

## Scientific Foundations Committee

February 6, 2015

7:30 – 9:00 am

Mayo B-620

### Minutes

2014-2015 Scientific Foundations Committee Members		
MEMBER	COURSE/ROLE	ATTENDANCE
Steve Katz	Chair (INMD 6814 Physiology)	x
Sharon Allen	INMD 6803/6804/6805 ECM 1, ECM 2, ECM 3A	x
Richard Amado	INMD 6815 Human Behavior	
H. Brent Clark	INMD 6819 HHD – N & P	x
Eli Coleman	INMD 6816 Human Sexuality	x
Greg Filice	MS 2 ID Thread	
Glenn Giesler	INMD 6813 Neuroscience	
Bob Kempainen	INMD 6808 HHD – C & R	x
Anne Minenko	INMD 6809 HHD – R, D & O <sup>3</sup>	
Kaz Nelson	INMD 6819 HHD – N & P	x
Catherine Niewoehner	INMD 6810 HHD – R & E-R	x
James Nixon	INMD 6803/6805/6806/6807 ECM 1, ECM 3A/B/C	
Jan Norrander	INMD 6801 Human Structure and Function	x
Deborah Powell	INMD 6817 Principles of Pathology, MS2 Pathology Thread	
Michel Sanders	INMD 6802 Science of Medical Practice	x
David Satin	INMD 6803/6804/6805/6806/6807 ECM 1, ECM 2, ECM 3	
Lisa Schimmenti	INMD 6802 Science of Medical Practice	x
Peter Southern	INMD 6812 Microbiology	x
Heather Thompson Buom	INMD 6811 HHD – GI & Heme	x
Doug Wangenstein	INMD 6814 Physiology	
Tony Weinhaus	INMD 6801 Human Structure and Function	x
Kevin Wickman	INMD 6818 Principles of Pharmacology	x
Mary Ramey	MS2 Lab Med/Path Coordinator	x
Kevin Kay	MS2 Student Representative	x
Nicole Cairns	MS1 Student Representative	x
<i>Mark Rosenberg</i>	<i>Vice Dean for Medical Education</i>	
<i>Kathy Watson</i>	<i>Senior Associate Dean for UME</i>	
<i>Jeffrey Chipman</i>	<i>Assistant Dean for Scientific Foundations</i>	
<i>Majka Woods</i>	<i>Assistant Dean for ACE</i>	x
<i>Anne Pereira</i>	<i>Assistant Dean for Clinical Education</i>	
<i>Marshall Hertz</i>	<i>Faculty Advisor</i>	
<i>Brad Clarke</i>	<i>ACE Curriculum Specialist</i>	x
<i>Leslie Anderson</i>	<i>Chief of Staff, Medical Education</i>	
<i>Scott Slattery</i>	<i>Director of Learner Development</i>	x
<i>Heather Peterson</i>	<i>Medical School Registrar</i>	x
<i>Brian Woods</i>	<i>Lead Course Manager</i>	x

Guests: Mark Hilliard

The meeting was called to order at 7:35am.

## Minutes

Draft minutes from the January 9 meeting were approved as submitted.

## Updates/Announcements

### LMS (Learning Management System) Update: Years 1-4

BlackBag is expanding to become the LMS for years 3 & 4. This should be completed in 18 months, and include both campuses. Years 1-4 would then be completely searchable for curriculum. On the office back end, extensive tagging will be utilized to enable this searchability.

### MEDS (Medical Educator Development and Scholarship)

SFC members are urged to check out the MEDS website for faculty development opportunities. These include Brownbag Technology Sessions, Journal Club, webinars, and sessions on research that are offered at noon on Wednesdays, led by Dr Rosenberg. The Medical Educator research certificate will be coming back from the AAMC. The Med School will sponsor the certificate training on 3 upcoming Fridays in March, April & May. Participants will be responsible for paying for the certificate itself, approx. \$100.

Best Practices Day is coming in May. There will also be workshops on flipped classrooms. Access the website at <http://www.meded.umn.edu/meds> to see the full calendar of events.

## Student Issues/Concerns/Questions

### SFC support for MS2-run review sessions for MS1s

*See attached proposal for full details*

Nikki Cairns has been working with Scott Slattery on weekly reviews for MS1 students, using MS2 students as tutors. 80% of those students who responded to a survey indicated interest in hearing from MS2 students. These sessions would be supplemental, and review sessions not be argued for test points. She is asking for SFC support re: specific topics, as brought to the attention of the review liaison or course LEADs.

*Question: Is there enough MS2 support?* Yes. Scott Slattery has 9 MS2 tutors who have expressed interest. They may tag-team closer to the end of their 2<sup>nd</sup> semester as studying heats up around Board exams. This would also be good review preparation for these MS2 students. Heather interviews and looks for interest in education. This is not an add-on.

### *Committee Comments/Concerns*

- Reconsider Tuesday morning time-this is often a day for required small groups in MS2 courses.
- If new content is presented in the year, how will the tutor or liaison learn this material for tutoring if they themselves did not have it in the previous year?
- This is a good opportunity for MS2s to add to their CV. Dr Thompson Buom participates in residency interview and often looks for applicants' interest in education.

Overall the committee feels that this is a good idea. Course Directors often don't have time in the schedule for additional review sessions. However, they (Course Directors) may have to give more input when new topics are presented.

## Defining Professionalism for the UMN Med School

Tabled until a future meeting.

### **Annual Course Review**

Human Health & Disease – GI & Heme (HHD2)

*See attached ACR for detail.*

This was the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration with Dr Thompson Buom as Course Director. The course moved from Spring to Fall semester this year. General feedback was very positive in the Spring; there was more negative feedback this past Fall, though the content and set-up of the course remained essentially unchanged. A couple of potential reasons for this may be 1) the resequencing, with the course now 2<sup>nd</sup> in the Year 2 curriculum, rather than last, and 2) the make-up of the current year 2 class.

#### *Evidence of outcomes being achieved:*

Basic evaluation numbers are similar to HHD1. Overall course ratings were 4.0/5.0.

#### *Working well:*

- Successful small groups & large group lectures
- The Pharmacology thread is strong.

#### *Areas of concern:*

- Again, there are more requests for practice questions.
- The 3-point quizzes before lectures may be phased out. They may not be effective.
- The variable quality of the small group facilitators. A solution may be to have a session of standardized training and expectations. There was general good experience using fellows as facilitators...they are closer to the learning experience, as near-peers.
- Requests for more boards material! Why is this a concern in October?

#### *Planned changes for next year:*

- Include a formative midterm exam for a gauge of student understanding & learning.
- Convert ½ of the lectures to prerecorded format.
  - Enhance the quality of large group lectures; live lectures would be given by the most positive/strongest lecturers.
  - Videos lectures could be produced and edited for highest quality control
  - Online lectures could go more in-depth into topics: add graphics, embedded quizzes, etc.
  - The discipline leaders on board. They are determining which lecturers would be live and which recorded.
- Improve small groups
  - Smaller number of students per group
  - Better train facilitators
  - Give an orientation to the topic at start of the group session
  - Include a group quiz, since this is a group learning experience

#### *Comments:*

- Course evaluations include individual facilitator names. Though the groups are small, it is not possible to determine which student wrote comments, as the surveys are anonymous. Most data collected through the course evaluation on small group facilitators is qualitative; there are not many individual comments.

- Prerecorded lectures don't have the interactive face-to-face component of a classroom. Perhaps the lecturer could have set online "office hours" to answer questions about their recorded lecture?
- ECM1 radiology lectures are partly online, with 3 live sessions so that students can ask questions. All the material is tested.
- Perhaps lectures can be added from outside "experts in the field"?
- Mark Hilliard: WebEx (online video conferencing) is available to all faculty & staff through the U, and can be used for large numbers of video office hours. He can also work with Course Directors to find appropriate recording tools for lectures.
- 1<sup>st</sup> year students find more value in attending lecture. This seems to taper off in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year.
- The point is not to turn the University of Minnesota into an online medical school. Certain topics lend themselves better to pre-recorded video lecture.
- There would have to be careful planning of the placement of these video lectures to coordinate with small groups, labs, FCT, etc.
- Concerns were expressed about variable temperatures in the lecture halls; they are generally cold. Could this be a contributing factor to low attendance at lectures? It is hard for facilities management to regulate these large rooms.

Course Directors generally agree with moving to more online lecture presentation.

## Discussion

### ECM courses to become Pass/Not Pass only (P or N)

Dr Sharon Allen presented the case, on behalf of herself, James Nixon, and David Satin, to remove the Honors grade from ECM 1, ECM 2, and ECM 3.

A quick history:

- Honors was added when grades were standardized to P/N/H, and both the Twin Cities & Duluth campuses were aligned in regards to grading.
- The idea to remove Honors from ECM was first presented about 2 years ago to SFC, but not granted.
- ECM is mostly a competency-based/skill-based course. Students learn skills, not Honors.

ECM 1 & 2 are where the "doctoring" skills are taught. Students score high on their skills, there is not knowledge taught in the same way that it is taught in lecture courses. These are competency-based skills, taught in an experiential/patient-encounter learning environment.

*Comments:*

- Would this throw off students? Residency interviews?
- Should there be no-grade, as in FCT? No. There must be competency assessing at some level.
- Heather Peterson: If a course is not graded, students don't get credit for the course, and it's not counted toward graduation. This is a University policy.
- Could all of ECM (1-3) get one grade? It would have to involve careful reorganization of the courses, their sections, and their grading. (Example: The new VA program is a longitudinal over 10 months. The grade only comes at the end, but individual segments of the course will receive a "K" grade until the 10 months are over. There is regular student evaluation throughout the program.)
- Nikki Cairns: If an H grade is really wanted, could students earn that by completing extra credit, or additional maneuvers, etc.?

- How can an Honors level physical exam be achieved when students see patients for less than ½ week? This is a life-long learning skill.
- How would the lack of H for ECM 1-3 courses be reflected on a student's transcript?
  - There could be a 2<sup>nd</sup>, explanatory page along with the transcript, explaining how the Medical School courses are graded. Transcripts come from the University of Minnesota, through OneStop, so the medical school would have to work with the University's registrar to include a supplemental explanatory page.
  - Could the Dean's page/letter that accompanies a transcript explain the grading?
- Residency competition is very high. We need to show/explain/highlight/present our students in the best light, which includes clearly explaining the variation in grading for ECM 1-3 courses if the Honors grade is dropped.

SFC cannot make the decision to drop Honors from ECM 1-3. They must send a recommendation to the Education Steering Committee for consideration and approval.

**Resolution: The Scientific Foundations Committee recommends to the Education Steering Committee that grading in Essentials of Clinical Medicine be changed from P/N/H to P/N, with no Honors grade.**

- The motion was moved by Catherine Niewoehner and seconded by Michel Sanders.
- There was no further discussion on the resolution.
- The resolution passed by unanimous vote, with no abstentions.

Sharon Allen will write up the recommendation, and send it to Stephen Katz, who will deliver it to the Education Steering Committee.

5

Resources tab on BlackBag

Tabled until a future meeting.

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Suggestions from Course Directors for future SFC meeting topics:

- Student disability services and accommodations
- ExamSoft & BlackBag assessments
- ILT feedback
- Copyrights & resources (focused on what we *can* do)
- Course administrator co-directors (not the dyad)
- Future joint meeting of CEC and SFC on longitudinal integration of basic science and clinical medicine
- Perhaps have Jan Norrander present in her capacity as a Blackbag committee member
- More Blackbag search examples
- BlackBag Resource page and how to use it effectively
- SFC web site for action item storage
- Survey students about type of practice questions/formative
- Heat/AC variability in classrooms may be a reason for poor student attendance
- Human Behavior course as depicted in the Nov 2014 Annual State of the Curriculum Report (pgs 13, 22-27) may need improvement.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40am.

The next meeting is March 6, 2015 in room Mayo B-620.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brian Woods

Scientific Foundations Committee Mtg.  
02/06/15

**Proposal:** MS2 Led Review Sessions for MS1s – regular review sessions led by MS2 tutors have been requested by MS1 students. We are seeking input from SFC on this possible resource and its potential coordination.

**Background:**

Student interest [from MS1 survey (n=88 responders)]

- 80% are interested in attending MS2 lead review sessions
- 68% say they should last 1 hour
- Session foci preferences:
  - 82% Short review of the week's material
  - 72% Relationships between concepts
  - 69% Review of practice questions
  - 41% Review of student submitted questions
- Dates: Best times for sessions:
  - Saturday, Sunday, Tuesday morning, or Friday afternoons

**Procedure:**

Step 1: tutor identified for the week as well as student liaison;

Step 2: students submit questions

Step 3: tutor prepares responses, high yield overview of the week's topics (with extra emphasis on relationships between topics)

Step 4: remaining time used for discussion and processing a sample of practice questions (either from sets provided by course directors or Step 1 related question bank)

Step 5: course directors and/or tutors use the student liaison for any questions or concerns

## Annual Course Review: Academic Year 2013-2014

Course: Human Health and Disease—GI and Heme

Course Directors: Heather Thompson Buum; Anne Blaes, James Abraham, discipline directors

Course Manager: Serena Sherrell

Date of Course: Oct 13—Nov 21, 2014

Overall Evaluation of the Course:

Overall course value = 4.0/5

Success in integrating basic science/clinical = 4.0/5

Course objectives made clear = 4.0/5

Course Grading Rubric: See below

Number of Failures for academic year: Zero (0)

---

### What worked well:

--all students passed

--Many successful large group lectures and also small group facilitators

---Pharmacology worked well

### Areas of concern:

--Need to add a formative midterm vs more practice questions (lowest scores noted in “nongraded assessments” = 3.0/5 and “resources”= 3.1/5)

--Re-work the final exam

--Variable quality of small group facilitators

--Some lectures simply too long; need to limit slides

--Transfusion Medicine component

--Many, many student concerns about boards/teaching to the test; a few direct quotes:

“I just focused on boards material”

“Many topics that are board relevant were never covered”

“The integration with the material that we need to know for step 1 and the material taught in this class was extremely poor”

“I do NOT feel adequately prepared for Step 1”

“I suggest you scrap the whole curriculum, take a look at First Aid for the USMLE and Pathoma”

### Changes for next iteration:

--Midterm exam

--Improving quality of the large group lectures: half pre-recorded, half presented live in-person; align topics/objectives more closely with didactics and also with small group integration; limit total # of slides

--Improving the quality of the small group experience: smaller # of students per group; better training of the facilitators; 10 min video at the start for overview/orientation to topic; possible completion of a group quiz

**Human Health and Disease - GI & HEME  
INMD 6811  
FALL 2014-2015**

<b>Formative Assessments</b>	<b>Required (Y/N)</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>% of All Possible Points</b>
Lab Attendance	yes	2	9.00%
Lab Participation	yes	3	13%
Small Group Attendance	yes	2	10.00%
Small Group Quizzes	yes	3	14%
Formative Subtotal		125	46%
<b>Summative Assessments</b>			
<b>Summative Assessments</b>	<b>Required (Y/N)</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>% of All Possible Points</b>
Final Written Exam	yes	100	36%
Final Lab Exam	yes	50	18%
Summative Subtotal		150	54%
<b>Total Course Points</b>		275	275
<b>Requirements to pass Course (per Medical School policy)</b>			
70% of cumulative points available for entire course	192.5 of 275		
<b>and</b>			
70% of the cumulative points available on the final written and lab exam	105 of 150		
<b>Requirements to earn Honors</b>			
	<i>93% of total points earned (275)</i>		
	<i>Completion of post course evaluation</i>		
	<i>No unexcused absences from Lab or Small Group Sessions*</i>		

\*Excused absences fall into one of three categories: 1) sudden personal illness  
2) family emergency or significant event requiring your presence 3) religious holiday