

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Medical Student Education Committee Minutes

7-20-2021

2021 July 20 - Medical Student Education Committee Minutes

Medical Student Education Committee, East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/msec-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Medical Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Medical Student Education Committee, East Tennessee State University, "2021 July 20 - Medical Student Education Committee Minutes" (2021). *Medical Student Education Committee Minutes*. 166.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/msec-minutes/166>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Medical Student Education Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.



QUILLEN
COLLEGE of MEDICINE

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

The Medical Student Education Committee (MSEC) of the Quillen College of Medicine met on Tuesday, July 20, 2021 via Zoom meeting.

Attendance

<u>Faculty Members</u>	<u>Ex Officio Non-Voting Member</u>
Ivy Click, EdD, Chair	Ken Olive, MD, EAD
Caroline Abercrombie, MD	
Martha Bird, MD	<u>Subcommittee Chairs</u>
Russell Hayman, PhD	Robert Acuff, PhD
Paul Monaco, PhD	
Jason Moore, MD	<u>Academic Affairs Staff</u>
Antonio Rusinol, PhD	Kortni Lindsey, MS, Staff
Robert Schoborg, PhD	Mariela McCandless, MPH, Staff
	Aneida Skeens, BSIS, CAP-OM, Staff
<u>Student Members</u>	
Andrew Hicks, M2	<u>Guests</u>
	Earl Brown, MD
	James Denham, MD
<u>Ex Officio Voting Members</u>	Leon Dumas, MMED
Deidre Pierce, MD	Lindsey Henson, MD, PhD
Robert Schoborg, PhD	Tom Kincer, MD, AD
Rachel Walden, MLIS	Diego Rodriguez-Gil, PhD
	Tory Street, AD

Meeting Minutes

1. Approve: Minutes from June 15, 2021 Retreat and Annual Meetings.

Dr. Click opened the meeting at 3:05 p.m. and asked for comments/updates to the June 15, 2021 retreat meeting minutes and the annual meeting minutes, which were distributed with the MSEC meeting reminder.

A motion was made to accept the June 15, 2021 retreat and annual minutes and seconded. MSEC approved the motion.

The MSEC minutes for June 15, 2021 are shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Announcements:

- Faculty Development
 - August 4, 3:30 pm – Writing Exam Items and Use of Patient Characteristics – Dr. Ken Olive
 - Session will be aimed at those writing multiple choice questions
 - Will review guidelines from the NBME regarding when patient characteristics such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, etc. are appropriate to include
 - Brief presentation primarily with people bringing their questions and dividing into small groups and looking at questions
- Book Club
 - Fall Selection – *What the Best College Teachers Do* by Ken Bain
 - Discussion Date: August 18 at 4:30 pm
- Entering Class - Class of 2025
 - 79 new medical students
- New Biostatistician
 - Dr. Nicole Lewis
- New MSEC Member
 - Dr. Amanda Stoltz

2. Report: Outcomes Subcommittee

Dr. James Denham presented the Outcomes Subcommittee report from their July 14, 2021 meeting. Dr. Denham noted that 23 measures were met, 2 measures were partially met, 2 measures were not met, and one measure was to be monitored.

Partially met:

- **Program Benchmark 1:** More than 85% of students will report satisfaction with the overall quality of the academic year.
 - M1 year: 91.5% satisfied/very satisfied. M2 year: **81.9%** satisfied/very satisfied.
 - The M2 year was much improved from the previous year. Discussion included processes put into place through CQI plan have been effective. We need to continue process began last year around coordination and integration of M2 year to see continued improvement.
- **Program Benchmark 6:** In order to address primary care needs of the public, QCOM graduates will obtain PGY 1 residency positions in Family Medicine, Internal Medicine, Pediatrics and OB/GYN above the annually reported national match rates for each specialty.
 - | Program | National % | QCOM % |
|---------|------------|--------------|
| IM | 19.1% | 12.5% |
| FM | 8.7% | 20.83% |
| Peds | 9.5% | 9.72% |
| OBGYN | 5.9% | 5.56% |
 - Discussion included that overall we are still meeting the primary care mission when averaged. Discussion also included that our increased rate of family medicine matches may be a better indicator of primary care than internal medicine (who may eventually specialize). It would be better to see a 5-year average rather than a one-year snapshot.

Measures not met:

- **Patient Care 2:** 95% of students will be rated at or above "Meet all Expectations" on overall M3 clerkship assessment question addressing Patient Care.
 - 93% of students were rated at or above "Meets all expectations" on overall M3 clerkship assessment question addressing Patient Care.
 - Discussion included that in AY 19-20 100% of students met patient care expectations. Consideration of whether Covid-19 modifications impacted this assessment. Outcomes Subcommittee will continue to monitor this benchmark.
- **Program Benchmark 4:** 95% of matriculating students will complete the curriculum within 5 years (rolling 5 yr average).
 - 93.56% of students over the past 5 years (including withdraws and dismissals) completed the curriculum within 5 years.
 - Discussion included this was the first year we have presented this rolling 5-year average. This data includes students who withdraw or were dismissed. Outcomes Subcommittee will continue to monitor this benchmark.

Please see the Outcomes Subcommittee Measures Report for additional data.

The following request and proposals were discussed:

- Request that this Benchmark data be reviewed by the M3/M4 Review Subcommittee.
 - Practice Based Learning and Improvement 3: 95% of students will be rated at or above "Building Competence" on the M3 clerkship assessment question addressing Practice-based Learning and Improvement.
- Proposed new measures for Practiced Based Learning and Improvement
 - Practice Based Learning and Improvement 1: 95% of students will be rated at or above "Meets Expectations" on questions addressing Practice-based Learning and Improvement on the AAMC Resident Readiness Survey.
 - 100% of graduates rated "Met Expectations" or above on questions addressing Practice-based Learning and Improvement on the AAMC Resident Readiness Survey.
 - Practice Based Learning and Improvement 2: 95% of students will be rated "No Concerns" on the Faculty Assessment of M4 Student question addressing Practice-based Learning and Improvement.
 - 99% of students were rated "No Concerns" on the Faculty Assessment of M4 Student question addressing Practice-based Learning and Improvement.

The Outcomes Subcommittee recommended the following actions be taken by MSEC:

- Professionalism 1: Recommends that MSEC move this measure to < 10% of students will receive a professionalism incident report in years 1 & 2.
- Interpersonal and Communication Skills 2: Because Step 2 Clinical Skills is no longer a requirement, the Outcomes Subcommittee recommends we remove this measure.
- Patient Care 3: Because Step 2 Clinical Skills is no longer a requirement, the Outcomes Subcommittee recommends we remove this measure.
- Professionalism 4: Recommends that MSEC change this measure to "no concerns" only.
- Program Benchmark 5: Requests using a rolling prior 5-year average, excluding current year.
- Program Benchmark 6b: Requests using a rolling prior 5-year average, excluding current year.

Additional Discussion: Referring to the recommendation of lowering Professionalism 1 to 10%, Dr. Olive commented that Professionalism 1 for M1 and M2 students was placed higher, 20%, to

assume students would progress during their M3 and M4 year. Dr. Bird commented that the wording for Professionalism 1 and 2 should be updated to ensure positivity like the other benchmarks. She continued, that the current verbiage might sway course directors and faculty from using the professionalism report form to ensure the benchmark is met. Dr. Abercrombie and Rachel Walden asked if Interpersonal and Communication Skills 2 and Patient Care 3 are removed that the Outcomes Subcommittee look at replacing the two measures.

Dr. Abercrombie made a motion to find a replacement for Interpersonal and Communication Skills 2 and Patient Care 3. The motion was seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

A motion was made to accept the Outcomes Subcommittee's recommendations in addition to changing the verbiage of Professionalism 1 and 2. The motion was seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Outcomes Subcommittee Report is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

3. Reports: M1/M2 Review Subcommittee 2020-2021

Please see the individual M1/M2 Review Subcommittee reports for additional data.

Lifespan Development

Dr. Acuff presented a course review for Lifespan Development. Dr. Luis C. Isaza is the course director. The reviewers were Dr. Michael Kruppa and Shannon O'Connor, M3.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: Met expectations.
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: Exceeded expectations.
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: Met expectations.
- Educational Outcomes: Pass/fail rate exceeded expectations. This is no NBME exam for this course
- Student Feedback: Exceeded or met expectations.
- Previous Reviews: Met expectations.

Strengths and weaknesses of the course were discussed. Please see the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Lifespan Development report for further details.

Recommended Changes to the Course Director: None.

Recommendations for MSEC: None.

A motion was made to accept the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Lifespan Development report as presented. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Lifespan Development Annual Course Review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Medical Pathology

Dr. Acuff presented a course review for Medical Pathology. Dr. Earl Brown is the course director. The reviewers were Dr. Brian Rowe and Dr. Leon Dumas.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: Met expectations.
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: Met expectations.
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: Met expectations.
- Educational Outcomes: Pass/fail rate exceeded expectations. NBME exam performance met expectations
- Student Feedback: Met expectations.
- Previous Reviews: Below expectations. The subcommittee's report commented that the course director stated item 24 noted no recommendations, but the previous subcommittee review did recommend splitting up exams. The subcommittee stated they do not know if this recommendation was faithfully passed on to the course director and noted that they do not necessarily concur with the recommendation but it should be addressed.

Strengths and weaknesses of the course were discussed. Please see the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Medical Pathology report for further details.

Recommended Changes to the Course Director: Some students complained that the course is focused on passing the step exam without imbuing the students with a deep understanding of pathological concepts. NBME exams utilize 2nd and 3rd order questions and it could be argued that when 64% of students scored above the national mean an understanding of pathological concepts was evident. The course director points out that Zoom sessions were designed to address this concern, but the majority of students failed to make use of them. In person or Zoom interactive sessions appear to be a good idea and the course director might need to consider how to motivate students to make better use of them.

Comments for MSEC: Message from the course director (9th July): From the report you can see that we plan to use the interactive Zoom sessions (recorded on Panopto) as a self-assessment means for the students. We are going to add a second method for students to self-assess, and this will be on a daily basis. This week I got permission from Amboss to be able to select and group sets of Amboss question. My goal is to provide a set of Amboss questions for each day (2 hour) set of live sessions. I estimate it will be about 10+ questions per day, or 80-100 Amboss questions per exam, for a total of around 800 Amboss questions for the year. I plan to use the scheduled exam review days to review any of these questions that the students want me to go over. I think they will really like this, and it should be very helpful too. If MSEC wants me to give an update about this, I would be more than happy to.

Additional Discussion: Dr. Abercrombie recommended that support for pathology be ensured for the new curriculum, but no motion was made. Dr. Click commended Dr. Brown for the hard work he has put into the course which is evident from the review.

A motion was made to accept the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Medical Pathology report as presented. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Medical Pathology Annual Course Review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Introduction to Clinical Psychiatry (ICP)

Dr. Acuff presented a course review for Introduction to Clinical Psychiatry. Dr. Natasha Gouge is the course director. The reviewers were Dr. Robert Acuff and Riley Parr, M3.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: Met or below expectations. The individual course sessions have not been linked to the QCOM Institutional Educational Objectives.
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: Met expectations.
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: Met expectations.
- Educational Outcomes: Exceeded expectations.
- Student Feedback: Below or met expectations. There were 54.17% of students satisfied or very satisfied with course quality; 66.67% satisfied or very satisfied with course organization, and 52.78% satisfied or very satisfied with the teaching quality of the course. Dr. Gouge received a 3.11/4.0 overall satisfaction score.
- Previous Reviews: Met expectations.

Strengths and weaknesses of the course were discussed. Please see the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Introduction to Clinical Psychiatry report for further details.

Recommended Changes to the Course Director: None.

Recommendations for MSEC: The course director is working on mapping individual sessions to the QCOM Institutional Educational Objectives, but it appears she could use some assistance in completing this task.

Additional Discussion:

- Dr. Olive let the committee know that Dr. Gouge had stepped down as ICP course director for this year. A search for a new course director was ongoing.
- Comments regarding flipping the order of ICP with the Neurology course were discussed. After much discussion, the committee determined that this would be very risky.
- Dr. Click noted that an updated CQI Plan would normally be requested given the subcommittee's findings, but a new course director will be taking over this course and therefore, an updated CQI Plan is not possible. Dr. Click recommended that the current CQI Plan be presented to the new course director along with the concerns of the course. Dr. Acuff commented that it would be nice if the new course director could get the course reviews from the last four or five years as well as the current CQI Plan so they are aware of the history and problems with the course. Dr. Schoborg noted that the Course Director's Guide could also be given to the new course director.
- Dr. Rusinol asked the committee their thoughts of changing the name of the course. Dr. Click stated it was too late to do an official name change in the system this year, but it is certainly worth considering.

A motion was made to accept the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Introduction to Clinical Psychiatry report as presented. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Introduction to Clinical Psychiatry Annual Course Review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Cell & Tissue Biology

Dr. Acuff presented a course review for Cell & Tissue Biology. Dr. Paul Monaco is the course director. The reviewers were Dr. Robert Acuff and Dr. Tyrone Genade.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: Met expectations.
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: Met or exceeded expectations.
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: Met expectations.
- Educational Outcomes: Exceeded or met expectations.
- Student Feedback: Exceeded or met expectations.
- Previous Reviews: Met expectations.

Strengths and weaknesses of the course were discussed. Please see the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Cell & Tissue Biology report for further details.

Recommended Changes to the Course Director: Many students felt that less teaching faculty were needed as the podcasts were enough while others felt overwhelmed by the array of study materials and formats. Emphasizing the best (most well received) format to students might help.

Comments for MSEC: The change in the course sequence from Anatomy/Biochemistry/Cell Biology to Biochemistry/Anatomy/Cell Biology has created a problem where the shelf exam is now out of sync with the course sequence and students complain that there isn't enough time to review the biochemistry for the NBME exam (please see comments under 'Weaknesses' from the CD). Admittedly, students are tested over material they should know on the NBME exam. Students have been asked to review material periodically to increase their foundation of knowledge which will likely be tested on an NBME exam. In addition, this will strengthen their preparation for STEP 1.

Dr. Monaco stated he felt that the sequencing did not impact how students performed on the shelf exam. Dr. Click noted that she did not see any issues with this as the course met or exceeded all recommendations and noted that this will go away next year with the new curriculum.

A motion was made to accept the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Cell & Tissue Biology report as presented. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Cell & Tissue Biology Annual Course Review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

4. Reports

Y2Q Student Survey

Dr. Kenneth Olive presented the findings from the 2020 Y2Q survey that were released in March 2021.

Please see Dr. Olive's PowerPoint presentation for detailed data.

Summary of Findings:

- QCOM students tend to be somewhat older and less diverse
- Overall satisfaction with education at the national average

- Class attendance lower but consistent with national trends
- Experiences with faculty generally positive but areas of needed improvement
- Mistreatment levels reported to be generally similar to national trends
- Learning environment not perceived as positively as we have believed
- Time spent in school activities, exercise, and sleep are similar to national trends
- Somewhat higher levels of stress and burnout
- Higher interest in primary care
- High percentage would choose medicine again
- Similar factors in selecting career choices

No voting action required.

The presented Y2Q Student Survey document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Pre-Clerkship Phase CQI Plan 2020-2021

Dr. Olive presented the Pre-Clerkship Phase CQI Plan for 2020-2021.

Please see the Pre-Clerkship Phase CQI Plan for additional data.

- Evaluation of Planning Effectiveness
 - Goal 1 - Highly effective – improving student dissatisfaction with coordination and integration of content in the first year of the curriculum to less than 15%
 - Goal 2 - Mostly effective – improving student dissatisfaction with coordination and integration of content in the second year of the curriculum to less than 15%
 - Goal 3 - Highly effective – improving overall student satisfaction with the first two years of the curriculum to 3.0/4.0 by the summer of 2021 retrospective survey of curriculum.
- Next Steps/Further Action
 - Goal 1 was met. Similar actions should continue to maintain satisfaction with coordination and integration of content in the first year.
 - Goal 2 was not met, but there is marked improvement. The same activities should continue to further decrease dissatisfaction.
 - Goal 3 was met. Similar actions should continue to maintain overall student satisfaction with the first two years of the curriculum
- New Goals for Next Cycle
 - Continue to work towards the goal of improving dissatisfaction with coordination and integration of content in the second year
 - Add a specific question to the retrospective survey for M2 students regarding improve overall student satisfaction with the first two years of the curriculum. The goal is to achieve student satisfaction to 3.0/4.0.

A motion was made to accept the Pre-Clerkship Phase CQI Plan as presented and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Pre-Clerkship Phase CQI Plan document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

5. Discussion/Action: Curriculum Transformation

Learning Communities

Dr. Pierce gave a presentation on Learning Communities, which will begin this academic year (2021-22). Learning Communities are intentionally developed longitudinal groups of faculty and students that aim to enhance students' medical school experience and maximize learning. Highlights of the learning communities plan at Quillen:

- Student-led implementation plan with 150 current students opting in, plus all Class of 2025 students. Students randomly sorted.
- Four communities: Iron Mountain, Hartsell Hollow, Cloudland, Laurel Falls.
- Focus on Wellness in AY 21-22.
- Planned expansion: career development, mentoring and advising, financial planning, social health.
- Recruitment plans for faculty: email for interest coming to faculty; faculty leadership of communities beginning AY 22-23.

For additional details regarding Learning Communities, please see Dr. Pierce's PowerPoint document.

Problem-Based Learning (PBL) Case Formats

Dr. Lindsey Henson gave a presentation regarding the formats (sequential disclosure versus IQ) used for problem-based learning cases for MSEC selection and approval of the format to be used in the TRAILS Curriculum. Dr. Henson noted PBL will be a component of the basic science courses and will be scheduled on Fridays from 8:00 am – 10:00 am in Year 1. There will be two successive weeks for PBL followed by a week for SPECTRM cases as part of the Doctoring courses. This will allow the same group of students to have PBL, PBL, SPECTRM across the TRAILS Curriculum for a year and a half. The goal of PBL is for it to be student directed and not teacher directed.

For additional details regarding PBL case formats, please see Dr. Henson's PowerPoint document.

CTSC's recommendations for PBL format:

- Use the IQ format – less risk of misinformation if all students have researched all objectives
 - One case in Immersion
 - One case every three weeks in Foundations and Organ Systems
 - One complex, longer (4-5 day) case in Transition to Clerkships with possibly some additional change to format
- Recommendation for a modified IQ format
 - Two days per case
 - All information in Session 1 (2 hours instead of 1)
 - Sequential disclosure of information
 - No case goal
 - Enhanced psychosocial content, more detailed clinical information
 - Diagnosis provided in Session 1
 - All students research all learning objectives
 - Interactive discussion of all learning objectives in second session
 - Faculty case objectives distributed at the end of the case
- Additional recommendations

- SOAPP in all IQ cases
 - Enhanced practice with oral clinical case presentations before clerkships
 - Consistent format for oral presentations in IQ and Doctoring
 - Align format with what is expected by clerkship directors
- Consider adding an interactive presentation of one learning objective during M2
 - Practice with formal presentations with PPT

Dr. Click commented that PBL will be part of the organ system courses and material covered will be subjected to assessment.

After discussion, the committee felt the IQ format would be the best option to use.

Dr. Click noted that MSEC will need to decide on whether to keep the IQ name or give it another name as other institutions have done.

Dr. Abercrombie made a motion to adopt the CTSC recommendations for the format for PBL cases. The motion was seconded by Dr. Rusinol. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The Learning Communities and PBL Cases documents are shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

The MSEC meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

MSEC Meeting Documents

MSEC Members have access to the meeting documents identified above through the shared Microsoft Teams document storage option made available with their ETSU Email account and login.

If you are unable to access Microsoft Teams MSEC Team please contact: Aneida Skeens at: skeensal@etsu.edu. Telephone contact is: 423-439-6233.

MSEC Meeting Dates 2020-2021:

May 18 – 3:30-6:00 pm - Zoom meeting
June 15 – **Retreat** 11:30 am-3:00 pm – Zoom meeting
June 15 - **Annual Meeting** - 3:30-5:00 pm – Zoom meeting

MSEC Meeting Dates 2021-2022: (Location TBD)

July 20, 2021 – 3:30 – 6:00 pm
August 17 – 3:30-6:00 pm
September 21 – 3:30-6:00 pm
October 19 – Retreat – 11:30 am-5:00 pm
November 2 – 3:30 – 5:00 pm*
November 16 – 3:30-6:00 pm
December 14 – 3:30-6:00 pm*
January 18, 2022 Retreat – 11:30 am-5:00 pm
February 15 – 3:30-6:00 pm
March 15 – 3:30-6:00 pm
April 19 – 3:30-6:00 pm

MSEC Minutes – July 20, 2021

May 17 – 3:30-6:00 pm

June 21 - Retreat -11:30 am-3:00 pm

June 21 - Annual Meeting - 3:30-5:00 pm