

Scientific Foundations Committee

Meeting

April 2, 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, D Powell, L Schimmenti, P Schlievert, S Thayer, T Walseth, D Wangensteen, K Watson, T Weinhaus, M Woods

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

I. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from previous meeting were approved.

II. Discussion

Practical Aspects of the Curriculum

The discussion began with faculty asking questions regarding the logistics of the curricular support structure in the upcoming academic year beginning in Fall of 2010. Considerable concern was voiced regarding the practical aspects of the infrastructure and the ability to support all the changes and the policy infrastructure to back those changes. Faculty were informed that all courses would be moving to Moodle and that starting in Fall of 2010 they can still run a course in WebCT but they are expected to transition to Moodle no later than Fall 2011. The faculty are concerned about the practical aspects of migrating courses. It was noted by Brad Clarke that WebCT is being phased out of the University as a whole and so this it is not an option for us to continue with this technology. Faculty were informed that there are specific staff who are assigned to support each of their courses in addition to helping with this migration of course materials from their current websites.

Concerns were voiced about the fact that while the courses are designated as 'integrated' they are still effectively functioning as stand alone courses and that the integration of any block of courses into one website may be challenging. Faculty need to know specifically what people are available to support them and what assistance they can expect in this transition. Faculty requested the specific the goals for each year or time period so that they may better work on the timelines and expectations within each block of courses. Many faculty members expressed concern about the ability of the Course Managers to support the courses.

Discussion surrounding the FCT cases focused on frustration that the cases are not done, details have not been shared with faculty, and lack of understanding as to how the courses are expected to integrate content with these courses.

Students voiced a concern about some of the very practical aspects of the course including the lack of organization and clarity in lecture slides. Several faculty members stated that they felt discussing what slides look like is unimportant and should not concern the students. Faculty went on to say that at this point in the preparation for the year the PPT slides are set and can not be changed. Students would like to know if we are moving to more online materials how the administration will enforce 'rules' about PPT formatting. Marilyn Becker reminds faculty that there are standards we need to follow for e-learning for students with disabilities (visually impaired) etc. Faculty would like someone from that department come and speak to us about these standards

For future discussion: what is the most efficient way for the course websites to be supported?; Is it possible for courses to support their own websites?; what role does the Curriculum Office have in helping Course Directors make decisions (structural) about the course websites? Faculty requested a working group be called to discuss these issues and come up with recommendations.

Scheduling review sessions

The timing and scheduling of review sessions was brought before the group as a discussion item. It was reiterated that review sessions should only occur during course hours (as previously discussed and approved by the Education Steering Committee). After further discussion in this group it was recommended that if they were not in support of this the faculty would need to form a group to approach the ESC and discuss the opening of ILT or lunch times for optional reviews. Faculty voiced the opinion that even though their review sessions may be the most well attended and best session they offer, they are not willing to give up a lab or lecture time to have the review session. The faculty asked if the Exam Week would have time for structured review sessions, no answer was given.

Independent Learning Time

Questions still remain of how courses are expected to make use of the ILT. They would like more clarity on what the expectations are for use of the ILT, how much time they can expect students to spend on their materials during the ILT, can students be required to participate in lectures on line during this time. The HD-4 block is prepared to move ahead with more active lectures that will require more out class learning but are concerned how students will respond and evaluate the experience. The ECM-4 block announced they are moving forward with the Hypothesis Driven Exam and an integrated course with anatomy and they are assigning readings and other resources that students will be expected to complete during their ILT. Both students and faculty reiterated that they need clarity in what is to be expected during the ILT. Faculty requested specific numbers (hours/minutes) that each course can be allotted to use during the ILT so that no one course is dominating all the time. In addition the

faculty requested an overall 'Czar' for the Course Directors who will help oversee the coordination and block management.

Exams

Faculty were informed that the Secure Exam Policy will go into full effect effective Fall 2010. In addition they were reminded that all exams were to be no longer than 3 hours (but could be shortened) and that alternative assessments to MCQ are encouraged. The faculty voiced an opinion that they need more clarification on the assessments and what their expectations for integration are within and across blocks. While several faculty agree that well written case vignettes could help make exams that are integrated and assess higher order thinking skills it was recognized that currently they are not prepared to do this on a large scale (need more faculty development, examples, and understanding of how the integrated blocks work). Dr's Vercelloti and Allen suggested using patient panel cases as a starting point.

The Course Directors need further clarification on how to gather the exam questions and how to create the integrated exam. They felt it was not realistic for the Course Director to do all this as they may/may not have a relationship with the faculty from whom they would need to request questions. This needs further discussion and clarification as to the role of the Course Director in the integrated blocks.

Finally faculty voiced the concern that there are no mid-terms and that they feel this really is a disservice to the students and will weaken their courses.

Issues that were brought up but need future discussion

What are the issues with failures and deceleration in the integrated blocks and how are the CD's expected to deal with these?

CD's still do not have a clear picture of what resources (financial, personnel, etc) they can expect in the upcoming year. They are still unclear about who to go to for questions and concerns.