

Evaluation Subcommittee Minutes- May 10, 2006 12:00 PM

**Present:** Penny Thomas, Kelli Crovo, Lou Ann Cooper, Bruce Stevens, Louis Ritz, Paulette Hahn, Lynn Romrell, Donna Duckworth **Recording:** Adrienne Cullins

The purpose of this meeting was to review the evaluation comments for the 2005 Fall courses. Dr. Rarey began by discussing the two handouts that were passed out regarding the 2005 Fall courses and syllabus data. Before getting started he asked the committee if there were any questions regarding the evaluations overall. Dr. Ritz asked if they would be meeting with the Anatomy by Diagnostic Imaging course director. Dr. Rarey stated that they would request to meet with Dr. Siström. It was stated that it is important for Dr. Siström to hear from the committee about the level of excellence that needs to be maintained. Dr. Rarey told the committee that he would like to go through all of the narrative comments.

Anatomy by Diagnostic Imaging will need to be discussed with Dr. Siström. Dr. Romrell stated that feedback could be given to the students through online quizzes.

The next meeting will be on May 24, 2006

Clinical Human Anatomy overall was evaluated very well. Reviewers looked at the organization of the syllabus. Dr. Ritz stated that the labels, IA, IB, etc. were extremely confusing and would it be possible to try a different approach. Lou Ann Cooper stated that the descriptors in the categories were not very helpful. In the learning objectives nothing was identified. Lou Ann Cooper does not feel that there is sufficient evidence that there are multiple methods of assessments.

Essentials of Patient Care I & III overall was evaluated very well. Dr. Rarey feels that Dr. Pauly has worked very hard and the improvement shows. Dr. Rarey asked Penny how she felt about Essentials of Patient Care II & IV and she stated that the syllabus had a lot of information on it. Sometimes the dates in the syllabus conflicted and the students would then have to refer to the online calendar. Kelli concurred with Penny.

In Ethical and Legal Issues the overview section was not organized per the set guidelines. It was stated that it will not be a pass/fail grade on the course. Dr. Romrell pointed out that sometimes the issue of ethics is not being considered as important of a course as compared to some of the clinical courses. Penny stated that she felt that most students enjoyed the ethics course. The exams were in essay form and some students felt that the exam was too objective. Dr. Hahn stated that students in small groups do good job of analyzing cases. She stated that the information is getting to the students and she believes they really how important it is.

General Pathology was skipped by Dr. Rarey to move on to Introduction to Clinical Practice. Dr. Rarey stated that it would be good for Dr. Hatch to come to one of the meetings and discuss the student performance forms about the preceptorships. No formal written feedback is being given. Dr. Hahn asked if there would be a way to use faculty development to the preceptors. Dr. Romrell stated that mid session feedback is a problem. Preceptors have been delayed in returning their evaluations of student performance. Dr. Romrell suggested that the preceptors would be able to use the online resources that are available to the volunteer faculty in the Health Science Library.

Medical Cell and Tissue Biology received negative reviews regarding the student performance section. There were also comments about poor discussion of feedback.

Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease received excellent comments there was a discrepancy with the syllabus. The last response to question 12 sparked the discussion of how students rate instructors. Dr. Duckworth asked Penny when she would give rating of a 4 or 5. Penny stated that she would give a 4 or 5 if the exams were handed back in a timely matter, if there was someone at the exam to explain questions, and if the instructor allowed the discussion of problem questions where the majority performed poorly.

Dr. Ritz suggested that there be faculty development on feedback. This should included input from the students. We need to get a clear definition of what feedback is.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00