

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Medical Student Education Committee Minutes

6-21-2022

2022 June 21 - Medical Student Education Committee Retreat 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, "2022 June 21 - Medical Student Education Committee Retreat Minutes" (2022). *Medical Student Education Committee Minutes*. 178.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/msec-minutes/178>

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 for a Retreat Meeting on Tuesday, June 21, 2022.

Attendance

<u>FACULTY MEMBERS</u>	<u>EX OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBERS</u>
Ivy Click, EdD, Chair	Ken Olive, MD, Assoc Dean for Accreditation Compliance
Caroline Abercrombie, MD	
Martha Bird, MD	<u>SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRS</u>
Thomas Ecay, PhD	Robert Acuff, PhD
Jennifer Hall, PhD	
Russell Hayman, PhD	<u>ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STAFF</u>
Jon Jones, MD	Kortni Dolinger, MS, Staff
Paul Monaco, PhD	Mariela McCandless, MPH, Staff
Jason Moore, MD	Aneida Skeens, MS, Staff
Antonio Rusinol, PhD	
	<u>GUESTS</u>
<u>STUDENT MEMBERS</u>	Regenia Campbell, PhD
Helen Mistler, M1 (Zoom)	Leon Dumas, MMED
	Lindsey Henson, MD (Zoom)
<u>EX OFFICIO VOTING MEMBERS</u>	Kelly Karpa, PhD
Deidre Pierce, MD	Ryan Landis, MD
Robert Schoborg, PhD	Robert T. Means, Jr, MD
Amanda Stoltz, MD	Diego Rodriguez-Gil, PhD
Rachel Walden, MLIS	Doug Thewke, PhD

Meeting Minutes

1. Approve: Minutes from the MSEC May 17, 2022 Meeting and June 7, 2022 called meeting.

Dr. Click opened the meeting at 12:05 p.m. and asked for comments/updates to the May 17, 2022 meeting minutes, which were distributed to MSEC members via email on Friday, June 17, 2022. It was noted that “Neurology” had been used instead of “Neuroscience” in the Clinical Neuroscience course review and that would be corrected in the minutes.

A motion was made to accept the May 17, 2022 minutes and seconded. MSEC approved the motion.

The MSEC minutes for May 17, 2022 are shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Dr. Click asked for comments/updates to the June 7, 2022 called meeting minutes, which were distributed to MSEC members via email on Friday, June 17, 2022.

A motion was made to accept the June 7, 2022 called minutes and seconded. MSEC approved the motion.

The MSEC minutes for June 7, 2022 are shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Announcements:

- Faculty Development
 - June 30 – 3:00-4:30 (Zoom)
 - Teaching Professionalism in the Clinical Learning Environment with Dr. Charlene Dewey
- Faculty Book Club
 - August 3 – 4:30-5:30 pm
 - *Radical Hope* by Kevin Gannon (potential luncheon with the author on August 8)

2. Report: M1/M2 Review Subcommittee 2021-2022

Lifespan Development

Please see the Lifespan Development Annual Review Report for additional data.

Dr. Acuff presented a review for the Lifespan Development course. Dr. Carlos Isaza is the course director. The reviewers were Dr. Michael Kruppa and Abbey Johnson, M2.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: **Met expectations.**
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: **Exceeded expectations.**
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: **Met expectations.**
- Educational Outcomes: **Exceeded expectations.** There is no NBME exam for this course.
- Student Feedback: Student satisfaction with course quality, course organization, and teaching quality **exceeded expectations.** All course instructors received an overall satisfaction score of 3.88/4.0, which **met expectations.**
- Previous Reviews: **Not applicable.**

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

Comments from Course Director: Please see the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Lifespan Development report for further details.

Upcoming Changes Proposed by the Course Director: No recommendations were made with the upcoming integration of the course into the TRAILS curriculum.

Recommendations for MSEC: No recommendations were made with the upcoming integration of the course into the TRAILS curriculum.

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

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

3. Report: Phase Review

Please see the Phase Review Report for additional data and information.

Dr. Olive presented a report from the Phase Review Subcommittee outlining the following areas:

Educational Outcomes

Overall, the two phases of the curriculum appear to be producing satisfactory educational outcomes.

In the Pre-Clerkship Phase, the areas of behavioral sciences and neuroscience were low outliers. The USMLE Step 1 pass rate for first time exam takers in 2021 was 96% - the same as the national average.

In the Clinical Phase, on the Resident Readiness Survey, program directors reported that 97% of graduates met or exceeded expectations. Additionally, 93% of students agreed or strongly agreed they were confident that they have acquired the clinical skills necessary to begin residency, which was slightly below the 75th percentile nationally. The USMLE Step 2 pass rate for first time exam takers in 2020-21 was 99% - the same as the national average. The first-time pass rate for Step 3 over the period May 2018-December 2020 was 95%. Graduating class residency program match rates are excellent at 96%. Percentage of students completing the curriculum within 4 years is 88.7% - above the national average of 81.6-84.1%.

Overall Quality of Phases

The overall quality of the Pre-Clerkship Phase appears to be satisfactory with areas for improvement identified. Courses that had been struggling to advance in terms of student expectations are improving in their overall success in meeting student satisfaction. Student satisfaction with the quality of their medical education reported on the AAMC Year 2 Questionnaire has decreased from 85% to 76%. Some themes related to diversity and inclusion reveal opportunities for improvement. There is still dissatisfaction with the coordination and integration of content in both the M1 and M2 year, although improvement has been made. At the request of the Outcomes Subcommittee, the Phase Review Subcommittee specifically looked at the Clinical Neuroscience course to address Program Benchmark 2 in relation to a poor response of 24.6% on the AAMC GQ “How well did your study of the following sciences basic to medicine prepare you for clinical clerkships and electives?” It was noted that this response represented students who took the course in 2018-19 and course evaluations indicated significant improvement in the Clinical Neuroscience course since that time. The primary themes in student narrative evaluations from the M1 year were related to COVID. The primary themes in student narrative evaluations from the M2 year were related to less integration in the M2 year than in the M1 year and multiple comments about having a systems-based curriculum.

The overall quality of the Clinical Phase appears to be satisfactory with areas for improvement identified. Themes in narrative comments were related to the need to improve organization, variability in quality of didactics, confusing nature of multiple different means of communication and schedules across clerkships, need for better quality feedback on performance, and the chaos created by COVID. Narrative themes were related to the large number of students on some selectives and the general disruption related to COVID. AAMC GQ data regarding the quality of the educational experiences in clinical clerkships (reflecting clerkships completed in the 2019-20 academic year), revealed that Internal Medicine was evaluated as poor to fair, 11% more often than the national averages. A Continuing Quality Improvement (CQI) plan was required and implementation of this plan has resulted in improvement in all problem areas identified in the 2021-22 academic year though these will not be reflected in the GQ until 2023. The AAMC GQ showed that 90% of graduates were satisfied with the overall quality of their medical education, slightly above the 50th percentile nationally.

Appropriateness of Organization and Sequencing

The appropriateness of organization and sequencing in the Pre-Clerkship Phase appears to be satisfactory. Although, failure to align similar content across courses during the M2 year was a theme of narrative comments.

The appropriateness of organization and sequencing in the Clinical phase appears to be satisfactory with areas for improvement identified. Narrative themes from the M3 retrospective survey addressed that standardizing organizations of clerkships would improve the student's experiences. In particular, students value the concept of a central calendar and clearly communicated schedule, which should improve with the addition of Leo. Narrative themes from the M4 retrospective survey indicate that the number of students on selectives and COVID impact were the main issues.

Adequacy of Horizontal and Vertical Integration

Collectively, the Pre-Clerkship Phase CQI plan and the M1 and M2 retrospective surveys indicate that while there has been some improvement in integration, there continues to be the need for further efforts to improve both horizontal and vertical integration within the phase.

On the AAMC GQ, there is agreement that clinical experiences integrated basic science content exceeded the national mean. Aside from suggestions related to standardizing the organization of clerkships, the M3 and M4 retrospective surveys did not provide information relevant to horizontal and vertical integration.

Alignment with Institutional Educational Objectives

Alignment of course objectives with Institutional Educational Objectives was addressed primarily in the course and clerkship self-studies and annual reviews by the curriculum review subcommittees. Course and clerkship objectives have been aligned with institutional educational objectives.

Identification of Gaps or Unnecessary Redundancies

The Resident Readiness Survey identified the following as areas potentially needing attention as the TRAILS curriculum is developed.

- Consider religious, ethnic, gender, educational, and other differences in interacting with patients and other members of the health care team.
- Identify and report system failures and patient safety concerns in a timely manner.
- Admit to one's own errors and accept responsibility for personal and professional development.

Description of Learning Environment

The AAMC Year 2 Questionnaire offers multiple pieces of information related to the Pre-Clerkship learning environment. Learning environment scales varied from the 25th to the 50th percentile. Scores on stress scales were in the 25th to 50th percentile range and quality of life scores were below the national means (percentile scores not provided). Quillen students spend a similar amount of time per day (10 hours) on educational activities as do students nationally. Current classroom space is not readily conducive to incorporate TBL and other interactive learning style. Auditoria in Stanton-Gerber Hall are not flexible for these purposes. Additionally, the number of small group rooms currently available will limit the ability to expand small group learning for more learners.

The learning environment of all clerkships in 2020-2021 was greatly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The main issues identified for the clinical phase related to the number of learners,

especially on sub-internships and the student to standardize organization across the third year. Additionally, improving feedback regarding clinical skills is needed.

Student Satisfaction with Phases and Quality of Teaching

Student satisfaction with phases and quality in the Pre-Clerkship Phase of teaching appear to be satisfactory. The main narrative themes were related to heavy use of Zoom and to COVID.

Student satisfaction with phases and quality in the Clinical Phase of teaching appear to be satisfactory. The only consistent narrative themes were related to COVID and the number of students on sub-internships.

Sufficiency of Educational Resources

Sufficiency of educational resources in the Pre-Clerkship Phase appeared satisfactory.

The main issue regarding sufficiency of educational resources in the Clinical Phase were repeatedly related to the number of students on M4 sub-internships.

Recommendations and/or Needed Follow-Up

In the Pre-Clerkship Phase, the main issues identified are the need to better integrate the M2 year and to improve both vertical and horizontal integration within the phase. Further efforts to reduce stress in the M2 year are needed.

In the Clinical Phase, the main issues identified relate to the number of learners especially on sub-internships and the desire of students to standardize organization across the M3 year. Additionally, improving feedback regarding clinical skills in the M3 year is needed.

There should be continued attention to the following content areas as the new TRAILS curriculum is implemented.

- Consider religious, ethnic, gender, educational, and other differences in interacting with patients and other members of the health care team.
- Identify and report system failures and patient safety concerns in a timely manner.
- Admit to one's own errors and accept responsibility for personal and professional development.

A motion was made to accept the Phase Review Report as presented and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Phase Review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

4. Workshop: IQ Case Facilitation

Dr. Michelle Lizotte-Waniewski, guest speaker from Florida Atlantic University Schmidt College of Medicine, led a workshop on the facilitation of IQ cases. Dr. Lizotte-Waniewski led participants through the facilitation process as the facilitator with the participants acting as the students to demonstrate how the IQ cases should evolve as a student-led activity.

The MSEC meeting adjourned at 2:45 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 2022-2023: (Zoom meetings unless noted)

- July 19, 2022 – 3:30 – 6:00 pm
- August 16 – 3:30-6:00 pm
- September 20 – 3:30-6:00 pm
- October 18 – Retreat – 11:30 am-5:00 pm (In person)
- November 8 – 3:30-6:00 pm*
- December 13 – 3:30-6:00 pm*
- January 17, 2022 Retreat – 11:30 am-5:00 pm (In person)
- February 21 – 3:30-6:00 pm
- March 21 – 3:30-6:00 pm
- April 18 – 3:30-6:00 pm
- May 16 – 3:30-6:00 pm
- June 20 - Retreat -11:30 am-3:00 pm (In person)
- June 20 - Annual Meeting - 3:30-5:00 pm (In person)

DRAFT