The University of Arizona

College of Medicine

TUCSON EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

June 20, 2012

Present: Paul St. John (Chair); Diana Darnell; Elizabeth Dupuy; Kristi Grall; Carol Howe; Patricia Lebensohn

Apologized: Bill Grana; Randy Horowitz; Adam Luber; Ted Price; Cindy Rankin; Sydney Rice; Wyatt Unger Aditya Paliwal; Andrew Tong; Julie Wynne

Resources: Jack Dexter; Raquel Givens; Jim Kerwin; Kevin Moynahan; Sonya Seaman; Amy Waer

Minutes: The minutes of March 3, 2012 were approved as corrected.

Announcements:

1. **TCCS Update** – (Givens):
   Raquel Givens reported that the TCCS met on March 15th and two items are noted from that meeting. First, Dr. Laura Meinke has stepped down as chair and Dr. Violet Siwik (FCM) has filled that vacancy; Dr. Evan Ong (Surgery) was elected as Vice Chair. Secondly, the TCCS reviewed the progression policy on Step I examinations with respect to the time requirements for repeat examinations. Second, the task of cataloging clerkship content into ArizonaMed is underway. However, Phoenix clerkships have not been using ArizonaMed as the principal means for documenting content, as has Tucson. As a result, all Phoenix-based clerkships have been entering their information into the database as well. This should help improve content tracking for both campuses’ clerkships.

2. **Announcement of EPC policy on dismissal (time limits)** – (Koshland)
   Dr. Koshland reported that at the last EPC meeting, the committee voted to establish a hard limit to the number of years students may take to complete their medical degree programs. That limit is six years, and is in force even if a student takes a one-year leave of absence for any reason, including illness, or must repeat courses, semesters or years for issues of progression.

3. **Update on Professionalism Committee and Curriculum** – (Koshland)
   Dr. Koshland explained to the committee the new professionalism curriculum and the statements on attributes of professional behavior. The professionalism curriculum also includes statements on how and where these behaviors are modeled, taught and assessed, which also contributes to accreditation needs concerning establishing positive learning environment (MS-31-A). The professionalism curriculum and policies will be posted online. In addition, an online form is being developed where individuals may report (without identifying themselves) both positive and negative experiences of professional behaviors by others.

4. **Announcement of TTT Directors** (Waer)
   Dr. Waer announced the three new directors for the Threads, Themes and Topics (TTT, or T3) curriculum. The new directors are Susan Hoover (Evidence in Medicine), Carlos Gonzalez (Health and Society), and Patricia Lebensohn (The Individual and Health). Dr. Waer mentioned that the directors will be meeting with her and Carol Galper to set up the priorities for topics to be
included in the curriculum, and then confer with block directors to get that accomplished. The T3 curriculum should be up and running by July. Dr. St.John reminded the committee that there needs to be a formal report to TEPC of the T3 program.

5. **Update on Preparation of LCME Self Study Standards (Givens)**

Ms. Givens reported that the first phase of preparation for LCME is coming to a close. This is a very complex effort, as it must include responses from Phoenix as well. It is anticipated that all preliminary database reports will be ready by early August, and that the first read-through by the Self-Study Coordinators of those reports already submitted has begun. The site visit dates have been set: January 12-15, 2014. TEPC members were asked to be available on January 13th in case they are needed to respond to site visit team needs. A “save the date” notice will be sent to all members.

A website is being developed to provide all LCME review participants with an ongoing record of updates to the database and other self-study activities. The self-study committees are being prepared; one committee for each of the Standards sections. Two administrative assistants will be hired to help support all of these committees.

**Discussion and Possible Vote:**

**DMH Block Review Report (Dupuy)**

Ms. Dupuy guided the committee through a draft of the TEPC final review report on the DMH block. The report is a synthesis of two preliminary reports received from the Tucson Evaluation Subcommittee (TEVS) and Tucson Curriculum Management Subcommittee (TCMS). The notable strength of the block is its organization and delivery: the block director is conscientious about making sure all aspects of the block are in order and complete. The main recommendation is that a clinical co-director should be identified for the block. It was noted that a clinician has co-directed the block in the past, and that this additional resource should help assure clinical correlations with the basic science are current. Examinations were cited as the weakest part of the block and a recommendation in the report is to have all exams reviewed before administration. The addition of more multi-step questions was also included in this recommendation. It was mentioned that the team approach to reviewing higher-order exam questions is the best way to ensure their quality.

The report was approved and will be delivered to the block director along with an invitation to attend a future meeting of the TEPC. It was decided that an additional procedure wrapping up block reviews will be to require a written response by the block director to recommendations in addition to the invitation to the meeting. This action will ensure the block response to recommendations are complete.

It was mentioned that some discussion has been made of time distribution across blocks and how each block encumbers that time with content. The important question, which has been difficult to approach, is, “What is being taught that is not necessary for Year III performance.” It was thought that this type of question is more suitable to a review across blocks than to include it in the reviews of individual blocks. While a system for reviewing the use of time among the blocks should be established, the question of how to define “block time” will be important (i.e., what instructional activities and student-learning activities will “count” toward block time). The was considered that TEVS is the appropriate evaluation entity to design such a review and report.
Assessments and Outcomes Report (Gail Koshland)

Dr. Koshland provided a report on assessment methods, and how those assessment methods are performing. As this is the first report of assessment methods, the first portion of the report was a description of assessment methods and how they are applied. The second portion of the report provided an analysis of how well the methods performed. The average reliability of exams per block (how consistent the exams are), the number of items with low point biserials (how exam items perform with high-to-low performing students), etc. These data have been delivered to block directors for their respective blocks, but the summary across blocks have not yet been delivered to them. In addition, the percent of exam items (across blocks) that were deemed higher and lower order by the Exam Review Committee were also reviewed. While the figures provide a broad-stroke look at how higher order exam items appear in block exams, there was no trend visible among Year II blocks, which may have importance to issues of the developmental curriculum.

The objectives for all blocks were also included in this report. It was thought that an analysis of the objectives should be conducted by TEVS to ascertain whether all block objectives should follow the same format, use action verbs consistently (referring to Blooms Taxonomy) and depth of detail. Dr. Darnell, who chairs that subcommittee, accepted the challenge and will use this report to help inform the upcoming Level II report on the Years I and II curriculum. The committee expressed its gratitude to Dr. Koshland for the thoughtfulness and thoroughness of this report.

The meeting adjourned at six o’clock.
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Jack Dexter, PhD
Office of Medical Student Education