

Undergraduate Medical Education Committee Meeting Minutes

SMHS

Wednesday, September 22, 2021 - 4:30 PM, via Zoom

In attendance: Pat Carr, Dinesh Bande, Marc Basson, Chris DeCock, Megan Denis, Jane Dunlevy, Kara Eickman, Bryon Grove, Donald Hamm, Eric Johnson, Minnie Faith, Mark Koponen, Saobo Lei, Susan Roe, Jon Roberts, Adrienne Salentiny, David Schmitz, Chernet Tessema, Steve Tinguely, Chris Tiongson, Rick Van Eck, Susan Zelewski.

Minutes Submitted by: Alissa Hancock

Minutes Reviewed by: Patrick Carr

Minutes Approved by: Bryon Grove and Saobo Lei

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome/call to order	Chair Dr. Patrick Carr called the meeting to order at 4:33 pm via Zoom. If no objections proposing time of adjournment at 6:00pm.	Informational
2. Approval of Minutes	September 9, 2021	MSC to approve the 9.8.21 minutes. Bryon Grove / Jane Dunlevy // carried.
3. Consent Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CEMC 8.23.21 minutes, b. P2P3C 8.10.21 minutes, Graduate Program, Graduate Residency & Program Director Survey 	MSC to approve the consent agenda. Bryon Grove / Jane Dunlevy // carried.
3. New Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Committee Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. P2P3C No report b. CEMC <u>Phase Report Templates</u> The Phase 1,2 & 3 reports will be completed annually at the curriculum retreat and are different from the Curriculum as a Whole or Unit reports. After receiving feedback from UMEC a few months ago more discussions and changes were made to the templates. The data for the reports will be collected by CEMC, and provided to those who would be completing the report. The goal was to eliminate duplication of work 	MSC to approve the phase 1,2 & 3 templates. Bryon Grove / Saobo Lei // carried.

	<p>wherever possible. Discussed who was involved in the creating of the templates and who will be completing the reports, then reviewing, and approving them. There was a concern that the templates have not been to the P1C or P2P3C yet, but their chairs are members of the CEMC where most of this discussion has occurred. It was also thought that since UMEC is in charge of the curriculum that UMEC should approve them to ensure that this is the direction we would like the curriculum reports to go.</p> <p>c. P1C No report</p> <p>d. DQIP - Office of Medical Accreditation: EASRC/SASRC/FASRC An external consultants group reviewed the DCI, and we received recommendations and guidance from them. There was good and bad new with the review.</p> <p>e. Ad hoc Committees</p>	
<p>4. Special Orders</p>	<p>a. Standard 11 Review The standard was very well written. There were some surprising numbers where students were reporting they were unsatisfied with all the counselling and testing that is provided to students. Then to have all the options available to them outlined. Discussion continued about what we do offer and why students would be unsatisfied and we have implemented a new career counselling system last year to try to address this dissatisfaction. From the student's point of view, they did not know why there is dissatisfaction, but as discussion continued, wondered if providing a sample of a dean's letter to the students at the beginning of medical school would help them understand would include. This was thought to be a good idea and it is in the ACHIEVE plan to provide this to phase 1 students. Dr. Pat Carr will follow up with Dr. Jim Porter on this. Also, wondered if we could screen students early for learning disabilities, as most students do not come into medical school with a diagnosis.</p>	<p>MSC to accept the Standard 11 review with the action item that Dr. Tinguely will work with the ISA 2 student group to explore student dissatisfaction further. Bryon Grove / Chris DeCock // carried.</p>
	<p>b. Policy 4.24 (Professionalism in the Learning Environment for Medical Students) Would like to add a section to state students are protected from retaliation from anyone is reported for mistreatment or unprofessional behavior. An anonymous online form can be completed if the students prefer.</p>	<p>MSC to approve the addition of the no retaliation statement to the policy 4.24. Bryon Grove / Jane Dunlevy // carried.</p>

	<p>c. Do we release Unit evaluations back to students? Likert, Narrative?</p> <p>The question has been raised if we return the elaborate evaluation we have students complete back to the students in any way. Currently this is not something we do. However, should we and in what format or how much of the data do we provide them? The full report is about 80 pages. We do not believe students will read or even skim a report that long. The student’s representatives did agree with that and thought if a topic five topics from the narratives be provided back to the students might be something useful. Also, need to find out if there is a legal standpoint, we need to be aware of for releasing information back to the students. There are many things to consider with this and we will discuss further at the next meeting.</p>	ACTION ITEM: Please think about this some for a full discussion at the next meeting.
	d. Unit 1, 2021 evaluation from students	Tabled
	e. Review GQ questions that are below 10th percentile on benchmarking	Tabled
5. Unfinished Business	a. Review of action item table	
7. Other Business		
8. Adjournment	<p>Meeting was adjourned at 6:03 pm</p> <p>Next Meeting – October 13, 2021 – 4:30 PM, Zoom</p>	Information