

## NOTES FROM THE CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT AND POLICY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

*June 22, 2006 at 7:00 a.m. in 4074 Bondurant Hall*

---

**Members Present/Absent:**  Dr. McCartney, Chair; Drs.  Byerley,  Chaney,  Cross,  Dent,  Hobgood,  Hoole,  Ingersoll,  Rao,  Shaheen,  Yankaskas;  Lewis,  Osmond,  Sutton;  Palmer,  Simhan

**1. Notes from the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting** were distributed for comment and corrections and unanimously accepted.

**2. LCME final report.** Dr. McCartney reported that our accreditation has been renewed and that the LCME is scheduled to return in 2012. They requested a progress report by May 1, 2008 regarding ED-21 (evidence of progress in cultural sensitivity), MS-32 (evidence of progress in student mistreatment numbers), curriculum reform in all years but especially years 3 and 4 (effectiveness and progress), and Berryhill renovation progress report. Evaluation of curriculum efficacy will be enhanced by 2008 by installation of the B-Line system.

**3. Article IV: responsibilities of teaching faculty.** Articles 4.02 and 4.03 of the Educational Policies were distributed for review by Drs. Yankaskas and Byerley. They expressed enthusiasm that the CETF work is moving forward, but noted a gap in mutual understanding as evidenced in the neurology / psychiatry grading issue. It was noted that course committee level leadership of curriculum change was facilitated in MS1 and MS2 because of a complete overhaul in organization and content, while CC3 and 4 sought to make adjustments with the same core personnel and content from before. It was agreed that issues internal to a single year should be handled at the Course Committee level, while those issues impacting multiple years should move to the CMPC. It was decided to permit a split grade in neuro / psych this year in the interest of maintaining stakeholder buy-in. It was also noted that attendance of course directors at required meetings is essential to ensure such issues are uncovered and discussed in a timely manner. Continued attendance of students at meetings is also important to support.

**4. Course Committee Block 11 leadership authority and management issues.** Dr. Clark sought to replace a faculty member. Dr. McCartney noted that those decisions lie with department heads, not the Course Committee co-chairs, and suggests that if the course director is not happy with a faculty member, he or she should first give feedback directly to that faculty member. If no result, the CC co-chair may consult with course director to speak to person and seek resolution; faculty may make the decision at that level to withdraw. If not, it would proceed to the EAD, who in consultation with department chair would offer remediation plan or decide to remove. Dr. Cross clarified that this process would be used while a course was ongoing or imminent; there is always an opportunity to change faculty between course offerings. Dr. Shaheen clarified this is series of one year repeating appointments who serve at the pleasure of the EAD; lecturer removal power is totally vested in course director, but the removal of a committee member needs more involvement because the financial implications are greater. Dr. Rao noted that we need input from department chairs to decide who gets involved in curricular issues; a discussion between the EAD and the chair is always advised. Dr. Byerley noted that the CC3-4 co-chairs do not have power to replace clerkship directors; Dr. McCartney noted that the EAD could also work in favor of such changes. Dr. Rao noted that she has made clear in the handoff of the Repro block that meeting attendance is compulsory for block leaders; she suggests we strengthen the language in 4.02 to reflect this conversation. Drs. McCartney and Rao will collaborate on a draft for review at a subsequent CMPC.

Dr. Cross notes that the appointment of an MD (Dr. Hobgood) to the Associate Dean for Curriculum and Educational Development (ADCED) position has changed the nature of that office. He notes that the role of the ADCED is not reflected in the process described by Dr. McCartney and suggested its inclusion be discussed, since the ADCED attends all annual course reviews she should be consulted because of her knowledge of the context. Dr. McCartney noted that the ADCED is responsible for the design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum elements, while the EAD is in charge of oversight and liaison between curriculum and support services, MSTL, the DAC, and department chairs. The ADCED advises before the EAD deploys the resources of that office. Dr. Shaheen advised against committing that relationship to policy, as it might hamstring both offices in practice. Dr. Cross noted that Co-Chairs first recourse is the ADCED and recommended that it be left a tacit understanding that some of the EAD's authority is delegated. Dr. Hoole noted that this policy was written under the last ADCED; the fact that she was not an MD made this conversation irrelevant. Dr. McCartney noted that Dr. Hobgood possesses education expertise as well, making her a particularly valuable resource.

**5. Next meeting: July 13 in 133 MacNider.**