

PART B. REQUIRED COURSE FORM

Course title:	Pathology
Sponsoring department or unit:	Pathology
Name of course director:	Lorraine Racusen, M.D., Mark Haas, M.D.

List all organizational units (e.g., physiology department, nursing school, library), including the lead department, with ongoing involvement in the course, and the number of instructional staff from each such unit:

Organizational Unit	Number of Teaching Staff Involved
Department of Pathology	96

Course Objectives

Are there written objectives for the course? (check)

Yes	√	No	
------------	---	-----------	--

Briefly summarize the objectives/content areas covered in the course.

COURSE GOALS: To teach mechanisms and manifestations of disease; To teach "the language" of disease; To expose students to methodologies and approach to diagnosis; To model and reinforce case-based problem solving; To foster and reinforce interpersonal and communication skills and professionalism; To reinforce data retrieval strategies and provide resources to foster life-long learning. OBJECTIVES: Upon completion of this course component, students should be able to: Explain disease processes and the spectrum of human disease; Conceptualize changes at subcellular, cellular, tissue and organ levels for major disease processes which underlie diagnosis and therapy; Understand and use the language of medicine; Integrate clinical, laboratory and gross and microscopic pathological data to arrive at a (differential) diagnosis; Demonstrate skills in communication, problem solving, and appropriate professional attitudes and behavior.

Preparation for Teaching

If graduate students, postdoctoral fellows in the biomedical sciences, or residents teach in the course (as lecturers, small group facilitators, laboratory instructors), describe how they are informed about the course objectives and prepared for their teaching role.

They are assigned to a teaching group with senior faculty supervisors, and provided with an orientation packet that includes course goals and objectives, resources, and evaluation forms. They teach in small group in tandem with senior instructor.

If the entire course is taught at more than one site (e.g., at geographically separate campuses), describe how faculty members at all sites are oriented to the objectives and grading system.

➤ *Not applicable.*

Student Evaluation

If NBME subject (shelf) examinations are used, give the mean scores for the last three classes:

- *Not applicable.*

Year:			
Score:			

Check all the formats that are used in examinations or other evaluations that students must take in order to pass the course:

X	Multiple-choice, true/false, matching questions		Laboratory practical items
	Fill-in, short answer questions	X	Problem-solving exercises
X	Essay questions or papers	X	Presentations
	Oral exams		Other (describe)

Briefly describe any formative assessment activities (practice exams, quizzes, etc.)

- *Interval testing*
- *Case-based small group discussions and exercises*
- *Laboratories*
- *CPC exercises*

Is there a narrative evaluation submitted in addition to the course grade? (check)

Yes	X	No	
-----	---	----	--

Course Outcomes/Evaluation

Comment on the adequacy of faculty and other resources to teach the course (e.g., educational space, computer hardware and software, support personnel).

Faculty are more than adequate, including 6 faculty that organize teaching in small groups and provide advising in that context, 2 faculty who mentor graduate students taking the course, the 96 faculty who teach in lecture and small group settings, the 40-45 residents and fellows that teach in small group settings, an aide who prepares gross teaching materials, 6 administrators who help run the small groups, and the 2 course directors and course administrator.

Resources and actual teaching space are adequate– However, computer upgrades, including larger computer resource center and better equipped venues, and virtual microscopy to replace current teaching with individual student microscopes are needed. Blackboard and the OAC facility and staff are very useful resources for the course.

Provide a summary of student feedback on the course (and any other available evaluation data) for the past two years. If the course is new or significantly revised, provide evaluation data for the new version of the course only. If problems have been identified by student evaluations or other data, describe how they are being addressed.

The course is generally well-received- student feedback is extensive, with feedback for each lecture, small group sessions and overall experiences in each organ block, as well as a final course evaluation in which students are asked to indicate a few aspects of the course that they would change and a few strong points, and to comment on lecturers overall, on exams, autopsy experience, resident instructors in small group overall. Response rate on evaluations is high – an extra point is applied to each exam score for completing evaluations. Rating on a 0 (worst)-5 (best) point scale, in the past 2 years, 69% of the students rated overall experience in the Pathology core as 4 or 5, with 21% rating it at 3, 2% at 2, and 0% at 1. Extensive evaluation materials are available to be appended for complete documentation.

All evaluations are kept by the Core Directors and Core Administrator. Evaluations on each lecture are provided to the lecturer, and sent to the Department Chair. Summary evaluations for each organ system block are also sent to the Department Chair, and to the Medical Student Education Advisory Committee, which consists of the leaders of the 6 medical student teaching groups, the faculty assigned to mentor graduate students taking the course, and a few senior support staff. Any problems are discussed in the MSEAC and/or with individual group leaders. Small group formats have been modified, and in some cases faculty assignments changed. All evaluations are sent to the Department Chair, and these evaluations are also discussed by the Department Chair in annual meetings with individual faculty.

Identify major successes in the course and problems to be overcome.

Successes: Lectures are generally up-to-date, informative, and well-received

Small group sessions overall rated as valuable – some outstanding

Very good student performance overall

Excellent faculty engagement and commitment

Strong departmental support and provision of resources

Problems: Some faculty, instructors need improvement

Need more formalized intentional assessment of competencies (have implemented this for evaluation of students)

Need to move to more student-driven case-based learning experiences in small groups.