

Attendance meeting II
May 15, 2006
8:00 AM - 9:00 AM

Present: Chaney, Cross, Toevs, Rao, Page, Alexander, Ma, Kernick, 3 students, Osmond
(8:30)

(Minutes begin at 8:30 – 30 minutes lost)

1. STEs scheduled as first of day helped strengthen attendance – “how we get it to work,” not “how we enforce attendance”
2. Alexander: what’s different about this question this year? Initiated by Gilligan resignation. What is different: for my faculty this is not their day job; traditionally very different, they have to figure out how to fit it in. he has no leverage, like herding cats. Changes dynamic. Second, historically faculty who taught students were fount of knowledge; that and a textbook. Clearly not the case now. Third, at this point the tech revolution, instructors have to compete with their own information. Instructors have to learn how not to be trumped up by their own PPTs. Also notes context is very different: 1st year wants to pass, instructors want to create doctors.
3. Chaney notes unwritten expectation that everything in the lecture needs to be posted in the PPT 24 hours ahead of time. Toevs concurs that is neither possible nor advisable. Chaney notes that faculty needs to be able to change things at the last minute. Maybe post updated version after the fact? Ma notes that she was a crummy medical student. Need to clarify some of the rules about those expectations. Idea on the floor to specify the nature of each lecture so students can better decide how to use their time.
4. Rao notes that she talked to Dr. Smith about this issue; notes that in every year some students love having it all up front, some hate it. Eternal dichotomy.
5. Student notes that having it all in the PPT helps her deal with new terminology, the better to focus on conceptual content. You can’t trust anything different fro
6. Chaney: if you haven’t; read ahead of time and come to class to know what is important, you will not have done what you need.
7. Chaney: Have we come further on development of concrete recommendations? Cross: have agreed that lectures that give guidance to students in the way that learning will happen in the next chunk of time will help students; at same time, we are working to make that expectation more uniform in light of diversity of faculty and material, create some guidelines for how that info presented and evaluated at the front end. To enable students to better use their time.
8. Concern about asking student to change their expectations and work styles between lectures. Alexander notes that either faculty are already doing it or they can’t do it any better. Osmond notes that it changes by content as well as faculty style.
9. Chaney notes that students will then also be able to evaluate faculty based on their own stated objectives. Toevs notes that using active learning requires participation; notes that he is not supportive of active learning in large group settings, breaking into smaller groups in a large lecture hall doesn’t work for him.

10. Rao notes that as adult learners all are responsible for their own learning. It is the job of each student to make their own choices and be accountable for those choices.
11. Cross moves that we succinctly describe at beginning of each course segment the way in which the teaching will occur and the way in which the evaluation will be done, and the corresponding expectation for student attendance and participation (or the supposed consequences of not attending). Noted that attendance at small groups is not a policy requirement; in next meeting discuss to what extent want to encourage or enforce attendance; if it is required, find a way to require it. Page notes that any instructor can require it, or build it into their grading system. Seconded and moved.
12. Rao notes that this is exactly the requirement of MS2 at present. Student concern that this will aid clarity of expectations but will not “fix the attendance problem”.
13. Next week will come together around Chaney summaries.