

Meeting Date: September 21st 2022
Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Zoom
Approval: October 26th 2022
Recorded By: Amy Rose

Attendance

Present = X, Absent = 0

Faculty Voting Members

Chamberlin, Mary (Clinical - Medicine)	X	Boardman, Maureen (Preclinical & Clinical- Family Medicine, Community Preceptor Rep)	X	Pellegrini, Vin (Department of Orthopaedics)	0	Crockett, Sarah (Clinical-Emergency Medicine)	0
Hanissian, Paul (Preclinical & Clinical- Obstetrics and Gynecology)	X	Hartford, Alan (Clinical-Medicine)	0	Hofley, Marc (Clinical – Pediatrics)	0	Homeier, Barbara (Preclinical- Pediatrics)	X
Matthew, Leah (Clinical-Family Medicine)	X	Myers, Larry (Preclinical- Medical Education)	X	Black, Candice (Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine)	X	Guthknoda, Kiran (Department of Anesthesiology)	X
Saunders, James (Clinical-Surgery)	X	Sorensen, Meredith, Chair (Clinical-Surgery)	X	Thompson, Rebecca (Clinical – Neurology)	X		

Student Voting Members Year 1

TBD		TBD		TBD		TBD	
-----	--	-----	--	-----	--	-----	--

Year 2

Fong, Justin	X	Gil Diaz, Macri		Maosulishvili, Tamar	X	Thomason, Helen	X
---------------------	---	------------------------	--	-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---

Year 3

Carhart, Briggs	X	Fitzsimmons, Emma	X	Thomson, Chris	X	Xu, Jane	0
------------------------	---	--------------------------	---	-----------------------	---	-----------------	---

Year 4

Banerji, Sarah		Cheema, Amal		Hanley, Meg		Morris, Linda	X
-----------------------	--	---------------------	--	--------------------	--	----------------------	---

MD/PhD

Emiliani, Francisco	0	Zipkin, Ronnie	X	Keim, Abigail	X	Reiner, Timothy	X
----------------------------	---	-----------------------	---	----------------------	---	------------------------	---

Non-Voting Members

Albright, Amanda (Instructional Designer)	X	Borges, Nicole (Chair, Dept. of Medical Education)	X	Chimienti, Sonia Senior Associate Dean for Medical Education	X	Dick III, John (Clinical - Associate Dean Clinical Curriculum)	0
Eastman, Terri (Preclinical - Director, Preclinical Curriculum)	X	Eidtson, Bill (Director, Learning Services)	0	Fountain, Jennifer (Assessment)	X	Holmes, Alison (Associate Dean, Student Affairs)	X

Jaeger, Mikki (Registrar)	0	Kerns, Stephanie (Director, Biomedical Libraries)	X	Lyons, Virginia (Preclinical - Associate Dean Preclinical Curriculum)	X	McAllister, Steve (Director, Educational Technology)	0
Barbour, Nancy (Director, Assessment & Evaluation)	X	Mullins, David (Associate Dean, Biomedical Science Integration Chair, Geisel Academy of Master Educators)	0	Pinto-Powell, Roshini (Associate Dean, Admissions)	X	Reid, Brian (Associate Director, Educational Technology)	X
Ricker, Alison (Clinical - Director, Clinical Curriculum)	X	Rose, Amy (Program Manager, UME Affairs)	X	Cameron, Justine (Director, Accreditation & CQI)	0	Shaker, Susan (Preclinical- Manager)	X
McBride, Lisa (Associate Dean, Diversity, and Inclusion)	0	Weissburg, Paul (Associate Dean, Evaluation and Assessment)	X				

**Student Non-Voting Members
Diversity and Inclusion & Community Engagement (DICE)**

Tersio, Isabelle	0						
-------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Vice Chairs for Academics – Student Government

Thomson, Chris	X	Morris, Linda	X				
-----------------------	---	----------------------	---	--	--	--	--

Former MEC Student Members – Student Government

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Guest(s)

Tim Fisher	Mairead Pfaff	Kelsey Plona	
Nathania Hartojo	Simran Sehgal		

Call to Order

Meredith Sorensen, MD Chair – Medical Education Committee

Meredith Sorensen, called the meeting to order at 4:35 pm.

Announcements

Meredith Sorensen, MD

1. Welcome Paul Weissburg, Associate Dean for Assessment, Quality and Accreditation
2. M1 elections are underway, interested MEC rep candidates were invited to join this meeting.
3. A Qualtrics will be sent out to determine MEC meeting dates for the month of October and December. The proposed date changes are Oct. 19th → Oct. 26th and Dec. 21st → Dec. 14th.
4. Call for MEC workgroups will go out.
 - o Workgroups – Policy group, Bylaws/Charge group, Pathways process group.
 - o Every voting member expected to participate in a workgroup.
 - o Timeline of work – next academic year, report work back to MEC in spring 2023.

5. Clinical Split Policy Update – Policy was revised to adjust credit requirements due to new curriculum implementation.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Meredith Sorensen, MD

Approval of August 2022 meeting minutes.

Chris Thomson made a motion to approve the August 2022 MEC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Barbara Homeier. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Student Issues & Feedback

No student issues were brought to the meeting.

Consent Agenda

Nothing on the consent agenda for this meeting.

Old Business

1. **MEC Subcommittee Charges** – Dr. Meredith Sorensen
 - There were 21 faculty applicants for Phase 1, 2, 3 and LC Subcommittees.
 - We are working on filling in the committees based on the predefined roles that were previously voted on (MEC subcommittee membership)
 - Be on the look out for an electronic ballot for Phase 2 and LC subcommittees voting faculty members
 - We will also send out the charges for Phase 1,2,3 and LC for comments. We are looking for big picture feedback – overarching tasks that might not belong or should be added to the subcommittee charge along with ex officio membership lists.

New Business

1. **On-Doctoring Course Review (M1 & M2)** – Dr. Virginia Lyons, Dr. Rosh Pinto-Powell, Dr. Leah Matthew

MEC Recommendations	Course Leader Action Plan
Several course objectives are not linked to assessments. We recommend that the course leaders review the objectives and their mapping to potentially identify links that are currently overlooked and/or identify course objectives that may be more appropriate as a session objective.	We will review all the course objectives to ensure that they are linked to an assessment and map appropriately. Course objectives that do not link will be either deleted or switched to session objectives if appropriate.
Course leaders in organ-system courses are unaware of what has been covered/not covered in On Doctoring at the time of their course, and this has led to misconceptions about what the students know and don't know. We suggest sharing information with each course leader about what has been taught in their subject area with regard to physical exam or other relevant topics.	Starting AY 21-22, the On Doc course has met each quarter with the preclinical staff and the course directors for that block to coordinate and integrate the timing of our advanced physical exam sessions as well as the clinical reasoning cases with the rest of the curriculum for that block. In this way course directors should be aware of what is covered in the On Doctoring. We will also ensure that all course and curricular leaders are invited to the On Doc course Canvas pages so that they can view the entire curriculum, course materials, resources and grading policies. This invitation will be emailed out immediately.
Students value the Pol sessions, but feel that the primary benefit is hearing from the patients. Additionally the debrief often felt rushed and students didn't have time to process their emotions. We suggest asking the Pol facilitator to carefully consider the student feedback (e.g., either eliminate the poem or spend less time discussing, less time moderating and more time hearing from patients) and modify his approach.	We have received this feedback regarding Pol directly from students and have discussed the feedback with the large group Pol facilitator. We believe that we are currently framing the Pol sessions more clearly and are being mindful of allowing more direct interaction with the panelists and the students and more space to process the information. As course directors we will continue to monitor the feedback received in real time from the Year 1 small group representatives during the mid and end of year feedback sessions and continue to adjust the sessions accordingly. The Pol sessions and panelists are a crucial component of the On Doctoring course and help the development and maintenance of empathy and compassion in the medical profession. As such we want to make sure that the sessions are well received by students.

<p>Although the clinical reasoning cases were praised in year 1, in year 2 students felt that they had learned these skills both in M1 On Doc and in PBL and time might be better spent with other activities such as more practice with oral presentations or physical exam skills - especially if the PE practice could be linked to a patient case to simulate what they will experience in Phase 2. Students also mentioned wanting opportunities to go back to sim clinic. We recommend re-evaluating activities in the year 2 course and considering what students need at this stage in their training.</p>	<p>We heard the feedback regarding clinical reasoning in Year 2 and have adjusted the curriculum accordingly. Currently we only have 2 clinical reasoning cases in Year 2 On Doc - again paired with the courses in the block and emphasizing different material than the cases in PBL. Clinical reasoning in On Doc simulates reasoning in the clinical setting and the objectives are different from PBL. We like the suggestion of incorporating PE skills practice within the case and will pilot this strategy with the second case this academic year and monitor the feedback. As mentioned in other areas, this year On Doc has endeavored to augment PE skills practice by the creation of the Clinical Skills Coaching Program. We hope to grow/maintain our students thinking and reasoning skills as well as their physical exam skills!</p>
<p>The lack of available preceptors continues to be a challenge for the On Doctoring team, causing some students to have to drive an hour for their visits while others are assigned to specialists (e.g., ED physicians) that may not provide an optimal experience. Although we know the On Doc team has worked on this issue, we encourage them to continue to look for creative solutions. For example, could local providers be surveyed to learn what incentives would convince them to host a student (e.g., higher stipend, other perk)?</p>	<p>Recruiting clinical preceptors to teach preclinical students is the bane of On Doctoring course directors at medical schools across the country! The increasing clinical pressures and decreasing clinical faculty as a result of the pandemic will only make this issue worse. There are simply not enough primary care providers in our system currently to see patients - let alone teach. Many schools across the country have given up longitudinal preceptorships as a result. At Geisel, we feel so strongly about the importance of "real life" skill building that we are trying to hold on to the goal of matching preclinical students with clinical preceptors. We have informally surveyed our DH facilitators and preceptors as more local facilitators would obviate the need for students to travel- what they want is FTE hours carved out for the teaching they do rather than more dollars. Additionally, educational RVUs should count toward pay incentives and bonuses - currently they do not. We will continue to look creatively at this, but welcome ideas and suggestions.</p>

Discussion

- Revisit course hours with MEC – causing weekly hours to creep up and making it hard to keep some afternoons open for on-doctoring preceptors
- In the past, preceptors and students were matched based on students' interests. Now preceptors are matched with students randomly, due to a shortage of preceptors and the variety of travel time to preceptor sites. The on-doctoring course leaders are working to customize as well as being fair. Essentially, working on creating a lottery system, by opting in, if you would like a rural site or slightly distant site for a particular experience.
- Course leaders are open to suggestions on enticing clinics/faculty to become preceptors.

James Saunders made a motion to accept the On-Doctoring Course Leader Action Plan as presented, Seconded by Maureen Boardman. The motion was passed with 1 abstaining.

2. Reproductive Medicine Course Review – Dr. Virginia Lyons, Dr. Paul Hanissian, Dr. Tim Fisher

MEC Recommendation	Course Leader Action Plan
<p>Several course objectives have a small number of sessions that map to them (e.g., #17), while others may be more appropriate as session objectives if they only correlate with a few sessions (e.g., #6). We recommend that the course leaders review the objectives now that the course has occurred for several years to potentially capture mapping with session objectives that might be overlooked and assess whether all objectives are appropriate as course objectives.</p>	<p>As course directors, we have reviewed our course objectives to ensure ongoing relevance. We intend to systematically review each course session to ensure accurate mapping to course objectives.</p>
<p>Some students were confused about expectations in the course regarding prework (required or recommended?) and what would be assessed on exams. We suggest improving communication around these issues. Regarding Canvas, anything that is required, testable material should be posted under "prework" or "session materials", while optional/non testable material should be posted under the "additional resources" section.</p>	<p>Course directors will take these recommendations and implement them for next year. We would appreciate further clarity on unified definitions of "prework" and "session materials" across all courses.</p>
<p>While students appreciated the alignment of ScholarRx with many sessions in the course, other sessions didn't align well. We suggest that bricks should only be assigned for a session if the content of the brick relates to what will be discussed in the session. The session on lactation was particularly called out as one that didn't align well.</p>	<p>Course directors will work with faculty to further align their sessions with bricks, or provide bricks as "additional resources" in cases where a pre-existing brick does not align with the intended session content.</p>
<p>Sessions on topics such as reproductive justice and abortion were not classified as required per MEC policy regarding the format of the session, however some students felt this sent the wrong message. We suggest raising this issue during the MEC meeting for discussion.</p>	<p>To be clear, the abortion and reproductive sessions are not optional. As with most of the content in our course, they are also not required. We provided optional enhancement activities for each topic: a panel discussion on abortion and discussions on reproductive justice topics where were optional, the latter in response to feedback from last year. These sessions were optional in part to remain within allotted course hours. We are challenged by the notion to elevate the importance of these topics above the remainder of the course content. We invite further discussion.</p>

Discussion

- There was discussion about the abortion/reproductive justice session. There was some confusion over if the session was optional or not. It was decided that it would be left to the course leaders' discretion, meaning the course leader can make it required because it is not recorded.

Chris Thomson made a motion to accept the Reproductive Course Leader Action Plan as presented, Seconded by Linda Morris. The motion was passed with 1 abstaining.

3. Phase 2 Protocol Review – Dr. Meredith Sorensen

- Reviewed the higher order recommendations from the Phase 1 review
 - A group (possibility members of the original curriculum modification subcommittee) be created to draft a Phase specific mission statement' that declares (1) its clear purpose, (2) why it even exists, (3) its overall goal(s), and (4) how it is meant to serve the students' successful advancement into the next Phase or opportunity.
 - A tracking mechanism be created and monitored for all reviews so the MEC can better gauge the outcomes of recommendations made.
- Phase 2 Protocol
 - Define overarching goals and outcomes of Phase 2.
 - Subcommittee reviews which medical program objectives (MPOs) belong in Phase 2.
 - Use Curriculum Inventory to conduct a gap analysis.
 - Evaluation and Assessment team works with subcommittee to pair outcomes (NBME shelf exams, AAMC GQ data, SPEs, etc) to MPOs to demonstrate if the curriculum is helping students to achieve proficiency with selected MPOs
- Phase 2 Review Timeline
 - Sept/Oct – Ad hoc Phase 2 subcommittee, chaired by Dr. John Dick works with the Evaluation and Assessment Team to perform work detailed in the Phase 2 protocol (bullet above).
 - October – Phase 2 review presented to MEC.
 - November – MEC votes on Phase 2 review.

Ongoing Business

- Phase 2 Review

Future Meetings

MEC meetings are the 3rd Wednesday of each month from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

- October 26th 2022
- November 16th 2022
- December 14th 2022