

Phase 1 Committee Meeting Minutes

SMHS

Tuesday, May 31, 2022 – 2pm via Zoom

In attendance: Jon Allen, Kurt Borg, Xuesong Chen, Jane Dunlevy, Kara Eickman, Amanda Haage, Mark Koponen, Gunjan Manocha Michelle Montgomery, Jim Porter, Ken Ruit, Adrienne Salentiny, Steffen Stroh, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski.

Members not in attendance: Marc Basson, Pat Carr, Megan Denis, Minnie Kalyanasundaram, Eric Johnson, Dev Pant, Min Wu.

Minutes Submitted by: Alissa Hancock

Minutes Reviewed by: Jane Dunlevy

MSC = motion made, seconded, carried

Minutes Approved by: Kurt Borg and Michelle Montgomery

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome/call to order	Dr. Dunlevy, chair called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm via Zoom.	Informational
2. Approval of Minutes 5.17.22		MSC to approve the 5.17.22 minutes. Kara Eickman / Mark Koponen // carried.
3. Standing Items	<p>Student Report</p> <p>Update on the satisfaction of formative feedback. Students are a little confused about the ratings that they get from different facilitators and what that means. Not all facilitators rate the students same creating confusion when moving from Unit to Unit with a new facilitator. They also would like to have more details with their formative feedback because they would like to know specifically what they can improve on instead of the generic phrases of encouragement they are often receiving. It was reported that both the students and some facilitators find that the mid-unit feedback meetings are not that useful and wondered if those meetings could be further into the unit. The students do know that there has to be two meetings per Unit and understand the difficulty with scheduling also. Also, concerns of the narrative feedback that is provided that could end up in the Dean’s letter, seems to be fairly vague.</p> <p>We will remind facilitators of the importance of their narrative feedback for the end of unit feedback and also to review the ratings for the weekly evaluations of the students in iSPIRAL.</p>	Rick Van Eck will review the rankings of students in the different categories across Units to look for progressive improvement on an individual basis. After this analysis is complete, further edu of students on progression or a review of ranking categories will be undertaken.
4. Old Business		
5. New Business	a. Phase 1 Objectives Review from CEMC	MSC to accept the Phase 1 objectives as

	<p>A few years ago UMEC approved the new format for objectives and CEMC has been revising the old objectives and any new objectives to be in the new format, however the numbering has not changed but will be updated in the future. This is so we do not lose track of any of the objectives. These objectives have been reviewed by several faculty members and students and we hope to have these approved for the class of 2026, who start in July.</p> <p>It was noted these are just a subset of the phase 1 objectives and were the objectives selected by the design teams and we know that there were additional objectives added after we started working on these. Discussion about the use of define vs describe and the amount of detail included in the objectives. There is a mix of faculty members that want us to provide those details that would be in the session objectives, however, we would like to have faculty to make as they are the subject matter experts. Continued to discuss what level of detail is best.</p>	<p>written and PIC will continue to review the objectives and make suggestions for the CEMC annual review of the objectives. Gunjan Manocha / Kara Eickman // carried with one abstention.</p>
	<p>e. AY 21-22 Unified Session 5 Report</p> <p>The was the class of 2024 with 63 students. This was the also the transition year with curriculum 1.5 that is for this class only, as we moved to curriculum 2.0 with the next class. We stopped offering re-examinations and moved to only having remediations. Recently, there have been lots of questions regarding the Immunology course. So, looking at classes 2018 to 2024, the students overall did well and all scored about the same.</p> <p>At the end of this Unified Session students took their first no stakes CBSE exam and the class also performed really well on the clinical skills exams. There were COVID restrictions that made it more challenging for students to be able to practice and take their clinical skills.</p> <p>There was a shift in the curricular content with shortening the unified session and this made us work around different holidays, that caused some challenges for delivering all the content. PCL cases were two days a week except for one case which was three days. Students were also tested on the content more frequently and that seemed to go well and was appreciated.</p> <p>Overall, the satisfaction of the unified session was lower than previous years and we think affects of COVID affected this, along with the condensing of the material and lack of vacation days. Which we did work for future unified sessions and classes. It was reported by a lecturer that when they did have a live zoom lecture only 10 or less students were present, which was about the same as before the pandemic.</p>	<p>MSC to approve the Unified Session 5 report. Jon Allen / Michelle Montgomery // carried.</p>
	<p>f. AY 21-22 Unified Session 6 Report</p>	<p>Tabled</p>

	g. Y2Q Review looking at Student Mistreatment	Tabled
	h. Mind Body Medicine Elective i. Credit? Assessment?	Tabled
6. Other Business		
	Meeting adjourned the meeting at 3:30pm.	Next meeting June 17, 2022.