First Year Curriculum Committee Meeting  
Alan Cross, M.D., and Stephen Chaney Ph.D, Co-Chairs  
July 8, 2008 - 8:00 - 9:30 A.M., 133 MacNider Hall

In Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stephen Chaney</th>
<th>Alan Cross</th>
<th>Jake Achey</th>
<th>Bruce Alexander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Cairns</td>
<td>Michael Goy</td>
<td>Deborah Ingersoll</td>
<td>Ed Kernick</td>
<td>Kurt Gilliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Aleman</td>
<td>Nilsa Morales</td>
<td>Ellen Roberts</td>
<td>Aldo Rustioni</td>
<td>Gwen Sancar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgette Dent</td>
<td>Eve Juliano</td>
<td>Karen Stone</td>
<td>Claudia Condrey</td>
<td>Sandra Void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Gilland</td>
<td>Joe Costello</td>
<td>David Klapper</td>
<td>Margaret Jameson</td>
<td>Erin Malloy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Update on Recommendations of the Task Force on Lecture Recording – Steve Chaney
   - Dr. Chaney presented a hand out for discussion. (see attached)
   - It was the consensus of student that there was no need for archiving lectures. Recorded lectures will be available until the end of July each academic year and then be taken down.
   - Access to lecture material will be limited to MS1, MS2, faculty and support staff by secure login via the Curriculum website.
   - Faculty Lecture Posting Authorization forms should be sent to MSTL to the attention of James Lindsey, Director.
   - Several changes were recommended to the document.
   - It was moved and properly second to accept this document with stated amendments and have it posted to the CC1 website.
   - Per OIS Lecture Recording not expected to Go Live until October 2008.

2) Assessment Preparation and Use of AIMS – Recommendations – Joey Woodyard
   - Joey presented the attached document for discussion.
   - Roughly eight weeks ago the assessment workers in OED were asked to start tracking some of the issues that the folks who manage the AIMS system repeatedly were bringing to our attention and work to look at some the issues and try to come up with some solutions. We invited Georgette Dent and Steve Chaney to join us for one of the days of the meeting and they gave us some feedback.
   - This is the document that we have come with as a recommendation to you for policy changes and really strengthening the original policy document that was already in place. It addresses concerns with students making up the exam, missing the exam, and timing of the exam. It addresses timing of getting questions in to the Aim’s Administrators and so those two things I think will really kind of make the exams more defensible as well as assist and facilitating the interactions between the faculty and Aim’s Administrator to make sure that the question the faculty want on the exams are what actually get put up and that the Aim’s administrator is not here until 11 o’clock at night on a Friday night trying to get it up for an 8 am. Monday morning Exam.
   - Future of Aims. We all know its strengths and weakness. Because it was a proprietary system that was developed quite a long time ago when nothing else was available we’ve been hanging on to and spending a lot of money in terms of personnel to keep it up dated. We had made the decision that we will purchase something new and go through a process of deciding what examination program to purchase in the course of this year. The goal is to create the committee this week and I do invite you all to join. Anyone who wants to join this committee that chooses a replacement for Aims please let Karen know. We would be thrilled to have faculty on it, we need to have faculty on it. We will go through a regular project management process where we look at what’s available. We do a needs assessment, we talk to the users, and we do everything we need to do. The goal is that by January we will have chosen something and then we’ll do testing of it and I hope that year from now we will abandon AIMS and use a new system that is being supported technically by somebody who has the resources to support it that would be a company, not us. Some of these things that we are raising here may not be issues any more. We would buy something that is web based, you could enter your own questions yourself or you could have somebody else enter them but we won’t be having people literally staying here until 10 o’clock at night.
   - New Software has been found that can score based on two correct answers.
   - After much discussion and amendments, it was moved and properly second to accept this document as a policy guideline.
3) **Course Evaluations – Margaret Jamison**
- A revised copy of the new course evaluation was distributed for discussion.
- The course evaluation was reworded to do a couple of things. First of all to have more generic questions, and also include more questions that dealt with small group wording.
- Comments were made to move the n/a to the first column.
- One of the things that we’ve not done a good job with is actually having a consistent centralized system for evaluating faculty teaching. Each department does it different. We are not going to be able to pass accreditation standards if we don’t come up with something. It was stated that in the future we need to be able to go to one place and be able to get all the data and be able to track it and show how it has modified our educational problem. This is fairly routine in a lot of medical school. We have no way for students to give faculty feedback without having a adversarial recording system which is not really meeting our needs.
- Question – Could we add a question in here that allows some sort of a student self-assessment. It would say something like ‘My classmates approached their education in this block with an adequate degree of professionalism’ and then it would be AGREE – STRONGLY AGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE
- We are going to be moving toward more centralization of faculty evaluation
- The residency programs are going to have to do this to because the ACGME is going to require it.

4) **Student Evaluation of Faculty - Karen Stone**
- It is hoped that the reorganization will be wrapped up in the next 2 weeks.
- The next LCME visit is expected Spring 2012.
- If we expand we invite an LCME visit earlier.
- There will be an internal review in 2010.
- We are optimistic that we will be able to do the student evaluation of faculty especially since we’ve already piloted it and have an instrument and really can go and have mostly sort of a technical job.

5) **Requirements of ONE45 – Dale Krams**
- A handout was present for review and discussion.
- As we are looking ahead at the curriculum and where are we going to go with managing our curricula information, I think most of you know that we’re in the process of implementing ONE45 and are on the 3rd and 4th year for scheduling and evaluation purposes and what we’re looking at for the coming year is to really evaluate our needs for the 1st and 2nd year and determine whether we take ONE45 or whether there is another product out there.
- What ONE45 calls itself is a better product. It’s a subscription that we buy into. A medical education administration suite and has many capabilities for sort of managing the business of medical education. The big push for it for this year was the student’s requests strongly to the Dr. Dent for electronic scheduling and so that’s why we’ve chosen an electronic scheduling as the first components of it. It has the capability to basically provide a schedule of courses. Students, faculty, administrators, community faculty and so forth can all log in and access student schedules. All evaluations can be conducted on ONE45. The last 3 items on the agenda here can kind of be talked about in the context. So all evaluations would be conducted in ONE45 and this is what our goal it for this year for 3rd and 4th year. As well as it has capabilities to meet some of our administrative need, addressing the LCME requirements specifically for 3 and 4 and addresses the requirements for procedure logging.
- The abilities to again mount our lecture material on a centralized system. If we wanted to go ahead and implement student evaluation of faculty it would be really simplified under this process. Everything in ONE45 is tied to the schedule. So once you have your schedule in there and whose teaching what day you have this six item evaluation of faculty that we’ve pilot tested and validated it and so forth, we can just put it in the system and literally set it up to the be attached to every lecture. An automated process that would take very little human intervention to keep the process going to send out that evaluation at the end of a lecture. A lot of the requirements that we’re talking about have really been addressed within this group
- Document will be attached to these minutes

6) **No meeting in August – Next Meeting September 9, 2008**