



Student Education Group
2/6/2018
Minutes

Members unable to attend: Charlotte Hastings, Laura Director, Brian Till, Dr. Jeffries

Members in attendance: Marc Vecchio, Daniel De Los Santos, Ethan Witt, Hanna Mathers, Sidney Hilker, Liz Carson, Chris Bernard, Flora Liu, Sienna Searles, Chad Serels, Audrea Bose, Alex Miller, Lawrence Leung, Rachel Carlson (Skype)

Committee Members in attendance: Sherilyn DeStefano (Clerkship Committee), David Leon (Skype, Clerkship Committee), Eric Day (MCC), Astia Roper-Batker (Foundations Committee)

Minutes by: Audrea Bose

Chairperson: None

Guests: Dr. Paula Tracey, Foundations Director

Update on NBME Questions (Dr. Tracey):

- Regarding general thoughts on using NBME questions for assessment, Dr. Tracey discussed the following:
 - o She noted that using retired NBME questions in medical school curriculums has been monitored and has resulted in great stats. Dr. Tracey stated that she likes the idea of using questions selected from this test bank so students have exposure to NBME-style questions before it's time for STEP 1.
 - o NBME questions were utilized in the CRR course this year and faculty received feedback from 2nd year students after they took it. Dr. Tracey noted that students received a good idea of what they were able to retain and liked that they were able to have practice with questions like this. She also said it was helpful for student support students in allowing students to see if they were having difficulty and ask for help, if needed.
 - o Dr. Tracey added that she also liked that course directors would be able to pick out the questions they would rather use for their exam.
 - o David suggested just designating Step 1 study time to the Convergence course. Dr. Tracey noted that this was attempted in the past and it became that attendance was very low because students felt that they could be more productive studying on their own.
 - o Liz added the point that these assessments could put the focus more on cumulative conceptual learning, rather than on details and specifics.
 - o Ethan noted that the score report students receive doesn't tell you specifics on certain questions you missed and there is no review of the questions. He mentioned that this would only make sense for the final exams, since those aren't reviewed anyway.
- Cost and frequency of NBME testing was discussed:
 - o Dr. Tracey informed the group that every exam would be expensive, so she was thinking one cumulative exam at the end of each course would be beneficial.

- She added that it's required to purchase this yearly, so would need approval each time. Faculty and TA's would be responsible for vetting the questions each year.
- Challenges that could be anticipated were discussed:
 - Dr. Tracey mentioned that a challenge could be course directors figuring out the best way to integrate this into their courses. She noted that SEG could be very helpful to work with course directors on this. She would like to form a subgroup that can make suggestions on how this can be done.
 - Chad suggested having curriculum TA's that can start working on this project, so the first year students could have this sooner. The group discussed this and decided we could suggest this idea, but don't expect to see much interest at this point.

Update on Peer Feedback (Chad Serels and Ethan Witt):

- **Discussion of this will continue in Foundations meetings**
- Regarding anonymity from course directors on feedback, we discussed:
 - Utilizing written feedback with strengths and weaknesses. Instead of using a point system, we would want to use more of the written style used in FOCS.
 - We discussed if course directors should be able to see what each person wrote. During FOCS, the course directors read through the feedback from each student and required students who wrote unprofessional or unsubstantial comments to redo it. Following this, students did write more constructive feedback, so this may be a good tactic. Now, first years are giving good feedback on the first attempt.
 - We discussed that an important part of our medical education is to help us make constructive feedback better for the future.
 - SEG voted on this matter and a majority voted to continue allowing course directors to see and monitor student's feedback.
- Regarding dealing with unprofessional feedback, we discussed:
 - In the January Foundations meeting, Dr. Everse noted that some students would write feedback about another group member regarding what they could improve on, then contact that person, assuring them that what they wrote was untrue. After discussing this issue, Dr. Tracey pointed out that she thinks there is no solution to this problem, and these students would continue to do this.
- Regarding hearing about/role-modeling constructive feedback in clinical life, we discussed:
 - We discussed how we are unsure of where this aspect fits best in the curriculum.
 - As residencies do teambuilding exercises, we discussed possibly doing this with anatomy groups (i.e. ropes course). This could help connect feedback with something fun.
 - There is an existing way in PCR where students can share their evaluation about their anatomy group with their PCR group to get feedback on it. We discussed encouraging more of this and utilizing the PCR group's feedback more.
 - We discussed the need for more practice giving feedback face to face, not just anonymously written. We discussed possibly revamping this session of the PCR course.
- Regarding anonymity with peers/ incorporating face to face feedback with written feedback, we discussed:
 - Evolving into face to face feedback with groups by first doing written, then moving up to face to face.

- It was suggested to do more of a discussion instead of a one on one session of feedback to make it more comfortable.
- Ethan suggested that it may work better to utilize the subgroups of each anatomy group, since they work together more frequently.
- We discussed that students might need a tool in order to help them do this, since it can be difficult to initiate, especially when just starting medical school.
- We discussed that self reflection could be a good addition too, where students can address to their group how they will respond to the feedback they've been given. This could even be utilized after receiving your feedback anonymously, so students can address it in the open.
- To make this easier, the first time could be more about group dynamics, rather than personal strengths and weaknesses.
- It was noted that with face to face feedback comes trust and we should make sure we are allowing the chance to build trust before doing this.
- Regarding frequency of feedback, we discussed:
 - We agreed that sometimes the request for feedback is too often.
 - Instead of at a specific time, we discussed asking for feedback just 3 times in the semester whenever something comes up. This would allow students to write feedback in real time, versus trying to come up with feedback, possibly when students can't recall anything.
 - For TBL, we discussed asking for feedback once per semester, except this semester due to a late change. Because of this, group feedback will be once per course this semester.

Grade Release Process (Sienna Searles):

- Sienna discussed how exam grades (aside from two) haven't been released before their review sessions. She met with Dr. Tracey regarding this issue earlier in the week and was told that occasionally it was due to someone not being physically present to push the button and allow the release of grades. It was also discussed that:
 - In FOCS, faculty didn't want to release secure exam scores before histology and anatomy scores since those take so long to grade, in case someone didn't do well on secure. Faculty didn't want them to get anxiety about not having histology and anatomy scores that may balance out their grades.
 - Dr. Tracey did say we could release secure exam scores as soon as they are ready if we wanted, which we agreed that we did.
 - Dr. Tracey also assured this should get done much quicker for the rest of the secure exams.
 - Ethan is meeting with Dr. Everse and Dr. Black on Friday and will discuss this, gauging their flexibility on this.

Closing the Loop Project & Town Hall Update (Liz Carson and Sidney):

- Liz and Sidney presented their latest plans on the upcoming Town Hall:
 - The proposed date is during Match week on Monday, March 12th from 12-1pm.
 - The session would include lunch with a poster/post it feedback activity where participants post their favorite thing and one thing they would change about UVM education. Next, there would be a presentation on the future of LCOM, explaining the top 3 things SEG is working on (making feedback easy, moving material to active learning, and something about new clerkship options). Finally,

there would be a brief explanation on what happens with student feedback and any questions/concerns/topics for the future.

- SEG reps then discussed their thoughts on the proposal:
 - o Hanna mentioned that the date may not be the best due to a Bridge session/activity scheduled on the same day for 2nd year students.
 - o In order to make the Town Hall more organized, Audrea suggested possibly getting questions/concerns beforehand to ensure we cover popular topics and form good responses. Sidney mentioned that Student Council has a google document that compiles suggestions/concerns from all students which we could use. She noted that she would figure out who runs this and if we could use it for the curriculum topics.
 - o It was agreed that this information should be widely disseminated as soon as possible and to use the weekly wire as one outlet.
 - o The teaching academy, technology concerns, etc, could also be a part of this Town Hall since this is within the SEG realm as well.
 - o Hanna also mentioned possibly connecting with information shared at the recent accreditation meeting.

Committee Updates:

- Foundations: No updates.
- MCC: Chad informed us that at the latest meeting, it was agreed to attempt to form a schedule as if Connections was 3 weeks in length in order to see how it would be structured.
- Clerkship: Sherilynn discussed some challenges she has faced being the student representative on the clerkship committee. Those of which were difficulty being incorporated in meetings, finding that the role wasn't explained well, needing more guidance, and inability to be part of the conversation due to untimely receipt of the next meeting's agenda. In response to this feedback, Liz noted that this position is a voting position and should be incorporated more. Liz added that the communication doesn't seem to be effective and there needs to be more proactivity. In addition to this, the group discussed:
 - o Students aren't being invited as much to give student perspectives during the clerkship portion of the curriculum and we should work on encouraging more of a discussion between students and faculty.
 - o Astia suggested having one position for a 4th year medical student and another position for a 3rd year medical student on the clerkship committee.
 - o Chad added that a handbook for students on this committee would be helpful.
 - o Rachel noted the importance of onboarding in March when the new committee member is selected to prevent lag time in student presence at meetings.
 - o Rachel also suggested including Dr. Bertsch and the rest of the committee in selection of the student representatives so they are more invested in this, as well. In response to that, Sidney suggested requesting Dr. Bertsch's ideas on what the committee is looking for from a student representative, so students know what is expected from them, then allowing students to vote from whoever applies.
 - o Sherilynn also mentioned how she is not that familiar with the LIC and questioning if we should have someone more involved with that on the committee in the future. Liz noted that this would be helpful, but it would present a challenge due to the program being smaller.

Priorities for 2018:

- Getting committee reps to be more involved
- Setting up a Town Hall/Update Session during Match Week 2018
- All of SEG encouraged to think about any new projects we'd want to start

Continuing Agenda:

- Invite Kiersten Hallquist to a future meeting to discuss using Learning Commons more as a centralized site for students to see what's going on with their student leadership.
- Invited Dr. Moore to April meeting to discuss his new role as Active Learning Director and his involvement with SEG.
- Invite Dr. Bertsch (Clerkship/Bridge Curriculum Chair) to March meeting to discuss Clerkship Committee meetings, see how SEG could be more involved in clerkship curriculum, and discuss the committee's involvement in student member selection.