

## Undergraduate Medical Education Committee Meeting Minutes

SMHS

Wednesday, August 24, 2022 - 4:30 PM, via Zoom

**In attendance:** Dinesh Bande, Marc Basson, Kurt Borg, Pat Carr, Chris DeCock, Megan Denis, Jane Dunlevy, Kara Eickman, Bryon Grove, Erik Heitkamp, Jeremy Holloway, Minnie Kalyanasundaram, Brianna Lupo, Michelle Montgomery, Jim Porter, Adrienne Salentiny, Steve Tinguely, Ken Ruit, Susan Roe, Chernet Tessema, Nadia Toumeh, Sara Westall.

**Guests:** Bryan Delage and Kamille Sherman.

**Minutes Submitted by:** Alissa Hancock

**Minutes Reviewed by:** Pat Carr

**Minutes Approved by:** Susan Roe and Kara Eickman

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome/call to order	Chair Dr. Patrick Carr called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm via Zoom. If no objections proposing time of adjournment at 6:00pm.	Informational
2. Approval of Minutes	August 10, 2022	<b>MSC to approve the 8.10.22 minutes. Erik Heitkamp/ Kara Eickman // carried.</b>
4. Student Check-in	<p>Bo Lauchner and Brianna Lupo met with Pat Carr to discuss how the class is feeling about the change in attendance expectations going back to pre-COVID expectations. Brianna Lupo is going to survey the class regarding their preferred method of content delivery and suggested to ask which type of modality they least prefer. The student's goal is to optimize their learning with the preferred modality. Concerns that were raised that include the research that backs active learning is the least liked by students but shows the highest learning benefits. Also, faculty are the content experts and have preferred modalities that they want to deliver the content. The students are wanting to provide some guidance to faculty of their preferred modality to learn from for the type of content being taught. Dr. Jane Dunlevy also expressed concern of the student's expectation of when they would see changes from this survey, as the curriculum is schedule ahead of time and changes take time. One last recommendation to Brianna for the survey is to ask the students what their preferred and least preferred modality to learn from and why. This would be more useful for us to be able to make changes that would fit their explanations or reasons to make any changes.</p> <p>Nadia Toumeh is taking over the Peer Tutoring program and they are having their first tutoring session this coming Sunday.</p>	<p>Information</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM:</b> Brianna Lupo is going to survey the class about preferred and least preferred learning modalities for content and also ask them why to help give faculty more guidance as to possible changes.</p>

**5. Committee Reports and consent agenda items**

(Annual and Unit reports and policies not eligible for the consent agenda)

**1. Committee Reports**

**i. Committees**

**a. P2P3C**

Verbal Report:

Phase 2 Report

Phase 3 report

Discussion about the approach to UMEC approval of the phase reports. Should UMEC: 1) accept the recommendations from (in this case) P2P3C with little discussion, 2) spend considerable time reviewing the reports as if they are the first committee seeing the report, or approach report review and approval as somewhere in between those two more extreme approaches. There was a reminder that UMEC considers recommendations from other committees but is the only committee that has the power to approve or accept reports.

Consent Agenda: Minutes 7.12.22, Timely Grading Report, EMRG 9106 & Dermatology Elective - Tabled

**b. CEMC - Tabled**

Verbal Report:

Consent Agenda: Minutes 7.11.22

**c. P1C - Tabled**

Verbal Report:

Unit 6 objectives

Consent Agenda: Minutes 7.19.22

**d. MPPRC – Tabled**

Verbal Report:

Policies 4.5, 4.7, 5.10

Consent Agenda: Minutes 7.11.22

**e. DEIC - Tabled**

**MSC to approve the P2P3C the Phase 2 Phase 3. Erik Heitkamp / Susan Roe // carried.**

Tabled P2P3C consent agenda.

	<p><u>Verbal Report:</u> <u>Consent Agenda:</u></p> <p>f. <b>DQIP - Office of Medical Accreditation: EASRC/SASRC/FASRC</b> - Tabled <u>Verbal Report:</u></p> <p>g. <b>Ad hoc Committees:</b> none</p>	
<p><b>6. Special Orders</b></p>	<p><b>a. ROME Selection Procedure</b> In the past, student selection for ROME site placement followed a specific, but unwritten, procedure. This year there were more applicants than there are ROME site availabilities, therefore, a written selection procedure should be created and implemented. The lottery and selection of preferred home campuses will be completed by September 2, 2022, so the students can begin their career counseling session with their campus dean.</p> <p>Drs. Bryan Delage and Kamille Sherman were able to join and offer the background of the types of questions on the application and why some are weighted more than others in the scoring process. For example, if they can provide their own housing with family or friends and if they were willing to go anywhere were given more points. Having a connection to a rural site for housing was thought to provide social support. There was concern that the scoring was too subjective, and a request was made for clearer definition in the scoring. Clarity would assist students in understanding how selections were made and may mitigate student grievances for not receiving a ROME spot.</p> <p>It was noted that students will be going to their rural location for another 18-20 months and that we do not have much academic history to guide the selection process. Students would have had their mid and end of unit exams and a doctoring skill exam also. We are not sure if students will end up taking a leave. The concern about the lack of academic history is the concern if the students selected will be able to endure the rigors of medical school in a rural setting.</p> <p>Also, with the time constraints of the procedure for the current class, working out the details in this meeting does not seem feasible. However, we can approve the procedure as written with a few recommendations for updating the process for the next class.</p>	<p><b>MSC to approve the ROME Selection Procedure for this academic year, with the recommendation to clarify the procedure for next year.</b> <b>Chris DeCock / Bryon Grove // carried, with 1 'no' vote.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM:</b> <b>Procedure recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Include the scoring rubric. This could help with any possible student grievance.</b></li> <li>• <b>Include academic feedback in the rubric.</b></li> <li>• <b>Increase the clarity and flow of the current procedure</b></li> </ul>
	<p><b>b. Curriculum Reports for Curriculum Retreat</b> <b>1. Phase 1 Report</b></p>	<p>Tabled</p>

	<b>2. Curriculum as a Whole Report</b>	
	<b>c. What is considered “Mandatory Curriculum” and what behavior does “mandatory” entail?</b>	Tabled
	<b>d. Student absence for research presentations (allow conflict with Assessment?)</b>	Tabled
	<b>e. CBSE Threshold for an independent study version of the step 1 prep course</b>	Tabled
	<b>f. Committee membership to include western campus representation (UMEC, MSAC, MSAPC)</b>	Tabled
	<b>g. Mid-unit formative feedback form (one pager with attestation)</b>	Tabled
	<b>h. Professionalism report table and form</b>	Tabled
	<b>i. Continued discussion of curricular LCME draft findings (informational) – Resume at element 7.1</b>	Tabled
	<b>j. Anonymous Feedback from Students</b>	Tabled
<b>7. Unfinished Business</b>	<b>a. Review of action item table</b>	
<b>8. Other Business</b>		
<b>9. Adjournment</b>	Meeting was adjourned at 6:28 pm  Next Meeting – August 10, 2022 – 4:30 PM, Zoom	Information