - 12/12/16 - a catch-up meeting for course/clerkship reviews, student issues and quick discussion on review of curriculum as a whole for spring.

3. SCEC Rep Reports

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

General Note

MS1 - no report

MS2 - Request that student be involved with future changes given the recent adjustment for SPM grading. Would appreciate a forum before implementation if similar changes are being considered (a forum for discussion).

MS3 - no report

MS4 - no students present

4. Policy Review

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

 Clerkship Director PD Policy draft06NOV2016.docx

 Formative Feedback Policy DRAFT12OCT2016.docx

Conclusion

As noted on attached record of asynchronous voting, both the Formative Feedback and Clerkship Director Position Description Policies were approved as written.

 MX-3070N_20161206_114814.pdf

5. Course Review Team

5. 1. Medical Skills

Presenter(s): Blunk, Dan, Cashin, Laura

Cashin, Laura

1. **Does the clerkship content fulfill the course goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus?** - yes
 - Student feedback - block assessment (class of 2018)
 - Detailed assessment methods covered in syllabus
2. **Does the student assessment plan fulfill the clerkship goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus?**
 - a. Assessments are active and ongoing
 - b. if students are at risk - encouraged to attend open sessions to catch up
3. **Are assessments performed – and outcomes reported in a timely manner?**
 - a. yes - within 2 weeks at most
4. **Would the course director know if a student had substantial deficiencies in any of the Medical Skills content domains or major components?**
 - a. Yes - constant feedback and assessments - weekly formative feedback
5. **At what point would student deficiencies in the course content domain or major component be identified?**
 - a. Weekly formatives or end of unit based on assessments and end of unit OSCEs; also review done with SPERRSA
6. **Are there sufficient mechanisms for remediation that allow the student to remain on 'on track'?**
 - a. clear and concise process to follow where course director intervenes early within a unit
 - b. OSCE identified deficiencies result in remediation
7. **Would it be possible for a student to pass the course with substantial deficiencies in any of the course's content domains or major components?** - short answer - no
 - a. Weekly formatives
 - b. SPERRSA and open lap
 - c. Summative OSCEs every 4-6 weeks
8. **Are the program outcomes associated with the course goals and objectives at or exceeding national or otherwise standardized benchmarks for student achievement?**
 - a. Step II pass rates in line with national averages from 2012-2016
 - b. Graduate Program Director's survey :
 - I. Gather history and perform physical exam - 93% in 2015 & 89% in 2016 about the same or superior as other graduates
 - II. Document a clinical encounter in the patient's record - 97% in 2015 & 90% in 2016 about the same or superior as other graduates
 - III. Note that this metric may be limited due to low response rate
 - c. GQ survey
 - I. History taking strong
 - II. Feel less confident with clinical encounter in the patient record. - *Area for improvement as suggested by Dr. Cashin*
 - III. 100% of students agree that they possess communication skills with patients and health professionals
9. **Are there apparent course factors potentially contributing to either exceptional or less-than-hoped for program performance?**
 - a. Strong student evaluations indicate success
 - b. Step 2 pass rates remain in line with national averages
 - c. Problem units of renal and reproductive system showed improvement over the last several years as means higher on evaluation question: "Overall, I learned useful knowledge and/or skills during this unit of Medical Skills" from Class of 2018 & 2019

Francis, Maureen

- Believes that students can get through with deficiencies - marginal skills could allow passage of the course. (reference to #7 above)
 - 30 points out of 100 for attendance, 20 points for skills, only need 25 points to pass
 - Recommend that attendance points should be reconsidered - feels that it is time to require attendance and points derived from the skills and knowledge and not from attendance.
- Recommends that all points for attendance are stricken.

General Note

- Group tended to agree that attendance issue is a concern
- MS3 student recommended that there needs to character limits in the first and second year that makes it a challenge when you are confronted with that requirement

Dr. Woods explains the rationale of the attendance points based on Dr. Steele's lead to encourage but not require attendance. But he is supportive that if CEPC required and believes this change would benefit students - particular given cost and time investments required in this course.

brittany.harper@ttuhsc.edu

- Suggests that the students would be supportive and she believes that most all students believe that attendance is required for this particular course.
- Also recommends the review of past results by excluding the attendance points to determine where students may fall short.

Brower, Richard

Asks if Dr. Htay would create a proposal that recommends revision to grading policy for course with consultation with Dr. Woods, Dr. Francis, and Dr. Hogg.

Conclusion

Dr. Htay provide proposal for grading procedure changes for next year.

Task	Due Date	Owner	Project	Completion	Priority
Grading change proposal request for MedSkills	03.12.2017	Htay, Thwe	Syllabi Updates	0%	*****

5. 2. Society, Community and Individual

Presenter(s): Pfarr, Curt, Hogg, Tanis

General Note

Dr. Woods presentation

1. **Does the course content fulfill the course goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus?**
 - a. Course evals ranged from student with means in the range of 3-4
 - b. Learning outcomes have been improving - Biostatistics and Epidemiology - over the last two years
 - c. CEYE scores improved as well
 - d. Yes - learning outcomes have been improving however declining favorability of course from student perspectives likely due to added rigor.
2. **Does the student assessment plan fulfill the course goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus?**
 - a. Thoroughly performed - variety of assessments, problem sets, quizzes, final exam, Spanish oral exam,

- preceptor feedback
- b. Outcomes always reported timely
- 3. **Would the course director know if a student had substantial deficiencies in any of the course content domains or major components? If so , how and by what point?**
 - a. Yes - midterm exam and final in M1 and fall of M2 - unsure on Spring of M2
 - b. Less evident in Spanish component - but suggest that interaction with students and instructor would indicate instructor would be aware of deficiency.
- 4. **Are there sufficient mechanisms for remediation that allow the student to remain on 'on track'?**
 - a. Students achieving < 75% average on written/oral assessments can take a remediation exam, either at the start of the Spring semester (optional) or at the end of the year (required).
 - b. Unexcused absences require remediation assignments
- 5. **Would it be possible for a student to pass the course with substantial deficiencies in any of the course content domains or major components?**
 - a. There are four components and it would be difficult to pass with any deficit in any one area -
 - b. Possible in Spanish component however
- 6. **Are the program outcomes associated with the course goals and objectives at or exceeding national or otherwise standardized benchmarks for student achievement?** used annual report table 68
 - a. 90.9 confidence (50th percentile nationally) on the issues in social sciences of medicine on PLFSOM survey and scores increase overtime
 - b. GQ - lower but this is showing results from students reflecting the older version of the course - must wait for GQ from current M3 students
- 7. **Are there apparent course factors potentially contributing to either exceptional or less-than-hoped for program performance?**
 - a. Strengths
 - I. well defined learning objectives and goals
 - II. trends in improved learning outcomes
 - a. Challenges
 - I. decline in student ratings of course - attributed to more stringent grading and increased load from content enhancements

 SCI Course Evaluation 12-5-16.pptx

Discussion ensue

Student proficiency in Spanish - should that be our goal? or an aspiration?

Dr. Brower supportive of our Spanish curriculum but knows if held high proficiency standards there would be dissent?

Dr. Francis - feels Spanish is a survival skill and it will ease students experiences of third year but echoes Dr. Brower concern.

Student concern as multiple places in the course for artificial grade inflation

Brower, Richard

Is there concern with the Spring Ms2 minimal assessments?

Francis, Mark

The semester is truncated and a continuation of the fall semester - so student deficiencies should be identified early in year 2.

When changes were being made; there was an expectation that favorability of course would decrease until new

normal is established in this course.

5. 3. Masters' Colloquium

Presenter(s): Lacy, Naomi, Perry, Cynthia

Master's Colloquium Review 2016 .pptx

Lacy, Naomi

1. Does Content Meet Goals/Objectives?

- a. Clearly made - but what about session level objectives linkages
 - I. Suggestion to take it the next step to make it clear for students
- b. Question arose - how much of the content remains similar across all colleges?
- c. Broad array of goals - if topics change do they objectives and goals need to change?

2. Assessment Plan Adequacy

- a. No formative feedback, at the masters' discretion
- b. Recommend that the syllabus was not as detailed as it could be
- c. Professionalism statements were reported anecdotally that they tend to be similar from student to student (although this was countered by both students and college masters in follow-up discussion)
- d. Rubric for critical reflection assignments
 - I. no clarity on pass point
 - II. appears that few course objectives are being assessed here given the large quantity for the course
- e. Several suggestions from team
 - I. Formative feedback required
 - II. More detailed syllabus
 - III. Rubrics are not in syllabus - no clear pass point

3. Would the course director know if a student had substantial deficiencies? - Not necessarily

- a. Students who rarely participated in class may be one that could slip through
- b. Concern absence policy may allow for students to miss 1/4 of the content and still pass course without remediation
- c. No documentation of participation rubric.

4. Are there sufficient mechanisms for remediation? -Unclear but Questionable

- a. Unexcused absences require written paper
- b. Professionalism - none
- c. Difficult to judge given weak assessment

5. Would it be possible for a student to pass the course/clerkship with substantial deficiencies?

- a. With limited required assignments and no formal testing there may be a possibility for a student to pass without meeting the goals and objectives of the course.
- b. Recommendations
 - I. detailed rubrics for student performance, participation and professionalism
 - II. Require attendance
 - III. Make up work for missed sessions

6. Do program outcomes suggest student achievement at or above national benchmarks?

- a. Course eval - students are fairly favorable thus the course is fairly successful - but evidence is difficult to find through course materials.

General Note

Student comment - formative feedback each time you make comment in class. It is difficult to never make a comment as masters call students out.

Conclusion

Dr. Sandroni will be departing role in the spring. Need to draft a new course director.

- A need to redress this course as we move forward.
- Dr. Hogg to take charge and meet with masters and decide how to move forward with this review
- Dr. Pharr requests that college masters get a copy of the review prior to future discussions
- Dr. Maureen Francis - notes that some assessment materials were dropped out of the syllabus from previous versions. Rubrics based on reflection, can you do the pieces of an ethical analysis, thinking processes. Grading is something that the faculty try very much to not comment on opinion- not the process. Professionalism statements are thorough and customized to each student.

Full syllabus review - spring 2017 required based on this review

5. 4. SARP

Presenter(s): Francis, Maureen, Kassar, Darine

Kassar, Darine

With Dr. Francis

1. **Content fulfill the course goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus** - yes for a number of reasons
 - a. Mentor
 - b. Mandatory orientation
 - c. Sessions with MS, SCI and SPM to introduce ethics and evidence based medicine
 - d. Appendix B of syllabus provides clear guidelines for reports and presentations
2. **Assessment plan fulfill the clerkship goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus/Assessments performed – and outcomes reported in a timely manner** - yes
 - a. Student needs eval form each year or if changed or concern by course directors. Assessments covers each objective required.
 - b. Yearly professionalism summary
3. **Substantial deficiencies know in any content domains or major components/Point student deficiencies in the course content domain or major component be identified**
 - a. Yes - students have to submit project summary - if miss deadlines - risk of failure
 - b. Professionalism summary at end of year
 - c. Yearly student report
4. **Sufficient mechanisms for remediation that allow the student to remain on 'on track'**
 - a. Probably not - if fall behind they are diverted to other track options.
 - b. Annual progress self-reported by student
5. **Can student pass the course with substantial deficiencies in any of the course's content domains or major components?** - no

 CEPC SARP.pptx

Pfarr, Curt

SARP course directors emphasize to students that meeting deadlines are critical - if there are issues - forward to Student Affairs. If unexcused they are given a 5 day grace period.

Brower, Richard

GQ - provided some feedback regarding opportunities to pursue research data

Conclusion

Need to add additional reporting on SARP in annual report

5. 5. SPM

Gest, Thomas

Perry & Gest Team (no input from Uga)

1. **Content fulfill the course goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus**
 - a. mismatch of matching objectives and assessments in some cases - as noted in slides - 1.5 - assessed but not mapped to SPM, 2.4, 2.5 not mapped but assessed, 2.6 mapped and not assessed,
2. **Assessment plan fulfill the clerkship goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus/Assessments performed – and outcomes reported in a timely manner**
 - a. optional weekly formative USMLE format summative end of each unit with timely feedback
 - b. Recommendations
 - I. recommendation to require based in the benefits
 - II. note the role of the CEYE - describe more explicitly - i.e. what would the failure mean?
3. **Substantial deficiencies known in any content domains or major components/Point identified**
 - a. reports based on summative assessments to unit co-directors which determine need for remediation
 - b. Course directors should identify discipline-specific deficiencies and advise students accordingly (although noted that student have detailed feedback in e-portfolio)
4. **Sufficient mechanisms for remediation that allow the student to remain on 'on track'**
 - a. Conducted through year 1 and opportunities provided as needed
 - b. Suggestions - send students email with discipline performance with detail for each domain and those with deficiency with any discipline could be asked to remediate discipline specific
5. **Can student pass the course with substantial deficiencies in any of the course's content domains or major components?**
 - a. yes - students can "game the system" by study the high yield discipline
 - b. graph illustrates the performance across disciplines that substantiates above notion some
 - c. Students in meeting concur with this notion
 - d. Suggestions - determine discipline threshold for remediation - addition mentored study
6. **Program outcomes association with the course goals and objectives - at or exceeding national or otherwise standardized benchmarks for student achievement**
 - a. small recent decline - what is the source - may be random flux
 - b. Step 1 passing and mean over time - detailed data shows slipped some 2015, difficult in identify the source at this time - needs to be monitored moving forward.

 CEPC SPM.pptx

Brower, Richard

Note the role of the CEYE - describe more explicitly in some capacity- i.e. what would the failure mean? - Dr. Brower requested that this be added to the ICE program elements syllabus that is in draft.

General Note

Discussion regarding the weighting of disciplines within SPM and graph on slide 11 is misleading as it does not note the question difficulty.

Students agree that there is a trend of throwing away low yield topics for study. But depending on the unit discipline there is more or less content covered across the disciplines. Students confirm that they have robust information on how they are performing in disciplines in e-portfolio.

Hogg, Tanis

Currently working on discipline specific tracking from exam soft into e-portfolio. We are beginning to work on dashboard in the spring. May also implement progress testing.

7. Adjourn

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

General Note

No other business - adjourned 6:50pm

Tasks Summary

Task	Due Date	Owner	Project	Completion	Priority
Grading change proposal request for MedSkills	03.12.2017	Htay, Thwe	Syllabi Updates	0%	*****
📋 Addition of SARP data to Annual Report	08.30.2017	Lacy, Naomi, C...	Annual Report	0%	*****

Parked Items P

5. 6. PICE

6. MD program Overall