

STUDENT EDUCATION GROUP (SEG) MEETING AGENDA

January 8th, 2019

- 5:30 – 6:00 Guest: Technology Team, Jill Jamison and Laurie Gelles
- 6:00 – 6:15 Accreditation Process Student Survey
- 6:15 – 6:45 Committee and Course updates
- 6:45 – 7:00 Leadership Town Hall

TEAMS

- **Team 1:** Charlotte Hastings (charlotte.hastings@med.uvm.edu), Laura Director, Ethan Witt, Sienna Searles, Maggie Carey
Foundations: FoCS, PCR
Liaison roles: Library, Academic Supports, Communications

- **Team 2:** Chris Bernard, Daniel De Los Santos, Audrea Bose, Megan Boyer
Foundations: A&D, NMGI, DIV
Liaison roles: Elections, Position Statements

- **Team 3:** Liz Carson, Lawrence Leung, Hanna Mathers, Flora Liu, Kelly Chan
Foundations: Neural Science, Connections, PHP
Liaison roles: Teaching Academy, LIC

- **Team 4:** Marc Vecchio, Chad Serels, Sidney Hilker, Rachel Harrison
Foundations: CRR, Generations, Convergence
Liaison roles: Technology, Clinical Skills

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MCC COMMITTEE (Suven Cooper, Chad Serels, Kalle Fjeld)

FOUNDATIONS COMMITTEE (Andrew Gallagher and Margaret Johnson)

CLERKSHIP COMMITTEE (Brian Rosen and Katie Warther)

AAMC REP: (Brian Rosen)



Student Education Group

1/8/2019

Minutes

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

Members in attendance: Flora Liu, Sienna Searles, Audrea Bose, Megan Boyer, Maggie Carey, Kelly Chan, Rachel Harrison, Sidney Hilker, Chad Serels (skype), Dr. Jeffries, Daniel De Los Santos (skype)

Committee Members in attendance: Brian Rosen (Clerkship and AAMC)

Minutes by: Megan Boyer

Chairperson: None

Guests: Jacob Weiss '22 (Social Justice Coalition), Jill Jamison and Laurie Gelles (Technology Team)

Guest Technology Team:

- They recently sent out a survey to ask students about mobile device usage. Currently seeking student input on what tools we use and what would help support us better. They hope to work collaboratively with us to accomplish this goal.
- Jill says they try to take a student-centric approach when evaluating technology, as they want to make sure it works for us and that it is not duplicative of a tool we already have. It needs to be user friendly for the students.
- Kelly asked if it would be possible to get the blackboard app on phones. Jill says they're in the process of updating blackboard and are going to try to roll it out for NMGI potentially. It's hard for faculty when they make interface changes.
- Sidney brought up that Laurie is assembling a team of students to go to for feedback. It was suggested that an announcement be made in the WeeklyWire soon for both technologically and non-technologically intuitive people to get involved, and then after this feedback, can be shifted back towards the October-February timeline. An assessment of Osmosis is also in the works.
 - Jill says there's a lot of technology out there and they really just need to hear from students what's necessary so they know what to advocate for in the future.
- Jacob asked what Oasis offers specifically, as it's a little harder to operate, especially for evaluations.
 - Jill says there's a lot to consider for evaluations. Oasis came into medical education very quickly so a lot of people know it and don't want to change the technology they're used to already.

- Sidney suggested we have the evaluation team back again, as we gave them a lot of positive feedback last time. We should let them know about the issues we have discovered after using the system for more time.
 - Sienna asked about completion rates of evaluations in VIC calendar vs. Oasis
 - Jill said you used to not get grades until you submitted them. The coerciveness allowed for higher completion rates. They also used to be in VIC calendar and were shorter question sets.
 - Maggie asked how it is decided what questions are asked for evaluations.
 - All different teams of people depending on what course/setting it is
 - Megan brought up that there are evaluation emails and calendar reminders which we asked for, but they're not always in sync for what we need/when we need them.
 - Flora says we get a lot of alerts and emails, so it's hard to manage all of them.
 - Jill mentioned that people tend to communicate what they want you to know, not what you need to know. Therefore, students need to communicate where it is most appropriate for us and what we need.
- Brian said that Cortex is now available for us. He wants to know if students were going to be told that eventually.
 - Jill said it's available for Acting Internships, but she's not sure it's available to all medical students yet. Her goal is to get us on equal footing with all of our ward teams when it comes to the tools they use.
 - Brian mentioned everyone uses secure texting now instead of pagers, which leaves students out of the conversation.
- Audrea asked if there's a specific survey for technology that they give us.
 - They generally receive feedback on the surface pros from SEG and the technology team.
 - Jill wants to know what the appropriate technology is for active learning, as the surfaces were originally intended for lectures. The process of them giving us laptops stemmed from the fact we don't have a testing center for exams. Our surfaces have bigger hard drives, faster processors, and a 4 year warranty, so the pool of technology out there that they can pick from is quite small. When they get feedback that something isn't working, they look at what the marketplace has to offer.
- Flora brought up the issue that OneNote crashes sometimes.
 - Jill says we have to turn the surfaces off every once in a while, as the issue is usually the processor. SEG suggested a WeeklyWire announcement to remind our classmates of this.
- The technology team will have a conference in the beginning of June in San Diego. They'd like to do a student panel regarding how technology affects learning and experiences. They are looking for someone to go, and will cover all the travel expenses.

Accreditation Process Student Survey:

- Next review for Larner COM is in 2021
- There is a student led process in which SEG would design and administrate a survey within the next year to see what students really think about our medical school.
 - This will give administration time to design and implement changes that address issues before the visit.
 - We should start to assemble a group of people interested in spearheading this survey.
 - Sidney suggested we identify who's interested, both people from SEG and the Larner COM general population, so we can design a survey that has questions that reflect all 4 years.
 - Dean Jeffries mentioned that we can probably get surveys from other schools as well as our own from past years, but we are supposed to develop our own questions. We want to make sure we have

breadth of student feedback, and want to attract people who are willing to improve the process. We do not want only complaints, as this would give a jaded interpretation when we are supposed to reflect the student feelings as a whole.

- Sidney said it might be helpful to have students apply to be on it, and then we could review applications to make it balanced.
- Dean Jeffries mentioned that Allison is good at survey design and ethics so she would be a great resource for this process.
- A general timeline would be to assemble a team and make a survey as soon as possible, get it out by end of 2019 at the latest, get results by early 2020, give them to administration by mid-2020, and administration will turn in results by January 1st 2021.
- Dean Jeffries made the point that we need to decide what classes we want to have participate, as in whether or not we want current 4th years to participate. If so, the survey needs to be administered by the end of April.
- Megan suggested getting a call for interested survey makers out in the WeeklyWire soon, and aim to have a team together by the time M2s finish STEP.

Committee and Course Updates:

- Jacob talked about what SJC does within the social medicine realm.
 - Social medicine themes of the week are still continuing.
 - They worked with Dr. Raszka to develop a session on lead exposure. He is the only faculty member they have officially engaged with so far.
 - He has been talking with Sheridan, who is the other point person for social medicine, and they are unsure if they should reach out directly to course directors or go through SEG.
 - Sienna brought up that we have new course directors for Neuro and CRR
 - She suggested reaching out to them early.
 - Audrea said it would be best just to update SEG every month on their progress.
 - Sidney said go directly to the course directors in regards to development of curriculum, then when SJC is trying to make sure it stays in the curriculum they would talk to SEG.
 - They have been working with Dr. Eldakar-Hein to put together case studies on the Flint water crisis and opioid addiction.
 - They're also meeting with Dr. Carney to spice up public health curriculum, and she seems to be very receptive to brainstorming.
 - Overall, they're continuing to engage faculty and administration to informally integrate social medicine into the curriculum. There is conversation about a director of social medicine, but that's a long-term goal.
 - They're going to screen Dr. King's speech next week for MLK day.
 - SJC wants to interface more openly with the community at large.
 - Sidney made the point that social medicine evaluations could also be made in the future, and SJC would just have to ask the evaluation team.
 - Jacob wants to make sure they're supporting faculty with everything that is already on their plate, and that any changes SJC requests that they make are manageable.

Committee Updates:

- MCC:
 - None
- Foundations:
 - None
- Clerkship:
 - Brian updated us on the clerkship committee.
 - He expressed that it has been frustrating as of late, as there appears to be a toxic environment due to conflict between course directors and student opinion. He hopes that newly elected people will try to brainstorm how to bring a more positive environment to the table.

- Flora asked whether the frustration stems from the issues they were experiencing with evaluations.
 - Brian said it's a lot of things, and the LCME stuff doesn't help. There is also a push for active learning which course directors are skeptical of, and he thinks a lot of it has to do with Connecticut. There are no Connecticut clerkship directors on committee yet.
- Sidney asked what 2 or 3 things we could change would be, and what recommendations Brian had moving forward.
 - Brian said there should be a dialogue with many students and the clerkship committee regarding their role as educators. The committee gets very aggressive emails from some students, which leads to "millennial bashing", as they view students as entitled.
 - Sidney thought part of the issue may be that the clerkship directors are only hearing the negative stuff and have new students every 6 weeks, so they keep getting similar feedback over and over.
 - ~~Dr. Jeffries said~~ It is the practice of the clerkship directors to not-you can't change anything in a clerkship until the entire year is over so all clerkships are the same and no group has an advantage. Brian suggested changing this ~~policy practice~~ so as not to subject students to the same thing that we know is not working.
 - There are concerns that this would impact grading policies and may not be fair for cohorts.
 - We think the transition to new course directors will help with this process, as they may be more receptive to feedback.
 - There are rumors that Garth and Dr. Raszka want to drop EBM entirely.
 - Sidney said they need suggestions for how to do EBM more effectively.
 - Maggie said she could talk to the High Value Care office to make sure EBM continues throughout the curriculum. She'll update us on this.
- Chad wanted to know if there was an issue with attendance of students at clerkship meetings. Do the faculty members not want to talk about grades in front of you?
 - Brian shows up for the beginning of the meeting and then leaves at the end when they need to talk about grades.
 - Sienna suggested that if there is a problem with professional feedback, we should try to get Leigh Ann Holterman to come in and talk about what feedback should look like.
 - Brian said it's also a problem with the faculty as well, so it's something both parties can work on.
 - Flora suggested that there be some type of follow up to someone sending an unprofessional email.
 - Brian is happy to continue to brainstorm on how to make this communication better. It was brought up that Dr. Feldman could potentially do some feedback sessions, including a bridge week for the M2s.
- Flora thought it may be a good idea to have a person in charge of gathering feedback from each clerkship.
 - Chad brought up that we'll have multiple locations giving feedback which will all be different. There are 8 rotations in total so we could split them so each team handles 2 rotations. This might be a good role for 3rd and 4th year students.
 - Sidney will send an email to whole SEG list to ask to assign members to clerkship teams.
 - Chad wondered if evaluation feedback could be given at end of each clerkship or if you have to wait until end of year.
 - Dean Jeffries clarified that evaluations are held for 42 days so faculty can't see them before grades go in.
- AAMC:
 - None
- Active Learning Task Force
 - None

Leadership Town Hall:

- Liz Carson is interested in being the point person for this event.
- The meeting that was supposed to be in December got cancelled.
- The purpose is to try to get all of student council, SEG, and wellness (plus other leadership) together and have students come talk to people in an open forum.
- Flora asked if this was a space for leadership groups to talk or only for students to ask questions.
 - Might be a time for both

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.
- Assign team assignments for new SEG representatives
- Decide how to manage LIC in future when we might not have a SEG representative who is doing the program