



Student Education Group
10/2/2018-10/9/2018
Minutes

10/2/2018

Members unable to attend: Chris Bernard, Ethan Witt, Laura Director, Charlotte Hastings

Members in attendance: Dr. Jeffries, Sidney Hilker, Flora Liu, Sienna Searles, Audrea Bose, Liz Carson, Hanna Mathers, Chad Serels (Skype), Lawrence Leung, Marc Vecchio (Skype), Daniel De Los Santos (Skype)

Committee Members in attendance: Kalle Fjeld (Medical Curriculum Committee)

Minutes by: Audrea Bose

Chairperson: None

Guests: Dr. Katie Huggett (Teaching Academy), Leigh Ann Holterman (Teaching Academy), Samuel Epstein ('21, Social Justice Coalition), Nina Dawson ('21, Social Justice Coalition), Raghav Goyal ('21, Social Justice Coalition), Michael Rodriguez ('20), Lizzi Hahn ('22), Megan Boyer ('22), Malla Keefe ('22), Jacob Weiss ('22, Social Justice Coalition)

10/9/2018

Members unable to attend: Chris Bernard, Laura Director, Charlotte Hastings, Liz Carson, Lawrence Leung, Marc Vecchio

Members in attendance: Sidney Hilker, Flora Liu, Sienna Searles, Daniel De Los Santos, Hanna Mathers, Brian Rosen, Chad Serels (Skype), Ethan Witt, Audrea Bose

Committee Members in attendance: Kalle Fjeld (Medical Curriculum Committee)

Minutes by: Sidney Hilker

Chairperson: None

Guests: Megan Boyer ('22), Malla Keefe ('22)

Evaluation Discussion (Drs. Katie Huggett and Leigh Ann Holterman):

- Dr. Holterman started with stating that part of her job is receiving feedback and continuous evaluation of the course. She notes that she is trying to reduce the amount of surveys, since switching to Oasis for the primary survey system. These surveys are grouped by week and course/ TA evaluations, offering feedback opportunities for every single session. This gives students the option of what sessions to evaluate and only faculty they interacted with. Dr. Huggett noted that they are figuring out how to make this more manageable to reduce the burden on students with more surveys.
- Dr. Holterman added that focus groups will start soon with Dr. Lounsbury and Dr. Moore, which they are writing questions for, too.

- Dr. Holterman stated that they have discussed comment cards, online forms, or town halls for more feedback with the goal of being able to act upon things more quickly.
- Dr. Jeffries added that the learning environment surveys/feedback is very important too. He noted that Dr. Feldman is a good resource and person to go to for students to tell their concerns to.
- Sidney stated that SEG holds cookies and milk sessions and sends feedback internally to course directors, which we could send to Dr. Huggett, if she wanted. She said that she is more interested in data collection after courses have been reflected on with the emphasis on giving some amount of time to act on change, adding that she wants to avoid an extremely swinging pendulum of change. Dr. Huggett suggested bringing problems from cookies and milk sessions to the end of year course review, in order to fix this in the future.
- Dr. Holterman added that is interested in quality assurance to ensure students are still doing well and the sessions are well run from year to year.
- SEG discussed possibly utilizing the VIC calendar to remind students of the Oasis evaluations, since many people miss it or forget.
- Sienna asked if active learning team designer feedback goes through this team. Dr. Holterman assured us that they have been talking to them regularly on how to improve things and they stay updated.
- Liz asked if this team is looking at 4th year rotation/elective evaluations because she thinks some questions could be more encompassing of all rotations or reworded. She said that she will give feedback to Dr. Huggett, noting that things may not change until next year, but they can definitely utilize this feedback.
- Hanna asked if this team has thought of focus groups for the 3rd and 4th year rotations. Dr. Holterman ran a rotations focus group in the late Spring/early Summer, but not many people signed up, even though they could also call in. She concluded that students think it would be better to give feedback to SEG than people who are grading you. Hanna suggested building this into the bridge week format, when more people are around and people will expect it.

Social Justice Coalition FoCS Curriculum Update (Raghav Goyal, Samuel Epstein, Nina Dawson, and Jacob Weiss):

- SJC believed many aspects that could be incorporated in our curriculum weren't, so they set out to add more into FoCS.
- SJC has updated many PCR sessions including the spring semester of 1st year.
- They noted that they are trying to enhance the ties between social determinants of health and other things were learning, which will be supported by utilizing themes of the week that ties into the objectives in classes throughout the week.
- SJC's goal is to push for more faculty to know about this and utilize this.
- Jacob added that at the beginning of each week, first years will introduce the theme of the week and students can speak to why they think that theme is important each week. The SJC hopes that this will prompt students to think about these throughout the week and they can speak to the connections in PCR that week.
- Liz suggested getting a list of faculty each week, then sending them an email, months in advance, to prompt them to incorporate themes into their classes. She thinks that most people will be supportive, but she is unsure if they will be comfortable talking about it without any prompt.
- Sam noted that the SJC's initial thought was having course directors lead the charge of promoting the theme of the week, but agrees with SEG that we don't think they have this bandwidth or time. Dr. Jeffries added that as this runs year after year, more and more

faculty will be involved and willing to add things. Sam noted the SJC's concern for sustainability because they want this to continue and to evolve with time. Kalle stated that we should evaluate this every year, in order for it to be changeable and flexible.

- Sidney mentioned that the SJC can involve SEG more, suggesting sending us the themes to reinforce the message and ask the plan for integrating the theme of the week from course directors/faculty, since SEG teams talk to course directors regularly and before each course starts.
- Nina added that the SJC is working with Dr. Huggett to survey faculty to see if they were able to incorporate the themes (how well/how easily) to see how feasible it is for faculty.
- Sidney suggested structuring the SJC like SEG, where certain people are assigned to certain courses, which would allow easier communication between the two groups and allows for more longitudinal sustainability.

Meeting with IT

- Flora - met with Jill Jemison to discuss IT. Each exam has a linked session and objective and it's available in COMET! Only exists for FoCS right now. All topics can be searched in COMET for every time the topic came up in the curriculum
- Kalle - mapping tool exists for the first two years, but doesn't exist for the third and fourth year
- Would be great to have clerkship feedback on COMET
- Dean Jeffries - still would like a more rigorous system for the LCME Self-Study, there will be a more robust system in place for LCME review. Could get more student support to help this process happen
- Going forward, ask course directors at pre-course meetings about whether they are mapping tests to objectives and know that this tool exists
- Flora - fourth year students could also provide curricular support to work with the IT team to link objectives in COMET
- Flora - team is working on the exam review process to make it faster

Committee Updates:

- MCC: (Kalle Fjeld and Chad Serels)
 - o Kalle - Quality assurance reports for internal med clerkship, family med, and PCR, approval of student handbook changes. Dr. Moore asked Dr. Rosen how rigorous the TA position was, Dr. Moore would like this role to be equivalent in rigor to other courses.
 - o Brian - there are other TA and curricular positions that are less rigorous
 - o Chad - Dr. Rosen constantly challenged to make the ideal PCR sessions
- Foundations: (Andrew Gallagher)
 - o None
- Clerkship: (Brian Rosen)
 - o Meeting this morning, reviewed GQ data - will discuss data at next meeting
 - o Brian - Clerkship committee discussed decorum of students and the way feedback is given. Committee members seems to feel students can be impolite and unprofessional. SEG could discuss how to help students act more professionally - student leadership discourse
 - o Evaluations and emails seem to be the most targeted, particularly the feedback given in the written evaluations. Also some issues with in person communication
 - o Dean Jeffries - more senior clinicians have seen the trend and wanted the right to eliminate some evaluations since they will all go into the review for promotion for the preceptors. Even discussion of identifying students who write

unprofessional comments, but this will not be pursued as students are protected unless there is a threat of physical harm. Learning environment comments also were made separate from evaluations so that students have a more secure place to put their anonymous feedback.

- Ethan - has the class been informed of where feedback goes?
 - Flora - there are also unprofessional comments in the course evals
 - Hanna - has the class of 2021 been better after the emphasis from FoCS and PCR? Yes, seems to be better... maybe we need to emphasize the professionalism topics even more
 - Dean Jeffries - on GQ data, there is an uptick in the proportion of mistreatment reports that identify the perpetrator of mistreatment as a fellow student
 - Chad - how do other schools deal with professionalism?
 - Dean Jeffries - yes, aware of how other schools do it. We are at about 50th percentile in terms of reported mistreatment. Solution we tried to put into place is like at Mayo - put students in charge of the feedback and allow students to curate the comments and publish the compilation (as SEG does now).
 - Sienna - we should have less anonymous feedback, consider having non-anonymous feedback for TBL, anatomy, PCR
 - Dean Jeffries - need to have some feedback that is anonymous, so students are never inhibited from providing feedback (and LCME requires some)
 - Ethan - students should be reminded in intro to third week Bridge week, in PCR session - remind in the context of the stress that students will experience in practice
 - Brian - talked about duplicated You Said, We Did for Clerkships
 - Sienna - the You Said, We Did has been done, will share with Brian and Dr. Feldman
- AAMC:
- Brian - has two projects going. Trying to bring back executive board meetings - all leadership groups meet and talk about what is going on at school. Have half of a session for leadership to talk and then have time for students to talk so that there is more diverse feedback. This would be helpful for OSR reps to have a greater view on what is going on at the school.
 - Dean Jeffries - this was a challenge to get people to show up in the past
 - Twice per year? With a town hall, include the Dean and other leadership
 - Hanna - Stephanie Brooks scheduled lunches in the past to get an idea of what was going on
 - Could we get minutes from all the leadership groups? **start to ask Wellness and Student Council for their minutes to include in our agenda
 - Dean Jeffries - ask Student Council to spearhead this effort
 - Brian - OSR happy to help run, will reach out to other student leadership groups
- Active Learning Task Force:
- Sienna - for Clerkship, developing core clinical competencies build around 12 chief complaints, guest speaker gave an example of how this could be done. There is a free version of the curriculum on the SIU website
 - Dean Jeffries - had core clinical competencies in strategic planning the in the past, now implementing. Curriculum is around clinical reasoning, not content knowledge
 - Chad - seems ideal for the LIC, could test in the LIC curriculum

Course Updates:

- CRR
- FoCS
 - o Extra help hours have been well received
 - o Group TA sessions are helpful
 - o People are figuring out their groove with how to student
 - o Block 2 seemed to be particularly challenging, but seems to have improved
 - o A few lighter weeks in the calendar now are well received
 - o Less active learning discussion after the letter went out about a month ago and Dr. Moore responded
 - o Fewer folks are going to Ethics and Pathology, but ~60-75% of students seem to attend more classes
 - o Workshops have been better attended since the second exam
 - o People don't know what is mandatory, particularly confusion about CBL (no exclamation points)
 - o Kalle - language about attendance was not approved during MCC
 - o Dean Jeffries - the policy is clear, but not explicitly enforced. Handbook says that participation in class is expected if your presence contributes to the learning of others. In a workshop, students are expected to be there. However, Dean Jeffries won't be knocking at the door of students who do not attend.
 - o Hanna - are there situations when a student would lose credit for not attending?
 - o Dean Jeffries - peer assessment is required, TBL, clinical skills
 - o Small groups are required for first students, that is known because students get feedback
 - o Ethan - encourage people to go to feedback session or directly connect with SEG to give immediate feedback on particularly sessions or professors
 - o SEG could make a one pager on all the ways to give feedback - Flora and Kalle
- Clerkship
 - o Michael stated that there are many feedback avenues for the clerkship year, but many students are concerned that they aren't seeing changes. He also notes that students frequently compare experiences between sites (not just SHELF exams and student performance) with a concern that some students get better experiences at different sites than others. He questioned the standards for clerkships and if all sites are meeting them. Dr. Jeffries assured him that all clinical sites meet all standards, regardless of which clinical sites students like more.
 - o Michael notes that he is also planning to speak with Dr. Feldman and Dr. Jeffries at a later time.

Continuing Agenda:

- Start preparations for LCME Standards Student Survey to prepare for next accreditation meeting in 2021; would want survey to be done during 2019 calendar year.
- Will send out first year election information for a call for candidates with a due date of November 12th.