

Scientific Foundations Committee
Meeting

August 5, 2011

7:30 – 9:00 am, B-646 Mayo

In attendance: S Allen, B Clarke, E Coleman, G Giesler, S Katz, K Lee, S Levine, C Niewoehner, J Norrander, J Pacala, P Southern, K Watson, T Weinhaus, M Woods

Absent: L Anderson, M Becker, A Bleas, W Donigan, A Edvenson, G Filice, M Hordinsky, A Johns @ CEC, T Killeen, T Mackenzie, A Minenko, K Norby, J Pacala, L Perkowski, D Powell, M Sanders, L Schimmenti, D Wangenstein, K Wickman,

Minutes

Minutes for July 8th meeting were reviewed and approved with no changes or additions.

LCME

Dr. Kathleen Watson reminded everyone that the Mock Site Visit is scheduled for October 2-October 5, 2011

Information

Dr. Linda Perkowski's last day will be August 29th; she will continue to work on the LCME Database and assist in writing the Executive Summary. Dr. Perkowski will return to campus to participate in the Mock Site Visit.

Dr. Niewoehner advised course directors to contact Dr. Watson or Dr. Woods for help with questions that Dr. Perkowski would have addressed.

Annual Course Reports

Neuroscience

Dr. Glen Giesler, Neuroscience Course Director reported class enrollment is made up of 150 medical students and 50 physical therapy students. Faculty are required to plan lectures 6 months in advance and not changes are made after that deadline. There is strong support from the department head for teaching, which allows Dr. Giesler to maintain quality control, while having a range of faculty teaching.

Areas that are working well include "outlines" which are of use to the students only if they attend class and fill in the outline as the lectures take place. When the lectures are all done, the outline is like a mini-textbook. He attends all lectures and provides feedback for every lecture. The course stresses the relationship between the material presented and clinical medicine and disease. This area continues to be strengthened every year. The syllabus for the neuro-anatomy labs continue to improve. An HCMC physician is an especially dedicated teacher and uses interviews with ALS patients in class to demonstrate the connection between basic science and clinical.

Because scheduling changes reduced hours in the course and in order to retain the assessments there was a reduction in lab time. This limited opportunities to provide guidance in the labs and some students didn't do as well as they could have with added 1:1 faculty guidance. In the future the goal is to go back to a midterm week to allow students to integrate and consolidate the information covered in the first half of the course. This past year three midterms were all scheduled for the same day, Microbiology was able to change their date. There will much greater communication between Physiology, Microbiology and Neuroscience to better coordinate in AY2011. There are plans to add a new lecture in exchange for one that will be dropped. Several Neuroscience faculty will assist with teaching the Duluth course; Department Head Dr. Ebner feels strongly that in-person instruction is necessary and he will teach several sessions. Also Dr. William England will travel to Duluth as one of the faculty and Dr. Giesler will travel there to

provide review sessions. Dr. Janet Fitzakerley is the course director for their course; four faculty who have retired at Duluth taught components of the class. She is reworking aspects of their course, which will bring improvements.

In response to questions about resources Dr. Giesler noted the textbook used for the course is very complex with specific portions used for the course. Dr. Sharon Allen noted the ECM course uses a neurological clinical case that may serve as a method for integration between the hypothesis driven physical exam concepts now taught in ECM and Neuroscience. She suggested the case also be used in the Neuroscience course at the appropriate time to repeat the concepts. Drs. Giesler and Allen will collaborate with other faculty to integrate basic science and clinical aspects for application. Dr. Levin asked how many students still buy the textbook. MS-2 Kacia Lee noted depending on students' educational background varying levels of "neuroscience" basics are needed. Discussion continued regarding use of resources, i.e. text books and on-line resources. Dr. Niewoehner suggested providing a list of all resources used across each year's set of courses. In order to gather a list of books and resources for all courses, a brief email will be sent to course directors to ask the following questions:

What readings and/or resources do you require or suggest?

Are they assessed in exams or by other means?

Do you pinpoint selected areas?

What parts of the text book(s) is used in your course?

Dr. Watson referenced the Neuroscience shared teaching responsibilities with Duluth as highlighting the strong efforts needed to meet the LCME standard for vertical and horizontal integration of course content, especially how to accomplish that across campuses. She noted that some course directors are involved in work to begin to look for opportunities for integration across the entire curriculum.

Discussion

Conflict of Interest Implementation

A draft of a disclosure form for lecturers to use at the beginning of each course lecture was discussed. The form would be located within the Course Director Handbook as a professional practice guideline. This would be a request distributed to course directors who then would distribute it to faculty involved in their scientific foundation courses. The goal is to provide basic information (see form) in the first slide of the lecturers presentation and it would include basic financial disclosure. This will be a first step to respond to student inquiries. Students expect this information in lunch presentations from outside speakers and feel it is good role modeling for their future career preparation. The Guidelines were adopted by consensus. A suggest alternative is a page with a table (see template

Ideas for Implementing ILT

ILT will not change for the coming year and cannot be used for review sessions. Dr. Niewoehner asked for feedback for how are faculty suggesting ILT be used in relation to course requirements. Dr. Giesler asked for clarification regarding review sessions, because there was an option to use ILT they did not hold their sessions last year. Review sessions can be held during lunch or during a didactic portion of the course. Dr. Watson stated that because there are no structured rules Course Directors are being asked how they would recommend using ILT. She provided background reporting that ILT was developed for students to have successive hours uninterrupted by class or other requirement, so they could make choices for their own active learning. Examples include time for preparing for small groups, preparing for reading and also for personal issues that can at times take away from their ability to fulfill required activities. The Faculty Advisors did an informal poll of their advisees and consistently the time was used for study, personal issues, exercise, research, or to work at a job. The FA's also found from their inquiry almost 100% of students really liked the time. In looking at course related activities, how could student use it for preparing for lecture or small groups and/or labs? Dr Katz added because faculty weren't prepared to give guidance for how students might use the time, there wasn't clear communication of their expectations. He added one reason ESC has determined there will be no change in the structure of ILT is

to give ample opportunity to see how it can be used and what improvements can be achieved. Secondly a quantitative survey is needed at the end of each semester asking students specifically how they used it, should it continue and what changes would increase the value of the time. Dr. Woods suggested using a matched survey asking faculty what the students gained and how did they prepare the students for more directed ILT.

Course directors shared steps they've taken to direct students for use of ILT and are included in the following:

- ECM has a section called student prep which directs student to specific tasks to complete to be prepared for the next session. Students did respond and came well prepared for small group.
- Some courses found that some students were well prepared, while others used computers in class to find the answers.
- For Gross Anatomy, students were informed they would need 2-3 hours for every lab session and that there is a pre-lab quiz to help them understand whether or not they were prepared for lab. In another setting those who use the time to do other things missed the opportunity to do in depth preparation and have a broader learning experience.
- Microbiology has determined they will hold 8 demonstrations and give a Moodle quiz after. Students will be told what to read and do to prepare for these and suggestions will be made regarding use of ILT for the preparation.
- After a recap of the steps and methods course directors have developed or are planning to use; the question was asked if it fits with "independent learning time".

Dr Watson noted that ILT was meant to have students make their own study and learning decisions with guidance on how to use their time to study. She reminded them that there are a number of students who don't have time management skills and don't understand that medical school is very different from college. She noted that there are 4 half day sessions in the 1st semester. This is because there is so much to learn and absorb and in the past there were always a number of students who failed because they didn't understand what was needed and got bogged down. Additional discussion centered on whether ILT was productive when students used it for activities that were unrelated to their medical education. The aspect that relates to guidance for use of ILT is what needs to be developed and put in place.

Next Meeting:
SFC
September 9, 2011