TUCSON EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE (TEPC)
MINUTES
September 15, 2010

Present: Paul St. John (Chair); Diana Darnell; Elizabeth Dupuy; Mindy Fain; Kristi Grall; Bill Grana; Ron Heimark; Randy Horowitz; Carol Howe; Adam Luber; Ted Price;

Apologized: Sean Elliott; Anna Landau; Cindy Rankin; Sydney Rice; Wyatt Unger

Resources: Jack Dexter; Raquel Givens; Nancy Koff; Gail Koshland; Kevin Moynahan; Jack Nolte; Amy Waer

Minutes:
The minutes for the TEPC meetings of August 4 and September 1, 2010 were approved as written.

Announcements:
Electronic Vote Results
Dr. St.John announced that all three items that had been called for a vote at the September 1 meeting were passed by the committee via electronic poll. The items are listed below and the full policies are attached to the end of these minutes:

• Start and End Dates – Years III and IV – The start and end dates for Years III and IV for 2011-12 were approved. Approval of proposed changes to Year III will follow.
• Student Petitions for Exceptions to Curricular Policy – Given that there may exist a circumstance that could allow a medical student to opt out of certain required activities, the committee provided a means to petition such exceptions.
• Formation of a workgroup to establish “Developmental Curriculum” standards for the CBI method – A workgroup was established to review the Case Based Instruction method and to provide recommended design standards that reflect advancing expectations for student performance across blocks. A report guideline was included with the adopted charge.

Dr. St.John reported that members have been identified for the CBI Workgroup from OMSE and the TCMS. The two Year III students who will consult with the group have been contacted. The remaining members to be identified are two facilitators and those who will represent TEPC. They are to be chosen by the Chair and Vice-Chair of TEPC. Dr. Howe offered to conduct the literature reviews for the workgroup, as the process is to be informed by research and educational theory.

Academy of Medical Education Scholars – Jack Nolte, PhD
Dr. Nolte provided the members a brief history of the Academy of Medical Education Scholars. The idea to establish an academy was raised four years ago with the support of (former) Dean Joiner. Its mission is to elevate status and quality of education and educational scholarship, and to promote the recognition of that scholarship and service within the institution’s career paths for faculty. The academy was formally established in March, 2009 with the nomination and election of 13 charter members: Helen Amerongen, Doug Campos-Outcalt, Kipp Charlton, Sean P. Elliott, Paul Gordon, William Johnson, John Mattox, Kevin Moynahan, Jack Nolte, Naomi Rance, Ziad Shehab, Paul R. Standley, Marc E. Tischler. Some of those members are no longer with the academy, and new members have recently been identified. They are: John Bloom, Chris Cuniff, Deborah Fuchs, Cindi Standley and Todd Vanderah.

A part of the Academy’s function is to oversee the small grants program for educational innovation (formerly the Furrow Awards). It was asked how new members are nominated and elected. Dr. Nolte remarked that the process is not formally established, but will include nominations from the faculty at large.

Discussion
Town Hall Meeting
Dr. St.John asked the committee members to review the second iteration of topics that may be discussed at the upcoming Town Hall meeting with the faculty. The date for the meeting has been set for Nov. 3, 4:30-6:00 pm, Kiewit Auditorium.

Dr. St. John considered the Town Hall event holds broad value for the committee. First, it provides opportunities for members to communicate directly with faculty and others about current curricular concerns. Second, in preparation for the event, issues of central concern that may arise at the meeting are identified and discussed by the members. Finally, members
must become well versed in the topics, supporting data and other information required to answer potential questions, thus becoming their own resources for curricular information and serving the betterment of the committee itself.

The format of the meeting was discussed at length. It was generally agreed that a brief presentation at the beginning will provide participants with an orientation to the structure and purpose of the TEPC, the integrative organization of the curriculum and certain outcome measures. It was also thought that a brief recounting of recent TEPC activities could inform participants of how their faculty representatives have been affecting the curriculum. The topics list was divided among committee members who will prepare to respond to questions in those areas.

For Future Agendas
- Curricular Outcomes
- Annual Block Reviews (MSS, Life Cycle)

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm

Minutes provided by
Jack Dexter, PhD
Office of Medical Student Education
ACADEMIC YEAR 2011-2012 SEMESTER START AND END DATES

Approved by the Tucson Educational Policy Committee – September 7, 2010

Year I:

Year II:
Aug. 8, 2011 – Dec. 9, 2011

Year III:

Year IV:
TEPC Final Disposition of Old Policy Issues  
Student Petitions for Exceptions to Curricular Policy  
Approved by the Tucson Educational Policy Committee - September 7, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General topic</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Student Petitions | 1. Student requests for exceptions to policies of the Tucson Educational Policy Committee (TEPC) will be considered by TEPC based on the merit of the request. The criteria used to guide the Committee's assessment include:  
   a. the nature of the circumstances advocating for a release from regular policy  
   b. the quality of the student's prior academic performance  
   c. faculty or advisor support of the request  
   d. discussion with the director of any affected course or block  
2. Student requests for curriculum changes must be petitioned no later than six weeks prior to the beginning of the experience. Credit for experiences at variance with curriculum guidelines will not be allowed after the fact.  
3. Students may appeal denials for waivers of curricular policy to the Deputy Dean for Education. The appeal must include written TEPC rationale for denial.  
4. The “Doctor and Patient” course is not exemptible. |
The Tucson Educational Policy Committee (TEPC) seeks to form an ad hoc Workgroup on Case-Based Instruction (CBI) that will report recommendations to TEPC concerning benchmarks for CBI in a developmental curriculum. TEPC plans this to be the first of a series of workgroups to recommend such benchmarks for all of the learning methods used in the ArizonaMed curriculum.

**Background and Rationale for Report**

The Tucson Educational Policy Committee supports the principle that the medical curriculum should be developmental. A developmental curriculum in this setting includes two components: 1) it helps students to develop increasingly higher-level cognitive skills and increasing autonomy, and 2) it uses a longitudinal approach to guide students to demonstrate the Educational Competencies and meet the Measureable Objectives of the Program Leading to the M.D. Degree.

An important part of planning and evaluating the curriculum is to articulate what levels of developing sophistication are desired and to identify the points in the academic program where those levels can be reached and measured. The success of a developmental curriculum requires that it present steadily increasing challenges for students. Students' gains may be quickly lost if sophistication they have acquired is not subsequently reinforced by the program as the students advance. For this reason, it is essential both to consider ways to continue to challenge students in order to promote development, and to identify the types of support students will need as they work to attain new levels of sophistication (after OMSE website, August, 2010).

Case-based learning has been incorporated into a variety of curricula for many years. Compared with other learning methods, CBI can provide special opportunities for students to: a) develop problem-solving skills; b) develop skills of self-critical analysis and of independent research; c) develop skills of teamwork in tackling a problem; d) understand the importance of basic science in clinical care and practice; e) begin to learn principles of differential diagnosis. Some recommendations for designing Case-Based Instruction (CBI) cases for the University ArizonaMed curriculum are contained in the attached document, "CBI Case Design Starter Kit."

Recent evaluations of individual CBI cases, individual blocks, and all of Years I & II as a curricular unit indicate that CBI case authors, block directors, facilitators, and students would benefit from the establishment of benchmarks to guide the design and use of CBI cases in a developmental curriculum.

**Composition of Workgroup**

TEPC proposes that the Workgroup include the following as members:

1. Three Block Directors, to be chosen by the Tucson Curriculum Management Subcommittee (TCMS).
2. Three members of the Office of Medical Student Education (OMSE), to be chosen by the Interim Assistant Dean for Medical Student Education.
3. The Director of Student Development.
4. Two experienced CBI facilitators who are not block directors or members of OMSE, to be chosen by the Chair and Vice-Chair of TEPC.
5. Two third-year medical students, to be chosen by the Deputy Dean for Education.

**Request for Report**

TEPC requests that the Workgroup report recommendations to TEPC concerning benchmarks for CBI in a developmental curriculum. In particular, TEPC asks the Workgroup to do the following:

1. Articulate uniform pedagogical principles and purposes for the CBI method.
2. Create a coherent design framework for the method, one that can be modified to apply at different stages in a developmental curriculum.
3. Consider how much content should be devoted to review, development, or independent research at different stages of the curriculum, and draft guidelines that can guide authors of CBI cases in this regard and that can be used in the review of CBI cases.
4. Consider how extensive and detailed Learning Objectives should be at different stages in the curriculum. Consider whether and when Learning Objectives for cases should be published to students.
5. Consider whether CBI content that has been researched by students should be included in exams.
6. Establish guidelines for the degree to which Facilitators direct discussion at different stages of the curriculum.
7. List expectations and measures for the quality of students' presentations, the depth of students' independent research, and students' critical assessment of literature at different stages of the curriculum.
8. Suggest methods to train Facilitators in order to maximize consistency among CBI groups in how completely Learning Objectives are covered during case discussions.
9. Evaluate how well the present methods of assessment of student performance determine whether benchmarks of learning addressed in items 1-8 above are accomplished in CBI.

This should be a scholarly report. The discussion, conclusions, and benchmarks in it should be supported by citations to peer-reviewed publications where they are available.

**Timetable for report**

TEPC requests that the Workgroup submit its report by February 1, 2011.