

Undergraduate Medical Education Committee Meeting Minutes

SMHS

Wednesday, March 8, 2023 - 4:30 PM, via Zoom

In attendance: Marc Basson, Pat Carr, Chris DeCock, Jane Dunlevy, Kara Eickman, Bryon Grove, Erik Heitkamp, Jeremy Holloway, Eric Johnson, Minnie Kalyanasundaram, Brianna Lupo, Susan Roe, Chernet Tessema, Michelle Montgomery, Ken Ruit, Adrienne Salentiny, Dinesh Bande, David Schmitz, Erika Johnson, Lisa Schock, Nadia Toumeh, Sara Westall, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski.

Minutes Submitted by: Alissa Hancock and Dawne Barwin

Minutes Reviewed by: Pat Carr

Minutes Approved by: Erik Heitkamp and Susan Roe

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome/call to order	Chair Dr. Patrick Carr called the meeting to order at 4:31 pm via Zoom. If no objections proposing time of adjournment at 6:00pm.	Informational
2. Approval of Minutes	February 22, 2023	MSC to approve the 2.22.23 minutes. Susan Roe / Bryon Grove // carried.
4. Student Check-in	No reports	Informational
5. Committee Reports and consent agenda items (Annual and Unit reports and policies not eligible for the consent agenda)	<p>1. Committee Reports</p> <p> i. Committees</p> <p> P2P3C—SZ</p> <p> Verbal Report: none</p> <p> Consent agenda:</p> <p> CEMC – AS</p> <p> Verbal Report:</p> <p> Consent agenda: 2.13.22 Minutes</p> <p> P1C—JD</p> <p> Verbal Report:</p> <p> Consent agenda:</p> <p> MPPRC – KR</p> <p> Verbal Report:</p>	MSC to approve committee reports and the CEMC minutes. Erick Heitkamp / Bryon Grove // carried.

	<p>Consent agenda:</p> <p>DEIC-MM Verbal Report: none Consent agenda:</p> <p>DQIP / Office of Medical Accreditation: EASRc/SASRc/FASRc – KR Verbal Report: All committees continue to meet. Consent agenda:</p> <p><i>Ad hoc</i> committees: none</p>	
<p>6. Special Orders</p>	<p>a. Working Group on Policy Language – Update They have met and are moving forward with ideas.</p>	<p>Information</p>
	<p>b. Geriatrics Initiative – (Jeremy Holloway) The Online Geriatrics curriculum has multiple levels to help students gain knowledge in geriatrics and can earn a Badge and Certificate for each level. Modules are available in different lengths and there are 12 modules for each badge averaging 4-6 hours per level.</p> <p>The reason this is important because 60% of student’s patients will be of geriatric age. This gives them the opportunity to gain this knowledge as they do not get a lot of experience in their education.</p> <p>We just finished creating level 1 and are about done with level 2 with the third level still to be created. The levels are flexible and can be accessed at any point because it is not connected to a specific curriculum. The badges are for all students across UND and not specifically connected to the MD Program. If we decide that this should be part of the MD curriculum then it would have to meet our standards, which is the goal, but this is the first step.</p> <p>Has this online curriculum been communicated to the MD students yet? Not yet but Pat Carr is willing to send out the email to the students on behalf of Dr. Jeremy Holloway with the details of the geriatric badge option and will make sure the incoming class in July 2023 knows about it also.</p>	<p>Information</p> <p>Carr sent email to all four medical classes on Thursday, March 09/23</p>

	<p>How would the student know they received a badge? Students would only receive a link saying they received a badge. There is no direct link for them through UND's current system Credibility. We are working on transitioning to the MILESTONE software for a badging system, which would provide additional options we have been looking for.</p>	
	<p>c. Board Vitals Presentation – (Erika Johnson) Erika Johnson presented the process in who Board Vitals was selected and how they compared the different software options.</p> <p>The librarians are not content experts and are not advocating for one software over another, but we do offer several options for study resources to all students within SMHS</p> <p>We chose Board Vitals because students requested the software and partnered with Drs. Minnie Kalyanasundaram and Ken Ruit when we started to look at different resources. We also contacted other schools asking about their tools and experiences. Then requested quotes and demonstration from the most mentioned.</p> <p>Amboss was good but through demonstrations they were lower quality than the others. Board Vitals demonstration went over how questions were developed and we thought the questions were of higher quality. They were also, responsive to our question's verses Amboss and Uworld being ok in responsiveness. We did purchase questions for STEP 1, 2, 3 and added the Board Review for the residency, they then gave us a bundle deal. However, the quote from Uworld did not seem accurate for the package that we are interested in based on the research Dr. Erik Heitkamp provided to Library Resources. Erika Johnson is willing to send out the additional information to the committee once she receives it.</p> <p>Both subscriptions are outside of the normal resources the library resources provides and is a worried about the amount of the administrative work could be for them per each student account., Just so everyone knows we do have about three-quarters of the medical students that use Board Vitals.</p> <p>At the last meeting it was discussed it was mentioned that if we switch software, we will have to go thru the RFP process based on the additional questions we received when we purchased Board Vitals. Erika also demonstrated how to create an assignment in Board Vitals for instructors.</p>	<p>Information</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Dr. Erika Johnson will send the information she receives from Uworld with the updated numbers to send out to UMEC to continue the discussion.</p>

Things to consider:

- Workload required to maintain members and by who
- How often should we be considering different software?
 - Even if a new class would like to see something different
- School wide issue of budget request/balance and needs school wide usages of the different tools. This decision also would not belong to this committee.
 - Board Vitals does offer courses for other programs such as PA and Nursing. We do not use them currently, but we could.
- Keep in mind that the subscription timing and when students are scheduled to take STEP 1 and 2, may not line up perfectly.

One of the big this that Dr. Erik Heitkamp and students keep saying is that the explanations of questions in Uworld are better, but that is difficult for us to know that. The lack of explanation or robustness of the questions is not enjoyed by students and has been commented on repeatedly.

This is a school provided resource knowing that students will purchase other study tools. However, with all the discussion that we have had on this topic a smaller group should look at both software programs and compare them side by side. They can take a practical look at how students use the tools in their studying.

If it is decided that Uworld is better and resources should be allocation we may not be able to provide it still because of how the budget could affect other resources for other programs.

If we decide one tool is more educationally sound, then we can recommend that tool should be looked at further by Dean Wynne for SMHS to make the decision and how other programs might be impacted.

ACTION ITEM: A small working group will compare of the two resources and the student studying process. Participants are Drs. Kara Eickman, Pat Carr, Rick Van Eck, Jane Dunlevy, Erik Heitkamp, Susan Roe and Briana Lupo will show the Board Vitals and Nadia Toumeh will show Uworld.

ACTION ITEM: A small working group will compare of the two resources and the student studying process. Participants are Drs. Kara Eickman, Pat Carr, Rick Van Eck, Jane Dunlevy, Erik Heitkamp, Susan Roe and Briana Lupo will show the Board Vitals and Nadia Toumeh will show Uworld.

	d. LCME Visit Outcome	Tabled
	e. Anonymous Feedback from Students	Tabled
	<p>f. STEP 1 Performance Summary</p> <p>This was just received for the 2020-2022 students on STEP 1 Performance. This year's report is different than they have been in the past and are not sure how they are counting students for each year. Example: for 2021 they said only 15 students took the exam, but we know some of those were repeat students.</p> <p>Since we have started with the STEP Prep course there have been no failures. However, the pass rate nationally has started to fall since they made the change to pass/fail and increased the passing score. The NBME has stated that their changes are not the cause of the drop in passing rate.</p> <p>Looking at the graphs and the way we think about the STEP 1 results and how we relate to the national percentage. We may need to readjust our thinking, but it is too early to make changes.</p> <p>NBME does send the numerical scores to the school but not the students. The students just get a pass/fail.</p>	MSC to approve the presentation and discussion of the STEP 1 Performance results. Erik Heitkamp / Susan Roe // carried
7. Unfinished Business		
8. New Business		
8. Other Business		Information
9. Adjournment	<p>Meeting was adjourned at 6:04pm</p> <p>Next Meeting – March 22, 2023 – 4:30 PM, Zoom</p>	Information