

NOTES FROM THE CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT AND POLICY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

September 20, 2007 at 7:00 a.m. in 4038 Bondurant

Members Present/Absent: McCartney, Chair Hobgood Byerley, Chaney, Cross, Dent, Farrell, Hoole, Ingersoll, Rao, Shaheen, Yankaskas; Lewis, Osmond, Sutton; Knierim, Fox

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

- September 5 JAMA focuses on medical education
- Student evaluation of faculty data issues: discussion and short-term plan
- Whitehead brief on space and medical student culture
- Lunch with Deans Roper and Pisano Monday, September 24

1. **The minutes from the August 23 meeting** will be circulated on email for final approval.
2. Abstracts from the **September 5 medical education issue of JAMA** were distributed.
3. **Student evaluation of faculty.** For several years more robust student evaluation of faculty data have been desired by course directors to improve instruction and, when taken with peer evaluation, to inform promotion and tenure decisions. The present end-of-course evaluation system provides useful course management data, but data on specific faculty are only found in the open comment fields, where they tend to focus on outliers (positive and negative) and are difficult to access or collate. The First Year Course Committee and the Office of Educational Development collaborated in the summer of 2007 to design a pilot study for a more robust student evaluation of faculty instrument, and it was agreed that it would be piloted in the Molecules to Cells block of MS1 this fall. Administration was delayed by concerns around data management and interface of its function with One45; the first administration of the instrument took place in Molecules to Cells on September 19.

Discussion of issues to be resolved around further administration was guided by a list of questions generated by Dr. McCartney. Dr. Hobgood noted that the first was most pressing: who will have access to these data, and under what conditions? The quantity of data that will be generated is substantial, and maintenance and delivery issues need to be worked out. Should it be managed differently than course review data is handled now - i.e., reports are delivered to chairs and course directors, who then parcel it out to teaching faculty? Some preclinical course directors pull specific quotes from student comments to share with individual faculty, while others give the whole report directly to their chairs (clinical faculty feedback is always collected by departments and maintained by chairs). If we implement a different electronic data collection method we need to be thoughtful about how data will be managed, who will be accountable, and who will support the substantial staff time required. If these data are maintained centrally, we anticipate a large number of requests for faculty to have reports delivered as promotion and tenure reviews are scheduled. Central management would also mean that administration would be able to compare faculty performance across content domains as never before, and faculty will be sensitive to the ramifications of that possibility. It was noted that these data need to be primarily formative, especially in the early years of faculty's teaching careers. It is crucial that individuals have opportunities to grow and improve, so early poor data does not hamper future advancement.

Dr. Chaney reported that CCI had recommended that the data be provided to course directors with an archive of the data maintained by OED. The course directors could then use the data, along with their peer evaluations, to mentor faculty and provide reports to their chairs. Dr. Chaney noted that in Molecules to Cells the course directors pass faculty data along to chairs, accompanied by an email contextualizing the data and providing the course director's peer evaluation of the faculty member's performance as well, which provides an opportunity for further professional development. Nonetheless, ultimately individual faculty will want to access their data in order to create their portfolios. It was suggested that candidates for promotion and tenure should create their own portfolios in concert with their chairs rather than having the promotion committee or Academy of Educators accessing faculty data directly. The question of who then would maintain access to and security of those data remains. Perhaps the OED could proceed as it has previously, by collecting the data and giving it electronically directly to the course directors and chairs, whose responsibility it then becomes to support portfolio development. It was noted that residencies using MyEvaluations archive and manage data in their departments so faculty can see it when needed. Any decision will involve expense: if management is central, then server and staff support need to be supported; if it becomes a chair responsibility, they will ask how it is to be supported. It was suggested that the OED could maintain ten years of data only, with older data kept only in the departments. The OED's guidelines on access to those data would inform department practice as well. There also needs to be an interim report generated to provide formative opportunities, which might be supported by a "look-in link" eventually (at present

it is impossible to “look in” on only one faculty member’s data). The OED can eventually fill this need but will need support commitment to execute it. The OED currently sends chairs a PDF of course evaluation output, not the full database. PDF reports meet data security needs by being immutable, but they are hard to use. Dr. Byerley noted that some schools have a software system that faculty and chairs can access to create reports for faculty portfolios, which would eliminate the need for an OED staff person to create those reports. It was suggested that we look into what software system those schools were using.

It was decided to seek an interim solution to the data management issues while continuing to explore the long-term resolution. At present, data will be sent directly to course directors for their disposition, accompanied by our stated expectation of how it will be managed. As an “early implementer,” Dr Chaney articulated the expectation thus: **course directors will be expected to combine these data with peer evaluation and their own contextualizing perspective and give final feedback in a report to report to chairs as a personal written communication.** The issue of direct chair and individual faculty access will be worked out later. Requests to the OED by faculty for data access will be referred to course directors. The Academy of Educators and OIS will review these issues and advise on next steps. Once a long-term proposal is created, it should go to the Dean of Faculty Affairs for final approval. All decisions might need to be adjusted in light of decision regarding purchase of One45 and its capacities.

Drs Chaney and Hobgood and an MS1 student representative will report on the pilot to CC1, and future sampling procedures will be finalized. There are greater challenges to piloting in Block 2 because of different groupings: one comprehensive evaluation for Block 2 may meet their needs because they have fewer faculty. The next pilot, then, might not be until Block 3; those decisions will wait until the adequacy of the present pilot’s data is established. Dr. Chaney will initiate a conversation between Drs. Gilliland and Hobgood to discuss further implementation in Block 2..

It was moved that the OED would proceed with the collection of student evaluation of faculty data in a limited way, returning those data to course directors with the expectation that they will manage it as noted above. The OED assumes no further archiving or reporting responsibility, and the OED and committee co-chairs will report back to the CMPC about progress on the other issues. The motion was seconded and passed.

4. **Teaching Space Report.** Whitehead representatives Daniel Fox and Kyle Knierem commented on their email brief to Dr. McCartney of September 13 detailing student concerns regarding space in the SOM. They noted that Berryhill’s closure was originally to be a two-year project, but the additional delays occasioned by SOM expansion discussions have resulted in a longer closure. They have heard student comments that the decentralization of student spaces across the campus – in particular, the dissolution of the “lab group” organization of students in the preclinical years – has resulted in a cultural change away from healthy, supportive community and toward cliquishness and competitiveness. They noted that after their class leaves no student will recall the previous culture, and they thought it wise to rearticulate the original hopes of the students before graduating. They feel these issues would be best addressed by recommitment to support of 24 hour accessible small-group meeting and study space. These culture concerns are especially critical in light of possible expansion of the class by 70 students. Schools with centralized facilities (like Emory) use their sense of community as a recruitment tool. They emphasized that this feedback is anecdotal, not systematic. Dr McCartney noted that this feedback is especially timely given that the interim plan is still in development, and thanked the students for their commitment to a supportive culture at the SOM.
5. Dr. McCartney has been invited to participate in the five year review of **Dr. James Anderson’s departmental leadership as chair.**, CMPC members were asked to provide perspective on his performance that might inform her input. She noted that the request for education leadership to be part of a department chair’s core review team represented a milestone for medical education at UNC.
6. At the next CMPC meeting we will review the clinical curriculum brief being prepared in support of the department chairs meeting scheduled for October 2. The Surgery department’s generous deployment of residents and faculty to support basic science instruction was noted with gratitude.
7. Next meeting: **Thursday, September 27, 2007 at 7:00 AM in 4038 Bondurant Hall.** Also note **CMPC Luncheon with Deans Pisano Monday, September 24, 2007 from 12:00 to 1:00 PM in 4038 Bondurant Hall.** The agenda will include an expansion update, chair recruitment issues, cancer funding update, and a brief clinical curriculum update by Drs Yankaskas and Byerley on the progress of the development of the new selectives.