

Phase 1 Committee Meeting Minutes
SMHS
Tuesday, October 17, 2023 – 2pm via Zoom

In attendance: Jon Allen, George Beddow, Kurt Borg, Xuesong Chen, Jane Dunlevy, Kara Eickman, Susan Zelewski, Megan Denis, Michelle Montgomery, Susan Eliazer

Members not in attendance: Amanda Haage, Mikhail Golovko, Lauren Huddle, Eric Johnson, Minnie Faith, Gunjan Manocha, Dev Pant, Pat Carr, Jim Porter, Ken Ruit, Rick Van Eck, Erika Johnson

Minutes Submitted by: Dawne Barwin

Minutes Reviewed by: Jane R. Dunlevy (JRD)

Minutes Approved by: Jon Allen and George Beddow

MSC = motion made, seconded, carried

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW- UP
1. Welcome/call to order	The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm via Zoom with a proposed adjournment time of 3:30pm.	Informational
2.) Approval of Minutes	Minutes of October 3, 2023	MSC to approve the 10.3.23 minutes. Kurt Borg / George Beddow // carried.
3. Business	<p>New Business:</p> <p>a. Student Representative Report (George Beddow)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Feedback: Student Government Meeting Survey of Class of 2026 on 9.24.23, to evaluate the concerns of the class secondary to the Student Government meeting. I am in continued progress along with meeting with Dr. Carr, to address the feedback about Anatomy (this came from the Group Leader feedback) and Pharmacology (which came from the GQ Q #9). • Pharmacology feedback from students was about when and how much they have learned dosing. George Beddow showed the Question on screen that will be asked of students if they felt they had been prepared from P1 pharmacology for P2 and P3 clinical experiences. There was discussion and wording given and all agreed it will be interesting to see the results. 	Information

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Anatomy Lab feedback from students relates to students going into lab with the sections of the dissector they are assigned, however it has already been torn apart from a previous dissection. • Jane Dunlevy agrees that this is something that needs to be looked into. <p>b. Revised P1 Non-Clinical Elective REMS II and REMS III: JRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah Sletten has submitted a revision to this elective in the highlighted portions of the elective that is on Blackboard. To ensure that the course must meet at a minimum of 45 hours for 1 credit. (This is not new to the elective but new to this template when it is published.) Also highlighted in Course Prerequisites is a UND SMHS PhD can be substituted for taking REMS I, when the PhD is in sciences that overlap with this material. The committee agreed with proposed changes yet also questioned whether it should be specific to training in one of the biomedical sciences fields. Also, of discussion was whether students holding a PhD in a biomedical sciences field from another University would also qualify for exemption from REMS-I. The committee agreed that current PhD students should be exempt from REMS-I and also requested that Dr. Sletten consider some of the discussed changes. 	<p>MSC to move to UMEC for approval, Revised addition P1 Non-Clinical Elective REMS II and REMS III. Jon Allen / Kara Eickman // carried.</p>
<p>4.) Other</p>	<p>a. 2023 GQ questions response evaluation write up regarding the Class of 2023: JRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 2, Overall satisfaction with medical education / basic sciences. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q#9/ Behavioral Sciences: How well did your study of the following sciences basic to medicine prepare you for clinical clerkships and electives? We di well compared to all medical schools. In benchmarking we are at the 86th percentile, or in a lower percentile. Kara Eickman has worked really hard pulling together components off Units 4 and 5 along with other improvements, we will see this improve in the future. ○ Pathology of Disease we can see improvements with benchmark at 100% or in the 90th percentile. • Table 13, Learning Environment / Professionalism of Faculty / Personal and Professional Development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q#20: Think about how often you experienced the following at your medical school. ○ There are no disconnects between what I am taught about professional behaviors and attitudes and what I am seeing demonstrated by faculty. ○ Q#21: Please rate how often the following professional behaviors/attitudes are demonstrated by your medical school’s faculty. ○ Respecting patient confidentiality, we rank well in this category. 	<p>MSC to note that PIC has reviewed components 8 and 9 in the 2023 GQ to our satisfaction. Kara Eickman / George Beddow // carried.</p> <p>MSC to note that PIC has satisfactorily reviewed Q#20 and #21 in the 2023 GQ. Kurt</p>

- Using professional language/avoiding derogatory language, we do well in this category with an exception. We have addressed the individual instances that have been reported to us as they occur.
- Susan Zelewski said that we have had some instances of derogatory language over the past year. Students that unfortunately have ended up in repeated situations, this is what sticks in their memory.
- Being respectful of house staff and other physicians. We range in the very often to always.
- Respecting diversity. We seem to do well here and the benchmark shows the same. When there is a report, we address them directly and immediately.
- Being respectful of other health professionals. We do an outstanding job in this category.
- Providing direction and constructive feedback. We are at the 84th percentile here.
- Showing respectful interaction with students. We are in the upper end here compared to other medical schools.
- Showing empathy and compassion. We are showing in the Fairly Often column.
- Being respectful of patient's dignity and autonomy. We are above the 95th percentile, which is fantastic.
- Actively listening and showed interest in patients. We are on par with other medical school and are at the 75th percentile.
- Taking time and effort to explain information to patients. This is good as well.
- Advocating appropriately on behalf of his/her patients. We are in the higher components here.
- Resolving conflicts in ways that respect the dignity of all involved. We are above other medical school in the benchmarking here.

b. Announcement of upcoming proposals or updates for 11.21.23 meeting.

- Where to place the Spirituality as a Social Determinant of Health in Unit 1? It is very busy the first 2 weeks for a new class in Unit 1, so looking towards the end of the first half of Unit 1, before the mid-timeframe. That would be when students have gained some experience with patient interviewing but have not yet proceeded to doing advanced interviewing.
- There was discussion about the timing and it was decided that putting this into an Achieve does not work well. It was felt that the 2 hours by Dr. Carson would

Borg / Jon Allen // carried.

Information

	<p>enhance their interviewing skills. Is there a testing component to this? There would have to be to put it into the curriculum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • George Beddow will communicate with Dr. Carson and update at the 11.21.23 meeting. <p>c. Policy on Phase 1 Laboratories: JRD along with PC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been some confusion of expectations of students and faculty on what constitutes a laboratory and whether it is mandatory, remote, recorded or in person. I will be bringing forth a policy that will change some of the language to make it clear. I will need student input with this important policy. I will rely on George Beddow for student feedback. <p>d. Unit 6 revision: JRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on 2 years of student feedback, it is clear that there needs to be more time in Unit 6. It has been noted that students cram the material in order for the exam but to absorb the intensity and material, they need more time. Now students end Unit 5 right before Memorial Day and then have a week of vacation, and then they have two 4-week collectives ending with another week of vacation before starting Unit 6. We are looking at that week of vacation before Unit 6 to expand into Unit 6. • George likes the idea and will take this to the Class of 2027 for feedback. 	
<p>5.) Future Agenda Items</p>	<p>Future Agenda Items before the 11.21.23 P1C meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • George Beddow will ask the Class of 2027 students about the policy on mandatory labs explained above and the Unit 6 revision thoughts and bring it back to the P1C 11.21.23 meeting. • JRD would like to get this student input before the next meeting to have the policy and the Unit 6 revision written by then. <p>Tabled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AY 21-22 Phase 1 Report 	<p>Information</p>
<p>6.) Adjournment:</p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.</p>	<p>Next meeting is November 21, 2023 at 2:00pm.</p>