



Student Education Group
4/5/16
Minutes

Members unable to attend: Rachel Carlson, Sarah Johnson, Reiko Sakai

Members in attendance: Karl Kristiansen, Nicholas Field (skype), Dylan Hershkowitz, Caleb Seufert (skype), Brian Till, Will Manning, Alex Miller (skype), Liz Carson, Charlotte Hastings (skype), Lawrence Leung, Chris Bernard, Marc Vecchio, Laura Director, Dean Jeffries

Minutes by: Chris Bernard

Chairperson: Brian Till

Guests: Jimmy Levins (Foundation Committee), Tara Higgins (Clerkship Committee)

Guest (Dr.Eileen CichoskiKelly)

- Dr. Cichoskikelly started by introducing herself and describing a little about her role at COM. She works a great deal with students in the fourth year, particularly with regards to scholarly projects and serving as TA's. She works with the TA's to provide a systematic approach to class material, and to help develop their skills as educators. More broadly, she helps set up tutoring and prepare students for step 1.
- She also discussed a grant she recently received from the AAMC. The grant is geared towards helping to train instructors. The grant is funded through AAMC. It is funded to study medical education over the next two years. There are multiple schools involved in this study.
- Marc proposed how there would be buy-in to other professor strategies.
- Liz proposed how the student body can provide feedback to instructors as well as how this plays into the teaching academy.
- Liz mentioned that she wished at times there was better feedback provided by students that can be more relevant to instructors.
- It was mentioned to ask for one thing that is done well and one thing that needs to be worked on and give examples of each. The example piece is the most important aspect.
- It was mentioned that at times some students may feel like there is bad teaching without knowing what the goal of that teaching was.
- There are some 4th year students that combine a scholarly project and teaching month where they work on the curriculum and try to improve a specific aspect of that. The student should work in concert with the faculty of that area. Sometimes a TBL session may be designed.

Building Renovations:

- Thanks to a significant donation from Dr. Lerner, COM will be remodeling the Dana Medical Library into a Learning Commons. Dr. Jeffries wants to include the students' voice in terms of the design of the library, and hopes SEG will appoint a group to work on this. It would be best to have

students of different years involved in providing feedback. Dean Jeffries stressed that the architect is coming next week and that this is time sensitive.

- Brian suggested putting the “library team” in charge of this feedback. He also plans to include first year student council members who have shown significant interest in the issue.
- There are also considerable renovations planned for this summer to the third floor med ed rooms. 300 and 301 as well as the hallway will be combined to provide a max capacity of 120, with a more comfortable fitting of 103. The podium will be placed in a different direction with two screens being placed on either wall. The tables and chairs will be like those in Lerner, being able to be disassembled and reassembled in various configurations as needed.
- Additionally, wall between 302 and 303 will be removed and replaced by a sliding wall with whiteboard capabilities. If the partition is put away there is space for an active learning session for 48 students.

Foundations Committee:

- Convergence is up for review next week.
- Brian suggested SEG consider electing two representatives from the 4th year class rather than a single representative to Foundations and Clerkship for the coming year. This would provide a larger student perspective and a more well-rounded student body voice, and also allow for fewer meetings without student representation during the year due to interviews and away rotations.
- It was mentioned that if there were too many representatives were elected then there could be too many students at a foundations meeting.
- Students should be at the meeting to represent the voice from the SEG group or issues that have been raised by the class.
- There should be a dialogue where concerns can be discussed in both SEG and at a foundations committee meeting.
- It was mentioned to have better continuity of students for the meetings.

Retreat Recap:

- SEG discussed four proposals emerging from the retreat and voted on amendments and adoption of each.

SEG Feedback System:

- This proposal aims to create a more active dialogue of qualitative feedback from students during a course. This is done both via email to the course rep and, potentially, via a new anonymous channel.
- Liz argued that encouraging anonymous feedback may not be the best method as it could limit dialogue.
- Karl noted that the reason for the proposed anonymous feedback system – which was suggested by a Foundations course director - was due to the fact that a first year student may not feel comfortable e-mailing a second year that is the course representative.
- There was an 8 to 4 vote in favor of not having an anonymous system.
- The proposal also says that SEG will provide a session early in the curriculum with examples of what good and bad feedback is.

- The proposal also includes an open forum at the midcourse. There will be no course directors or instructors present for this. Part of the goal of this will be to (1) provide a feedback for oral feedback, as some students are unlikely to offer written feedback, and (2) to see if written feedback received is an accurate representation of the class's view as a whole.
- Unanimous vote to pass this feedback system.
- Dr. Jeffries suggested that creating an interim first year SEG representative during FOM and HSF might be a good idea.
- Charlotte will develop a proposal on this issue and bring it back to the SEG.

Standardizing Foundations Course Engagement:

- Teams will meet with the course director a minimum of 3 times. This may not work best however with a couple courses such as connections or convergence. It was brought up that the midcourse meetings maybe should be up to the discretion of the course director.
- Teams will be responsible for creating a presentation for the foundations meeting.
- It was proposed pairing a first year representative with the second year rep for Foundations and HSF.
- It was mentioned what could be the possibility of the TA being an interim SEG rep.
- Vote for presenting to SEG before Foundations 11:1
- Vote for Standardizing Foundations Course Engagement: unanimous

Teams:

- SEG will be dividing into teams, with each team being comprised of one rep for each class year. Team members will represent the same courses, and will have shared the same MS1 responsibility. It was mentioned to provide the opportunity to move things if certain groups are overworked.
- Vote: unanimous

Project Selection:

- The idea is to start to build and create more things each year. Each team would be charged with doing a project each year, something they can propose in the fall and carry through to completion.
- Karl questioned where we are generating projects from, and asked if we could include language urging teams to go to course directors or clerkship directors and ask for ideas.
- One of the issues was that previously projects were originally based off of one person wanting to accomplish a task and trying to find time for it. Now it will be more team oriented in attempt to get more things accomplished.
- Vote unanimous.

Proposed amendment to the bylaws.

- Nick came up with a protocol for SEG members to follow when developing new projects and communicating broad initiatives.

- The measure would require SEG members interested in a project to notify the entire group via email that they are pursuing an idea. If no one objects, they will assume it's ok to push ahead.
- Brian raised concerns about the fact that many emails go unanswered.
- It was mentioned that if you invoke the name SEG to pursue something than you should discuss it with the group prior.
- It was brought up that this could possibly stifle some creativity.
- Overall the group agreed it's imperative to alter the bylaws in some ways, and members were encouraged to bring back counter proposals to the next meeting.

SEG went into executive session to elect representatives to the Clerkship and Foundations Committees.