

Scientific Foundations Committee
Meeting

February 5, 2010
7:30 – 9:00 am, B-646 Mayo

In attendance: M Becker, B Clarke, A Edverson, G Filice, L Henson, , T Killeen, M Kim, M Lee, S Levine, A Minenko, C Niewoehner, K Nordby, J Norrander, L Schimmenti, P Schlievert, S Thayer, T Walseth, D Wangensteen, K Watson, T Weinhaus, M Woods

Guest: D Dykoski,

Absent: R Bache, G Brown, E Coleman, B Conti-Fine, J Day, G Giesler, R Hoffman, M Hordinsky, R Kempainen, C Lam, S Levine, T Mackenzie, C Manske, L Perkowski (@CEC), M Sanders, R Soltis, J Thompson, T Thompson @ (CEC), B Varda, G Vercellotti

Announcements

Cancel May 7th meeting – Medical School Commencement

Curriculum Retreat - May 21st

Information

Discussion

Secure Exam Pilot and Policy

Notes – Brad Clarke

After a short introduction by Dr. Niewoehner, Brad Clarke briefly went over what has occurred this year primarily in Year 2 in terms of secure exams and how it actually works. It was noted that Year 1 Courses do a wide variety of challenge formats and that Year 2 has refined the process as time went on this year. It was also noted that every course using the secure exam format should also be giving students review questions that give students an idea of the type and format of questions they would see on the final/midterm exams.

Doug W. and Pat S. questioned whether or not they had to follow the policy directly next year as they rewrite (actually select from a question bank?) their tests every year anyway. Some discussion ensued and Dr. Niewoehner thought that they could post their tests online for student viewing.

After this discussion a number of familiar ideas emerged ranging from more standardization between courses to making sure daily learning objectives are stated at the beginning of the sessions and also reviewed at the end of each session (closure). The usual discussion also took place concerning course packets with printouts of slides that don't match the lecture slides and how often the Curriculum Office hears about the incongruity between the two.

Notes – K. Watson

Agreement on continuing secure exam policy, but physiology and microbiology will be allowed to continue providing old exams, as long as they write new exams every year

1. Challenges/Reviews after exams:

- a. Improving student and faculty satisfaction with larger room, 2 hours instead of 4 hours
- b. Staff intensive, as Brad collects questions that have been challenged and tracks them on the whiteboard for prioritization

- c. Variety of approaches:
 - i. Some faculty, e.g. endocrine/repro review exam scores first, then send information by e mail to all students and agree to meet 1:1 with students as needed
 - ii. Histology colleges all challenges first , then 2 days later prepared responses to discuss at a group review session
- 2. STANDARDIZATION. Formative feedback must continue throughout all courses to allow students to understand the scope, focus, and type of questions that are to be asked. Committee agreed that these should have a common format and organization on the websites: We have many good examples and need to choose from among the best practices in our courses, with students' input, and Standardize format for all courses!
 - a. Packet for self assessment and study, eg. Quizzes—(ID)
 - b. List learning objectives for each lecture on first and last slide of talk (genetics)
 - c. Have a single format for a FOLDER on the web for last minute changes in talks (genetics)
 - d. Faculty must submit materials to the course director by a specified time, or they will not appear (!!)
 - e. Ability to download AND Annotate files (Histology)

Annual Course Review Process

New format and forms that will be implemented for annual review of courses were presented. Clinical Education Committee has begun their schedule of monthly report and presentations.

Curriculum Committee, Friday, March 5th, 7:30-9:00, B646 Mayo

The next Scientific Foundations Committee meeting

Friday, April 2nd, 7:30-9:00 am, B646 Mayo