

First Year Curriculum Committee Meeting
Co-Chairs Stephen Chaney, Ph.D. and Alan Cross, MD
June 12, 2007, 8:00 - 9:30 A.M., 133 MacNider

In Attendance:

Stephen Chaney	Cheryl McCartney	Dale Krams	Kathy Sulik
Alan Cross	Peter Petrusz	Ed Kernick	Meredith Miller
Bruce Cairns	Kurt Gilliland	Nilsa Morales	Ali Chhotani
Claudia Condrey	Michael Goy	Chris Osmond	Lydia Lewis
Stephen Charles	Tim Weiner	Sandra Void	Aldo Rustioni

1) Announcements- S. Chaney and A. Cross

- Meredith Miller was introduced as a second year student that is Co-VP for Curriculum Affairs from the Whitehead Society.
- There is talk of expanding the School of Medicine to UNC-Asheville as well as UNC-Charlotte.
- Dr. McCartney stated that UNC-Asheville is discussing adding 20 students per class to the UNC School of Medicine. UNC-Asheville has huge hospitals at full capacity and lots of rural medicine practices. UNC-Asheville does not currently have residencies in all of the things that UNC Chapel Hill has in parallel clerkships. The medical students would be working directly with the attending physicians. UNC-Asheville has only 2 of the required 7 clerkships. Over the next few years UNC-Asheville would have to work on adding these missing clerkships.
- Dr. McCartney stated that working with the Charlotte Expansion Project, there is a concern about scholarship monies. The School of Medicine will need to have more scholarship monies for the students who are unable to pay if the school increases its enrollment. The Medical Foundation wouldn't have a parallel funds to increase the scholarship funds if additional students are accepted.
- Dr. McCartney stated that the numbers of students could be increasing and it may be challenging to educate the students in the same way we have done before in the past.
- Dr. Chaney stated that despite their recommendations, there will be pressure to admit students incrementally before Berryhill is rebuilt. It was stated by Dr. Chaney that Dr. Pisano is aware of the space needs for the medical school.

2) Student Evaluation of Faculty- C. Osmond

- Dr. Osmond passed out and read two handouts, one on Student Evaluation of Faculty Proposal and one on Student Evaluation of Faculty Instrument.
- Please see the handouts for specific details.
- Dr. Osmond stated that he had tried to make them geared towards teacher competence rather than lecturing competence.
- This will be a Qualtrix based program.
- One third of the class would be selected at random to evaluate faculty for that week. Every three weeks the groups would be re-randomized.
- The students will be able to see a photo of the person/instructor that they are evaluating. It was suggested to put the topic with the photo as well.
- This will be presented at orientation before the first block starts.
- Processed results should be made available to course directors, but raw data would not go directly with the department chairs.
- It was asked who was going to maintain the data? It was suggested that the data should be centrally stored.
- Dr. Sulik stated that there needs to be a weight to which data set is more valuable, the student evaluations of faculty or the peer evaluations of faculty.
- Dr. McCartney stated that we could correlate the data from the student evaluations with student performance.
- It was decided to try out the current form of student evaluation of faculty on Block 1, and make any necessary changes before Block 2. This current form would include the one third of the class that would be selected at random to evaluate the faculty members for that week.

3) Peer Evaluation of Students by Students- C. Osmond

- It was already stated that peer evaluations in the first semester could not be used for grades, but in the second semester peer evaluation could be used for grades in small group activities of block courses.
- Dr. Osmond distributed a sample of 1st and 2nd year small group peer evaluation.
- Dr. Cross stated that this only works if students take this evaluation seriously and use the same standard.
- It was suggested to add to the form a question that asked if the group was able to achieve the overall goals and objectives.
- It was suggested that each year the clinical faculty get a one page summary of what changes have been made in the clinical years as regards to curriculum.
- It was suggested that if students are getting good feedback to have course directors note this feedback and inform the student of their positive behaviors.
- Dr. Sulik stated that having peer evaluation is useful for Block 2, but using the exact form with these current questions may not appropriate.
- Dr. Hobgood stated that there needs to be more time to gather resources and assign responsibilities to staff members before a decision could be made on using this form.
- It was suggested to go ahead and send the peer evaluation form to Block 2, and to have them suggest changes related to the questions, to make the form more tailored to their block.

4) Block 4 Report- Block 4 Course Directors

- This item will be held over until the July meeting.
- Stephen Charles will find out if there will be enough faculty, staff and students to have a meeting in July. If a meeting is held in July, it will be on July 10, 2007 in 4052 Bondurant Hall.