

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Medical Student Education Committee Minutes

11-8-2022

2022 November 8 - 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, "2022 November 8 - Medical Student Education Committee Minutes" (2022). *Medical Student Education Committee Minutes*. 182. <https://dc.etsu.edu/msec-minutes/182>

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 Meeting on Tuesday, November 8, 2022 via Zoom meeting.

Attendance

<u>FACULTY MEMBERS</u>	<u>EX OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBERS</u>
Ivy Click, EdD, Chair	Beth Anne Fox, MD, Vice Dean for Academic Affairs
Caroline Abercrombie, MD	Ken Olive, MD, Assoc Dean for Accreditation Compliance
Martha Bird, MD	
Jean Daniels, PhD	<u>SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRS</u>
Thomas Ecay, PhD	Robert Acuff, PhD
Jennifer Hall, PhD	James Denham, MD
Russell Hayman, PhD	Keelin Roche, MD
Paul Monaco, PhD	
Jerry Mullersman, MD	
Antonio Rusinol, PhD	<u>ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STAFF</u>
	Kortni Dolinger, MS, Staff
	Mariela McCandless, MPH, Staff
	Aneida Skeens, MPS, Staff
<u>STUDENT MEMBERS</u>	
Andrew Hicks, M3	
Michael Jacobs, M1	<u>GUESTS</u>
RJ Leach, M4	Earl Brown, MD
Helen Mistler, M2	Leon Dumas, MMED
	Lindsey Henson, MD
	Kelly Karpa, PhD
	Ryan Landis, MD
<u>EX OFFICIO VOTING MEMBERS</u>	Brennan McNeil, M2 Class President
Deidre Pierce, MD	Robert T. Means, Jr, MD
Melissa Robinson, MD	Skylar Moore, MPH, HCMC
Robert Schoborg, PhD	Tory Street, Assistant Dean
Amanda Stoltz, MD	Doug Taylor, Associate Dean, Admissions & Records
Rachel Walden, MLIS	Doug Thewke, PhD

Meeting Minutes

1. Approve: Minutes from the MSEC Retreat Meeting – October 18, 2022.

Dr. Click opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. and asked for comments/updates to the October 18, 2022 Retreat meeting minutes, which were distributed to MSEC members via email on Monday, October 17, 2022.

A motion was made to accept the October 18, 2022 Retreat Meeting minutes and seconded. MSEC approved the motion.

The MSEC Retreat Meeting minutes for October 18, 2022 are shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Announcements:

- Faculty Development
 - November 16 – 3:15-4:45 pm – Medical Library Basement
 - Overcoming Student Resistance with Amy Johnson, EdD and Alison Barton, PhD
 - January 18, 2023 – Time and Location to be determined
 - Writing Grants for foundations with Karen Smith, Dept. of Family Medicine Grants Administrator
- Faculty Book Club
 - January 25, 2023 – 4:30 pm
 - *Inclusive Teaching* by Kelly A. Hogan and Viji Sathy
- Updates
 - The 2022-23 Academic Calendar was updated to reflect the USMLE Step 1 course that was approved as a requirement for the Class of 2025. The updated calendar has been posted to the website.
 - The 2023-24 Academic Calendar is being finalized and will be posted possibly this week. Dr. Click noted that due to how the curriculum is shifting and the pre-clerkship has been shortened and clerkships are moving up, the calendar will look a little different than what we have had in the past.

2. Report: Outcomes Subcommittee Report

Please see the Outcomes Subcommittee Measures Report for additional information.

Dr. Denham presented the Outcomes Subcommittee report from their October 6, 2022 meeting. Dr. Denham stated there were seven benchmarks reviewed. Dr. Denham noted the first two benchmarks were met and the five remaining benchmarks were not met.

The benchmarks not met were:

1. Knowledge for Practice 2 – 50% of students will score at or above the national mean on NBME subject exams or other nationally normed exams within Phase 1.
 - a. Overall, 36.86% of students scored at or above the national mean on NBME subject exams.
2. Knowledge for Practice 5 – Fewer than 10% of students will score at or below the 10th percentile on overall Phase 1 (pre-clerkship) on any NBME end-of-course exam or other nationally normed exam.
 - a. Overall, 17.71% of students scored at or below the 10th percentile on overall Phase 1 (pre-clerkship) on any NBME end-of-course exam or other nationally normed exam.
3. Personal and Professional Development 1 – 90% of students who utilize Student Mental Health Services will report being at least satisfied with services and care provided, as reflected by GQ responses.
 - a. There were 72% of students who reported being at least satisfied with student mental health services. The national average is 71.6%
4. Program Benchmark 2 – Curricular questions with greater than a 15% rating of poor overall dissatisfaction rating (on GQ) will be targeted for a review to identify where a topic is

addressed within the curriculum and determine if it is covered adequately or if there are gaps in the curriculum

- a. On the 2021 GQ, 21.4% of students rated Emergency Medicine of poor overall dissatisfaction. In addition, 25% of students rated Neurology of poor overall dissatisfaction.
5. Program Benchmark 4 – 95% of matriculating students will complete the curriculum within five years (rolling five-year average). Look at matriculation vs class.
 - a. There were 93.6% of students matriculating 2012-13 through 2016-17 completed the curriculum within five years.

Outcomes Subcommittee Recommendations to MSEC:

1. Program Benchmark 6B – QCOM graduates will obtain PGY-I residency positions in Primary Care above the national match rates for U.S. MD Seniors for these combined specialties.
 - a. Though the benchmark was met, the Outcomes Subcommittee recommends monitoring this benchmark as it was changed last year to use a rolling five-year average.
2. Knowledge for Practice 2
 - a. Recommends replacing this benchmark to 50% of students will score at or above the national mean on the M2 end-of-year required Comprehensive Basic Science Exam (CBSE).
 - b. Recommends that the Phase Review Subcommittee look at how we can measure disciplines across our curriculum in the future with NBME exams going away.
3. Knowledge for Practice 5
 - a. Recommends that the Phase Review Subcommittee look at how we can measure disciplines across our curriculum in the future with NBME exams going away.
4. Personal and Professional Development 1
 - a. Recommends that a representative from Student Support Services report to MSEC on current changes of services
 - b. The Outcomes Subcommittee will be monitoring this benchmark.
 - c. Recommends looking at the five-year rolling average.
 - i. Five-year rolling average excluding the 2021-22 year: 81.7% of students who utilize student mental health services reported being at least satisfied with services and care.
5. Program Benchmark 2
 - a. Neurology has improved from 40% to 25% dissatisfaction rating this year.
 - b. QCOM does not have clerkships in Neurology or Emergency Medicine, which could indicate the poor ratings in these areas.
 - c. Recommends MSEC determine if further action is needed from the Phase Review Subcommittee. Potential ideas: adding a clerkship in Emergency Medicine or requiring an elective during the M4 year in each.
6. Program Benchmark 4
 - a. Recommends this benchmark be calculated including and excluding MPH students in the future
 - b. Outcomes Subcommittee does not recommend any action at this time. They will continue to monitor.

Dr. Olive asked if it was more important to be aspirational or realistic when it comes to benchmark settings. Dr. Olive stated that some of the benchmarks are set relatively high such as student satisfaction with mental health services being set at a level markedly above the national average on the GQ. With the CBSE performance scores set at or above the national average this could be a stretch for us if you look at how our students do on Step 1 of being a little bit below the national average. Dr. Olive commented that it is a good aspiration for us to have, but he is not sure it will be

realistic for us to consistently have 50% of students above that, and this is something to consider. Dr. Olive also commented that Dr. Denham noted that we do not have required clerkships in emergency medicine and neurology, so it is not surprising that the numbers are a little bit lower in those areas. This is an issue we will need to be thinking more about in the future as the GQ asks about a lot of courses that we will not have in the future since switching to the TRAILS curriculum.

Dr. Click asked that MSEC review and discuss each recommendation made by the Outcomes Subcommittee as there is a lot to discuss.

- Knowledge for Practice 2 and 5
 - Dr. Click stated that the whole curriculum has changed and we are no longer using the NBME subject exams for the pre-clerkship phase. The question is what do we use instead. Students are required to take the CBSE at the end of the second year. The CBSE seems to be a reasonable suggestion to replace the individual NBME exams and is more of a global assessment of knowledge. After discussion, MSEC will investigate the use of the CBSE exam and will come back with a specific recommendation for the benchmark at a future MSEC meeting.
- Personal and Professional Development 1
 - After discussion, MSEC asked that Dr. Jean Daniels present a report to MSEC members at a future meeting regarding current changes in student support services and the feedback she has heard from students regarding the value of the CBSEs.
 - MSEC will support the recommendations for Personal and Professional Development 1 and will look at the correct benchmark for this.
 - Dr. Abercrombie commented that in looking at the benchmark of 90% (students who utilize student mental health services will report being at least satisfied with services and care provided as reflected by GQ responses), she noted that it is odd that we are expecting our services to be above our teaching levels, which are at 85% and felt that MSEC needs to look at whether to keep the 90% or lower. Dr. Abercrombie also commented on the emergency medicine rotation and feels that we need to look at implementing that elective in the future. Dr. Fox commented that it is a great idea, but we need to look at the availability we have to meet the requirements.
- Program Benchmark 2
 - After discussion, MSEC agreed with the recommended changes.
- Program Benchmark 4
 - After discussion, MSEC agreed with the recommended changes.

A motion was made to accept the Outcome Subcommittee report and to investigate the use of CBSE for Knowledge for Practice and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

A motion was made to accept the Outcome Subcommittee's recommendations for Program Benchmarks 2 and 4 and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

A motion was made to table the recommendation for Personal and Professional Development 1 until more information is received from Dr. Jean Daniels and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

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

3. Report: M1/M2 Review Subcommittee 2021-22

Physiology

Please see the Physiology Annual Review Report for additional data.

Dr. Acuff presented a review for the Physiology course. Dr. Tom Ecay is the course director. The reviewer was Dr. Robert Acuff.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: **Met expectations.**
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: **Exceeded expectations.**
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: **Met expectations.**
- Educational Outcomes: Grade breakdown **exceeded expectations.** There is no NBME exam for this course. A customized shelf exam was used in this course.
- Student Feedback: **Exceeded or met expectations.**
- Previous Reviews: The course director has addressed recommendations from previous reviews.

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

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

Recommended Changes to the Course Director: None.

Recommendations for MSEC: MSEC will determine how NBME questions will change for pre-clerkship courses.

A discussion ensued regarding the report noting percentages (38/79 or 48%) of students scoring at or above the national mean on the NBME and the percentages (10/78 or 12.6%) of students scoring at or below the 10th percentile on the NBME as the course does not use the NBME exam but uses a customized shelf exam instead. Dr. Acuff stated that 38/79 met the 50th percentile on the customized exam and 12.6% were at the 10th percentile on the customized exam. Dr. Ecay noted that each question was set with a target difficulty level given to them by the NBME. A target difficulty was set for the exam in the high 70s and 38/79 of the students scored above the target.

Dr. Click noted that the current rubric only lists NBME Exam Performance and that an updated rubric will need to be developed to reflect the use of a customized exam in the TRAILS curriculum in addition to the NBME exam. This will be brought back to MSEC and discussed at a future meeting.

Dr. Hayman suggested putting “N/A” in those sections regarding the NBME Exam Performance since the data is not applicable to the standard. Dr. Click stated that the information could be moved to the “Recommendations for MSEC” section as MSEC will need to decide what that benchmark will be.

Dr. Click noted this change to the report could be done administratively. Dr. Acuff commented that maybe a footnote needed to be added on the customized exam but feels it is important to recognize it as part of the report and Dr. Click agreed.

A motion was made to accept the M1/M2 Review Subcommittee Physiology course report as presented with the addition of adding a footnote regarding the customized exam and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Physiology Annual course review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

4. Report: M3/M4 Review Subcommittee 2021-22

Transition to Clinical Clerkships

Please see the Transition to Clinical Clerkships Annual Review Report for additional data.

Dr. Roche presented a review for the Transition to Clinical Clerkships course. Dr. Caroline Abercrombie is the course director. The reviewers were Dr. Sheree Bray and Shannon O'Connor, M4.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: **Met expectations.**
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: **Exceeded expectations.**
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: Feedback to students was **below expectations** as only 83% of students agreed that feedback was provided in a timely manner. It was noted that dissatisfaction in this area may stem from very brisk turn-around required to make use of SOAP note feedback prior to graded OSCE. Student satisfaction with quality of feedback, grading transparency, and timeliness of grades **met expectations.** This course does not have mid-clerkship formative assessment.
- Educational Outcomes: Grade breakdown **exceeded expectations.** There is no NBME exam for this course.
- Student Feedback: **Exceeded expectations.**
- Previous Reviews: **Met expectations.**

Strengths and weaknesses of the course were discussed. Please see the M3/M4 Review Subcommittee Transition to Clinical Clerkships report for further details.

Comments from Course Director: Please see the M3/M4 Review Subcommittee Transition to Clinical Clerkships report for further details.

Recommended Changes for Course Director:

- Overall, comments by students were largely positive, reflecting the hard work Dr. Abercrombie has put in to acting on past student feedback and making improvements to the course.
- There was only one area that was Below Expectations and that involved feedback in a timely manner, specifically feedback for their SOAP note prior to the OSCE.
- Dr. Abercrombie notes that she sent out feedback more quickly than in the past, and dissatisfaction might be attributed to concern over high-stakes OSCE at the end of the week.
- In addition to discussing the possibility of rescheduling the OSCE for a time other than during the transitions course, it may be beneficial to add staffing support to help improve turnaround time for grading assignment in question and decrease work-load for Dr. Abercrombie.

Recommendations for MSEC: None.

A motion was made to accept the M3/M4 Review Subcommittee Transition to Clinical Clerkships report as presented and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Transition to Clinical Clerkships Annual review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

5. Report: 2022 Graduation Questionnaire

Please see the 2022 AAMC Graduation Questionnaire presentation slides for additional data.

Dr. Olive presented the 2022 Graduation Questionnaire (GQ). Dr. Olive noted that this would be a shorter presentation as some of the GQ data was reviewed during the presentation on the learning environment at the September 20, 2022 meeting.

Dr. Olive noted there was a 96% response rate for 2022. Overall, 89% of medical students were satisfied with the quality of their medical education. Dr. Olive stated the results of the GQ show both areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. Dr. Olive commented that he realized there was something he intended to speak to when looking at the data about the basic science course in years one and two is the question of how well did the course prepare you for clerkships. Dr. Olive stated that one of the things we will need to be attentive to moving forward in TRAILS curriculum is that there will not be courses in all of these things and we will need to prep the students when they are doing the GQ by reminding them that they had a Foundations of Medical Knowledge course and not specifically a biochemistry course, etc. and that they need to reflect back on things they had in all courses and how the integrated organ systems curriculum prepared you performing in clerkships. Dr. Olive also noted that he has a concern about Biostatistics and Epidemiology moving forward in the TRAILS curriculum and we need to make sure we have included as we are going from a course that was a significant time commitment for students where they had a good introduction to principals of Biostatistics and Epidemiology to it now being tagged into the different systems-based courses. Dr. Olive stated this is not the only area but is an area he has concern about that we have identified enough so students will feel they are adequately prepared for clerkships.

No voting action required.

The presented 2022 Graduation Questionnaire presentation slides are shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

6. Discussion/Approval: Periodic and Comprehensive Evaluation of Curriculum Policy (updates-review cycle)

Dr. Click presented the Periodic and Comprehensive Evaluation of Curriculum Policy to MSEC members noting that we have a five-year review cycle and would be coming into a comprehensive review year. Dr. Click stated she does not believe it makes sense for comprehensive reviews be done for courses that have just ran one time. Dr. Click stated that a sentence was added to the policy stating that due to the implementation of a new pre-clerkship curriculum, the curriculum evaluation cycle would restart beginning with the academic year 2022-23.

A motion was made to approve the added language in the Periodic and Comprehensive Evaluation of Curriculum Policy of restarting the curriculum evaluation cycle beginning in the 2022-23 academic year and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Curriculum Review Policy document is shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

7. Report: Pre-Clerkship Assessment Policy Update

Dr. Click presented the Pre-Clerkship Assessment Policy. Dr. Click stated an Exam Question Rebuttal Policy was developed several years ago that focused on the ExamSoft exams that were given in the legacy curriculum. With the change to the TRAILS curriculum, that policy will sunset. Language from this policy has been added to the Pre-Clerkship Assessment policy that is specific to the TRAILS curriculum.

A motion was made to approve the exam question language in the Pre-Clerkship Assessment Policy and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Pre-Clerkship Assessment Policy document is shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

8. Report: TRAILS Pre-Clerkship Attendance Policy Update

Dr. Click presented the TRAILS Pre-Clerkship Attendance Policy. Dr. Click stated when the M3 Attendance Policy was reviewed at the October 18 MSEC meeting, she realized that the TRAILS Pre-Clerkship Attendance Policy would also need to have the language added where students may ask to be absent from courses for religious observance. This will keep us in line with the ETSU policy as well as keeping us inline with what the M3 Attendance Policy states.

A motion was made to approve the religious observance language in the TRAILS Pre-Clerkship Attendance Policy and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented TRAILS Pre-Clerkship Attendance Policy document is shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

9. Update: Content Gaps and Redundancies

Dr. Click presented a slide presentation on Content Gaps and Redundancies. Dr. Click stated that the course directors and faculty have been meeting to discuss gaps and redundancies and agreed to use the USMLE Content Outline to identify content coverage in the TRAILS curriculum. Dr. Click noted the process uses a spreadsheet with each tab representing a major content area from the USMLE Content Outline with a subheading on each tab where faculty are identifying which course content is covered and who is teaching it. Dr. Click noted that this is an ongoing process.

Below is a rough estimate of where content coverage is currently.

- 18 Major Content Areas (by system)
 - 80-90% coverage of:
 - General Principles
 - Immune
 - Blood and lymph
 - Nervous system
 - Cardiovascular
 - Respiratory
 - 50-60%
 - Behavioral Health
 - Gastrointestinal
 - Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Population Health
 - Social Science
 - Less content filled in
 - General Principles: developmental stages
 - Skin and Subcutaneous
 - Musculoskeletal System
 - Pregnancy, Childbirth and Puerperium
 - Reproductive Systems, Endocrine
 - Multisystem Processes and Disorders

No voting action required.

The presented Content Gaps and Redundancies slide presentation document is shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

10. Approval: M4 Online Electives Offered to M3 Students

Dr. Click presented a list of online electives for MSEC to approve. Dr. Click stated that one of the consequences of having more students off cycle than we normally have is that we will have more students who will still be finishing their clerkship requirements while we have new clerkship students coming into the clerkships. With the largest class we have had coming into the clerkships next year at the same time as having roughly 20 students who are off cycle, we are having to account for those students and allow the off-cycle students to spread out so they will not all end up in Period 1 and Period 2 and overload those periods' capacities.

Dr. Click stated they are proposing to spread out some of the off-cycle students who are at the end of their third year so they will complete their clerkship requirements before the end of the first half of the year but not necessarily all during the first and second periods. To do that, they have to be enrolled in something, but they will not technically be promoted to fourth-year students yet. The issue is, can we allow students who are not promoted to the fourth year to take some online electives that were originally proposed as fourth-year courses? Kortni Dolinger stated that approval has been received from the course directors who run the electives. Kortni noted that since MSEC approves these course descriptions that they are being brought back for approval and stated it is a technicality for M3 and M4 students but only for the 2023-24 year. Dr. Olive commented that the off-cycle students are students who have already completed most of their third-year clerkships. Dr. Click noted that additional electives could be added to the list. Dr. Schoborg asked if the Back to Basics elective could be added to the list and Kortni stated that it could be added. A comment was made on whether students would be allowed to do away rotations during that time and Kortni stated they are only proposing for them to do online electives and that direct patient care will come once they are promoted to fourth-year students. Helen Mistler asked if the Class of 2024 would be enrolled in the new Step 2 Study Skills course and if this would be happening when these electives are happening. Kortni stated that the Step 2 Study Skills course is an elective and it is the student's choice but is highly recommended. Kortni stated that if a student is placed on a clerkship in Period 1 then they could not be enrolled in the Step 2 Study Skills course in addition to the clerkship. This is why it is a recommended elective whereas the Step 1 is a requirement for M2 students. Helen asked if a student could choose to do the Step 2 Study Skills elective at the same time as taking one of the online electives and Kortni stated that they could not. Kortni commented that was a good point and the USMLE Step 2 Study Skills could added to the online electives list since it is an asynchronous course. Helen also asked if the new Step 2 Study Skills elective will function as an elective like the ones listed or if it could be taken in conjunction with these. Kortni stated that they could not be taken at the same time so even a student who is on track, starting their M4 year on May 1, will either opt in for the Study Skills course or go on an away elective and can only take one course at any given time. Dr. Click stated that the main reason behind approving these online electives to be taken by M3 students is to keep them enrolled and keeps them from going further behind as well.

A motion was made to allow M3 students to enroll in the presented list of M4 online electives and any additional online electives approved by course directors and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented list of M4 online electives document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

11. Report: M3/M4 Duty Hours

Dr. Click commented that these data have not been looked at for several years and is something that MSEC is supposed to review each year but was inadvertently missed.

Kortni Dolinger presented a table showing the duty hours from 2016-17 academic year through the 2021-22 academic year. Kortni noted that the earlier data was included to show how much improvement we have had, especially recently. Kortni stated the data is collected on the evaluation of courses at the end of courses. Dr. Henson asked if students were asked to fill out a questionnaire that asks them how many days they were in the hospital, how much time they spent, etc. Kortni stated that M3 students log their hours daily and noted there is a policy stating what students are to include when logging their duty hours and to make sure it matches what is reported at the end of a course. Dr. Olive noted that there may be valid educational reasons for students to work more than 80 hours, for example, in surgery, a very procedural specialty where you may only see a particular case during a rotation and may be worth staying over in order to have that experience. Dr. Click stated it was important to note that what we have to watch for is if the average number goes over 80 hours and not those one-time kinds of violations and our averages were below 80 in the last few years.

A motion was made to approve the M3/M4 Duty Hours report as presented and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented M3/M4 Duty Hours document is shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

The MSEC meeting adjourned at 5:42 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, **2023 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**)