

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Medical Student Education Committee Minutes

2-21-2023

2023 February 21 - 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, "2023 February 21 - Medical Student Education Committee Minutes" (2023). *Medical Student Education Committee Minutes*. 185. <https://dc.etsu.edu/msec-minutes/185>

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 digitlib@etsu.edu.



The Medical Student Education Committee (MSEC) of the Quillen College of Medicine met for a Meeting on Tuesday, February 21, 2023 via Zoom.

Attendance

<u>FACULTY MEMBERS</u>	<u>EX OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBERS</u>
Ivy Click, EdD, MSEC Chair	Beth Anne Fox, MD, Vice Dean for Academic Affairs
Caroline Abercrombie, MD	Ken Olive, MD, Assoc Dean for Accreditation Compliance
Jean Daniels, PhD	
Joel Danisi, MD	<u>SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRS</u>
Thomas Ecay, PhD	
Jennifer Hall, PhD	
Russell Hayman, PhD	<u>ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STAFF</u>
Paul Monaco, PhD	Kortni Dolinger, MS, Staff
Jason Moore, MD	Chelsea Gilbert, MA, Staff
Jerry Mullersman, MD	Mariela McCandless, MPH, Staff
Antonio Rusiñol, PhD	Aneida Skeens, MPS, Staff
Amanda Stoltz, MD	
	<u>GUESTS</u>
<u>STUDENT MEMBERS</u>	Earl Brown, MD
Andrew Hicks, M3	Michelle Duffourc, PhD
RJ Leach, M4	Leon Dumas, MMED
	Lindsey Henson, MD
<u>EX OFFICIO VOTING MEMBERS</u>	Amy Johnson, EdD
Deidre Pierce, MD	Kelly Karpa, PhD
Melissa Robinson, MD	Tom Kwasigroch, PhD
Robert Schoborg, PhD	Ryan Landis, MD
Rachel Walden, MLIS	Robert T. Means, Jr., MD
	Diego Rodriguez-Gil, PhD
	Tory Street, Assistant Dean
	Doug Thewke, PhD

Meeting Minutes

1. Approve: Minutes from the MSEC Retreat Meeting – January 17, 2023

Dr. Click opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. and asked for comments/corrections to the January 17, 2023 Retreat meeting minutes, which were distributed to MSEC members via email on Friday, February 17, 2023.

A motion was made to accept the January 17, 2023 retreat meeting minutes and seconded. MSEC approved the motion.

The MSEC Retreat meeting minutes for January 17, 2023 are shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

Announcements:

- Faculty Book Club
 - February 22, 2023 – 4:00-5:00 pm via Zoom
 - *Inclusive Teaching: Strategies for Promoting Equity in the College Classroom* by Kelly A. Hogan and Viji Sathy
 - March 22, 2023 – 4:30-6:00 pm
 - *You're the Only One I've Told* by Meera Shah
- Follow-up
 - Dr. Click noted that during one of the previous clerkship reviews, the question was asked whether there was a policy stating students could be dismissed from clerkships one or two days prior to the NBME exams to study and prepare. Dr. Click stated this was discussed with the clerkship directors during a recent meeting, and there is no policy regarding this. Dr. Click stated if we were to institute a policy, we should wait as the 2023-24 AY will be the shortened clerkship year, and there will be several policies that will need to be revised due to this.
- January MSEC Retreats
 - Dr. Click stated that January seems too soon to have a retreat following the October retreat, and we are also just returning from the holiday break. Dr. Click stated she would like to propose that the January 2024 retreat meeting be held in February so it would give more time between the October retreat and would allow for better placement between the other retreats. MSEC members voted to move the January 2024 retreat to February 2024.

2. Report: M1/M2 Review Subcommittee

Clinical Neuroscience – 2022-23

Please see the Clinical Neuroscience Annual Review Report for additional data.

Dr. Click presented a review for the Clinical Neuroscience course on behalf of Dr. Kruppa, who was unable to attend today's meeting. Dr. Diego Rodriguez-Gil is the course director. The reviewers were Dr. Michael Kruppa and Blanton Gillespie, M2.

- Goals, Outcomes, and Objectives: **Met expectations.**
- Content, Delivery, and Environment: **Met expectations.** Student satisfaction with learning environment **exceeded expectations** with 98.7% of students being satisfied.
- Assessment, Feedback, and Grading: **Met expectations.** There is no narrative assessment required for this course.
- Educational Outcomes: Grade breakdown **exceeded expectations.** The customized NBME exam was used for this year. Dr. Click noted that we do not have a national standard for the customized NBME exam where we can compare students' scores. Dr. Click stated that she would like to discuss at a future MSEC meeting if this should or should not be included as part of the review rubric and if so, should it be a percent passing or other outcome measure.
- Student Feedback: Student satisfaction with overall course quality and teaching quality **exceeded expectations** with 92% and 89.4% of students being satisfied respectively, surpassing the CQI Plan goals for these areas presented at the May 17, 2022 MSEC meeting. Student satisfaction with course organization was **below expectations** at 82.7% (previously 76.1%), but this met the CQI Plan goal of moving course organization closer to the 15% mark. Course instructors receiving an overall satisfaction score of $\geq 3.0/4.0$ **met expectations.**
- Previous Reviews: **Met expectations.**

Strengths of the Course:

1. Student comments: Professors

2. Content and organization of topics
3. Clinical relevance of contents and clinical examples
4. Alignment of Neuro Pathology at the end of the Neuroscience course
5. Course director

Weaknesses of the Course:

1. Student comments: PhD / too detailed contents
2. Content and organization of topics
3. Handouts not provided from a professor
4. Peripheral nerves / cranial nerves
5. Customized NBME exam

Comments from Course Director: We will keep on working to maintain these strengths in the coming year because, most of the professors will be part of the new TRAILS curriculum. While the items listed above were identified by several students as strengths, some of them also identified items 2 and 3 as weaknesses. In the new TRAILS curriculum, there will be more clinical cases and questions for the students during the TBL classes, so this will hopefully be a strength in the coming year.

Recommended Changes to the Course Director: None as this will be the last iteration of the course before going to the TRAILS curriculum. It is clear that the course director has identified the weaknesses that need to be improved and is presently making adjustments for the transition of this material to the TRAILS curriculum. While handouts were not provided for some of the lectures taught by the MD in the course, several office hours were scheduled during the semester by the MD for the students to ask questions, clarify contents and objectives, and to emphasize studying strategies for each of the topics. We think that the peripheral nerves / cranial nerves lectures are necessary in the course. But at the same time, we find that having them in the course can confuse students because these are not new materials, but the concepts are necessary as part of a general Neuroscience course. We will evaluate whether we consider including these or not in the new TRAILS curriculum.

Recommendations for MSEC: No action recommended.

Dr. Click stated that Dr. Rodriguez-Gil should be commended for his excellent leadership of the Clinical Neuroscience course. The course has shown steady improvement and increased student satisfaction over the last several years. She also noted she was pleased to see the many of the strengths of the course, such as faculty and clinical relevance will be retained or increased in the new Brain, Body, & Behavior course.

Dr. Rodriguez-Gil commented that some students stated the customized exam was not representative of the Step 1 exam. Dr. Click noted that the customized exam questions come from Step 1 exams. Dr. Rusiñol stated that it might be helpful to survey faculty, since most have now selected questions for the customized exams, and ask how many questions have we seen that we have not taught. Dr. Rusiñol stated that he has noticed that faculty, in general, do not look at the difficulty of a question when selecting them but look at if they taught that or not. Dr. Rusiñol stated if we see we are teaching the correct information related to the questions, faculty would feel better. Dr. Click commented that this would be a good idea to get more information and could be something to bring back to MSEC. Dr. Means commented that while these are Step 1 questions, they are questions that have been taken out of the active pool and noticed on the Immuno/Heme theme there were a number of questions that contained information that was out of date and were possibly incorrect. He stated some of these questions have been retired. Dr. Click stated this was the first time she had heard this and would have hoped the NBME would have filtered some of those incorrect questions. Dr. Click stated the NBME customized assessment services is an important discussion and will add this to a future MSEC meeting and will also discuss at course director meetings as well. Dr. Henson commented that even though the NBME customized exams may be out of date or retired, the students will be sitting down with a computer, will have the same amount of time, and will have the same sort of issues as taking the NBME Step exams and this will help prepare them for those exams. Dr. Click stated this is the

first students have commented about the NBME customized exams. Dr. Click stated that in some of the new TRAILS courses, students have been complimentary of the customized assessments.

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

The presented Clinical Neuroscience annual course review document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

3. Approval: Student Transfer Between Accelerated and Generalist Track Policy

Dr. Click presented the Student Transfer Between Accelerated and Generalist Track Policy for MSEC's review and approval. Dr. Click stated that with the implementation of the accelerated track, a policy is needed in case a student requests a transfer from one track to the other. Dr. Click asked Dr. Stoltz, who is the Tri-TRAILS Director, if she would like to comment on the policy. Dr. Stoltz stated this policy will outline the procedure for students to be able to move from one track to the other. Dr. Stoltz stated students can electively transfer back to the Generalist Track during the M2 or M3 portion of the curriculum. If a student wants to transfer back to the Generalist Track, they will send a written request to Dr. Stoltz at which time a meeting will be scheduled with the student. Dr. Stoltz stated that students who receive a course failure or board exam failure cannot continue in the Accelerated Track and will be referred to the Student Promotions Committee for discussion as to whether the student will be transferred back to the Generalist Track or dismissed from medical school. Dr. Fox noted that student transfers are not accepted into the Accelerated Program after the first year.

A motion was made to approve the Student Transfer Between Accelerated and Generalist Track Policy as presented and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Student Transfer Between Accelerated and Generalist Track Policy is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

4. Approval: Outcomes Subcommittee Report

Dr. Click stated when the Outcomes Subcommittee presented their report at the November 8, 2022 MSEC meeting, there were motions made to bring back additional information on two of the benchmarks.

The first motion pertained to the Personal and Professional Development 1 benchmark. There were 72% of students who reported they were satisfied, which was above the national average. MSEC made a motion to have Dr. Jean Daniels report to MSEC on the current changes in student support services and the feedback she has heard from students regarding the value of the CBSEs. Dr. Daniels presented this report at the December 13, 2022 MSEC meeting. Dr. Click stated a decision needs to be made regarding the benchmark and if there should be any further recommendations from MSEC. Dr. Click stated that the Outcomes Subcommittee believes that we should strive to be higher than the national average, and we do believe this is very important. However, the 90% benchmark was out of line with our other benchmarks of 85%. The Outcomes Subcommittee is proposing that the Personal and Professional Development 1 benchmark be changed to 85% to keep in line with our other benchmarks, which would keep it a little higher than what the national norm would be.

The second motion pertained to the Knowledge for Practice benchmarks. Dr. Click stated that we will not be using the NBME Subject Exams in the future and with these two benchmarks being based on the NBME Subject Exams, they will need to be replaced. Dr. Click noted we have other markers such as Step 1 performance but need an additional marker. Dr. Click stated there had been discussion about using the CBSE as a marker, and this was the motion from the November 8, 2022 MSEC meeting. Dr. Click stated

what is being proposed is 85% of students will score within or above one standard deviation on the final administration of the CBSE. Dr. Click gave an example of the national mean for the 2021-22 norm was 57.3 and the standard deviation was 12. The 2021-22 mean for Quillen students was 58.1 and the standard deviation was 10. Our average was above the national mean. If you look at the percent above the national mean, 51% of our students were at or above the national mean and 96% were within or above one standard deviation of the national mean. Discussion ensued and Dr. Olive felt it was a reasonable proposal to consider. Dr. Olive also stated there had been previous discussions in MSEC meetings regarding aspirational versus realistic benchmarks and stated he had this discussion with the Dean (Dr. Block) several weeks before and that the Dean supports the idea of realistic benchmarks related to LCME reporting.

Dr. Click noted that she has asked Kortni Dolinger to provide an Outcomes Subcommittee end-of-year summary report to MSEC that will specifically speak to how we are meeting our Institutional Educational Objectives as demonstrated by the Outcomes Subcommittee reports and by our benchmarks. Dr. Click stated this type of report has not been provided to MSEC previously.

A motion was made to approve that the Personal and Professional Development 1 benchmark be changed to 85% and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

A motion was made to approve that the CBSE replace the NBME Subject Exams marker for the Knowledge for Practice benchmarks and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Outcomes Subcommittee Measures Follow-up document is shared with MSEC Members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

5. Approval: Evaluation Changes for Student Evaluation of Pre-Clerkship Faculty

Dr. Karpa gave a slide presentation on changing the student evaluation of pre-clerkship faculty for the 2023-24 AY. Dr. Karpa stated that Dr. Fox asked her to look at whether or not we need to make any changes regarding the way we evaluate our curriculum. A committee was formed to begin looking at the evaluation process. Dr. Karpa stated they first began looking at how faculty are currently being evaluated by students. Dr. Karpa stated they have spent the last two months looking at data, best practices, and getting examples from other institutions. The committee developed a proposal that looks at having faculty evaluations completed on a weekly basis; however, the difference would be that about a quarter of the class would be asked to provide feedback on the faculty who taught that week. Students would be rotating each week meaning students would only have to evaluate faculty approximately every four weeks. Dr. Karpa noted that in looking at literature, it appeared that if as few as 10 students responded, the statistical data would be no different than if an entire class had responded.

TRAILS Proposal

- Weekly, on-going feedback
- Faculty that taught in course that week will be evaluated
- Only ~20 students evaluate each week, on a rotating basis
 - There would be a separate electronic means for others to provide feedback
- Data is provided in a timely manner so adjustments can be made

Benefit of Ongoing Faculty Evaluations Versus End of Course Faculty Evaluations

- Timely and actionable feedback
- Improved quality of the feedback
- Faculty should close the loop with learners, “You Said...I Did.”
 - Shared responsibility between students and faculty – empowers learners to provide thoughtful, constructive feedback
- Informative for faculty development purposes

- Better quality education

Faculty Evaluation Data – Leo can provide graphs and statistics

- Used by faculty for formative purposes
- Available to faculty member “in real time”
- Available to course director(s): “in real time” and for end-of-course review/debriefs
- Summative reporting

Framework for Questions

- “Less is more”
- Use declarative language
- Learner-centric language
- Data that is actionable

Proposed Questions

- My mastery of the session objectives was advanced, extended, or clarified by the faculty member’s in-class teaching. (Disagree to Agree Likert)
- The learning resources provided by the instructor (pre-work, readings, handouts, practice sets, etc.) increased/supported/advanced my mastery/learning of the session objectives (Disagree to Agree Likert)
- Four each one hour of scheduled class time, approximately how much time were you engaged in pre-work prior to this faculty member’s session(s) (1,2,3,4, ≥ 5 hours)
- The faculty member was respectful towards students (Disagree to Agree Likert)
- Overall, the instructor promoted a meaningful learning experience for me (Disagree to Agree Likert)
- What aspects of this faculty member’s instructional sessions helped or hindered your learning? (Free text; optional)

Dr. Karpa noted that they are also looking at the end-of-course evaluations with the idea that less is more.

MSEC discussed the proposal. Concerns raised in the discussion included:

- Culture of constant feedback
- Students expecting or demanding that change happen as quickly as they would like to see
- How a formative assessment might be viewed differently than what is at the end of course evaluations
 - Dr. Click noted there would need to be a lot of education around the fact that there are still end-of-course evaluations that are viewed as summative.
- Making sure there is faculty representation on these changes and in the discussions of these changes
- Few wording questions
- Four-point versus five-point scale

MSEC members felt there should be a representation of faculty on the committee looking at these changes and noted that discussions should be had with course directors and teaching faculty. It was also noted that this proposal will need to be review by the Faculty Advisory Committee. MSEC suggested the proposal be brought to the Department of Medical Education and possibly the Department of Biomedical Sciences.

Dr. Click noted that additional changes will be made and what is brought for MSEC review today is focused on the basic sciences and will not work for the Doctoring courses. This will be another piece of the process for consideration and will need to be discussed by MSEC members at another meeting in the near future.

MSEC members made no motion today regarding the change in student evaluation of pre-clerkship faculty and asked that Dr. Karpa obtain more input from other faculty and the Faculty Advisory Committee and bring back additional information for discussion at a meeting in the near future.

No voting action required.

The presented Change in Student Evaluation of Pre-Clerkship Faculty presentation slides are shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

6. Approval: Incorporation of Advanced Basic Science into the Clerkships 2024-25

Dr. Click presented a proposal to MSEC members of integrating basic sciences into the clerkships. Dr. Click reminded MSEC members that when they shortened the pre-clerkship phase, one of the motions was to integrate at least four weeks of advanced basic sciences into the clinical phase of the curriculum. Dr. Click stated there has been a group working on changes and how to accomplish this since the motion was made.

MSEC Charge

- Develop recommendations for a clerkship model that best fits our needs and meets the guiding principles of the TRAILS curriculum.
- Provide a framework for incorporation of 80-96 hours of basic science content during clerkship phase.
- Develop a timeline for implementation.
- Identify resources necessary for successful implementation of the clerkships.
- Identify faculty development needed to meet these recommendations.
- Provide recommendations to the Curriculum Transformation Steering Committee and MSEC.

Recommended Framework: 80-96 Hours of Basic Science

- BRIDGE to Clinical Clerkships: 20 hours
- Basic Medical Science Immersion week: 20 hours
- Two hours of basic science content every two weeks: 48 hrs
- Consistent academic half day across clerkships
 - Tuesday afternoon?
- Divide curricular content across 6- and 8-week clerkships
 - Allows for smaller groups
 - Will need to conduct sessions twice per year
- Case-based instruction
- Use Zoom to allow rural/underserved students to participate
- Participation in sessions becomes part of clerkship grade

Dr. Click commented that when the group tried looking at integrating the basic sciences monthly, it did not come out evenly across the clerkships.

Resources/Needs:

- Decisions to Make
 - Specific topics for curriculum, including placement
 - More details on pedagogy
 - Cases
 - Format of immersion week
- Resources Needed
 - Director to oversee (stipend)
 - Faculty to facilitate

- Clinical and basic science
- Technology resources?
 - Aquifer or OME or other

Dr. Click gave a summary of what the group is asking MSEC to approve:

- Clerkships will all have a consistent academic half-day
- 2 hours of basic science every other week (using case-based model)
- Basic science immersion week (20-24 hours)
- Director of experience
- Beginning AY 2024/2025

A motion was made to approve the framework and further development of the integration of basic sciences into the clinical phase of the curriculum and seconded. MSEC discussed and approved the motion.

The presented Integrating Basic Science into the Clerkships presentation slides are shared with MSEC members via Microsoft Teams document storage.

The MSEC meeting adjourned at 5:20 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**)