

# CEPC Monthly Meeting

10.10.2016 05:00 PM - 06:30 PM

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Purpose:</b>    |   |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Brower, Richard, Lacy, Naomi, Lopez, Josev  |
| <b>Note Taker:</b> | De-Lara, Veronica   |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | De-Lara, Veronica, Beinhoff, Lisa, Blunk, Dan, Brower, Richard, <del>Cashin, Laura</del> , Cervantes, Jorge, Dankovich, Robin, Francis, Mark, Francis, Maureen, Gest, Thomas, Hogg, Tanis, <del>Horn, Kathryn</del> , Kassir, Darine, Lacy, Naomi, Lopez, Josev, <del>Padilla, Osvaldo</del> , <del>Peden, Lucy A</del> , Perry, Cynthia, Pfarr, Curt, Uga, Aghaegbulam H |
| <b>Guests:</b>     | 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  |
| <b>Location:</b>   | MEB 1140  |

## 1. Review of the prior meeting's agenda

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

 2016SEP19\_CEPC Meeting\_MeetingMinutesDRAFT2.pdf

### General Note

Minutes have been approved as written.

## 2. SCEC Rep reports/concerns

### General Note

#### MS2 Concerns

- Had questions about the flat rate pass rate at 70% - both M1 M2 have 20% fail rate on first exam.
- Could it be the curriculum? What happens if they fail again? Concern over pass rate.
- Concern lack of knowledge and improved communication to students how it will be addressed
- Quite a few disclaimers in CHAMP – corrected to one time on log in

#### Brower, Richard

Evaluation committee – should bring this issue up on next committee meeting, some analysis and recommendations for potential suggestion

Discussion ensued: What is the cause of the bump? Generally the bottom 5% of the curve. Likely more remediation's and possibility more who repeat a year.

#### Hogg, Tanis

College masters had noted that formative performance was predictive of poor performance on the exams

- Make the connection – every time you miss formative – take half point off summative –those who take formative Average 232, some formatives average 221, those that did not take 219.

Discussion ensued: do formatives trigger interventions - No because they are optional.  
However, college masters meet with Dr. Salazar and Dr. Horn to identify low flyers.

### General Note

#### MS1 and MS2 combined concerns

- Issue with timeliness of lecture uploads – recordings specifically showing up on the day of formative – ie Wednesday lectures not up until

Monday



## MS1 Concerns

- A lot of self-studies – request to have only self study as monograph or voice over – it should not be an advance topic
- MS1 – Objectives on CHAMP than in lectures –
  - Dr. Hogg reported it was isolated to Microbiology - materials uploaded from last year – a disconnect with new faculty member making changes without knowledge it was changing on CHAMP
  - Brittany asked if every test questions is tied to an objective –Dr. Hogg confirmed that is correct.

## Conclusion

Dr. Hogg informed students that zip package now to be loaded on Friday for the next week.

## 3. The student Med Ed IT committee initiative

Presenter(s): Lopez, Josev, Brower, Richard

Brower, Richard

Discussion about the idea is to have students interact directly with IT for formation of a committee to be implemented for the next academic year.

Discussion ensued:

- Suggestion on possibly incorporating in SCEC charter
- welcome whomever is interested immediately– should the group grow to large - we will revisited– exploratory stage
- Charge SCEC members to find interested party and forward them to Jose Lopez.

## 4. ICE Case Presentations Exercise

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

  ICPE ASSESSMENT FORM v16SEP16.pdf

  ICPE ATTESTATION FORM v16SEP16.pdf

  ICPE Ice Case Presentation Exercise v16SEP16.pdf

Brower, Richard

Presented the idea of curricular requirement that all students must complete for graduation.-The development of case presentations

- Dr. Horn request the deadline to be several months before graduation to avoid this requirement delaying graduation.

Dr. Brower presents the format and goal to incorporate some of these cases back into the curriculum and suggests the benefits of reinforcing the basic science knowledge.

General Note

Discussion ensued:

- Student felt that this idea is a great opportunity to get students more material to have in WCE – students need more practice on that..
- Dr. Maureen Francis did not feel by adding one case would not be overly taxing for years 3 and 4 - the M3 concurred
- MS3 agreed it was doable with broad time frame.

## Conclusion

Plan to pilot implementation next year

Once a plan is in place, topic will be brought for CEPC final review.

## 5. Review of the process and teams for reviews of the course/clerkships

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

and of the "curriculum as a whole"

  Proposal for AY2016-17 Curriculum Reviews updated 23SEP16.pptx

Brower, Richard

Presented the plan and timeline

- Next meeting will cover the clerkship reviews

Key questions to answer:

- Does the course/clerkship content (the learning objectives and instructional methods) fulfill the course goals/objectives as stated in the

syllabus?

- Does the student assessment plan (formative and summative) fulfill the course/clerkship goals/objectives as stated in the syllabus? Are assessments performed – and outcomes reported – in a timely manner (consistent with educational program policy)?
- Would the course director know if a student had substantial deficiencies in any of the course/clerkship content domains or major components? If so, how, and by what point?
- At the point that student deficiencies in a course/clerkship content domain or major component can be identified, are there sufficient mechanisms for remediation that allow the student to remain 'on track'?
- Would it be possible for a student to pass the course/clerkship with substantial deficiencies in any of the course/clerkship content domains or major components?
- Are the program outcomes associated with the course/clerkship goals/objectives at or exceeding national or otherwise standardized benchmarks for student achievement? Are there apparent course/clerkship factors potentially contributing to either exceptional or less-than-hoped-for program performance?

- Suggest that teams meet before next meeting – develop a consensus report – one report per review team
- Include thoughts on quality of course – strengths and weaknesses
- Goal is use to improve
- Oral reports of 10-15 minutes – discussion to be held after as needed.

Reminder Pre-Clerkship Courses will be reviewed in December.

## 6. Overview of the Annual Report

Presenter(s): Lacy, Naomi

 Annual Report Synopsis Presentation.pptx

 [Link to DRAFT report on CEPC website](#)

Lacy, Naomi

Dr. Lacy presented power point of annual report highlights.

- Double the size of the report – expanded it to meet the new proposal approved of CEPC – some items missed – addendum forth coming
- Methods section is larger
  - Incorporates more detail for outsiders to understand data collection.
- Curricular contents section
  - Curricular maps – included
- PGO mapping – included for the first time
  - Dr. Hogg and Dr. Maureen Francis are working to improve the mapping with course and clerkship objectives
- Policy Monitoring for newly adopted policies
  - Provides baseline data for comparison
- STEP SCORES – on page 91
  - Drop below national mean on the first time rate (3% below) – STEP 1
  - STEP 3 – above national average on first attempts

Potential Areas for improvement from GQ data

- Two preparation for residency items ranked in 25th percentile
- Residents as teachers - Only Pediatrics scoring above the 50th percentile

Internal evaluation results

- Generally positive
- SCI - decline into neutral range
- SPM – dip on a couple of areas on the work load on several units
- Clerkship
  - Oral and verbal feedback
  - New usefulness is low satisfaction

Francis, Maureen

Dr. Francis was concerned that the pre-clerkship low threshold GQ data not incorporated in the annual report . She suggests lopsided needs for improvement.

### Conclusion

- Dr. Lacy to incorporate Dr. Maureen Francis suggestion of the Pre-clerkship data.
- Dr. Brower asked CEPC member to review report and provide feedback.

## 7. Open Forum ad Adjorn

General Note

Meeting adjourned 6:35pm