Announcements & Updates:

1. Bridge Evaluation Report

   Results of Bridge survey presented by Susan Ellis. These results are from a survey of the Bridge program. The survey was requested by TEPC as part of the block evaluation process. Students were asked to take a pre-post survey at the start and end of the bridge program. Descriptive data for all questions and inferential analysis to assess change from pre to post were presented. Questions were derived from a post-program evaluation used by Dr. Tischler, and he worked with Celia O’Brien to develop the pre questions. The results seem to indicate the program is useful to students in that students said it reduced their anxiety.

2. Set deadlines for TEPC tasks groups (Rice)

   Deadlines for TEPC task groups: The Developmental Curriculum task group is regrouping due to loss of chair (left university). Dr. Gordon provided an update for introductory curriculum task group. Sees no profound recommendations coming from the committee. No serious problems found. Committee is looking to OMSE to provide information on what other schools do. The Bridge program prefers to remain as a cohort; are there other cohorts that could benefit? It's not clear. Dr. Moynahan asked about integration of Bridge students with the rest of the curriculum. The committee will make recommendations about those issues. Timeline for finishing is Oct 1, pending info from the task group.

   Dr. Rankin provided the update from the interactive learning committee: they are working on a definition of what interactive includes and where do we fall on the spectrum. Then reviewing where these elements occur in the curriculum. Group members are reviewing sections of lectures. Dr. Moynahan suggested asking the lecturers if they consider their lectures interactive. Dr. Darnell may already be doing that. Dr. Viscusi looking at which types of content are better suited to interactivity. Oct 1 is a fine deadline.

Discussion and Possible Vote:

1. Histology Discipline Director Report

   Dr. Amerongen presented Histology discipline report. She meets annually with block directors. No gaps in histology identified. The only block without histology content is Immunity & Infection and Advanced Topics. The histology relevant to I&I is taught in the Foundations block. Review of histology in Advanced Topics previously conducted but has been dropped. This content may be reinstated in 2015 per conversation with the Advanced Topics block director. Changes to histology labs (reducing length of intro by faculty) has been
made to increase amount of time students are engaged/interacting with material rather than faculty giving mini-lectures. Pathology faculty may apply similar approach to Path labs in Foundations. Working on increasing number of histology virtual slides available by scanning accumulated glass slides. Dr. Amerongen raised points that she feels should be addressed by all discipline directors. These include a succession plan and training provided by discipline directors. These areas reinforce quality control of teaching of discipline topics. Dr. Amerongen advocated for continued support of discipline directors because of the amount of work required to monitor disciplines in the curriculum, even well-established disciplines such as histology. Dr. Sanders asked if collaboration with Phoenix campus is done as a method for faculty coverage. Several T faculty have covered in Phoenix in the past. Dr. Moynahan mentioned that Phoenix faculty will cover for Pharmacology faculty in the Nervous System block this year. It's a patch, not a long term solution. The Histology Discipline Report was accepted by TEPC.

2. Advanced Topics TCMS Block Review

Further discussion of the Advanced Topics Block Review was postponed until Diana Darnell is back. There was some confusion as to whether continued discussion is to occur or whether just a vote is required.

3. TEPC Level Two Report Prioritization Retreat – Next Steps

Dr. Marshall provided a summary of years 3 & 4 retreat. Priorities: Common skills, procedures and experiences that would be common across the clerkships. Who would be responsible for formulating those? Could those be coded? Grading practices in years 3 & 4 and have a TEPC report that would promote consistency. TEPC commission and inventory of instructional methods in years 3 & 4 which would move committee to 5th priority, faculty development for attendings and residents. Inventory of how things are done, graded in order to promote faculty development and consistency. Not necessarily rank-ordered. These will set the long term agenda for TEPC.

4. Molecular and Genetics Discipline Director Report

Dr. Kreig presented the molecular genetics and biology discipline review, He is principle teacher of the topic. As a College we are consistency just below national average on genetics on USMLE Step 1. Molecular genetics is big influence on medical practice in the future. Most of topic covered in Foundations and there is a chance to incorporate it in additional blocks in relation to topics such as personalized medicine. Content is not a problem, but reinforcement is. Content should be added in other blocks for medical relevance and keeping content current. Dr. Gordon asked about a succession plan. Dr. Kreig says there isn't another molecular biologist available that he knows of. Dr Rankin mentioned that perhaps Dr. Krieg could make specific topical recommendations to the block directors. Dr. Krieg agrees. He feels that's where they are currently. The Molecular and Genetics Discipline Report was accepted by TEPC.

5. LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire

AMA distributes the annual questionnaire to all schools and used by AMA and AAMC to monitor between survey visits. Raquel highlighted certain aspects of the report including:

- the percentage of female graduates
- the number of students taking 4 or more years to graduate
- the percentage who did not enter into residency
- in-state/out-of state percentages
- enrollees in dual degree programs
- students in undergraduate programs (approx. 400 in physiology program)
Additionally, the questionnaire asks about certain topics and if there is a discipline director for that topic. Combined data for GQ rate pharmacology as good or excellent, and there was an improvement from the prior year. In terms of genetics, rating is lower than last year. Others areas of concern included direct observation and Tucson has lower numbers than the national average. GQ did show some improvements in the surgery clerkship in terms of student observation. The annual questionnaire also asks about professionalism. The GQ data regarding mistreatment indicates about half of the students don’t know the procedures for reporting issues of professionalism. Additional tools for use include the AAMC Mission Management tool. Dr. Moynahan encouraged the committee to rethink how the school and educational units want to be measured and invites the committee to develop/select applicable metrics. Dr. Moynahan clarifies that the impetus for establishing metrics is coming from the Dean’s office with the goal of distinguishing ourselves nationally.
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