 L

Student Education Group
1/5/16
Minutes

Members unable to attend: Karl Kristiansen, Nicholas Field, Sarah Johnson, Brian Till, Will Manning

Members in attendance: Reiko Sakai (link), Dylan Hershkowitz (link), Caleb Seufert (link), Liz Carson, Rachel Carlson, Charlotte Hastings, Alex Miller, Lawrence Leung, Chris Bernard, Marc Vecchio, Laura Director, Dean Jeffries

Minutes by: Chris Bernard

Chairperson: Liz

Guests: Curtis Gwlliam (MCC), Jimmy Levins (Foundation Committee), Tara Higgins (Clerkship committee)

Guest (Dr. Cate Nicholas)

- Simulation lab was accredited by 2 separate groups: American college of surgeons and Society for Simulation and Health Care. UVM was accredited in all 5 areas (Core +4). Strength is the standardized patient program.
- Under 100 accredited simulation labs so it shows that peers have validated this site. May be a more attractive site for residents and other medical professionals. Most 4th years feel well prepared for their step 2 CSE.
- Allows possibility to have a pathway for simulation technicians. 60,000 user hours a year for the sim lab.
- The goal of simulation center is to be used as often as possible. Clerkship has precedence over all other groups that use the simulation lab.
- Looking into early evening events (4:30-6:30pm) that can be run by standardized patients (no faculty) to make scheduling easier.
- Thought that having later hours might be able to attract more opportunities for additional standardized patients and could promote diversity of standardized patient population.
- Age range of standardized patients is also thought to be better with later hours and could possibly bring in younger standardized patients.
- Going forward Dr. Nicholas will work with foundation directors to see how the scheduling for hours will work out best.
- The point was brought up about family and kids with regards to the possibility of having later hours. If a different time is desired it would be possible to switch times with another student if both agree and is cleared ahead of time.

Project Updates

- Charlotte brought up smart boards and how to access those.

- Alex discussed a training session on the Anatomage training table. Those that went through the training can access the tables, which is required before use. Appears not to be a substitute for anatomy lab itself. Could be a good resource during clerkship.
- Liz discussed evaluations and wants emails about suggestions for improvements to them including sending specific questions you may want to see on the evaluations as well as things that seem to not be working well. Charlotte raised the question of what would be the frequency and number evaluations which is still under consideration. Liz talked about possibly adding how students viewed the material, whether it was through podcasting, lecture, or neither.
- Rachel talked with Dr. Rosen about tutoring information. A score below an 80 qualifies any student for free tutoring. It was brought up when this information would be presented to students and it may be presented at the beginning of each course.

Committee reports

- Curtis (MCC) talked about a policy for having uniformity across the curriculum. This uniformity would also apply to TBLs as it appears that there have been some great and some bad TBLs. There were some complaints about annotation of formative quizzes in that it generally is not complete. They are trying to recruit residents as PCR mentors. There was discussion about having continuity of an instructor for a course or to diversify faculty based on content expertise.
- Tara (clerkship) talked about the meeting in Connecticut that clerkship directors went to in order to discuss a UVM western Connecticut clinical campus. This was a consultative visit by the LCME. Students currently cannot stay there for longer than 6 months and when the campus is instituted students will be recruited to stay in Connecticut for the duration of their clinical training.
- Liz is standing in for Jimmy (foundations) discussed that students may be able to fill out a form on a separate format in order to make anonymous comments about a lecturer if concerns were raised. This is in response to the student justice coalition's desire to have this opportunity.

Update on student proposal for evaluation/tracking of learning environment concerns in Foundations

Dr. Jeffries reviewed the work of the Foundations Directors, who proposed an "Instant Footprinting" mechanism for alerting the course director to concerns. Instant Footprinting would work via the following steps:

- A tab in COMET Courses will be created to report concerns about slide, lecture comment, etc
- Ticket # assigned, and report can be anonymous or not (option), always confidential
- Notification goes to course and foundations directors
- Course director will immediately discuss issue with involved faculty to plan resolution
- Dialog can be established with students to resolve
- Foundations director will compile results and inform the Learning Environment and Professionalism (LEAP) Committee of issues and trends

The chairs of the departments have been informed of the plan and approve, and the Foundations Directors and COMIS are currently working out the details for implementation. It was noted that student involvement in the reporting process to the LEAP committee will be essential. It was also pointed out that this plan will await approval by the Office of General Counsel and that perceived

violations of Title IX or the Cleary Act found in Footprints will be forwarded to the AA/EO office of the University for investigation.