Medical Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes – Additional Meeting  
SMHS  
Wednesday, March 9th, 2016- 4:30 PM, Room 1917, via telecomm, and video

In attendance: Mike Booth, Lucas Holkup, Steffen Christensen, Sarah Meyers, Steve Tinguely, Rick Van Eck, Shae Samuelson, Bryon Grove, Gene DeLorme, Heidi Philpot, Dev Pant, Susan Zelewski, Charlie Christianson, Dawn Hackman, Marc Basson, Pat Carr, Gwen Halaas, Lilia Pedersen, Thad Rosenberger, Joy Dorscher

Minutes Submitted by: Shae Samuelson
Minutes Reviewed by: Richard Van Eck, March 17, 2016
Minutes Approved by: Bryon Grove/Heidi Philpot 3.23.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>ACTION/FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welcome/call to order (Carr)</td>
<td>Dr. Van Eck called the meeting to order at 4:33p in room 1917.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Review Block 1 Report 2015-16 (Pant) | Dr. Pant presented the full report, which had been initially presented at MCC 2/10/16 but deferred to this meeting in order to address missing information in the report at that time. The whole report was received and discussed at this (3/9/16) meeting. Discussion occurred regarding student comments that preparing two learning objectives (SLOs) felt like a waste of time. Different ideas for more efficient PCL time were discussed, which lead to the option of starting PCL early (7:30) and having students do some preliminary reading if they are jumping into the case without introduction. It was noted in discussion that there is a limited amount of time and opportunity in PCL to discuss the case and for students to ask each other questions and facilitators to encourage this behavior due to larger PCL groups which in turn creates additional LO’s. Group sizes have been trimmed down to 9. The idea to shoot for only 4 SLOs in Block 1 by having students pair up was discussed, but no decisions were made. There were no outcomes out of the discussion.

Dr. Grove suggested that the report should: include the iSpiral focus group findings, which met after the report was written, and raised concerns about the nature of iSPIRAL. A comment will be added to this effect and also state the comments that will be considered in future revisions of iSPIRAL. A request to see the outcome results of the g the November 17th meeting I was made as was an inquiry about what the outcomes were. Dr. Pant noted he would talk to Dr. McBride and report back. Dr. Christianson commented that there didn’t seem to be any problems and the comments seemed to be minor. | MSC to file Block 1 report as discussed, approved and reviewed with the recommendations as followed: more information will be gathered from Dr. McBride’s November 17th meeting and the iSpiral focus group discussion element will be added to the final report. Bryon Grove/Thad Rosenberger – all in favor, motion carried unanimously. |
### 3. Review of Block 2 & 6 Reports of 2015-16 (Pant & Carr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 2 - Pant</th>
<th>Block 6 – Carr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Pant gave the Block 2 report. Key discussion points included: better communication/coordination, 4 total block failures, and introduction of podcasts. There was a lengthy discussion on the immunology lectures. It was noted that Dr. Sukalski is working with Dr. Bradley and BSCS on this issue. The lectures now go in order of the textbook and previously have tried different orders. There are 2 questions per lecture area. The question would it be worthwhile to pull the topic areas out and look at the distribution of questions. A solution needs to be found because it is one of the lower scored subjects on the Step exam. Another question that arose, is there a curricular mismatch of the board and our exam?</td>
<td>Block was successful. Numbers to look at reexamination and the mean is 5 but there were not block failures. More honors 15 than average 10 but there was more remediation. The comment regarding “not listening” was discussed. The committee didn’t know it meant they want more avenues of feedback or that their comments aren’t heard. There are weekly quarterback meetings, 1 meeting a block with class presidents and end of block feedback from all students. No outcomes arose from the student comment. Discussion on making certain lectures mandatory to seize the moment and tie to professionalism. Send the students a reminder email, comment on the schedule a different color that it is out of town lecturer, and note the mandatory lectures. It was commented that certain meeting times on the schedule are already marked mandatory. If a student doesn’t show, they will have a discussion with Dr. Carr and get a letter of unprofessional conduct in their file. If a student receives 4 through their medical school career, there is an MSAP hearing. There was also a discussion on the student handbook with the small percentage that doesn’t read it and how to ensure everyone reads it. Another discussion point was Active Learning drawbacks and to have different colors on the lectures on the block schedule that need prior preparation. No definite outcome came out of either discussion points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

MSC to file and accept the block 2 report as reviewed and discussed as it was presented. Bryon Grove/Gene DeLorme – all in favor, carried unanimously.

**Action Item:**
MCC Chair to talk to Dr. Borg on revisiting test banks in a larger context. Begin to look at how we can bring this into alignment with how the curriculum is organized. Topic for the retreat. Communicate that to Dr. Borg.

Motion to move and file the Block 6 report as discussed, reviewed, and approved with the recommendation to have Dr. Kilgore’s lecture on The Impaired Physician mandatory and notify students of out of town lectures that they are encouraged to go. Charlie/Bryon Grove – motion carried, all in favor – motion carried unanimously.
4. Other Business

- Dr. Christianson requested to terminate his interim membership of CSCS on behalf of MCC. Email discussion to be sent out regarding a replacement.
- A currently 3rd year student (4th year student) is needed for the task force—email will be used to identify such a person.
- Statistics for media site have been received and will be discussed at a later MCC. The raw data is hard to decipher but we have found an easier way to sort to make them helpful.

5. Next MCC Meeting

Next Regular Meeting – March 23, 2016 – 4:30 PM, Room 1917 & Video Bismarck/Fargo
Next Clerkship Report/Special Meeting – April 13, 2016 – 4:30 PM, Room 1917

6. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 6:08p