

## Scientific Foundations Committee

May 13, 2016  
7:45 – 9:00 am  
Mayo B-646

### Minutes

<b>2015-2016 Scientific Foundations Committee Members</b>		
<b>MEMBER</b>	<b>COURSE/ROLE</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>
Steve Katz	Chair (INMD 6814 Physiology)	x
Sharon Allen	INMD 6803/6804/6805 ECM 1, ECM 2, ECM 3A	
David Baldes	INMD 6815 Human Behavior	
H. Brent Clark	INMD 6819 HHD – N & P	x
Greg Filice	MS 2 ID Thread	x
Glenn Giesler / Matthew Chafee	INMD 6813 Neuroscience	x / x
Bob Kempainen	INMD 6808 HHD – C & R	x
Robert Morgan	INMD 6809 HHD – R, D & O <sup>3</sup>	x
Brian Muthyala	INMD 6803/6804/6805 ECM 1, ECM 2, ECM 3A	
Kaz Nelson	INMD 6819 HHD – N & P	x
Catherine Niewoehner	INMD 6810 HHD – R & E-R	x
James Nixon	INMD 6803/6805/6806/6807 ECM 1, ECM 3A/B/C	
Jan Norrander	INMD 6801 Human Structure and Function	x
Deborah Powell	INMD 6817 Principles of Pathology, MS2 Pathology Thread	
Michael Ross	INMD 6816 Human Sexuality	
Michel Sanders	INMD 6802 Science of Medical Practice	
David Satin	INMD 6803/6804/6805/6806/6807 ECM 1, ECM 2, ECM 3	
Peter Southern	INMD 6812 Microbiology	x
Heather Thompson Buom	INMD 6811 HHD – GI & Heme	x
Tony Weinhaus	INMD 6801 Human Structure and Function	x
Kevin Wickman	INMD 6818 Principles of Pharmacology	
Mary Ramey	MS2 Lab Med/Path Coordinator	
Nicole Cairns	MS2 Student Representative	
Blake Stagg	MS1 Student Representative	x
<i>Mark Rosenberg</i>	<i>Vice Dean for Medical Education</i>	
<i>Bob Englander</i>	<i>Associate Dean for UME</i>	
<i>Jeffrey Chipman</i>	<i>Assistant Dean for Curriculum</i>	
<i>Anne Pereira</i>	<i>Assistant Dean for Clinical Education</i>	
<i>Michael Kim</i>	<i>Assistant Dean for Student Affairs</i>	
<i>Suzanne van den Hoogenhof</i>	<i>Interim Assistant Dean for Assessment &amp; Evaluation</i>	x
<i>Brad Clarke</i>	<i>Director of Curriculum</i>	x
<i>Jim Beattie</i>	<i>Director of MEDS / FCT Course Director</i>	
<i>Leslie Anderson</i>	<i>Chief of Staff, Medical Education</i>	
<i>Scott Slattery</i>	<i>Director of Learner Development</i>	x
<i>Heather Peterson</i>	<i>Medical School Registrar</i>	x
<i>Brian Woods</i>	<i>Lead Course Manager</i>	x

**Guests:** Dimple Patel, Christine Peterson, Sara Roberts, Chelsea Jernberg, Jeff Wallner

The meeting was called to order at 7:32am.

### **Minutes**

Draft minutes from the March 11 & April 1 meetings were approved as submitted.

### **Updates/Announcements**

Christine Peterson from the Center for Educational Innovation (CEI) was in attendance. She presented a session on multi-instructor courses at the Best Practices Day on May 5, and is available if Course Directors ever have questions about course design. Contact her at the CEI.

The next SFC meeting on June 10 will be held in room Mayo B-620.

Course Directors are encouraged to attend the MEDS Workshop on May 17 from 10-11:00am, entitled *Medical School Curriculum Mapping in Action*, facilitated by Brad Clarke & Adam Maier. Course Directors will have the opportunity to work on their course mapping during this time, and ask any questions they may have. Brad gave an update on the status of the mapping project. Deadline is July 1 to map courses for the 2015-2016 academic year.

Dr Sharon Allen & Dr Glenn Giesler were recognized for their many years of service as Course Directors for ECM1 & Neuroscience respectively. Dr Giesler has led Neuroscience for 21 years.

Dr Katz reminds Spring Course Directors that the Spring 2017 courses do not start on a Monday in January 2017, due to the University holiday for New Year's. Extra planning considerations will need to be taken.

2

### **Student Issues/Concerns/Questions**

Blake is looking forward to the conclusion of mapping, to identify redundancies & holes in the curriculum. Dr Katz mentioned that some redundancies are planned...some are not.

### **Annual Course Review**

Human Structure & Function – Jan Norrander & Anthony Weinhaus  
*See attached ACR for details.*

Dr Norrander & Dr Weinhaus elected not to present the ACR in-person. Please refer to the ACR attached to these minutes.

### **Discussion**

UPDATE: Completion of student Incomplete (I) course grades – Heather Peterson  
*See attached draft Incomplete grade contract.*

Heather reviewed the definition of an Incomplete (I) grade. Best practice is to have an Incomplete contract that lays out the exact work to be done to complete the course, and to agree on a deadline for the completion. Heather would like the form to be online, either on the web or as a fillable PDF. Question about whether the student's faculty advisor needs to be involved: in the actual planning of the Incomplete completion, or just whether they need to be informed of the contract? Committee discussion favors faculty advisor involvement in

the planning of the contract. Heather will contact the FA group & update the form. Other discussion included a variety of ideas about what should or shouldn't be added to the form.

This same form will also be used for students in years 3 & 4.

Can definitional guidance be added? I.e. what does "substantial portion of the course" mean? Heather agreed to add clarification to the form.

#### Course Director representation on the Admissions Committee – Dimple Patel & Stephen Katz

Dimple Patel, Associate Dean for Admissions, asked for volunteers to serve on the Admissions Committee. In the past, committee members were appointed. She would like 1 or 2 representatives from each faculty committee to participate. There are currently two groups: the application review committee, and the full admissions committee. There is a restructuring of the full committee in process; it will move from one large committee to smaller groups. She is looking for a wide range of representation on the committee—current faculty, retired faculty, community members—as each group adds unique perspectives.

There is no financial compensation. Lunch and parking is provided.

For teaching faculty on a tenure or non-tenure track: this kind of key committee participation is valued in a promotion portfolio. Dr Southern has served several terms on the committee—it is a very valuable experience, it does take time, but it's an immensely important responsibility.

The admissions review committee is web-based: student files are reviewed (July – Feb) by 1 or two members. The full admissions committee requires about 5 hours per month in-person to make final decisions on student admissions. Participation in interviews on Interview Days asks for 4 days of the 34 interview days.

3

The challenge for Course Directors is to add another task to their already full plate. Dr Katz would like each Course Director to consider 2-3 faculty in their course that may be qualified for the Admissions Committee.

Dr Patel would like to tie this up by July 1 at the latest. She will prepare a "blurb" describing the time & responsibilities that can be expected for those that participate in the Admissions process.

#### Variability in the implementation of disabilities accommodations – Stephen Katz

Issue: Approximately 10% of each Medical School class has documented disabilities. Some Course Directors have been able to handle testing accommodations in their individual departments, but the number of students is throwing that into chaos. When students test at DRC, they often miss the debrief due to their extended time for test taking.

Neuroscience holds the debrief for quizzes later in the day, after DRC students have completed their quizzes. For exams, DRC Xeroxed the student's scantron, gave it to the student, and the student brought it back to the debrief and then handed it in at the end.

Dr Thompson Buom asked about having annotated answer keys. Would this take some of the angst out of the debrief process for Course Directors? Dr Morgan has some annotated answers due to his responses to some of the challenges.

Other discussion included debrief processes in each course; differences in the structure of year 1 & year 2 exam questions; security of exams and the testing process at the DRC; holding students to their honor code & professionalism; adjusting DRC exam schedules so that all students there are done at the same time; timing of

debriefs during and/or after exams; pros & cons of starting the debrief later; student use of their DRC accommodation letter – some do not use their accommodation for every exam; differences in lab & written practicals; the possibility for cheating.

DRC opens at 7:30am. Brad volunteered to talk to Barb Blacklock about possible adjustments to the DRC testing process.

Dr Katz ended the meeting by highlighting several of the new future agenda items below.

### **Future Agenda Items**

Suggestions from Course Directors for future SFC meeting topics:

- ExamSoft & BlackBag assessments
- ILT feedback
- Copyrights & resources (focused on what we *can* do)
- More Blackbag search examples, Gradebook, downloading, calendar, checking feedback cards
- Survey students about type of practice questions/formative
- The Four Habits Model (Michael Kim)
- Grades H S N is in jeopardy
- New COSSS guidelines for failing students
- New promotion guidelines for teachers (non-tenure track)
- Mandatory (90 minute?) hidden bias training for Course Directors

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51am.

4 The next meeting is June 10, 2016, from 7:30-9:00am in room **Mayo B-620**.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brian Woods

**Annual Course Review (ACR)**  
**University of Minnesota Medical School**

Course: 2015 - 2016 Human Structure & Function  
Course Director(s): Anthony Weinhaus, Jan Norrander  
Course Manager: Aliyu Ojarigi

Date of course: 8/10/2015-12/18/2015

Overall evaluation of the course: 4.3/5.0

Course grading rubric:

**Histology** (298 pts):

Quizzes	10 pts/quiz x 4 quizzes (lowest score dropped)	= 30 pts	
Midterm lecture exam	1 pt/question x 60 questions	= 60 pts	
Midterm lab exam	2 pts/question x 37 questions	= 74 pts	
Final lecture exam	1 pt/question x 60 questions	= 60 pts	
Final lab exam	2 pts/question x 37 questions	= <u>74 pts</u>	
			298 pts total

**Anatomy** (305 pts)

Midterm lecture exam	1 pt/question x 60 questions	= 60 pts	
Midterm lab exam	1 pt/question x 75 questions	= 75 pts	
Final lecture exam	1 pt/question x 60 questions	= 60 pts	
Final lab exam	1 pt/question x 75 questions	= 75 pts	
Small group discussions	5 pt/discussion x 7 discussions	= <u>35 pts</u>	
			305 pts total

**Embryology** (115 pts)

Quizzes		= 35 pts	
Midterm lecture exam	1 pt/question x 20 questions	= 20 pts	
Midterm lab exam	1 pt/question x 20 questions	= 20 pts	
Final lecture exam	1 pt/question x 20 questions	= 20 pts	
Final lab exam	1 pt/question x 20 questions	= <u>20 pts</u>	
			115 pts total

There are 718 total points in HSF

-----

Number of failures for academic year:

**Nine failures in HSF**

- Four students achieved <70% total points in HSF.
- Nine students achieved <70% of points on final exam.
- Four students did both.

1. Briefly describe the learning outcomes for your course

Anatomy/Embryology: Identify and apply knowledge of Gross anatomy. This is facilitated with the understanding of developmental anatomy.

Histology: Histology puts biochemistry, molecular biology and physiology in the context of cell structure and function.

2. Describe what evidence you have that the outcomes are being achieved. Include student review information.

HSF overall:

Mean = 623.55/ 718 total points

Mean percent = 86.85 (1.9% lower than 2014)

St Dev = 6.80

Number of students < 70% total points = 4

**Individual Courses within HSF:**

	<b>Embryology</b> (out of 115 pts)	<b>Gross Anatomy</b> (out of 305 pts)	<b>Histology</b> (out of 298 pts)
<b>Mean</b>	<b>104.08</b>	<b>261.95</b>	<b>254.92</b>
<b>Mean percent</b>	<b>90.5%</b>	<b>85.89%</b>	<b>85.54%</b>
<b>StDEV</b>	<b>7.35%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>8.26%</b>
<b>Number of students &lt; 70%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>

- Honors: Students who receive honors must score 90% in each component of HSF.
  - 41 students were awarded honors in HSF (23.8% of class)
  - 107 students achieved  $\geq 90\%$  in embryology (62.6%)
  - 50 students achieved  $\geq 90\%$  in anatomy (29.2%)
  - 65 students achieved  $\geq 90\%$  in histology (38.0%)
- **Fails:** There were 9 students who failed HSF
  - Four students achieved <70% total points in HSF.
  - Nine students achieved <70% of points on final exam.
  - Four students did both.

**REPORTS FROM STUDENT EVALUATIONS – Fall 2015**  
(end of semester: N = 162 out of 172 students)

**HSF OVERALL:**

2015-2016 Human Structure & Function Survey Fall (2015)		University of Minnesota School of Medicine - Twin Cities					
Course: INMD 6801 - 2015-2016 Human Structure and Function		Department: Anatomy					
Director(s): Jan Norrander; Anthony Weinhaus		Responses / Expected: 162 / 172 (94.19%)					
Basic Science Core Rating Items Basic Science Core Rating Items	INMD 6801						
	Responses					Course	
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean
Q1 The course objectives were made clear to me.	1	4	16	99	42	162	4.1
Q2 The assignments planned for independent learning time facilitated my learning of the course material.	2	15	30	90	25	162	3.7
Q3 The resources provided for the class were useful in learning the material: (i.e. recommended readings, course packet, BlackBag site)	2	12	26	86	36	162	3.9
Q4 There were adequate opportunities for non-graded self-assessments (i.e. quizzes, discussion questions, practice or review questions).	4	4	15	86	53	162	4.1
Q5 There was close agreement between the stated course and session objectives and the information taught.	0	12	19	103	28	162	3.9
Q6 The graded assessment(s) appropriately tested the course objectives.	2	8	25	95	32	162	3.9
Q7 Overall, I have acquired an understanding of the stated course objectives.	0	4	13	103	42	162	4.1
Q8 The course content was successful in integrating basic science knowledge and clinical practice.	0	6	20	106	30	162	4.0
Q9 Public Health topics were integrated within the course.	17	71	44	29	1	162	2.5
Q10 Quality Improvement topics were integrated within the course.	18	59	48	32	5	162	2.7
Q11 Interprofessional Education topics were integrated within the course.	17	66	46	31	2	162	2.6
Q12 Overall, I have found this course to be valuable.	0	1	12	83	66	162	4.3
Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5							

**HISTOLOGY:**

HSF - Histology Histology	INMD 6801						
	Responses					Course	
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean
Q15 Overall, I have acquired an understanding of the stated course objectives for the histology component.	0	2	9	102	47	160	4.2
Q16 The overall organization of the histology component facilitated my learning of the course material.	1	4	12	101	42	160	4.1
Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5							

HSF - Histology Histology	INMD 6801						
	Responses					Course	
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean
Q19 The resources provided for histology (study guides, Sorenson Atlas, Moodle quizzes, lecture outlines, PowerPoint slides, Histology Guide virtual microscope, practice lab exams, etc.) were useful in learning the material.	0	0	6	54	100	160	4.6
Q20 The histology course has provided me with an appreciation for the relationship between	0	1	7	90	63	161	4.3

microscopic structure and the functions of cells, tissues and organs.

<b>Q21</b>	The histology course has given me an appreciation for the relevance of histology to the practice of medicine.	2	10	28	85	35	160	3.9
<b>Q22</b>	There were adequate opportunities for non-graded self-assessments of the histology material.	0	5	8	72	76	161	4.4
<b>Q23</b>	The graded histology assessments were fair and appropriately tested the material.	0	0	7	79	75	161	4.4
<b>Q24</b>	Overall, I have found the histology course to be valuable.	0	3	13	85	59	160	4.3

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5

### Gross Anatomy:

HSF - Gross Anatomy Gross Anatomy	INMD 6801							
	Responses					Course		
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	
<b>Q27</b>	I went to lab adequately prepared to carry out gross anatomy dissections.	0	8	22	97	34	161	4.0
<b>Q28</b>	The materials provided gave me the tools I needed to adequately prepare myself for gross anatomy dissections.	3	16	30	88	24	161	3.7
<b>Q29</b>	The TAs are an important part of the gross anatomy component of HSF.	0	2	8	49	102	161	4.6

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5

HSF - Gross Anatomy Gross Anatomy	INMD 6801							
	Responses					Course		
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	
<b>Q31</b>	The various workshops presented in Gross Anatomy were useful in enhancing the learning of anatomy and appreciating the clinical application.	0	6	12	88	52	158	4.2

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5

HSF - Gross Anatomy Gross Anatomy	INMD 6801							
	Responses					Course		
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	
<b>Q33</b>	The laboratory environment was effective in helping me develop my professional work ethic and other tenets of professionalism.	1	6	23	100	32	162	4.0
<b>Q34</b>	The various clinical procedures as described in the Gross Anatomy Laboratory Notes were useful in enhancing the learning of anatomy and appreciating the clinical application.	0	13	18	97	34	162	3.9
<b>Q35</b>	The embryology questions that are integrated into the gross anatomy laboratory notes were useful to understand the relationships between embryology and gross anatomy.	6	22	28	82	24	162	3.6

s://med-courseval.umn.edu/etw/ets/et.asp

26

2018

Survey Report

<b>Q36</b>	The in-lab case study discussions with my body-buddies were helpful in helping me apply gross anatomy to a condition and also learn to solve problems.	3	20	20	75	43	161	3.8
<b>Q37</b>	The mini-radiograph packets made learning radiography easier than the large radiographic packet.	2	4	21	54	81	162	4.3

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5

## Embryology:

HSF - Embryology Embryology	INMD 6801						
	Responses					Course	
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean
<b>Q39</b> The Embryology component of HSF provided a basic foundation of the concepts in Embryology.	3	6	19	103	26	157	3.9
<b>Responses:</b> [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5							

HSF - Embryology Embryology	INMD 6801						
	Responses					Course	
	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean
<b>Q41</b> The embryology textbook was an important part of learning embryology.	22	59	39	29	11	160	2.7
<b>Q42</b> The Embryology component of HSF facilitated the understanding of difficult concepts in gross anatomy.	4	20	32	89	16	161	3.6
<b>Responses:</b> [SD] Strongly Disagree=1 [D] Disagree=2 [N] Neutral=3 [A] Agree=4 [SA] Strongly Agree=5							

3. Describe what is working well in your course.

### Gross:

- Instruction by 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year medical students as Teaching Assistants in gross lab and ECM.
- Improvements to lecture videos
- Continued improvement of small radiographic packets – structures are integrated with dissections.
- Introduction of new study tool, a compendium of anatomical landmarks, with quizzes.
- Numerous clinical procedure workshops throughout course demonstrate to students the importance of understanding anatomy in conducting a procedure (arthroscopy, ultrasound, thoracocentesis, cricothyrotomy, intubation, etc).
- Frequent Practice Practical Review sessions (assembled by students and TAs together)
- Post midterm small group sessions in lab with students who struggled on midterm lab practical exam.
- Non-cognitive assessments were acquired for all students. These were especially useful in detecting and addressing student behaviors before midterm.

### Embryo:

- Integration of embryology into dissection lab notes (further Integration).
- Workshop to examine the Embryo and Fetal collection (52 specimens)
- Embryo course packet (goals, learning objectives, lecture outlines, reading assignments) was well received.
- Replacement of clinical lecturers with basic scientists

## Histology:

- A group of GCD faculty who have taught this course for a number of years, and are dedicated to teaching histology
- Organization of material
  - First half of course (pre-midterm) covers cells and tissues (Cell & Methods, Cytoskeleton, Epithelia, Connective Tissue, Muscle, Nerve, Cartilage and Bone, Peripheral Blood, Hematopoiesis)
  - The second half of the course builds on the first and covers organs and organ systems (Cardiovascular System, Lymphoid System, Skin, Exocrine glands, Endocrine glands, Digestive Tract, Liver and Gallbladder, Urinary System, Respiratory System, Male Reproductive System, Female Reproductive System)
- Practice quizzes on Moodle (linked to on Black Bag)
  - Both lab and lecture practice quizzes, which can be taken multiple times, are provided for each topic
  - Quizzes draw random questions from a databank (students get 'new' quiz each time)
    - >600 lecture questions (taken from 'old' exams)
    - >750 lab questions
  - Multi-topic quizzes for each exam
- Graded quizzes (four 10-point quizzes) encourage students to keep up and provide low-stakes feedback on their progress
- 'Human Histology' course packet which includes
  - Lecture outlines (lecture slides are posted on Black Bag)
  - Lab exercises for each topic
  - Study guides for each topic (Lists of questions designed to help students identify key points for each topic)
- Robert Sorenson's 'Histology Guide Virtual Histology Laboratory' allows students to 'view' slides via a browser (preview at [histologyguide.org](http://histologyguide.org))
- Robert Sorenson's 'Atlas of Human Histology' provides images taken from course slide box
- Inclusion of electron micrographs as part of the lab exercises (posted on website as PDFs and interactive Flash movies)
- Lab intro lectures
  - PowerPoint slides (images taken from Sorenson Atlas) used to point out important structures and related functions
  - PowerPoint slides of laboratory EMs
- Practice lab exams (four)
- Early intervention with struggling students

4. Describe any areas of concern.

**HSF:**

- Students “skipped” a week of class half-way between midterm and final exams. The students were studying for SMP and neglecting HSF and ECM.

**Gross Anatomy:**

- A few students were chronically late for lab. Numerous did not complete prelab assignments. To address this, attendance was taken. Prelab assignments were graded. This was slightly effective.
- In response to student evaluations from last year, small-group case-discussions were created to provide students with the opportunity to practice the application of anatomy/ problem-solve in preparation for written exams. The students who needed this activity the most, were most likely to find away to avoid participation. To address this, group assessment will be changed to individual.
- LEADS student representatives provided some constructive input:
  - concern about the Orientation session for all of HSF. It is the first day of the course. There are so many resources to discuss the day before the start of the course. Asked that this session be moved to orientation week.
  - requested that the “Resources” page in the HSF BlackBag site be re-organized (more logical and less cluttered).
  - There are a number of introduction/ orientation video on learning gross anatomy on BlackBag. Make these available to students early in the summer and strongly advise students to view them.

**Histology:**

- Loss of faculty due to retirements (especially a problem for the lab sessions). In the past two years, we have lost 4 out of our 6 core faculty to retirement. I expect to lose one more after this coming year’s course. We are bringing new faculty into the course, but it will take time for them to ‘get up to speed’.
- Students coming to lab ‘unprepared’ (their words) due to having the lecture and lab on the same day. They would prefer to have lectures one day, and the lab the next.

5. Describe the progress of the changes being made as the result of your previous ACR (*your intended changes will be pre-filled by ACE*)

*Intended Changes for 2015-2016:*

**Anatomy:**

- Will upgrade the quality of a number of lecture videos.
  - 30 of the 35 videos have been upgraded in the past two years.
- Will have TAs take attendance and grade all prelab assignments.
  - This was modestly effective

- Will have TAs complete short (3 question) evaluation of MS I students professionalism during lab (about 12 students per TA)
  - This was most effective in changing student behavior before midterm.
- Student evaluations (from 2014) requested lists/ tables of anatomical landmarks. Will make this an ongoing project for TAs in lab. (Project began mid-semester last fall)
  - This was gratefully received by the students
- Will incorporate more small-group discussion questions (clinical vignettes) into laboratory dissection notes.
  - The students who needed this activity the most were most likely to avoid participation.

#### **Embryology:**

- Continue to improve quality of lectures and course packet.
  - Student evaluations contain fewer complaints

#### **Histology:**

- Update practice quiz questions (a yearly process)
- Update study guides (a yearly process)
- Continue the process of recruiting and integrating new faculty into the course to compensate for multiple upcoming losses due to retirements
- Eliminate one topic (Cytoskeleton) to better fit into the time we have been given.
- Emphasize to new faculty the need to update the outlines for their lectures.

6. Describe any changes you intend to make for the next academic year.

#### **Anatomy:**

- Finish upgrading the lecture videos.
- Will change assessment of small-group discussion questions (clinical cases) from group assessment to individual.
- Improve objectives and aims for all lecture and lab notes. Will get student input during changes.

#### **Embryology:**

- Continue to improve quality of lectures and course packet.

#### **Histology:**

- Continue process of 'training' and recruiting new faculty.
- Since histology and anatomy/embryology will most likely be split into two courses this fall (2016) I would like to review our schedule for 2017 with the hope of having lectures completed a day before their corresponding lab session (per request by students)

# University of Minnesota Medical School

## Agreement for the Completion of Incomplete Work

The Medical School Education Policy Committee requires completion of this formal agreement between the Course/Clerkship Director and student regarding the assignment of "I" grade.

According to the Medical School policy (see Medical School Grading and Transcripts: Twin Cities, Duluth) the grade "I" indicates that the Course/Clerkship Director

1. has determined the student has successfully completed a substantial portion of the course work with a passing grade (the "I" is not given to help a student improve their grade in the course),
2. believes that legitimate reasons exist to justify extending the deadline for course completion, and
3. has a "reasonable expectation" that the student can successfully complete the unfinished work by the agreed upon deadline.

Failure of the student to comply with the terms of the agreement will result in a failing grade (N). Course/Clerkship Directors may, at their discretion, resubmit an "I" or, after evaluating completed coursework, submit a final grade. Student should never re-register for the course in which an "I" has been issued.

Part 1. Student Information		
University ID	Name (last, first, middle initial)	
Birthday (mm/dd/yyyy)	Email address	Phone (include area code)
Part 2. Course Information/Conditions		
Semester/Year/Period	Course designator and number (i.e. INMD 6809)	Percent of work completed
<b>Reason for assigning the "I" grade (attach relevant documentation, e.g. from a health care provider)</b>		

