

Meeting Date: April 19, 2023
Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Zoom
Approval: May 17, 2023
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)	X	Crockett, Sarah (Clinical-Emergency Medicine)	0
Hanissian, Paul (Preclinical & Clinical- Obstetrics and Gynecology)	X	Hartford, Alan (Clinical-Medicine)	0	Hofley, Marc (Clinical – Pediatrics)	X	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	Guthiknoda, 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

Hernandez, Eli	X	Li, Kevin	X	Pfaff, Mairead	X	Plona, Kelsey	X
-----------------------	---	------------------	---	-----------------------	---	----------------------	---

Year 2

Fong, Justin	0	Gil Diaz, Macri	0	Maosulishvili, Tamar	X	Thomason, Helen	0
---------------------	---	------------------------	---	-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---

Year 3

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

Year 4

Banerji, Sarah	0	Cheema, Amal	0	Hanley, Meg	X	Morris, Linda	X
-----------------------	---	---------------------	---	--------------------	---	----------------------	---

MD/PhD

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

Non-Voting Members

Albright, Amanda (Instructional Designer)	X	Borges, Nicole (Chair, Dept. of Medical Education)	0	Chimienti, Sonia Senior Associate Dean for Medical Education	X	Dick III, John (Clinical - Associate Dean Clinical Curriculum)	X
Eastman, Terri (Preclinical - Director, Preclinical Curriculum)	0	Eidtson, Bill (Director, Learning Services)	0	Fountain, Jennifer (Assessment)	X	Holmes, Alison (Associate Dean, Student Affairs)	X
Jaeger, Mikki (Registrar)	X	Kerns, Stephanie (Associate Dean, Health Sciences & 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)	X	Pinto-Powell, Roshini (Associate Dean, Admissions)	X	Reid, Brian (Associate Director, Educational Technology)	0
Ricker, Alison (Clinical - Director, Clinical Curriculum)	X	Rose, Amy (Administrative Support, UME Affairs)	X	Cameron, Justine (Director, Accreditation & CQI)	0	Shaker, Susan (Preclinical- Manager)	X
McBride, Lisa (Associate Dean, Diversity, and Inclusion)	X	Weissburg, Paul (Associate Dean, Evaluation and Assessment)	X	Levy, Campbell Phase 3 Director	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)

Thomas Thesen							
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Call to Order

Meredith Sorensen, MD Chair – Medical Education Committee

Meredith Sorensen, called the meeting to order at 4:05pm.

Announcements

Meredith Sorensen, MD

1. May MEC meeting will hybrid, in person location TBD
2. A call will go out shortly for MEC faculty membership, there are a couple MEC faculty members that are terming out. The candidates will be brought to faculty council for approval. There is a 2-person limit per department.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Meredith Sorensen, MD

Approval of March 2023 meeting minutes.

Chris Thomson made a motion to approve the March 2023 MEC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Vin Pellegrini. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Student Issues & Feedback

- Students mentioned the ongoing work on the attendance policy.
- Student elections are going on and results for the AY 23-24 will be announced soon.

Consent Agenda

Nothing on the consent agenda for this meeting.

Subcommittee Updates

1. **SPE Revisions** – Dr. John Dick & Dr. Paul Weissburg
 - GAOC was charged with reviewing student performance evaluations (SPEs).
 - Focused on clerkship SPEs.
 - Shifting more towards criterion-based rather than normative-based.
 - There is more work to do with SPE revisions, but this is a step in the right direction.
 - Requesting more student input – please reach out to Dr. Weissburg if interested in working on SPE revisions.

New Business

1. Physiology LC Objectives – Dr. David Mullins

- Dr. Mason established the Physiology LC objectives based on criteria from the American Physiologic Society to align with the national objectives of that organization (see below).
- LCs all have MEC approved objectives that map to Geisel competencies.
- There was turnover in physiology leadership as these were going through, the physiology teaching defaulted to the individual courses.
- This is the first time we have had actual objectives for physiology.
- The LCC committee reviewed, provided feedback and voted to submit to the MEC for approval.
- Discussion focused on having an objective 8 and removing the assessment method. The assessment method was originally included by suggestion from the LCC.

Physiology Longitudinal Curriculum - Learning Objectives

Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth

Nena Mason Ph.D.

Revised: 4.6.2022

1. Distinguish between cellular functions that are common among all cells, and those that are distinct and specialized to accomplish specific goals for the human organism. MS.2
2. Describe how mass-balance and energy transfer is maintained at all levels of the human organism to regulate the constant acquisition, transformation, and expenditure of energy necessary to sustain life. MS.2
3. Compare and contrast physiological mechanisms used to transport substances and information across membranes, and between cells and organs. MS.2
4. Describe how homeostatic internal environments are maintained in the body via negative feedback mechanisms and the integration of functional sensor, control center, and effector activity. MS.2
5. Integrate knowledge of cellular, tissue, and anatomical structure with normal physiological function in human organ systems. MS.2
6. Apply knowledge of normal physiological pathways and mechanisms to predict the effects of pathological changes in the human body. MS.2, MS.3, MS.7
7. Describe the mechanisms that allow clinical interventions to correct or improve pathological deviations from normal physiologic function. MS.2, MS.5, MS.7
8. Communicate the physiologic basis of common diseases effectively and professionally with patients or peers ~~through practice in TBL sessions and small group activities.~~ CC.1 CC.12

Candice Black made a motion to accept the Physiology LC Objectives as presented with an edit to objective 8 to read - Communicate the physiologic basis of common diseases effectively and professionally with patients or peers. Seconded by Mary Chamberlain. The motion was passed by a unanimous vote.

2. Patients & Populations Course Review – Dr. Virginia Lyons

Recommendations:	Course Leader Action Plan
M1: Slides in the Data module need to be revised to meet guidelines for Accessible Course Design. Animations should be avoided as they don't translate well in the .pdf version of slides. Some lectures may be longer than needed to effectively convey the topic – explore opportunities for condensing sessions or recording lectures and delivering asynchronously	1. Slides in the Data module. Animations – employed when they contribute to learning objectives, and reliably 'played out' in PDF's posted after session – will be reviewed, as will Powerpoint format, which typically relies on installed themes, as per Accessible Course Design guidelines. Compressed 'lecture' presentations would then no longer serve as interactive sessions, which appear to be valued by a fraction of the class. A conundrum.
M1: Several MCQs have formats that Geisel doesn't recommending using (e.g., "All of the above" choice, Lead-in not in the form of a question, hidden True/False). The Assessment team can help you identify questions that need to be revised.	2. MCQ's on exams. P&P faculty work closely with the Assessment Team, which reviews and contributes to P&P assessments each cycle, a process we plan to continue.
M1: Consider ways to develop/revamp the Making a Difference module into a longitudinal QI experience that spans all three phase of the curriculum.	3. Develop / augment MaD to extend throughout the curriculum. The P&P teaching team has met with Capstone faculty over several years; both teams support this approach. Considerable institutional investment could help set the stage for such an undertaking to be explored, whereby student-initiated projects unfolded as longitudinal student-driven undertakings.
M1: At times the prework in the Systems module did not align with what was discussed in class; we suggest demonstrating relevance, for example by incorporating discussion of prework topics into class.	4. Systems prework / session content. In order to reduce reliance on out-of-class work, prework has been underplayed during sessions. This feedback is appreciated and improved integration of pre- and session work is underway.
M2: Instructions for the assignments were cited as being confusing for some students. We suggest soliciting the perspective of several students to help you identify things that need clarification. Some students felt the prework was excessive. Consider whether the goals of the session can be achieved with a smaller amount of prework.	5. P&P M2 pre-work instructions/amount. Iterative revision has been undertaken annually during Dr. Mackwood's tenure and will continue. Expected time investment will be specified. A substantive reduction in expected pre-work investment is expected to undermine learning value.

Discussion

- There was a question about the intention of prework – is there a way to categorize or qualify the pre-work? This year, there are categories on Canvas. One of the categories is labeled as pre-work which is work meant to be work done in preparation for the session. Another category on Canvas is additional/supplemental resources which includes extra materials that are not required for session.

- Timeline for changing exam questions seems too long, should be done for this upcoming academic year (23-24).
- Restructuring of MaD – make this more longitudinal and QI project.
 - Do we keep MaD in its form for 1 more year AY or do we eliminate while we work on making it a longitudinal project?
 - Need to be mindful of the objectives that the MaD project is linked to.
 - There was discussion about if it should be a Research project or QI project?
 - Explore what is in current MaD framework that we can use to design a longitudinal project
 - Is there an off ramp that could be built in if student is no longer interested in that project?
 - Capstone project may have been taken more seriously if introduced earlier and allows the opportunity for student to expand their team.
 - This should be explored through the LCC subcommittee with involvement from necessary stakeholders.

Chris Thomson made a motion to accept the action item 1, 2, 4 & 5 of the Patients & Populations Course Leader Action Plan with action item 3 to be considered by the LCC to create a proposal and action items 1 & 2 being completed for the upcoming academic year. Seconded by James Saunders. The motion was passed with 1 not in favor.

3. Academic & Promotion Policy Revisions – Dr. Sonia Chimienti

- Revisions include:
 - ISSP – replaced MSGP and CSGP.
 - The Academic Success & Accessibility team included a tiered support structure.
 - Added language to clarify that none of this is on the MSPE.
 - Take out voting for PGAGG & CGAGG.
 - Communication to APC is from PGAGG Chair & CGAGG Chair to the APC Chair.
 - There was clarification added around roles for meeting preparation, structure and follow up.
 - Associate Dean for Admissions was added to the additional members for PGAGG and CGAGG
 - Faculty Voting Members – final approval of APC slate will be approved by the Associate Dean’s Group which is chaired by SADME, this would align with how the PSCB panel is approved.
 - Faculty members may be Phase 3 elective, sub-internship directors, PBL facilitators, coaching or on-doctoring faculty but must recuse themselves if there is a conflict of interest.
 - Recommendation for a Vice Chair for APC to ensure timely APC processes in the event that the Chair is not available.
- Discussion
 - Clarification on Tiered support structure
 - Need for clarification for the different tiers.
 - There might be some intentionality around the ambiguity in the language.
 - Dr. Chimienti will reach out to Academic Success & Accessibility team for clarification on the tiers.
 - Debate on Faculty Council’s role in approving APC slate
 - If students approve the slate, should faculty have a role in approving slate?
 - The Faculty Council may not have much knowledge about Academic & Promotion Policy and perhaps should not vote if the council is not deeply involved/aware in the whole process.
 - There were concerns with the timing of Faculty Council’s approval of the initial APC slate.
 - A smaller group could convene to further discuss faculty council’s role
- Next steps:
 - Tiered support structure will go back to the team to clarify some of the wording
 - Dr. Chimienti will make modifications to policy and a revised version will be sent to the MEC prior to the May meeting.
 - The MEC will vote on the policy revisions during the May meeting.

4. Grade Appeal Policy Revisions – Dr. Paul Weissburg

- The revisions have been approved by the GAOC
- The Current System
 - Level 0: An informal conversation with the course leader or clerkship/elective director to ask questions about a grade.

- Level 1: Student submits a formal appeal to course leader of clerkship/elective director
- Level 2: Student appeals to the next level, which is the associate curricular dean (Dr. Virginia Lyons for phase 1, Dr. John Dick for phases 2 and 3)
- Level 3: Student appeals to the SADME, who convenes a panel of 3 GAOC members to review the request, interview people, etc. That group makes a final determination
- Challenges of the current system
 - Level 2 – This system places the curricular associate dean in a difficult situation. They know the people involved and they are being asked to make these decisions unilaterally.
 - Level 3 – Having different people (the panel of 3 GAOC members) decide each case limits consistency in how appeals are decided and the development of consistent criteria for making those decisions.
 - Confusion between Level 0 and Level 1
- Proposal – New System
 - Level 0: This informal conversation still occurs but it's not referred to as "Level 0." It's just a conversation. The formal appeal process begins with Level 1.
 - Level 1: Student submits a formal appeal to course leader of clerkship/elective director – **No changes**
 - Level 2: Student appeals to the next level, which is the **Grade Appeals Response Team (GART)**, a small group that handles all Level 2 grade appeals. By having the same group handle each appeal, we would ensure consistency in the handling of those appeals. Also, the members of GART are far less likely to know the student making the appeal or the person whose grade is being appealed, which reduces the likelihood of unintentional bias. Finally, it would no longer be one person's decision; there would be opportunity for differing perspectives.
 - Level 3: Student appeals to a **Final Appeals Committee**, whose role is to determine if processes and policies were correctly followed. If so, the decision is upheld. If not, appropriate next steps are decided.
- Suggestions for the composition for the groups
 - The members of GART
 - ADAQA
 - Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
 - Director, Evaluation and Assessment
 - At least 2 faculty (out of 6 faculty members)
 - Curricular Associate Deans (non-voting role)
 - The members of the Final Appeals Committee
 - The SADME
 - The Chair of the APC
 - Registrar
- Discussion
 - This is a model that other schools use and the proposal helps to remove any bias from just 1 person reviewing a level 2 appeal.
 - Create a back-up plan for any conflicts of interest/specifically outlining in policy

- Email Dr. Weissburg with any suggestions you have on how to get 6 faculty for GART.
- Next step – vote on Appeals policy during the May meeting so it is in place before Block 1 grades are due for the first set of clerkships

Ongoing Business

- Pathways working group
- Policy working group
- MEC Bylaws/Charge working group

Future Meetings

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

- May 17th hybrid, in person location Borwell 383
- June 21st