

**Undergraduate Medical Education Committee Meeting Minutes**

SMHS

**Wednesday, August 25, 2021 - 4:30 PM, via Zoom**

**In attendance:** Pat Carr, Marc Basson, Jim Beal, Chris DeCock, Megan Denis, Jane Dunlevy, Kara Eickman, Minnie Faith, Bryon Grove, Donald Hamm, Eric Johnson, Mark Koponen, Jim Porter, Susan Roe, Ken Ruit, Adrienne Salentiny, David Schmitz, Chernet Tessema, Steve Tinguely, Don Warne.

**Minutes Submitted by:** Alissa Hancock

**Minutes Reviewed by:** Patrick Carr

**Minutes Approved by:** Bryon Grove and Chris DeCock

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
<b>1. Welcome/call to order</b>	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
<b>2. Approval of Minutes</b>	August 11, 2021	Tabled
<b>3. Consent Agenda</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. CEMC 7.26.21 minutes</li> <li>b. P1C 7.20.21 minutes</li> <li>c. P2P3C 7.13.21 minutes, Timely Grading Reports, IMED 9325, Phase 2 Scheduling Rotation</li> </ul>	<b>MSC to approve the consent agenda. Jim Beal / Jane Dunlevy // carried.</b>
<b>3. New Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Committee Reports</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Committees</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. P2P3C</b> No report.</li> <li><b>b. CEMC</b> Working hard to complete the ‘curriculum as a whole’ report for the curriculum retreat in a couple of weeks. It might not make it to UMEC for approval before then. However, it is important to receive recommendations and comments on the report. The phase reports that will be presented at the curriculum retreat will not be in the new format the CEMC has been working on, due to time constraints. The new phase report templates will be coming to UMEC for approval very soon.</li> <li><b>c. P1C</b> The language for the questions we ask students regarding their studying time outside of what is expected of them for the curriculum was approved. We also have added a</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p align="center"><b>Informational</b></p> <p align="center"><b>Informational</b></p>

	<p>question about their satisfaction of studying time and will be providing them the opportunity to write what they did appreciate in the unit.</p> <p><b>d. DQIP - Office of Medical Accreditation: EASRC/SASRC/FASRC</b></p> <p><b>e. Ad hoc Committees</b></p>	
<p><b>4. Special Orders</b></p>	<p><b>a. Standard 9 Review</b>  Dr. Chris DeCock reviewed this standard.</p> <p><u>9.1</u>  Everything looked good and was easy to understand.</p> <p><u>9.2</u>  Wondering if we actually monitor faculty appointments monthly, as it says we do. Or should this be annually? It was also confirmed that we do send and review the objectives with presenters.</p> <p><u>9.3</u>  We should add in mid-clerkship feedback.</p> <p><u>9.4</u>  The table looks good but was wondering if you needed to list that boot camp was several days? Does it need to be that specific?</p> <p><u>9.5 &amp; 9.6</u>  Both of these elements look good and are clearly explained.</p> <p><u>9.7</u>  Discussion revolved around the quantity and quality of feedback to students. The Clerkship Directors group will discuss further how to improve the quality of the feedback to students. Would be nice to have one thing for the students to work on and one thing they are doing well at, especially in the clerkships. As for the phase 1 students; there was a change in policy and exam style that determined how or if they could review exams. With the start of NBME exams, we are not allowed to see the questions, and therefore, we cannot review the questions as students would like.</p>	<p><b>MSC to accept the review of Standard 9 as presented. Jane Dunlevy / Jim Beal // carried with 1 abstention.</b></p>

	<p><u>9.8</u> There were edits that were still on the document and just wanted to make sure that those edits were completed. Otherwise, everything looked good and made sense.</p>	
	<p><b>b. Standard 10 Review</b> Reviewed by Donald Hamm</p> <p><u>10.1</u> For the list of required courses for medical school. A suggestion to think about how universities categorize some of the courses such as the different math options as requirements for a general education degree. This will be forwarded to the Admissions Committee to consider.</p> <p><u>10.2</u> Suggested to change student representatives are peer elected instead of elected by their class.</p> <p><u>10.3</u> The GPA grading is very transparent across the board within the school. However, for residency status it is not as transparent and wondered if there could be a point breakdown as well.</p> <p><u>10.4</u> Looking at the list of attributes there are some that could have dual categorization depending on how you are looking at it.</p> <p><u>10.5</u> No recommendations and was written very well.</p> <p><u>10.6</u> It was very clear on where printed documents are sent to regional hospitals and lists them out. However, for the IMED section it just states they are sent to dedicated recruiting programs. It would be nice if we could also list those recruiting programs for consistency.</p> <p><u>10.7</u> Lists the same attributes as in 10.4 and show the same criteria for any potential student.</p>	<p><b>MSC to accept the review Standard 10. Chris DeCock / Bryon Grove // carried with 1 abstention.</b></p>

	<p><u>10.8 &amp; 10.9</u> No recommendation.</p>	
	<p><b>c. Non-completion in 4 years' policy recommendation</b> The changes being the that phase 1 to be completed in 34 months and phase 2 &amp; 3 in 38 months. This change is in proportion to the previous curriculum timing. These changes would be helpful to MSAPC in their decisions for needing to complete the MD degree in 6 years.</p>	<p><b>MSC to approve the recommended changes to policy 4.20. Bryon Grove / Jim Beal // carried.</b></p>
	<p><b>d. GQ review #7 &amp; #14</b></p> <p><u>#7</u> Our average over the last few years is 86%. This year our strongly agree and disagree went down but our neutral increased which is why our percentage was a little lower. However, those changes are concerning along with our benchmark is below the 10% percentile. This was the class that was strategizing their way through the curriculum with re-examinations. There was about a quarter of the class repeatedly remediating every block. However, when we stopped the re-examinations option re-examinations also stopped and only two students of the class struggled to pass STEP 1.</p> <p><u>#14</u> These are very specific questions. We were lower in that students learned another language to improve their skills and also decreased with field experience in nursing home care.</p> <p>However, we did increase with research project opportunities with faculty members that were voluntary and not required in the curriculum with added electives. So, this question might be determined how students think about the questions because we do offer them opportunities for volunteer research but also require the Epidemiology project.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Pat Carr will make a stoplight table with these specific areas to help us see what areas we are going great in and which we need to take action or watch.</p>	<p><b>MSC to approve the review of #7 &amp; #14 with the action item that Pat Carr will create a stoplight table for #14. Chris DeCock / Jim Beal // carried.</b></p>
	<p><b>e. 2021 GQ Questions 1, 14 and review sheet for P1C, P2P3C, SAA, Campus Deans</b> We have received feedback from one campus dean so far. Their thing there is still a disconnect between basic science and clinical sciences. However, they also had reduced opportunities for</p>	<p>Informational</p>

	away rotations due to COVID. The student comments were troubling as well but we will discuss those after we have heard back from all everyone.	
	<b>f. ISA Report (continue with 5.2.4)</b>	Tabled
	<b>g. Implementation of the Medical Program Policy Review Committee (contact members and set date for first meeting); <i>Waiting for one BS member and one CS member from the nominating committee.</i></b>	
<b>5. Unfinished Business</b>	<b>a. Review of action item table</b>	Tabled
<b>7. Other Business</b>		
<b>8. Adjournment</b>	Meeting was adjourned at 5:59 pm  Next Meeting – September 8, 2021 – 4:30 PM, Zoom	Information