First Year Curriculum Committee Meeting  
Co-Chairs Stephen Chaney, Ph.D. and Alan Cross, MD  
April 8, 2008, 8:00 - 9:30 A.M., 133 MacNider
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<td>James Lindsey</td>
<td>Deborah Ingersoll</td>
<td>Michael Goy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldo Rustioni</td>
<td>Gwen Sancar</td>
<td>Peter Petrusz</td>
<td>Sandra Void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Stone</td>
<td>Alfred Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Announcements- Open
   - Reminder for faculty to attend graduation on May 11, 2008.

2) Laptop Exam Policy
   - The Educational Technology Committee (i.e. FACET) struggled with this for a while and one of our main issues was trying to separate out the technical staff support issues from the educational policy issues. We really try to focus our efforts on the staff technical support issues and tried to leave the educational policy stuff alone.
   - It was moved that with the recommended change that the laptop policy would go to the CMPC next.
   - The Laptop policy has not changed much. The issue is students coming technically unprepared and putting exam proctors or OIS support personnel in a hard situation of having to enforce or in some cases make up a policy that they really didn’t have any backing for. The idea here was to make sure that the policy explicitly addresses those issues so that people who were in a position of having to implement or enforce it would not feel like they were hanging out there on their own.
   - Comments - Pertaining to the CC2 testing. Over the last two tests we have bolstered up our number of cables. It is expected for a few people to forget their cables. We currently have 18 in the box and every one is gone at the end of the class. This means that as many as 18 students have had some type of issue with their cord that has not been taken care of before the test. The goal is to enforce the penalty for not bringing your cable.
   - From the point of administrators and faculty it seems imminently reasonable for every student to come in with their cable and laptop ready to do.
   - Student Comments – The students are more focused on the exam and not equipment. Lots of students don’t use an Ethernet cord and for that reason it is often not in their book bag and that’s the reason it is often forgotten. If the students knew that this was a more serious of an issue then students would be better prepared if they knew it was going to be enforced. When students think that nothing is going to happen if I forget my Ethernet cord or laptop it is not taken serious.
   - Recommendation: It was recommended that a reminder be sent. A couple of days running before the test to make sure that the lecturer remind the students about the Laptop Policy. Suggested more vigorous reminding.
   - Summary - The students indicated that they complied when they thought it was going to be enforced. The policy needs to be enforced. It is not the responsibility of the lecturer. The main issue is not that it cost for more cords or makes more work for the staff but that the 90% of the students who showed up prepared have to have people crawl over them while they are trying to take an exam.
   - Recommendation: Need to find a way of notifying the students proactively, reminding them and enforcing the policy. A reminder should be sent out on the forum and to MS1 and MS2 listserv at least 3-5 business days before the exam.
   - The main goal of the policy is to have a backing of support that lays things down and then enforce them. It was suggested to send out short email with the headline of the email saying ‘bring your Ethernet cable’.
   - This constitutes FACET’s recommendation to this committee for what the policy should be. CC2 approved the policy at their last meeting with the one change that was made which was
inserting Dr. Dent’s name instead of promotion's committee. See #5. At this point if CC1 approves it will then go the CMPC.

- Other issue – Appeal for Block Directors from 1, 2 and 3 – During an exam an IPOD had to be taken from a student. It is extremely difficult to do that without being disruptive.
- Policy of scratch paper discussed. It makes sense to have scratch paper supplied and collected at the end.
- If a student is caught with exam material on an IPOD it would be an honor code violation.
- It was moved that the policy was adopted as stated in this document with the change of Georgette Dent’s name to Associate Dean for Student Affairs.

3) Suggestions for Reorganization of the Office of Medical Education

- There is a committee empowered to look at the reorganization and make recommendations. The committee would like to meet with CC1 to formally discuss this and gather input. The preliminary review was distributed with instructions not to copy and distribute and to confidentially dispose of.
- Etta’s charge to the committee was to think outside the box. Please feel free to contact either Steve Chaney or Warren Newton with any further suggestions.
- What we want to look at is what the Offices of Medical Education should look like. How should it be structured to carry out the roles that are to be carried out? Do not be constrained by budget, but don’t assume the budget is going to be any different than it is.
- Refer to organizational charts on the back. Refer to summary of current organization which is composed of six separate offices within the Offices of Medical Education, each of whom have separate roles: Dean of Medical Education, Office of Student Affairs, Office of Educational Development, Office of Admissions, Office of Continuing Medical Education and Medical Sciences Teaching Labs.
- The reason for the Office of Continuing Medication Education being required in the Offices of Medical Education is obscure. It has nothing to do with the education of medical students or residents. It got grafted in there a number of years ago. On the other hand, IT which is an integral part of what we do is not a part of the Offices of Medical Education. They report to the Office of Finance.
- The role of the Offices of Medical Education has had to do with student support, faculty support and curricular support.
- The currently recognized problems are listed in the report, one being the ‘silo’ approach, meaning that each of the separate units within the Offices of Medical Education do not always communicate well with each other. We may be wasting resources because we are duplicating efforts.
- The customer service aspect focus is missing.
- After reviewing the preliminary review of organizational structure of Offices of Medical Education the floor was open for discussion. Our recommendations need to be in by June. The major work of the committee is envisioned to be over by the end of April.
  - There is also an IT Report that is not part of this report that will be submitted to the committee by the end of the week. All IT personnel were interviewed across all of the Offices of Medical Education and have come up with recommendations about IT work for all the Offices of Medical Education.
  - One of the things that came up in the meeting was better customer service for both faculty and students. Who do you go to for things? What is the chain of command?
  - One of the things that the committee discussed which is not currently a major mission of the Offices of Medical Education, but has been more so in the past is faculty development. What could the Offices of Medical Education be doing in order to prepare your faculty to do a better job of teaching? The other issue is faculty support in terms of dollars. The total budget is a significant budget of $4.9M in FY2009. Currently there are 80 slots in the Offices of Medical Education.
  - When you are putting together how your salary is paid, it is easy to figure out how much is paid from clinical how much from grants, etc. Teaching typically isn’t compensated in a tangible way. Salary compensation is a consistent issue.
  - One of the administrative realities is that there is a fairly substantial state budget that is historically distributed to the departments in ways that are unrelated to teaching activities and department chairs are not required to account for the educational use of that money. It is the only flexible money they have. To even suggest to your
department chair that you want to assign those dollars to specific teaching activities is a cultural change. At some level someone needs to be ready to move in that direction. We are trying to run the curriculum on new money that has been bound to tuition increases and ultimately the Charlotte expansion. It has been advocated that the Dean's Office get the department chair to match whatever money is given. If Office of Medical Education gives 10% of your salary for being a course director your department chair should visibly match that and then you've got 20% of your time to do it.

- The report states that there is $4.9M excluding Professional Tuition money. Would it be correct to assume that the money that is currently being distributed to the faculty in compensation include the money that's currently being paid to faculty for teaching their courses and other administrative functions that they are performing or is there additional money to the $4.9M coming from tuition. It is presumed that that includes the portion of the tuition increase that is dedicated to the Office of Medical Education.

- Administrative Support – things like entering test questions in the database and handling communication between faculty and course directors. Block 3 pays one of their office staff in the Physiology Department to be a liaison for the course director to work with. That is not really the function of the departmental budget and therefore maybe a position like that could be funded. There could be a lot more integration from block to block if there was a person whose full time job was to provide administrative support from block to block. Reinventing the wheel to solve problems would not be if there was administrative support facilitating that understanding of how to solve these problems.

- The current curriculum facilitator role is the theoretical administrative support person that moves from block to block. However the individual currently in this role has various other assignments. Since administrative support for the block directors are very important functions maybe these should be the only functions that the person involved deals with. These are critical functions and course directors should see a significant amount of resources in a one person slot devoted to these functions.

- It is the feeling that one person alone cannot do CC1 and CC2. There needs to be multiple people. A vision of having maybe alternating administrative support staff who would do Block 1 and the alternate support do Block 2 and person three assist with Block 3 or 4. These alternating support staff would be available to be at the planning stages, and would help with technical support, individual schedules, assist with scheduling individual lecturers, etc. This is not the job that just one person can do.

- The question was asked could one person provide assistance for CC1 and one person for CC2. MSTL has presented the role of curriculum facilitator and then they would have a coordinator or two working underneath them. The curriculum facilitator person would be the person who moves from block to block with whom each course director directly communicated and the curriculum facilitator would allocate certain needs now to the coordinator.

- We should recognize the good will of Physiology supplying a person to provide administrative support for Block 3. This may appear to represent that the course is within the department but the course is owned and operated by the Dean's Office.

- From a course director’s perspective, when a problem comes up that sometimes needs a really rapid response is the reason for the need for a dedicated person where you know you can contact that person and they will not have a lot of other responsibilities that affect their ability to respond in a timely fashion. There needs to be a cultural change put in place so that the person who does this can work really easily with the course directors and sort of move their operation from Block 1 to Block 2 to Block 3.

- In an interim situation a listserv has been created as a means for course directors to make a request for their course. The address is cfacilitator@listserv.med.unc.edu. It is monitored by numerous staff members in MSTL and response time has been very timely and productively.

- One of the critical features that goes beyond that is longitudinal familiarity. The first year such a person is marginally helpful, the second year they can do a better job and by the 3rd and 4th year they can really carry on the process. It was suggested
that to have this to be multiple people who change on a regular basis is totally not helpful.

- One suggestion is to find a vehicle to inform the faculty outside this group about the existence of these various offices under Offices of Medical Education.
- Student perspective – we don’t feel that we have the comprehensive knowledge of what is available and what resources are within the offices and how students can interface.
- Having heard from both faculty and students both saying that individual faculty and individual students had no idea of knowing what services the offices that make up the Office of Medical Education actually provide, that then becomes a high priority issue that needs to be addressed.
- The Preliminary Review of Organizational Structure of Offices of Medical Education report is not to be distributed electronically. If people want to read it have them read it and take it back. Do not scan it. It is a draft. There will be a final report that will not be a draft.

4) Legal Perspective on Intellectual Property Issues with respect to Classroom Recording – Fletcher Fairey, Associate University Counsel

- Issues in terms of what would be the intellectual property laws. As we move toward educational intensivist and as we move to thinking about the possibility of having faculty whose primary mission is going to be education and to think about how are your faculty going to be promoted. There are a couple of websites which are peer reviewed for the pure purpose of sharing peer reviewed educational materials which would represent publications for somebody who is an education intensivist and wanted to build up their resume for promotional purposes.
- Students will be invited to make a presentation at the next meeting.
- Intellectual Property Issues – There are two kinds of intellectual properties that the University has policy addressing.
  - Inventions and patent right that arrive out of inventions. Anything you invent at the University that is patentable by policy is owned by the University. The Office of Technology Development is where those inventions are reported to or either marketed or commercialized. You do not want to disclose in a lecture or any other sort of presentation an invention that you have created without first having reported that invention internally to OTD or you will lose rights to that invention.
  - Copyright issues – Copyright is difficult to manage because it arises so easily. Copyright springs automatically from the work that you do every day. The notes that you’re are taking now, the email that you draft, the paper or lecture you create are all copyrighted just by the mere fact that you created it. There is no need to register it; there is no need to take any affirmative action to formally obtain copyright in that material.
  - University Policy of dealing with copyright is quite different from the patent policy.
  - There are a number of copyrighted materials which are owned by the individual faculty or EPA non-faculty member who has created that work. The typical example is the journal article or manuscript that is owned by the individual faculty member. The University usually has no right or interest to those articles. When those go to journals, journals typically require the faculty member to sign an assignment of copyright to the journal to hand over those works. The University is not involved in that process at all.
  - You need to distinguish between what are you putting out there for the University community to have access to and what are you putting our there for a larger community to have access to.
  - There is a wide range of options of what you want to do. You need to ask what makes sense programmatically and what are your goals and objectives and what is the best way to reach it. With respect to works you’ve created, neither University policy nor federal law is going to drive this decision; rather, the decision is driven by identifying your needs an objectives and finding out the best way to meet them.
  - PowerPoints in lecture presentation that is available on the Internet– if the intent is to distribute to the university community but the students distributed it outside the University, how do we control that.
You must be aware of the rights to your work that you assign to publishers or to websites. If you create a work that you assign to a publisher or assign to a website, that assignment may prevent you from using or distributing that work in other ways. Many publishers require “exclusive” assignments, meaning that the work cannot be assigned to someone else or even distributed by you. You, in effect, lose ownership of that work unless you specify in the assignment that you reserve certain rights to use the work you created. You cannot, of course, assign exclusive rights to the same work to two different people.

The PowerPoint could be put on a closed network. A network that is accessible only to students in the courses or students in the school or university. You can limit that circulation. You do not lose any ownership rights by distributing your own work. It is helpful, however, that any distribution is accompanied by a statement of the rights you are granting to those receiving the work to use your work. If you wish to limit their use of that work to their preparation for coursework only, then you should state it. If you wish to prevent them from distributing the work to other people, you should state that restriction. If you don’t care what they do with the work, say so.

You have ability to define what rights you are granting to people. You can have a more restrictive license. You can clearly state on the material itself that it is to be used only by the faculty and students of a particular course without prior written consent.

Here is link to Creative Commons licenses http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ These licenses complement other licensing arrangements, including the traditional "All Rights Reserved" which completely restricts use.