# **2016 INDEPENDENT STUDENT ANALYSIS**

# Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center El Paso

# Paul L. Foster School of Medicine

Jared Bell
Carolina Blotte
Brittany Harper, M.S.
Eliezer Hernandez, M.S.
Chandi Jain
Aura Lamas
Meena Manivannan, M.S.
Alysa Nash
Emily Nes

Colton Palmer
Laura Palmer
Kelcy Steffen
Timothy Tran, M.S.
Tyler Trevino, M.S.
Daniel Welder
Jake Wilson
Meredith Wittie
Claire Zeorlin

# **Faculty Advisor:**

Tammy Salazar, Ph.D., Director of Academic Support

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION	3
METHODS	3
LIMITATIONS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
DISCUSSION	8
STUDENT-FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIPS	8
OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF STUDENTS	8
SUMMARY	9
STRENGTHS	9
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	9
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	9
OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION	10
SUMMARY	10
STRENGTHS	10
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	11
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	11
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT & FACILITIES	11
SUMMARY	12
STRENGTHS	13
OPPORTUNITES FOR IMPROVEMENT	13
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	14
LIBRARY & INFORMATION RESOURCES	15
SUMMARY	16
STRENGTHS	16
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	16
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	17
STUDENT SERVICES	17
SUMMARY	19
STRENGTHS	19
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	20
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	22
MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM	23
SUMMARY	25
STRENGTHS	25
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	26
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	27
APPENDIX A: 2016 LCME ISA COMPLETE SURVEY RESULTS, stratified by class year	29
APPENDIX B: 2016 LCME ISA SURVEY TOTAL STUDENT BODY RESULTS	71

## INTRODUCTION

The following report contains the results of an independent student analysis of Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center El Paso's Paul L. Foster School of Medicine (PLFSOM) in El Paso, Texas. The report was conducted to satisfy the requirement of the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) for each medical education program seeking accreditation to conduct an independent student analysis of the institution, as outlined in the LCME-published document "The Role of Students in the Accreditation of Medical Education Programs in the U.S. and Canada."

#### **METHODS**

In order to collect the data for this analysis, four student teams, representing each of the four classes were established. The student teams worked together to compose a survey which could correctly assess the opinions of the student population with questions directly related to the LCME accreditation standards, including those questions given in "Appendix D" of the LCME-published document "The Role of Students in the Accreditation of Medical Education Programs in the U.S." On the primary survey, a total of 114 categories, organized into the five sections suggested by the LCME (Student-Faculty-Administration Relationships, Learning Environment & Facilities, Library & Information Resources, Student Services, & Medical Education Program) were assessed for student satisfaction. Using a Likert scale, with 1 representing the least satisfied response and 4 representing the most, students were asked to assign one of the following response options to each category: "Very dissatisfied," "Somewhat dissatisfied," "Somewhat satisfied," "Very Satisfied," and "N/A: No opportunity to assess, No opinion.". The N/A response was not assigned a Likert scale value. Two additional questions asked students to elaborate on their response of dissatisfaction to a previous category, specifying instructional site(s) where they feel unsafe and clerkships that do not follow common clerkship policies. The final survey was assembled into an electronically accessible format by the Paul L. Foster Information Technology department, using Qualtrics, an online software survey tool, and distributed to students on September 28, 2016, through institutional email. The survey remained open until midnight on October 19, 2016. All medical students at PLFSOM were invited to participate in the survey.

Student teams worked to encourage survey participation through email reminders and in-class announcements. Incentives for participation were offered to individuals participating in the survey and to each class achieving a 90% response rate. Each individual who participated was rewarded with a TTUHSC El Paso logo keychain and water bottle. Each class with at least a 90% response rate was rewarded with a \$2000 budget to plan a class party. The overall response rate for all four classes was 100%, with 398 of 398 total students completing the survey.

Some categories/questions do not apply to all classes, such as those pertaining to the quality of the clinical/ clerkship years. Therefore, several categories were omitted from the surveys for certain classes in order to only assess those students to whom the categories pertained. Whenever these categories appear in the analysis and appendix data, they have been noted as being assessed among a specific population of students. Please note that the terms pre-clinical, referring to the first and second year programs, and clinical, referring to third and fourth year programs, are used synonymously with the terms pre-clerkship and clerkship, respectively.

An additional follow-up survey of six questions was composed on Qualtrics and disseminated via institutional email to all PLFSOM students on January 24, 2017, and was open until midnight on

February 6, 2017. The purpose of the follow-up survey was to address categories which were accidentally excluded from the primary survey or which required changes to the wording in order to match that required by LCME. The total response rate for the follow-up survey was 65% for all four classes, with 60% of first year students, 70% of second year students, 74% of third year students, and 56% of fourth year students responding. Additionally, due to a technical error, five of the eight students who reported dissatisfaction with campus safety were not properly prompted by the primary survey to provide a narrative explanation for the question "At which instructional site(s) do you not not feel safe and why?" and, therefore, received a separate Qualtrics survey with this single narrative-response question via email on October 3, 2016. Four of the five students completed this survey. The response data from the follow-up surveys was considered alongside the data from the original survey to support and further the analysis, and is noted when it appears as being from a follow-up survey.

The four individual student teams were given the responsibility of analyzing the collected data for their respective classes and writing a summary of their findings. For the analysis, each of the five survey sections was analyzed and summarized separately, with the Student-Faculty-Administration Relationships section divided into the two sub-sections Office of the Associate Dean of Students and Office of the Associate Dean of Medical Education, for a total of six separate section discussions. Arithmetic means for each category and overall section were calculated from the Likert scale values of the responses, excluding N/A responses. Within each section, all categories with at least 90% somewhat or very satisfied responses were considered potential strengths of the program and all categories with greater than 5% somewhat or very dissatisfied responses were considered potential weaknesses. Those categories identified as potential strengths and weaknesses were analyzed further, with specific consideration of their response means, their relationship of satisfied to dissatisfied responses, their percentage of N/A responses, and their response trends across the four individual classes. The four individual class analyses were edited and compiled into a single analysis, representative of the entire student body. It is this final analysis that is presented in the discussion chapter of this paper. An executive summary comparing all five LCME categories highlights key findings of the LCME ISA team and is included below.

The complete survey response data from every category, stratified by class year and organized alphabetically by section, is presented in Appendix A. The results of the total student body responses for every category, organized by descending means, are presented in Appendix B in six tables corresponding to the six discussed survey sections. Total student body response results for those select categories which are analyzed in the discussion are included within the six sections of the discussion.

#### LIMITATIONS

It is important to consider certain notable limitations of the survey and its analysis. First, first year students had only been enrolled at PLFSOM for three months when they were asked to complete the primary survey, significantly limiting their ability to access the school and its programs. The tendency of first year students to report higher levels of satisfaction in the survey than students from the other three classes may be a product of this limitation.

Second, like the naiveté of the first year class, the varying dynamics between classes and the overall satisfaction within each class may influence student responses, making comparisons between classes difficult. For this reason, this analysis focuses on the results of the total student body and on trends across multiple classes, with only limited discussion of individual class results.

Third, the limited ability to compare results between classes is compounded by the substantial changes in the educational program and the various services offered by the school from year to year. Although

changes are expected for a young school and are a promising indication of the school's adaptability, multiple alterations to programs, policies, and resources limits the survey's ability to expose the effects of individual variables.

Third, the need for a follow-up survey created a few of the limitations for the analysis. At only 65% compliance, it is possible that the results of the follow-up survey are not an accurate reflection of the opinions of total student body. The fact that there are often certain qualities which predispose individuals to completing a survey furthers the probability that the follow-up survey results are not comparable to those of the primary survey. For example, students with negative opinions may be more likely to complete an additional survey to increase the chances of their concerns being heard. This may explain the noticeably higher percentage of dissatisfied responses in the follow-up survey than in the primary survey, as 13% of follow-up survey responses are somewhat or very dissatisfied, while only 5% of primary survey responses indicate dissatisfaction. Additionally, the follow-up survey was distributed almost four months after the primary survey, during which time student's opinions may have changed. Indeed, some of categories assessed in the follow-up survey, when compared to nearly identical categories on the primary survey, reveal increased numbers, as well as percentages, of dissatisfied students, which cannot be unexplained by the minor changes in wording alone.

Fourth, many of the categories assessed may only be applicable to certain students. Some categories could be excluded from surveys for students to whom they did not apply, and was done by eliminating categories concerning the clerkship years from the first and second year class surveys. However, there was no way to ethically target specific students for other categories such as those concerning use of mental health resources. Although unlikely to be true, it is assumed that students to whom such a category did not apply at the time of the survey chose the N/A response for said category. However, the N/A response option was described in the survey as representing "no opinion/no opportunity to access," such that responses of apathy or neutrality may are indistinguishable from those indicating inapplicability. For this reason, although all the percentages presented in the tables are calculated with the N/A values, the analysis and discussion considers values recalculated excluding N/A responses for those categories with approximately 10% or more N/A responses, under the assumption that these categories are more likely to have been inapplicable to a sizable portion of the student body. Any value considered that excludes N/A responses is noted as such in the discussion.

Fifth, students' knowledge that the survey and its subsequent analysis would be considered during the school's accreditation process may have introduced bias, as students may have been more hesitant to express dissatisfaction for fear of negatively impacting the school's LCME accreditation.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The 2016 survey results demonstrate a high level of general satisfaction on the part of the Paul L. Foster School of Medicine student body with various aspects of the institution's academic offices, student services, and medical education. Of all the individual responses of the primary survey (n=39,584), 89% are either somewhat or very satisfied, this percentage increases to 95% when N/A values are excluded. Likewise, the percent satisfaction for all responses from the primary and follow-up surveys is also 89%, with 5% dissatisfaction and 6% N/A responses. Overall, Student-Faculty-Administration Relationships, Learning Environment and Facilities, and the Medical Education Program all received greater than 90% satisfaction. If N/A results are excluded from the calculation, all five sections of the survey received greater than 90% satisfaction individually.

The weakest section of the survey is Library and Information Resources, having 8% dissatisfaction.

Students are highly satisfied with library support and services. Therefore, it can be inferred that the elevated rate of dissatisfaction with this section is largely attributed to student dissatisfaction with electronic resources, as three of the categories in this section with the lowest rates of student satisfaction are access to and utility of the student portal and ease of access to electronic learning materials, especially in the hospitals and clinics.

The strongest sections of the survey are Student-Faculty-Administration Relationships and Student Services, both with less than 5% overall dissatisfaction. There are no areas of concern for Student-Faculty-Administration relationships, and almost every category assessed for this section has at least 90% satisfaction. Students across all four classes report high satisfaction with student services; no one item consistently causes dissatisfaction across the student body. Many of the categories in the Student Services section apply to specific populations of students. Categories like the availability of disability insurance and the confidentiality of mental health services could only be assessed by those members of the student population who had inquired into or used these services at the time of the survey. Therefore, as expected, several categories of the Student Services section have high percentages of N/A responses from students, which lowers the overall percentages of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for this section. An understanding the limited ability of students to assess certain categories, combined with the fact that only 4% of students are dissatisfied with student services, reveals Student Services to be one of the strongest sections assessed for the institution.

Across the entire survey, first year students are more likely to report high levels of satisfaction and low levels of dissatisfaction than are students from the other classes. For both the primary and follow-survey combined, the first year class reports 91% satisfaction and only 3% dissatisfaction. In contrast, all other classes report 88-89% satisfaction and 6-7% dissatisfaction, with second and fourth year students being the most dissatisfied. The satisfaction of the first year class may be attributed to their limited exposure to the school, which decreases their chances of having had any negative experiences. The fact that the first year class has the approximately the same amount of total N/A responses as the other classes is surprising, but this may be a result of similar trends among all classes for the categories which only apply to certain students. This also suggests that the first year class may have overestimated their ability to assess the school in several categories to which they had had limited exposure, thus accounting for the lower levels of dissatisfaction among the first year class.

Of all the categories assessed in both the primary and follow-up surveys, there are several notable strengths of PLFSOM, as well as areas for improvement. These include the following:

#### Areas of Strength

The offices of the Associate Dean of Students and the Associate Dean for Medical Education. Students express high levels of satisfied responses across all categories concerning these offices.

Accessibility of and support provided by faculty and administration. Students report that the faculty and administration are readily available, concerned about students' success, and adherent to program requirements and policies.

**Safety and security for all students at all instructional sites**. In addition to high levels of student satisfaction with safety and security, students also report being greatly satisfied with the adequacy of the school's mistreatment and discrimination policies and their mechanisms of enforcement, as well as with the overall diversity on campus.

**Opportunities to participate in service learning.** Students have ample opportunities for service learning through the Society, Community and Individual (SCI) course, through multiple schoolwide service days and projects, and through the three voluntary, medical student-staffed clinics associated with PLFSOM.

Quality of library support and services. Student satisfaction with library support and services is likely due to the adequate size and staffing of the two readily accessible libraries on campus, both of which are now available to students 24/7 with ID-badge access.

**Confidentiality of services.** Students report high levels of satisfaction with the confidentiality of multiple services, including the Office of the Assistant Dean of Students, personal counseling services, and mental health services.

**Professional community.** Student satisfaction with professionalism policies, interdisciplinary opportunities, the college system, the sense of community within each class, and the ability of the learning environment to foster collegiality and respect contributes to a positive, professional community experience for students, which is further supported by the relatively small class size and the strong emphasis the school places on professionalism.

**Pre-clerkship curriculum.** Almost every category assessed for the pre-clerkship medical education curriculum reveals high levels of student satisfaction. Students are especially satisfied with the clinical skills instruction in the first and second years, and the quality, integration, and workload of the first year. The high degree of student satisfaction with the pre-clerkship curriculum is especially important in light of the uniqueness of the curriculum, which is vertically integrated, is organized by clinical presentations, and requires attendance at medical Spanish courses, small group work case sessions, and community preceptorships.

# Opportunities for Improvement

Parking. The weakest category of the entire survey is adequacy of parking in the pre-clerkship years, for which 34% of students express dissatisfaction. The high rates of student dissatisfaction with parking in the third and fourth years are likewise concerning. The inadequacy of student parking is a growing problem due to the difficulty of physically expanding the campus to accommodate the increasing number of students enrolled at PLFSOM and at TTUHSC El Paso as a whole. Parking availability and locations have changed yearly due to campus growth and surrounding construction, greatly contributing to dissatisfaction. Additionally, students begin assigned community preceptorships in the pre-clerkship years and continue in later years to various community clinics and hospitals, where parking space is no longer under direct control of the institution.

**Adequacy of physical space**. Students report high levels of dissatisfaction with the adequacy of student study and relaxation space, of educational/teaching spaces at hospitals, and of secure storage space, especially at clerkship sites. Dissatisfaction with the adequacy of space provided for studying, relaxing, learning, and storing personal items can be largely attributed to the same factors affecting parking – increasing student enrollment and lack of direct control of these services at off-site locations.

**Electronic resources**. Students express high levels of dissatisfaction with the student portals, including Canvas, and both the new student portal CHAMP and its predecessor, Blackboard. Poor satisfaction with the usability of these student portals likely contributes to the high levels of

dissatisfaction with students' ability to easily accesses electronic learning materials. Access and utility of electronic resources is especially problematic in hospitals and clinics, and students report dissatisfaction with electronic learning materials at clerkship sites, ease of logging clerkship hours, and adequacy of experiences with electronic medical records.

Adequacy of USMLE preparation. Students report overall dissatisfaction with the adequacy of USMLE preparation provided by the school. This was only assessed for third and fourth year students, and significant changes have been made this year to the Step I preparation time in the second year curriculum. Therefore, the school should continue to monitor student satisfaction in this area for the next few years, further adapting the curriculum as needed to provide an adequate amount of high quality, USMLE preparation experiences as well as sufficient time allotted for preparation.

Third year curriculum. Many students express dissatisfaction with the overall quality of the third year curriculum. The greatest source of this dissatisfaction is the integration of third year clerkships. Other areas of the third year clerkship curriculum with high levels of dissatisfaction include scheduling of clerkships, clarity and fairness of grading policies, adequacy of formative feedback, and school responsiveness to student feedback. As a key component of the school's curriculum, and major factor influencing students' ability to match to and succeed in residency programs, the third year curriculum should be the main priority of PLFSOM's improvement efforts at this time.

#### **DISCUSSION**

## STUDENT-FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIPS

## OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF STUDENTS

		Very	Somewhat	Somewhat	Very	
	Mean	Dissatisfied N (%)	Dissatisfied N (%)	Satisfied N (%)	Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Confidentiality	3.94	4(1)	3 (1)	26 (7)	346 (87)	19 (5)
Accessibility	3.90	2 (1)	2 (1)	40 (10)	342 (86)	12 (3)
Awareness of student concerns	3.77	6 (2)	6 (2)	66 (17)	317 (80)	3 (1)
Responsiveness to student problems	3.76	6 (2)	10 (3)	61 (15)	317 (80)	4 (1)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Responsiveness to student feedback	3.75	5 (1)	12 (3)	65 (16)	312 (78)	4 (1)
Total	3.82	23 (1)	33 (2)	258 (13)	1634 (82)	42 (2)

#### **SUMMARY**

Overall, students are satisfied with the Office of the Associate Dean of Students. Of all the individual responses to the questions concerning student satisfaction with the Office of the Associate Dean of Students (n=1990), 95% are either somewhat or very satisfied (n=1892). There are no categories that revealed a cause for concern.

#### **STRENGTHS**

All four classes have an overall satisfaction with the school's Office of the Associate Dean of Students and its interaction with and relationship to the students. Every individual category within this section received more than 94% total satisfaction, with high rates of student satisfaction across all four classes. The category with the greatest number of satisfied responses is awareness of student concerns, with 383 (96%) somewhat or very satisfied responses. Students are also highly satisfied with the level of confidentiality and accessibility of the Office of the Associate Dean of Students, with 94% and 96% student satisfaction in each category, respectively. All four classes express 90% or more satisfaction and 5% or less dissatisfaction with the Office of the Associate Dean of Students' awareness of student concerns, confidentiality, and accessibility.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

The Office of the Associate Dean of Students does not demonstrate any categories with a high level of dissatisfaction. Every category has 5% or less total dissatisfied responses. The categories receiving the greatest number of dissatisfied responses are responsiveness to student feedback and responsiveness to student problems, at 5% and 4% dissatisfaction, respectively. The second year class is the least satisfied class with the office's responsiveness to student feedback and problems, however the other three student classes report high levels of satisfaction in both of these categories. Although the greater than 90% total satisfaction in each of these categories suggests these are not areas of concern at this time, the responsiveness of the Office of the Associate Dean of Students should continue to be monitored.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In light of the high level of satisfaction recorded for the Office of the Associate Dean of Students, the few students who report dissatisfaction likely represent outliers. However, the student body may still benefit from more open communication from the Office of the Associate Dean of Students regarding students' concerns and responses to student problems and feedback. Currently, the school has a curriculum committee where students and faculty meet to discuss students' curriculum concerns. Establishing a similar committee meeting where students, faculty, and the Associate Dean of Students meet to address student affairs concerns could be beneficial to the school and the student body. This could also be accomplished by the student government, Medical Student Council (MSC), which could act as a liaison between the students and the Associate Dean of Students to both address concerns and communicate the problems discussed and the solutions provided to the student body.

#### OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

Table 2.1. Total Student Body Responses to Select Categories Concerning the Office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education, organized by descending means <sup>1</sup>

Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
3.86	2 (1)	7 (2)	36 (9)	346 (87)	7 (2)
3.83	2 (1)	3 (1)	55 (14)	328 (82)	10 (3)
3.82	1 (0)	4 (1)	56 (14)	318 (80)	19 (5)
3.67	2 (1)	16 (4)	87 (22)	275 (69)	18 (5)
3.78	25 (1)	70 (2)	544 (15)	2778 (78)	165 (5)
	3.86 3.83 3.82 3.67	Mean         Dissatisfied N (%)           3.86         2 (1)           3.83         2 (1)           3.82         1 (0)           3.67         2 (1)	Mean         Dissatisfied N (%)         Dissatisfied N (%)           3.86         2 (1)         7 (2)           3.83         2 (1)         3 (1)           3.82         1 (0)         4 (1)           3.67         2 (1)         16 (4)	Mean         Dissatisfied N (%)         Dissatisfied N (%)         Satisfied N (%)           3.86         2 (1)         7 (2)         36 (9)           3.83         2 (1)         3 (1)         55 (14)           3.82         1 (0)         4 (1)         56 (14)           3.67         2 (1)         16 (4)         87 (22)	Mean         Dissatisfied N (%)         Dissatisfied N (%)         Satisfied N (%)         Satisfied N (%)           3.86         2 (1)         7 (2)         36 (9)         346 (87)           3.83         2 (1)         3 (1)         55 (14)         328 (82)           3.82         1 (0)         4 (1)         56 (14)         318 (80)           3.67         2 (1)         16 (4)         87 (22)         275 (69)

## **SUMMARY**

Overall, students are highly satisfied with the Office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education, as demonstrated by the fact that, out of all the individual student responses to questions concerning satisfaction with the office (n=3582), 93% are either somewhat or very satisfied with the Office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education (n=3322). There are no categories within this section which indicate a cause for concern.

#### **STRENGTHS**

PLFSOM students are especially satisfied when it comes to the care the office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education has for students and their success. Seven of the nine categories concerning the Associate Dean for Medical Education have greater than 90% satisfaction, and all nine categories received at least 88% somewhat or very satisfied responses. This section of the survey reveals a high level of satisfaction in categories concerning accessibility of the medical faculty, with 96% of students reporting satisfaction in response to "The medical school faculty are readily available to me," which is supported by the 94% student satisfaction reported in response to "accessibility of medical school faculty." Furthermore, only 1% of students report dissatisfaction with the later. Additionally, 96% of students report being somewhat or very satisfied with the administration's desire for students to succeed, with this category having the greatest percent of very satisfied responses at 87%. The strength of these categories is consistent across all four classes, with every class reporting greater than or equal to 90%

satisfaction and less than or equal to 5% dissatisfaction in each of the three categories.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

This section does not demonstrate any areas with a high level of dissatisfaction, and every category has equal to or less than 5% dissatisfaction, including both somewhat dissatisfied and very dissatisfied responses. The category in this section with which students are most dissatisfied is the Office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education's responsiveness to student problems. This category has just less than 5% of students reporting being somewhat or very dissatisfied, has the lowest percent of students reporting being very satisfied, at 69%. While the Office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education's responsiveness to student problems has the lowest amount of student satisfaction in the section for second through fourth year classes, first year students are highly satisfied with the office's responsiveness. Only second year students report greater than 5% dissatisfaction with the office's responsiveness to student problems, and the 91% of the total student body satisfaction rating for this category suggests that there is no cause for concern at this time. It is worth noting, however, that responsiveness was also the weakest area for the Office of the Associate Dean of Students.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Since the school currently has a curriculum committee where students and faculty meet to discuss students' curriculum concerns, this committee should discuss ways to increase the ability of the committee and the Office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education to respond to student problems and to communicate these responses to the student population.

#### LEARNING ENVIRONMENT & FACILITIES

Table 3.1. Total Student Body Responses to Select Categories Concerning the Learning Environment & Facilities, organized by descending means <sup>2</sup>								
	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)		
Adequacy of the school's discrimination policy	3.89	2 (1)	5 (1)	28 (7)	352 (88)	11 (3)		
Opportunities to participate in service learning	3.87	1 (0)	4 (1)	41 (10)	347 (87)	5 (1)		
Adequacy of safety and security on campus and all other instructional sites	3.87	2 (1)	6 (2)	32 (8)	355 (89)	3 (1)		
Adequacy of the school's student mistreatment policy	3.87	2 (1)	4 (1)	33 (8)	328 (82)	31 (8)		

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Environment conducive to culturally competent health care	3.85	7 (2)	5 (1)	27 (7)	354 (89)	5 (1)
The learning environment in the pre-clinical years fosters collegiality and respect	3.84	1 (0)	9 (2)	44 (11)	343 (86)	1 (0)
Adequacy of the testing facilities and environment	3.82	3 (1)	8 (2)	47 (12)	339 (85)	1 (0)
Adequacy of student relaxation space	3.55	10 (3)	30 (8)	86 (22)	269 (68)	3 (1)
Adequacy of educational/ teaching spaces at hospitals <sup>a</sup>	3.53	5 (3)	12 (6)	48 (26)	119 (64)	2 (1)
Access to secure storage space for personal belongings	3.52	18 (5)	34 (9)	70 (18)	274 (69)	2 (1)
Adequacy of parking for 3 <sup>-d</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> year clinical rotations <sup>a</sup>	3.52	7 (4)	16 (9)	34 (18)	126 (68)	3 (2)
Adequacy of student study space	3.29	17 (4)	54 (14)	123 (31)	202 (51)	2 (1)
Adequacy of parking in the pre-clinical years	2.86	64 (16)	73 (18)	115 (29)	144 (36)	2 (1)
Total Section Responses	3.68	181 (2)	369 (4)	1298 (16)	6317 (76)	167 (2)

**SUMMARY** 

Overall, students are satisfied with the learning environment and facilities. Of all the individual student responses to questions concerning satisfaction with the learning environment and facilities (n= 8332), 91% are either somewhat or very satisfied (n= 7615).

#### **STRENGTHS**

The survey reveals student satisfaction ratings of greater than or equal to 90% for 17 of the 22 categories assessed for the learning environment & facilities. Of the 17 categories with 90% or greater student satisfaction, the four categories with the highest percent satisfaction are the adequacy of safety and security on campus and all other instructional sites, the opportunities to participate in service learning, the ability of the learning environment in the pre-clerkship years to foster collegiality and respect, and the adequacy of the testing facilities and environment. All four of these categories have 97% somewhat or very satisfied responses as well as at least 90% satisfaction and less than or equal to 5% dissatisfaction for all individual classes. Additionally, the opportunities to participate in service learning and the adequacy of safety and security on campus and all other instructional sites have the highest response means within this section. Regarding campus safety, these results provide positive reinforcement for the qualitative responses to the survey question "At which instructional site(s) do you not feel safe and why?" to which student responses indicated that they feel safe at all instructional sites.

Of the remaining 13 categories with 90% or greater student satisfaction, the categories with the highest combination of percent satisfaction and response means are those pertaining to the institution's mistreatment and discrimination policies and to the institution's establishment of an environment conducive to culturally competent health care. Student satisfaction with the environment conducive to culturally competent health care is 96%, and their satisfaction rates with the adequacy of the school's discrimination policy and the adequacy of the school's student mistreatment policy are 95% and 91%, respectively. The high levels of satisfaction and low levels of dissatisfaction in these three categories are consistent across all four classes. High levels of student satisfaction with the diversity of both the student body and the administration/faculty population, both with 94% satisfaction, may contribute to the strength of the school's discrimination policy and the conduciveness of the environment to culturally competent health care. Student satisfaction ratings with the adequacy of activities to prevent mistreatment (93%) adds further support to the strength of the school's mistreatment policy. Furthermore, the adequacy of the school's mistreatment and discrimination policies and procedures likely plays a role in the high level of student satisfaction for the collegiality and respect fostered by the pre-clerkship learning environment mentioned above.

As many of the areas of concern in this category, and across the entire survey, reflect students' dissatisfaction with the adequacy of physical spaces, it is worth noting that students are highly satisfied with the adequacy of the testing facilities and environment, the adequacy of lecture halls and large group classroom facilities, and the adequacy of small group teaching spaces on campus. The adequacy of the testing facilities and environment received a 97% student satisfaction rating, as mentioned above, while the adequacy of lecture halls and large group classroom facilities and the adequacy of small group teaching spaces on campus received 96% and 95% student satisfaction, respectively.

## OPPORTUNITES FOR IMPROVEMENT

The most significant area of weakness concerning student satisfaction with the learning environment & facilities is the adequacy of parking in the pre-clinical/ pre-clerkship years, in which 34% of students report dissatisfaction. This is the greatest percent of dissatisfaction reported in any category of the entire survey for the total student body and for all of the individual classes except the second year class, which reported slightly more dissatisfaction with the utility of the student portal. The lack of parking in the pre-clerkship years is a two-fold problem. First, the class sizes within the medical school, and within the adjoining nursing school, have continued to grow each year without a significant addition of parking spaces for pre-clerkship years. Second, construction on nearby buildings has cut down on the available parking spaces. Inadequate parking negatively affects class attendance and availability of the campus resources. Notably, the third and fourth year students express much higher rates of dissatisfaction with parking in the pre-clerkship years than do the first and second years students, suggesting that the parking

has improved in the past few years, although 19% of first year students and 27% of second year students remain dissatisfied. Adequacy of parking for third and fourth year clerkship rotations also has high rates of dissatisfaction, with 12% of third and fourth year students reporting being somewhat or very dissatisfied.

The next major category of concern for the Learning Environment & Facilities section is the adequacy of student study space, with 18% of students reporting dissatisfaction. Concern for the adequacy of student study space in increased by this category having only 51% very satisfied responses. Student dissatisfaction with the adequacy of student study space likely has the same root cause as student dissatisfaction with parking, as both resources have suffered from the student enrollment growing faster than the facilities have adapted. The school has already made plans to increase student study space and construction on the MEB is scheduled to begin in the fall. While this should benefit students once completed, the construction is likely to temporarily exacerbate student dissatisfaction with available space. Other categories which have been affected by the increasing number of students competing for limited resources are the adequacy of student relaxation space, amenities available to students in the student lounge and gym, opportunities to participate in research, the adequacy of educational/teaching spaces at hospitals, and access to secure storage space for personal belongings. Students report 10% dissatisfaction with the adequacy of student relaxation space and 7% dissatisfaction with the amenities available to students in the student lounge and gym. Since the close of the survey, the school has added a Quiet Room, equipped with recliners and yoga mats, to the MEB library, which should increase student satisfaction with the adequacy of student relaxation space. All four classes express greater than 5% dissatisfaction with parking, study space, and relaxation space, further supporting the conclusion that the adequacy of resources to support the student population is a concern across all four classes. Furthermore the inadequacy of student resources is a problem at both the MEB and clerkship sites. Although access to secure storage space for personal belongings has 13% total student dissatisfaction, the survey results suggest that this is a problem specifically at clerkship sites, as 27% of third and fourth year students are dissatisfied with access to secure storage space, while only 1% of first and second years feel the same. The 8% of third year students and 10% of fourth year students who are dissatisfied with the adequacy of educational/teaching spaces at hospitals also support the theory that students are competing for inadequate resources at clerkship sites. This is important to note as the school is already moving forward with plans to change the current MEB (I) and to build a second Medical Education Building (MEB II), but no set plans have been revealed for alleviating these problems at clerkship sites.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

There are several areas of the Learning Environment & Resources section that need improvement. One is parking in pre-clerkship and clerkship years, which may be alleviated by establishing a set and reliable schedule for the shuttle that currently transports students to and from the off-site parking space at the Coliseum, and by working with clerkship sites to increase the number of dedicated parking spaces for students.

Additionally, PLFSOM should work with UMC faculty liaisons to find or create additional spaces for student learning and places for students to safely store their belongings. Currently, there are assigned lockers available for the first and second year students in the MEB, where pre-clerkship classes are held. In contrast, lockers for third and fourth year students are only available on a first-come, first-served basis daily and are located less conveniently in the clinical building across the street from the main UMC building. The lockers in the UMC lounge are currently reserved for residents and fellows only. Furthermore, off-site clinical locations such as Kenworthy Clinic and William Beaumont Army Medical Center currently offer no set storage space for students. Options for increasing educational spaces and storage for student's personal belongings should be explored with the faculty liaisons at these institutions, and any other off-site clerkship location.

Ultimately, due to the relatively high levels of dissatisfaction with items regarding physical space and resources, such as adequate parking and study space, PLFSOM should refrain from any further increases in class size until substantial facility changes have been made and the current rates of student satisfaction with the learning environment and facilities noticeably improve.

## LIBRARY & INFORMATION RESOURCES

Table 4.1. Total Student Body Responses to Select Categories Concerning the Library & Information Resources, organized by descending means <sup>3</sup>									
	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)			
Quality of library support and services	3.84	1 (0)	4 (1)	53 (13)	331 (83)	9 (2)			
Ease of access to electronic learning materials on campus <sup>a</sup>	3.81	2 (1)	2 (1)	25 (13)	153 (82)	4 (2)			
Adequacy of computer learning resources	3.80	2 (1)	8 (2)	54 (14)	322 (81)	12 (3)			
Ease of logging hours in the clinical years <sup>a</sup>	3.46	9 (5)	14 (8)	44 (24)	118 (63)	1 (1)			
Access to student portal (Blackboard / Canvas)	3.42	11 (3)	47 (12)	104 (26)	234 (59)	2 (1)			
Ease of access to electronic learning materials <sup>b</sup>	3.31	4 (2)	29 (11)	107 (41)	117 (45)	2 (1)			
Utility of student portal (Blackboard / Canvas)	3.27	16 (4)	61 (15)	117 (29)	200 (50)	4 (1)			
Ease of access to electronic learning materials in hospitals and clinics <sup>c</sup>	3.01	9 (7)	14 (12)	60 (50)	33 (27)	5 (4)			
Total Section Responses	3.59	63 (2)	202 (6)	677 (22)	2132 (68)	66 (2)			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Selections from Table 4.2 in Appendix B <sup>a</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students (n=186) <sup>b</sup>Assessed on the follow-up survey (n=259) <sup>c</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students on the follow-up survey (n=121)

#### **SUMMARY**

Overall, students appear to be somewhat satisfied with the school's library and information resources, with only 89% of the 3140 total responses to categories within this section being somewhat or very satisfied. As one of the only sections of the survey with less than 90% student satisfaction, and as the section of the survey with the highest percent of dissatisfaction at 8% somewhat or very dissatisfied responses, the Library & Information Resources section with the weakest section of the survey. While students report satisfaction with the library support and services, a large portion of students expressed dissatisfaction with electronic resources.

#### **STRENGTHS**

The quality of library support and services is the greatest strengths of the library program, with 96% total student satisfaction, as well as at least 95% satisfaction and less than 3% dissatisfaction in all four classes. The high rate of satisfaction with the library program is likely due to having two well-staffed libraries on campus, one conveniently located in the MEB for the first and second year students and the other in the Academic Education Center (AEC), conveniently located next to UMC & El Paso Children's Hospital, where the bulk of third year clerkships take place. Although accidentally only assessed for third and fourth year students, ease of access to electronic learning materials on campus also received 96% satisfied responses from all assessed classes. However, the high satisfaction levels of third and fourth year students with the ease of access to electronic learning materials in campus may conflict with the amount of dissatisfied responses recorded in the follow-up survey for the general category of ease of access to learning materials. This discrepancy is discussed further under opportunities for improvement. The remaining category in the Library & Information Resources section with greater than or equal to 90% somewhat or very satisfied responses across all four classes is the adequacy of computer learning resources (95%).

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

The survey reveals multiple areas of dissatisfaction within the Library & Information Resources section, with five categories receiving greater than 10% somewhat or very dissatisfied responses. Of these five, access to and utility of the student portal are two of the categories with which students are least satisfied, as evidenced by students reporting 15% dissatisfaction with access and 19% dissatisfaction with utility. Dissatisfaction with the student portal can largely be attributed to the new student portal, CHAMP, which was implemented this academic year. This theory is supported by the fact that first and second year students report 23% dissatisfaction with the combined categories of accessibility and utility of the student portal, while third and fourth year students express 10% for the combined categories. However, third and fourth year students, who worked with the previous student portal, Blackboard, still expressed dissatisfaction with the student portal. Some problems are to be expected with any new software program, but CHAMP is expected to be superior to its predecessor, although there is no evidence to support this at the time. Several issues with the new student portal CHAMP have already been addressed by the Curriculum and Educational Policy Committee, which recently established a student IT committee to help correct issues with the student portal. Unfortunately, improvements to CHAMP have recently slowed.

Another area of significant concern is the ease of access to electronic learning materials. The general category from the follow-up survey of "ease of access to electronic learning materials," which does not specify on campus or in hospitals, has a student dissatisfaction rate of 13%. Since the sub-category which specifies "on campus" has only 2% dissatisfaction, while the sub-category that specifies "in hospitals and clinics" has 19% dissatisfaction, it is likely that the dissatisfaction rate in the general category is largely a reflection of students' opinions on the access to electronic learning materials in hospitals and clinics, specifically. However, this assumption is complicated by the fact that the second year class, whose experience is mostly on campus and not in clinics, is the most dissatisfied with the general category, as

well as by the fact that the general category was assessed for all four classes, while the two specific categories were only assessed for third and fourth year students. Both the general category and the category specifying "in hospitals and clinics" have greater than 5% dissatisfaction in all assessed classes, yet these two categories were assessed in the follow-up survey, which reports higher percentages of student dissatisfaction overall. In conclusion, the ease of access to electronic learning materials should be considered a category for concern in general, although efforts to address this weakness should place more emphasis on increasing access in hospitals and clinics. Additionally, it is likely that student dissatisfaction with access to electronic learning materials is partly due to dissatisfaction with the student portal, as discussed above, and through which students would access most electronic materials.

The ease of logging hours in the clerkship years should also be considered an area for improvement, as 10% of the third year class and 15% of the fourth year class report being somewhat or very dissatisfied.

The only additional category from the Library & Information Resources section with greater than 5% dissatisfaction is accessibility of computer support with 6% somewhat or very dissatisfied responses. Although the dissatisfaction rating for accessibility of computer support is consistent across all four classes, this category is not considered a cause for concern due to its 91% total student satisfaction rating.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The school should prioritize student concerns with CHAMP and take the necessary steps to improve the student portal's accessibility and utility. It may be beneficial to conduct additional research into student concerns, further analyze student feedback regarding the student portals, continue use of the student IT committee to act as a liaison between students and the IT department, and increase communication by the IT department, directly addressing student concerns. As the school continues to modify the CHAMP software, student satisfaction with the student portal should be regularly monitored. One way in which the ease of logging hours in the clerkship years may be increased is to lengthen the amount of time in which students are allowed to log hours. Currently, students only have a 48-hour window in which they can log clinic hours. Creating a longer time window, perhaps a week, would alleviate pressure on students, especially when logging Friday hours, which under the current system expire before Monday. Additionally, while the location of IT support in the MEB is convenient for students to access, the student body may benefit from increased visibility or advertisement of the IT support department as a means to improve access.

## STUDENT SERVICES

Table 5.1. Total Student Body Responses to Select Categories Concerning the Student Services, organized by descending means 4									
	Mean	Very dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)			
Confidentiality of personal counseling	3.85	4 (1)	7 (2)	16 (4)	254 (64)	117 (29)			
		Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	N/A			
	Mean	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)			

Confidentiality of mental health services	3.85	4 (1)	6 (2)	14 (4)	236 (59)	138 (35)
Availability of disability insurance	3.84	4 (1)	2 (1)	19 (5)	193 (48)	180 (45)
Adequacy of education about prevention and exposure to infectious and environmental hazards	3.83	1 (0)	1 (0)	60 (15)	320 (80)	16 (4)
Clarity of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the pre- clinical years	3.82	6 (2)	6 (2)	42 (11)	337 (85)	7 (2)
Knowledge of protocol following exposure to infectious or environmental hazards	3.80	2 (1)	5 (1)	59 (15)	318 (80)	14 (4)
Clarity of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the clinical years <sup>a</sup>	3.75	2 (1)	6 (3)	28 (15)	148 (80)	2 (1)
Sense of community within your class	3.75	5 (1)	13 (3)	57 (14)	322 (81)	1 (0)
Fairness of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the clinical years <sup>a</sup>	3.71	1 (1)	8 (4)	34 (18)	141 (76)	2 (1)
Accessibility of student health services	3.69	5 (1)	20 (5)	53 (13)	272 (68)	48 (12)
Availability of programs to support student well-being	3.66	9 (2)	19 (5)	57 (14)	276 (69)	37 (9)
Overall debt management counseling	3.66	6 (2)	12 (3)	69 (17)	244 (61)	67 (17)
	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)

Adequacy of counseling about elective choices <sup>b</sup>	3.65	6 (2)	17 (4)	52 (13)	222 (56)	101 (25)
Adequacy of debt management counseling <sup>b</sup>	3.22	5 (2)	33 (13)	76 (29)	88 (34)	57 (22)
Total Section Responses	3.75	135 (1)	294 (3)	1333 (13)	7374 (70)	1445 (14)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Selections from Table 5.2 in Appendix B <sup>a</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students (n=186) <sup>b</sup>Assessed on the follow-up survey (n=259)

#### **SUMMARY**

Of all the individual student responses to questions concerning satisfaction with Student Services (n=10,581), only 82% were either somewhat or very satisfied (n=8,707). However, only 4% of responses indicated dissatisfaction (n=429). This seeming discrepancy between measures of overall satisfaction is due to the large percent of N/A responses in this section. If N/A responses are excluded (n=1445), the overall percentage of student satisfaction increases to 95%, suggesting that although many students have not yet used the services evaluated in this section of the survey, overall, students are satisfied with the learning environment and facilities. Since N/A stands for both "no opinion" and "no opportunity to access," it is unwise to completely exclude these values. However, those categories with greater than or equal to 10% N/A responses for the total student body are assumed to be not applicable to a portion of the population. The Student Services section has 15 categories with at least 10% N/A responses, and an additional 3 categories with 9% N/A, as compared to only 2 categories with more than 10% N/A responses in the other four sections of the survey combined.

#### **STRENGTHS**

Ten of the 28 categories concerning Student Services received 90% or more somewhat or very satisfied responses, 7 of which have 90% or greater student satisfaction in every class assessed. Of these 7 categories with greater than or equal to 90% satisfaction, 5 also have less than or equal to 5% dissatisfaction, making these 5 categories significant strengths of student services. The 5 categories consist of the two categories concerned with hazard exposure, the clarity of standards of conduct and professionalism in both the pre-clerkship and clerkship years, and the fairness of the standards of conduct and professionalism in clerkship years. Ninety-five percent of the student body is satisfied with the adequacy of education about prevention and exposure to infectious and environmental hazards and their knowledge of protocol following such an exposure. Therefore, the education about hazard exposure prevention and protocols that students receive during orientation and during the Medical Skills course can be considered sufficient and effective.

The strength of the categories concerned with standards of conduct & professionalism in both preclerkship and clerkship years is likely due to the emphasis that the school places on professionalism across multiple courses, including professional dress expected for preceptorships and the Medical Skills course, timely completion of faculty evaluations, and the ability to for students to report both positive and negative professionalism concerns about faculty and fellow students. The clarity of professionalism policies in the pre-clerkship and clerkship years, as well as the fairness of these standards in the clerkship years all received 95% somewhat or very satisfied responses. Similarly, fairness of standards of conduct and professionalism in the pre-clerkship years also received 95% satisfied responses from the total student

body, with greater than 90% in each class. However, it is unclear as to why the third year class expresses 7% dissatisfaction with the fairness of professionalism standards in the pre-clerkship years, while the other three classes all have less than or equal to 5% satisfaction in this category.

The last of the 7 categories in the Student Services section with greater than or equal to 90% student satisfaction across all four classes is the sense of community within each class, with 95% total satisfied responses. While first and fourth year students are extremely satisfied with the sense of community within their respective classes, the second and third year classes report 8% and 6% dissatisfaction in this category, respectively. Without knowledge of a specific reason for this discrepancy, it is worth noting that the second and third year students are the most dissatisfied overall, which may affect their opinions in all categories. Despite this, the sense of community within each class is considered a strength of the school due to the consistently high rates of student satisfaction in all four classes. The camaraderie among students is likely fostered by the pass/fail grading system in the pre-clerkship years, the college system, and the relatively small class sizes of approximately 100 students per class.

As mentioned previously, the relatively high percent of N/A responses within the Student Services section makes accurate analysis more difficult, and there may be several areas of strength which did not receive at least 90% somewhat or very satisfied responses overall. Of the 18 categories concerning student services which had less than 90% overall satisfaction, 15 have greater than or equal to 10% N/A responses, and the remaining 3 have 9% N/A responses. If these high percentages of N/A responses are due to the limited applicability of the corresponding categories to the total student body, the true percentage of satisfaction for those students to whom these categories apply is likely closer to that calculated after excluding the N/A responses than to the original calculations presented in the results. Excluding N/A responses, all but one category concerning student services has at least 90% student satisfaction. Of the 17 categories with at least 9% N/A responses and at least 90% satisfied responses after excluding the N/A responses, 11 have less than or equal to 5% student dissatisfaction overall, of which only 2 have less than or equal to 5% dissatisfaction in all four classes. These two categories are the availability of disability insurance and the quality of financial aid administrative services. Both of which should be considered strengths of student services.

Of the remaining 9 categories, which, after excluding N/A responses, have at least 90% total satisfied responses and less than or equal to 5% total dissatisfied responses, the notable areas of strength are the confidentiality of both mental health services and personal counseling services and the availability of tutorial help, all with mean responses greater than 3.80. Confidentiality of mental health and personal counseling services is protected by the school's use of PAS, a service which connects students to off-site counselors and psychiatrists who are not directly involved with the school. Tutorial help from student peers is readily available by request through student TAs, who are selected and paid by the department of student services to offer review sessions and to act as peer tutors.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Only five of the categories pertaining to student services demonstrate greater than 5% student dissatisfaction, and only one of these 5 categories received greater than 5% dissatisfaction from all four individual classes. This lone category is the adequacy of debt management counseling, which received a total dissatisfaction rating of 15% on the follow-up survey. Student dissatisfaction with the adequacy of debt management counseling is consistently high across all four classes, but is especially concerning for the fourth year students who report 23% dissatisfaction and who arguably have the greatest need for this service. Furthermore, the inadequacy of debt management counseling is confirmed by the fact that the category is the only one within the Student Services section which remains below 90% satisfaction when N/A values are excluded. Interestingly, all four classes equally contribute to the only 5% total dissatisfaction with "Overall debt management counseling" on the primary survey, which may suggest

that there is a specific problem with the "adequacy" of debt management counseling offered, such as the amount and/or quality of the counseling rather than the access to it.

The remaining 4 student services categories with more than 5% somewhat or very dissatisfied responses are accessibility of student health services, availability of programs to support student well-being, adequacy of counseling for elective choices, and accessibility of immunizations/ PPD's and associated records. While only 4% of the first and third year classes are dissatisfied with the accessibility of student health services, 6% of second year students and 12% of fourth year students express dissatisfaction with this same category. Overall dissatisfaction with access to student health services may be due to the fact that exposure concerns and vaccines are handled by Occupational Health in the Clinical Science Building on campus, while students are directed to the off-site Texas Tech Physicians of El Paso at Hague for all other medical concerns, which is only open Monday through Friday from 8am to 5pm. Additionally, the Hague clinic has limited testing capabilities and requires students to go to a stand-alone testing center, such as Quest Diagnostics, for any blood work. Parking at the Hague clinic is also difficult as it consists only of metered parking on near-by streets littered with construction or a pay-by-the-hour hospital parking lot more than a block away. While the challenges to care listed above may explain the overall 6% student dissatisfaction with accessibility of student health services, they do not explain why access is a much larger problem for fourth year students than all other students. Students' dissatisfaction with the accessibility of immunizations/ PPD's and associated records may contribute to their dissatisfaction with the accessibility of student health services, or have the same root problem, which may explain why the class trends are the same in both categories. As with accessibility of student health services, second and fourth year students are more dissatisfied with accessibility of immunizations/ PPD's than are first and third year students. Only 3% of the first and third year classes report dissatisfaction with the accessibility of immunizations/ PPD's and associated records, but up to 7% and 11% of the second and fourth year classes, respectively, are dissatisfied with this same category. The limited hours of operation of the Occupational Health Immunizations Clinic, which opens for four hours on four days of the week, may also be a cause of dissatisfaction. Another contributing factor to student dissatisfaction with the accessibility of immunizations/ PPD's and associated records may be due to the accessibility of immunization records which must either be requested in person at Occupational Health or found on the difficult to use electronic portal WebRaider. It is worth noting that despite the 6% overall dissatisfaction rate, all classes other than the fourth year class report at least 90% satisfaction with the accessibility of immunizations/ PPD's and associated records, making this category less of a concern.

Students in every class other than the first year class reported higher rates of dissatisfaction with the availability of programs to support student well-being than the overall 7% dissatisfaction rate reported for this category. It is unclear as to why first year students are more satisfied with the availability of programs to support student well-being, but it may be a reflection of their limited ability to assess most categories of the survey, having only been enrolled at PLFSOM for 4 months at the time of the survey. The limited ability of first year students to accurately complete the survey is supported by the higher rates of N/A responses chosen by the first year class compared to the other three classes, and may be part of the reason first year students express more satisfaction overall. The trend of the first year class reporting more satisfaction and more N/A responses than other classes is also seen in the survey results for the adequacy of counseling for elective choices. Since electives only take place during clerkship years, the adequacy of counseling for elective choices should probably not have been assessed for pre-clerkship students, as further indicated by the high rates of N/A responses to this category among the first and second year classes. Overall, the adequacy of counseling about elective choices has a 6% rate of student dissatisfaction, but the rate increases to 9% if first and second year students are excluded, making this category an important area of concern. Student dissatisfaction with counseling about elective choices may be reflective of overall student dissatisfaction with the clerkship curriculum, as discussed below in the Medical Education Program section.

Upon excluding N/A values for those categories with at least 9% N/A responses, six categories reveal more than 5% student dissatisfaction. The four of these six categories which have already been identified above as areas for improvement are the adequacy of debt management counseling, the accessibility of student health services, the availability of programs to support student well-being, and the adequacy of counseling for elective choices. The remaining two categories which are to be considered areas of concern for the Student Services section are the accessibility of personal counseling and the availability of mental health services, both with 6% student dissatisfaction, excluding N/A responses. Students in the second and fourth years are more dissatisfied than their peers with the accessibility of personal counseling. Although the reason for the higher rates of dissatisfaction among second and fourth year students for this category is unclear, it does follow a trend for higher dissatisfaction rates in general for these two classes in categories concerning student services. Student satisfaction with both the availability of mental health services and the accessibility of personal counseling may have improved since the time of the survey, as the Office of Student Affairs has begun sending out bi-annual emails reminding students how to access the 5 free counseling and psychiatric services available to them per academic year through the Program of Assistance for Students (PAS).

Although a majority of students are satisfied with the clarity and the fairness of policies and procedures for disciplinary action, special consideration should be given to the more than 10% of the second year class who express dissatisfaction with these categories.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The school should gather further student feedback to determine the specific deficiencies in the current the debt management counseling program, in order to increase student satisfaction with this service.

Accessibility to student health services could be improved by having a more convenient location for the student health clinic or by allowing more than one of the Texas Tech Physicians of El Paso locations to function as the student health clinic. Designated student parking spaces near the student clinic(s) would also increase accessibility. Additionally, having at least one day with extended hours at the clinic would significantly improve student access, as the clinic is not currently open on weekends or after hours, when students would be better able to attend without missing required activities. Extended clinic hours may be one way to improve fourth year students' satisfaction levels, specifically, as clerkship schedules seem to offer less flexibility than pre-clerkship schedules provide.

As mentioned previously, the Office of Student Affairs has begun to send an email each semester reminding students of the confidential counseling and mental health services available for students and how to contact these services. This should help improve student satisfaction with the availability of personal counseling and mental health services as well as with the availability of programs to support student well-being. Further exploration into programs to increase student well-being should be pursued.

Elective counseling satisfaction could be improved by creating a system in which students have more influence over their third year elective clerkships, referred to in the curriculum as "selectives." As of now, it is a lottery system for each clerkship, and no weight is given to the student's career of interest. In contrast, fourth year electives are requested by each student after meeting with the his or her advisor, who provides specialty-specific input to the student. Increasing students' access to advisors and influence over electives, especially in the third year, should increase student satisfaction with (s)elective counseling.

Second year student satisfaction with the clarity of policies and procedures for disciplinary action can easily be addressed with a concise presentation of these policies at the next second year class meeting. Inquiries as to student concerns about the fairness of policies and procedures for disciplinary action may also be addressed at this time, or students can be prompted to contact a specific administrator with specific questions or concerns regarding these policies.

# MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Table 6.1. Total Student Body Responses to Select Categories Concerning the Medical Education Program, organized by descending means <sup>5</sup>									
	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)			
Satisfaction with the College system	3.81	4 (1)	6 (2)	52 (13)	332 (83)	4 (1)			
Clinical skills instruction in the first and second years	3.80	1 (0)	4 (1)	68 (17)	323 (81)	2 (1)			
Adequacy of education to diagnose disease	3.75	4 (1)	5 (1)	78 (20)	306 (77)	5 (1)			
Quality of the first year	3.74	2 (1)	13 (3)	72 (18)	308 (77)	3 (1)			
Adequacy of education in caring for patients from different backgrounds	3.74	6 (2)	9 (2)	67 (17)	309 (78)	7 (2)			
Coordination/integrati on of content in the first year	3.73	3 (1)	10 (3)	76 (19)	307 (77)	2 (1)			
Appropriateness of methods to assess achievement in the first year	3.72	4 (1)	6 (2)	85 (21)	298 (75)	5 (1)			
Overall workload in the first year	3.70	4(1)	8 (2)	89 (22)	294 (74)	3 (1)			
Each clerkship follows common clerkship policies <sup>a</sup>	3.67	1 (1)	5 (3)	45 (24)	124 (67)	11 (6)			
	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)			

Access to patients during third-year clerkships <sup>a</sup>	3.66	3 (2)	5 (3)	41 (22)	129 (69)	8 (4)
Faculty in the clinical years adhere to students' clerkship requirements <sup>a</sup>	3.63	1 (1)	8 (4)	48 (26)	122 (66)	7 (4)
School responsiveness to student feedback on courses and teaching	3.60	11 (3)	21 (5)	79 (20)	273 (69)	14 (4)
Utility of the student daily calendar	3.56	13 (3)	26 (7)	80 (20)	271 (68)	8 (2)
Amount and quality of formative feedback in the third year <sup>a</sup>	3.45	7 (4)	17 (9)	41 (22)	108 (58)	13 (7)
Quality of the third year clerkships <sup>a</sup>	3.44	5 (3)	16 (9)	53 (28)	104 (56)	8 (4)
Overall workload in the first/second years <sup>b</sup>	3.43	3 (1)	18 (7)	100 (39)	135 (52)	3 (1)
Fairness of grading policies in the clerkship years <sup>a</sup>	3.43	8 (4)	15 (8)	46 (25)	105 (56)	12 (6)
Satisfaction with third- year scheduling <sup>a</sup>	3.38	8 (4)	16 (9)	55 (30)	100 (54)	7 (4)
Adequacy of USMLE preparation <sup>a</sup>	3.27	8 (4)	24 (13)	61 (33)	88 (47)	5 (3)
School responsiveness to student feedback on courses/ clerkships <sup>b</sup>	3.24	9 (4)	38 (15)	86 (33)	117 (45)	9 (4)
Satisfaction with having integrated third year clerkship rotations <sup>a</sup>	3.18	20 (11)	21 (11)	42 (23)	93 (50)	10 (5)
	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
	1.17011	- 1 (70)	- 1 (70)	- 1 (70)	- 1 ( / 0)	1. (70)

<b>Total Section</b>	2.62	210 (2)	5(0(4)	2002 (22)	0171 ((0)	425 (2)
Responses	3.63	218 (2)	569 (4)	2982 (22)	91/1 (69)	435 (3)

<sup>5</sup>Selections from Table 6.2. in Appendix B <sup>a</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students (n=186) <sup>b</sup>Assessed on the follow-up survey (n=259)

#### **SUMMARY**

Overall, students are satisfied with the medical education program. Of all individual responses to the questions concerning student satisfaction with the medical education program (n=13,375), 91% are either somewhat or very satisfied (n=12,153). It is important to note that despite overall satisfaction with the medical education program and high levels of satisfaction with the pre-clerkship education program, there is a concerning number of students who are dissatisfied with various aspects of the clerkship education program, especially the third year curriculum.

#### **STRENGTHS**

Several categories of the medical education program show high levels of satisfaction, with 28 of 46 categories reporting 90% or greater satisfaction. Students are especially satisfied with the pre-clerkship curriculum, as 13 of the 14 categories specific to the pre-clerkship curriculum had greater than or equal to 90% total student satisfaction, and the one remaining category (quality of the second year) also has at least 90% satisfaction if first year student responses are excluded, as justified by the 79% N/A responses of first year students. The greatest strength of the pre-clerkship curriculum is the clinical skills instruction in the first and second years, which, with 98% total satisfaction, has the greatest percent of satisfied responses out of all the categories within the Medical Education Program section. With 100% satisfaction among second year students and 99% among first year students, the clinical skills instruction in the first and second years is one of 5 categories specific to the pre-clerkship curriculum which has greater than or equal to 90% satisfaction and less than or equal to 5% dissatisfaction in all four classes. The strength of the pre- clerkship skills instruction and overall curriculum is supported by the 92% student satisfaction reported for the utility of the first and second years as preparation for clinical clerkships. The remaining 4 pre-clerkship categories with greater than or equal to 90% satisfaction and less than or equal to 5% dissatisfaction in all four classes all pertain to the first year specifically. They are the coordination/integration of content, the overall workload, the appropriateness of methods to assess achievement, and the overall quality of the first year, all with at least 95% total satisfaction. Other categories pertaining to the pre-clerkship curriculum which have 95% or greater total satisfaction and at least 90% student satisfaction for each class are the fairness of summative assessment in the first and second years and the amount and quality of formative feedback in the first and second years.

Although not nearly as strong as the pre-clerkship curriculum, 5 of 18 categories specific to the third and fourth year clerkship curriculum have at least 90% total satisfied responses. Of these 5 categories, 4 were assessed for both third and fourth year students, none of which have at least 90% satisfaction for both classes. These four categories are the adherence of faculty to students' clerkship requirements with 92% satisfaction, the adherence of each clerkship to common clerkship policies with 91% satisfaction, the access to patients during the third year clerkships with 91% satisfaction, and the availability of educational resources at hospitals and clinics with 90% satisfaction. Of these four, only the availability of educational resources at hospitals and clinics has more than 5% dissatisfaction from either class, as 9% of fourth year students report dissatisfaction with this category. The remaining clerkship-focused medical education category which has at least 90% is the sense of preparedness for residency interview/ match process, which was only assessed for fourth years.

Additionally, 10 of 14 categories which apply to all four years of education have at least 90% satisfaction, 5 of which have greater than or equal to 90% satisfaction and less than or equal to 5% dissatisfaction in all four classes. These 5 categories are adequacy of education to diagnose disease (97%), adequacy of education in disease prevention (94%), satisfaction with the college system (96%), clarity of policies for advancement/graduation (95%), and utility of the educational program objectives to support learning (96%). Although student satisfaction in these categories is relatively consistent across all four classes, second year students express slightly less satisfaction with the college system than their peers, while third year students are less satisfied with the adequacy of education to prevent and diagnose disease and with the clarity of policies for graduation. Adequacy of education in caring for patients from different backgrounds and adequacy of education in health maintenance both have a similarly high levels of student satisfaction as the afore mentioned categories, with greater than 90% satisfaction for each class and less than or equal to 5% total dissatisfaction, despite that the second year class expresses 6% dissatisfaction in each category. While the second and third year classes are less satisfied than their peers in multiple categories of the Medical Education Program section, the overall strength of the above listed categories, of the medical education program as a whole, and of the pre-clerkship education in particular, is reflected in the responses provided by each of the four classes individually and combined.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

More than half of the 23 medical education categories that received greater than 5% somewhat or very dissatisfied responses from the total student body pertain to the clerkship curriculum. Both third and fourth year classes report greater than 5% student dissatisfaction in 5 categories specific to the third year curriculum and 2 additional categories pertaining to both third and fourth year programs. Of these 7 categories, the area of greatest concern category is integrated third-year clerkship rotations, with which 13% of third year students and 31% of fourth year students are dissatisfied. The remaining 6 categories are the amount and quality of formative feedback in the third year, the quality of the third year clerkships, the fairness of grading policies in the clerkship years, and satisfaction with third year scheduling, which all exceed 10% student dissatisfaction, and the adequacy of experiences with electronic medical records and the fairness of summative assessment in the third year which have 10% and 8% dissatisfaction, respectively. Furthermore, 6% of the fourth year class, which was the only class assessed, is dissatisfied with their sense of preparedness for skills required during internship year/ residency.

The strength of the pre-clerkship curriculum is reflected in the fact that none of the 14 pre-clerkship curriculum specific categories of the Medical Education Program section received greater than 5% dissatisfaction from all classes assessed. However, several categories have high rates of dissatisfied second year students, as 16% of second year students are dissatisfied with the utility of the end of unit evaluations in the pre-clerkship years, 9% with the quality of the second year, 14% with the quality of self-directed learning activities in in the first and second years, and 11% with the opportunities for selfdirected learning activities in in the first and second years. According to the survey, second year students are notably more dissatisfied with the school overall, and this trend is especially strong in the Medical Education Program section, where second year students report equal to or greater percentages of dissatisfaction than the other three classes in 21 of the 26 categories for which they were assessed. While the overall lower satisfaction of the second year class may negatively affect their responses, this does not entirely account for differences between the first and second years of the pre-clerkship curriculum, which is revealed in the noticeably higher rates of dissatisfaction among multiple classes for the overall workload and coordination/integration of the "first and second years," as compared to that of the first years only. Interestingly, the overall workload for first and second years has higher rates of dissatisfaction among first and second year students than among third and fourth year students. While the difference of class opinions on the pre-clerkship workload could be due to the different perspective that third and fourth year students have as clerkship students, it may also be due to the recent condensation of the pre-clerkship

curriculum, which was not in effect for third and fourth year students. Considering the overall strength of the medical education program and the pre-clerkship curriculum, the trend of dissatisfaction among second year students does not definitively suggest deficiencies in particular survey categories. However, the school should be concerned for second year students.

Other categories of the medical education program with high rates of dissatisfaction among students are the adequacy of USMLE preparation and the school's responsiveness to student feedback on courses/clerkships. Overall, 17% of the student body is dissatisfied with the adequacy of USMLE preparation, and, although third year students express the most dissatisfaction, the dissatisfaction rates with this category are relatively consistent across all four classes. Currently, first and second year students receive a two year subscription to Board Vitals USMLE-style question bank and a six month UWorld subscription, which they can activate at their convenience, for USMLE Step I preparation. U world is the most popular Step I question bank with proven results, and 6 months is an often-recommended amount of subscription time for this resource. Therefore, it is likely that student dissatisfaction with USMLE preparation is either due to a lack of protected study time or due to insufficient coverage of USMLE topics and question styles in the pre-clerkship curriculum.

Although the original survey question of "school responsiveness to student feedback on courses and teaching" reported only 8% dissatisfaction, the data trend across classes was similar to that recorded for the follow-up question "school responsiveness to student feedback on courses/clerkships" which received 19% dissatisfaction. Part of the discrepancy between these two categories may be due to the distinction of clerkships in the latter category, suggesting that the school's responsiveness is more of a problem in clerkship years. However, the second-year class expressed the most dissatisfaction in both categories, with the third and fourth year classes only slightly less dissatisfied.

An additional area for improvement in the medical education program is the utility of the student daily calendar. The dissatisfaction with the student daily calendar is most likely attributed to the implementation of the new student portal and calendar, CHAMP, as addressed under the Library & Information Resources section above. However, it is worth noting that the first year class is significantly more satisfied with the daily calendar than the other three classes. This may be due to the general trend of first year students to express higher levels of satisfaction or it may be an indication of CHAMP's superiority to the previous student calendar.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

To increase student satisfaction with the USMLE preparation provided by the school, students should be surveyed further to determine specific areas for improvement and to differentiate if student dissatisfaction is due to an insufficient amount of focus given to USMLE subjects in the pre-clerkship years, of USMLE-style questions in the pre-clerkship years, or of time given to prepare for the USMLE Step I between the second and third years, or is due to other factors. USMLE preparation is an issue that should be revisited after the class of 2019 has completed USMLE Step I, as additional preparatory steps have already been implemented, such as an increase in the amount of protected study time provided to second year students before Step I of USMLE, the implementation of a PICE course project which helps students identify areas of weakness, and the altering the SCI second year final exam to better reflect Step I content.

Besides addressing concerns about USMLE preparation, the school should focus most of its efforts on improving the third year curriculum. There is an alarmingly high rate of dissatisfaction with the integrated third year clerkships. Integrated units are proving to be a successful means of teaching during the first two years, as evidenced by the high rate of student satisfaction with the pre-clerkship curriculum. However, the survey results suggest that this method of instruction is currently unsuccessful during third year clerkships and should be reevaluated. A transition to the traditional third year clerkship approach or a drastic revision of the integrated approach is highly suggested. Additionally, a traditional third year

clerkship model would allow students to build relationships with the house staff, potentially enhancing residency applications through strong letters of recommendations. In an effort to improve fairness of grading during clerkships, a new grading system may need to be instituted. The current system places the entirety of the grading on the NBME exam percentile with specific cutoffs designated for each subject exam, requiring students to score approximately at or above the 60th percentile to earn a grade of "Honors." A system of "Fail," "Pass," "High Pass," and "Honors," or similar, could be used to separate the students into categories based on their percentiles on the NBME exams. Finally, satisfaction with the amount of interaction students have with electronic medical records at UMC and Texas Tech Physicians of El Paso clinics could be improved by allowing students to write notes and enter orders. These notes and orders would be approved and signed off by the senior staff, allowing the clinics to bill patients normally, while still serving an educational purpose. This would improve workflow in the clinics and hospitals, while also enhancing student learning experiences.

The school should also survey the current first year students in October 2017 on the same categories for which the second year students currently express significant dissatisfaction in order to help determine if the second year dissatisfaction rates are due to problems with the second year curriculum or problems within the second year class.

# APPENDIX A: 2016 LCME ISA COMPLETE SURVEY RESULTS, stratified by class year

# STUDENT-FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIPS

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF STUDENTS, organized alphabetically

Accessibility

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.91	2 (2)	0 (0)	9 (8)	92 (85)	5 (5)
Second year students	3.95	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (9)	89 (86)	5(5)
Third year students	3.86	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (16)	75 (82)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.89	0 (0)	2 (2)	6 (6)	86 (91)	0 (0)
Total	3.90	2 (1)	2 (1)	40 (10)	342 (86)	12 (3)

**Awareness of student concerns** 

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.86	3 (3)	0 (0)	6 (6)	99 (92)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.71	1 (1)	3 (3)	23 (22)	75 (72)	2 (2)
Third year students	3.76	1 (1)	1 (1)	17 (18)	73 (79)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.72	1 (1)	2 (2)	20 (21)	70 (74)	1 (1)
Total	3.77	6 (2)	6 (2)	66 (17)	317 (80)	3 (1)

Confidentiality

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.91	3 (3)	0 (0)	7 (6)	92 (85)	6 (6)
Second year students	3.98	0 (0)	1 (1)	5 (5)	93 (90)	5 (5)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.91	0 (0)	2 (2)	8 (9)	78 (85)	4()
Fourth year students	3.95	1 (1)	0	6 (6)	83 (88)	4 (4)
Total	3.94	4(1)	3 (1)	26 (7)	346 (87)	19 (5)

Responsiveness to student feedback

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.83	2 (2)	0 (0)	12 (11)	94 (87)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.63	2 (2)	7 (7)	20 (19)	73 (70)	2 (2)
Third year students	3.73	1 (1)	2 (2)	18 (20)	71 (76)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.80	0 (0)	3 (3)	15 (16)	74 (79)	2 (2)
Total	3.75	5 (1)	12 (3)	65 (16)	312 (78)	4 (1)

Responsiveness to student problems

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.82	2 (2)	1 (1)	11 (10)	94 (87)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.66	2 (2)	5 (5)	21 (20)	74 (71)	2 (2)
Third year students	3.79	1 (1)	1 (1)	14 (15)	76 (82)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.77	1 (1)	3 (3)	15 (16)	73 (78)	2 (2)
Total	3.76	6 (2)	10 (3)	61 (15)	317 (80)	4 (1)

Accessibility

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.93	1 (1)	0 (0)	4 (4)	95 (88)	8 (7)
Second year students	3.80	0 (0)	0 (0)	19 (18)	74 (71)	11 (11)
Third year students	3.58	0 (0)	4 (4)	27 (29)	53 (58)	8 (9)
Fourth year students	3.85	0 (0)	2 (2)	13 (14)	66 (70)	13 (14)
Total	3.78	1 (0)	6 (2)	63 (16)	288 (72)	40 (10)

Accessibility of medical school faculty

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.94	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (3)	100 (93)	4 (4)
Second year students	3.79	0 (0)	1 (1)	19 (18)	78 (75)	6 (6)
Third year students	3.58	0 (0)	3 (3)	21 (23)	65 (71)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.85	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (14)	75 (80)	6 (6)
Total	3.82	1 (0)	4 (1)	56 (14)	318 (80)	19 (5)

# **Awareness of student concerns**

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.88	1 (1)	0 (0)	10 (9)	95 (88)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.70	1 (1)	5 (5)	17 (16)	78 (75)	3 (3)
Third year students	3.71	0 (0)	4 (4)	18 (20)	67 (73)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.69	0 (0)	3 (3)	20 (21)	62 (66)	9 (10)
Total	3.75	2 (1)	12 (3)	65 (16)	302 (76)	17 (4)

I feel comfortable talking to the administration

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.87	2 (2)	0 (0)	8 (7)	96 (89)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.74	1 (1)	2 (2)	20 (19)	81 (78)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.62	3 (3)	3 (3)	19 (21)	64 (70)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.73	3 (3)	1 (1)	14 (15)	73 (78)	3 (3)
Total	3.74	9 (2)	6 (2)	61 (15)	314 (79)	8 (2)

Participation of students on key medical school committees

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.94	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (3)	97 (90)	7 (6)
Second year students	3.71	1 (1)	5 (5)	16 (15)	78 (75)	4 (4)
Third year students	3.74	0 (0)	1 (1)	19 (21)	61 (66)	11 (12)
Fourth year students	3.79	0 (0)	1 (1)	15 (16)	65 (69)	13 (14)
Total	3.80	2 (1)	7 (2)	53 (13)	301 (76)	35 (9)

Responsiveness to student problems

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.86	1 (1)	1 (1)	10 (9)	94 (87)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.54	1 (1)	6 (6)	31 (30)	62 (60)	4 (4)
Third year students	3.60	0 (0)	5 (5)	26 (28)	58 (63)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.67	0 (0)	4 (4)	20 (21)	61 (65)	9 (10)
Total	3.67	2 (1)	16 (4)	87 (22)	275 (69)	18 (5)

The administration has a genuine desire for students to succeed

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.94	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (3)	103 (95)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.84	0 (0)	3 (3)	11 (11)	90 (87)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.81	0 (0)	2 (2)	13 (14)	75 (82)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.82	1 (1)	2 (2)	9 (10)	78 (83)	4 (4)
Total	3.86	2 (1)	7 (2)	36 (9)	346 (87)	7 (2)

The administration maintains open communication with the student body

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	9 (8)	97 (90)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.66	2 (2)	4 (4)	21 (20)	76 (73)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.68	1 (1)	2 (2)	22 (24)	65 (71)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.75	0 (0)	3 (3)	16 (17)	68 (72)	7 (7)
Total	3.75	4 (1)	9 (2)	68 (17)	306 (77)	11 (3)

The medical school faculty are readily available to me

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.92	1 (1)	0 (0)	6 (6)	100 (93)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.81	0 (0)	2 (2)	15 (14)	85 (82)	2 (2)
Third year students	3.73	1 (1)	1 (1)	19 (21)	69 (75)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.83	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (16)	74 (79)	5 (5)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.83	2 (1)	3 (1)	55 (14)	328 (82)	10 (3)

# LEARNING ENVIRONMENT & FACILITIES, organized alphabetically

Access to secure storage space for personal belongings

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.90	1 (1)	0 (0)	8 (7)	99 (92)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.87	0 (0)	1 (1)	11 (11)	91 (88)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.13	6 (7)	17 (18)	28 (30)	41 (45)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.05	11 (12)	16 (17)	23 (24)	43 (46)	1 (1)
Total	3.52	18 (5)	34 (9)	70 (18)	274 (69)	2 (1)

Adequacy of educational/teaching spaces at hospitals

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.57	1 (1)	6 (7)	24 (26)	60 (65)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.48	4 (4)	6 (6)	24 (26)	59 (63)	1 (1)
Total	3.53	5 (3)	12 (6)	48 (26)	119 (64)	2 (1)

Adequacy of lecture halls, large group classroom facilities

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.90	1 (1)	2 (2)	4 (4)	101 (94)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.77	1 (1)	1 (1)	19 (19)	82 (79)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.73	0 (0)	3 (3)	19 (21)	70 (76)	0 (0)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.65	1 (1)	7 (7)	16 (17)	69 (73)	1 (1)
Total	3.77	3 (1)	13 (3)	58 (15)	322 (81)	2 (1)

Adequacy of parking for 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year clinical rotations

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.6	2(2)	6(7)	18(20)	65(70)	1(1)
Fourth year students	3.45	5 (5)	10 (11)	16 (17)	61 (65)	2 (2)
Total	3.52	7 (4)	16 (9)	34 (18)	126 (68)	3 (2)

Adequacy of parking in the pre-clinical years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.26	4 (4)	16 (15)	36 (33)	52 (48)	0 (0)
Second year students	2.89	15 (14)	14 (13)	42 (40)	33 (32)	0 (0)
Third year students	2.67	16 (17)	25 (27)	24 (26)	27 (29)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	2.52	29 (31)	18 (19)	13 (14)	32 (34)	2 (2)
Total	2.86	64 (16)	73 (18)	115 (29)	144 (36)	2 (1)

Adequacy of safety and security on campus and all other instructional sites

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.95	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	105 (97)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.87	1 (1)	1 (1)	8 (8)	93 (89)	1 (1)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.77	0 (0)	4 (4)	13 (14)	74 (80)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.88	0 (0)	1 (1)	9 (10)	83 (88)	1 (1)
Total	3.87	2 (1)	6 (2)	32 (8)	355 (89)	3 (1)

Adequacy of school activities to prevent mistreatment

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.92	1 (1)	0 (0)	5 (5)	97 (90)	5 (5)
Second year students	3.82	0 (0)	2 (2)	14 (13)	82 (79)	6 (6)
Third year students	3.73	0 (0)	3 (3)	18 (20)	69 (75)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.79	1 (1)	3 (3)	9 (10)	74 (79)	7 (7)
Total	3.82	2 (1)	8 (2)	46 (12)	322 (81)	20 (5)

Adequacy of small group teaching spaces on campus

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.79	1 (1)	0 (0)	20 (19)	86 (80)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.65	4 (4)	4 (4)	16 (15)	79 (76)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.73	0 (0)	3 (3)	19 (21)	69 (75)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.63	1 (1)	6 (6)	19 (20)	67 (71)	1 (1)
Total	3.70	6 (1)	13 (3)	74 (19)	301 (76)	4 (1)

Adequacy of student relaxation space

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.64	3 (3)	4 (4)	22 (20)	79 (73)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.45	5 (5)	9 (9)	24 (23)	65 (63)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.57	0 (0)	11 (12)	18 (20)	63 (68)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.57	2 (2)	6 (6)	22 (23)	62 (66)	2 (2)
Total	3.55	10 (3)	30 (8)	86 (22)	269 (68)	3 (1)

Adequacy of student study space

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.39	2 (2)	10 (9)	40 (37)	56 (52)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.26	6 (6)	15 (14)	28 (27)	54 (52)	1(1)
Third year students	3.27	2 (2)	16 (17)	29 (32)	45 (49)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.22	7 (7)	13 (14)	26 (28)	47 (50)	1(1)
Total	3.29	17 (4)	54 (14)	123 (31)	202 (51)	2 (1)

Adequacy of the mechanisms to report mistreatment

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.96	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)	97 (90)	9 (8)
Second year students	3.82	0 (0)	2 (2)	13 (13)	79 (76)	10 (10)
Third year students	3.78	0 (0)	1 (1)	17 (18)	68 (74)	6 (7)
Fourth year students	3.81	1 (1)	2 (2)	9 (10)	72 (77)	10 (11)
Total	3.85	2 (1)	5 (1)	40 (10)	316 (79)	35 (9)

Adequacy of the school's discrimination policy

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.96	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)	102 (94)	4 (4)
Second year students	3.9	0 (0)	1 (1)	8 (8)	92 (88)	3 (3)
Third year students	3.87	0 (0)	1 (1)	10 (11)	79 (86)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.80	1 (1)	3 (3)	9 (10)	79 (84)	2 (2)
Total	3.89	2 (1)	5 (1)	28 (7)	352 (88)	11 (3)

Adequacy of the school's mistreatment policy

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.94	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (3)	94 (87)	10 (9)
Second year students	3.86	0 (0)	1 (1)	11 (11)	83 (80)	9 (9)
Third year students	3.84	0 (0)	1 (1)	12 (13)	75 (82)	4 (4)
Fourth year students	3.84	1 (1)	2 (2)	7 (7)	76 (81)	8 (9)
Total	3.87	2 (1)	4 (1)	33 (8)	328 (82)	31 (8)

Adequacy of the testing facilities and environment

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.92	1 (1)	0 (0)	6 (6)	101 (94)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.88	1 (1)	2 (2)	6 (6)	95 (91)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.78	0 (0)	2 (2)	16 (17)	74 (80)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.68	1 (1)	4 (4)	19 (20)	69 (73)	1 (1)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.82	3 (1)	8 (2)	47 (12)	339 (85)	1 (0)

Administration and faculty diversity

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	1 (1)	7 (6)	98 (91)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.76	4 (4)	2 (2)	8 (8)	86 (83)	4 (4)
Third year students	3.78	1 (1)	1 (1)	15 (16)	75 (82)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.77	1 (1)	1 (1)	15 (16)	70 (74)	7 (7)
Total	3.80	7 (2)	5 (1)	45 (11)	329 (83)	12 (3)

Amenities available to students in the student lounge and gym

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.69	1 (1)	4 (4)	23 (21)	80 (74)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.46	6 (6)	6 (6)	26 (25)	66 (63)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.62	2 (2)	1 (1)	27 (29)	62 (67)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.66	0 (0)	6 (6)	19 (20)	67 (71)	2 (2)
Total	3.61	9 (2)	17 (4)	95 (24)	275 (69)	2 (1)

**Environment conductive to culturally competent health care** 

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.93	1 (1)	0 (0)	5 (5)	102 (94)	0 (0)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Second year students	3.86	2 (2)	2 (2)	4 (4)	95 (91)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.78	2 (2)	2 (2)	10 (11)	77 (84)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.82	2 (2)	1 (1)	8 (9)	80 (85)	3 (3)
Total	3.85	7 (2)	5 (1)	27 (7)	354 (89)	5 (1)

Opportunities to participate in research

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.82	1 (1)	1 (1)	13 (12)	83 (77)	10 (9)
Second year students	3.63	2 (2)	6 (6)	21 (20)	75 (72)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.70	1 (1)	4 (4)	17 (18)	70 (76)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.58	0 (0)	11 (12)	17 (18)	65 (69)	1 (1)
Total	3.68	4 (1)	22 (6)	68 (17)	293 (74)	11 (3)

Opportunities to participate in service learning

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	9 (8)	96 (89)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.86	0 (0)	2 (2)	10 (10)	91 (88)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.86	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (14)	79 (86)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.86	0 (0)	2 (2)	9 (10)	81 (86)	2 (2)
Total	3.87	1 (0)	4 (1)	41 (10)	347 (87)	5 (1)

Opportunity for interaction with other medical disciplines

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.85	1 (1)	2 (2)	9 (8)	96 (89)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.61	1 (1)	5 (5)	27 (26)	70 (67)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.59	0 (0)	4 (4)	30 (33)	58 (63)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.68	1 (1)	4 (4)	18 (19)	69 (73)	2 (2)
Total	3.69	3 (1)	15 (4)	84 (21)	293 (74)	3 (1)

**Student diversity** 

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.86	1 (1)	2 (2)	8 (7)	96 (89)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.69	4 (4)	3 (3)	14 (13)	82 (79)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.70	0 (0)	3 (3)	21 (22)	67 (73)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.71	1 (1)	3 (3)	17 (18)	69 (73)	4 (4)
Total	3.74	6 (2)	11 (3)	60 (15)	314 (79)	7 (2)

The learning environment in the pre-clinical years fosters collegiality and respect

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.94	1 (1)	0 (0)	4 (4)	103 (95)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.85	0 (0)	4 (4)	8 (8)	92 (88)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.74	0 (0)	4 (4)	16 (17)	72 (78)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.81	0 (0)	1 (1)	16 (17)	76 (81)	1 (1)
Total	3.84	1 (0)	9 (2)	44 (11)	343 (86)	1 (0)

### LIBRARY & INFORMATION RESOURCES, organized alphabetically

Access to student portal (Blackboard/CHAMP/Canvas)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.37	3 (3)	17 (16)	24 (22)	63 (58)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.11	8 (8)	18 (17)	33 (32)	45 (43)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.62	0 (0)	6 (7)	23 (25)	63 (68)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.61	0 (0)	6 (6)	24 (26)	63 (67)	1 (1)
Total	3.42	11 (3)	47 (12)	104 (26)	234 (59)	2 (1)

**Accessibility of computer support** 

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.72	2 (2)	3 (3)	17 (16)	83 (77)	3 (3)
Second year students	3.67	3 (3)	4 (4)	16 (15)	78 (75)	3 (3)
Third year students	3.72	0 (0)	6 (7)	13 (14)	71 (77)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.69	2 (2)	3 (3)	16 (17)	69 (73)	4 (4)
Total	3.70	7 (2)	16 (4)	62 (16)	301 (76)	12 (3)

**Adequacy of computer learning resources** 

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.82	1 (1)	0 (0)	16 (15)	87 (81)	4 (4)
Second year students	3.78	0 (0)	5 (5)	12 (12)	82 (79)	5 (5)
Third year students	3.78	0 (0)	2 (2)	16 (17)	73 (80)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.84	1 (1)	1 (1)	10 (11)	80 (85)	2 (2)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.80	2 (1)	8 (2)	54 (14)	322 (81)	12 (3)

Ease of access to electronic learning materials on campus

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.80	1(1)	1(1)	13(14)	75(82)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.82	1 (1)	1 (1)	12 (13)	78 (83)	2 (2)
Total	3.81	2 (1)	2 (1)	25 (13)	153 (82)	4 (2)

Ease of access to electronic learning materials<sup>a</sup>

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.46	0 (0)	5 (8)	25 (38)	35 (54)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.05	2 (3)	12 (16)	39 (53)	20 (27)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.41	2 (3)	7 (10)	20 (29)	39 (57)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.35	0 (0)	5 (9)	23 (43)	23 (43)	2 (4)
Total	3.31	4 (2)	29 (11)	107 (41)	117 (45)	2(1)

Ease of access to electronic learning materials in hospitals and clinics<sup>a</sup>

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.08	5 (7)	6 (9)	32 (47)	21 (31)	4 (6)
Fourth year students	2.92	4 (8)	8 (15)	28 (53)	12 (23)	1 (2)
Total	3.01	9 (7)	14 (12)	60 (50)	33 (27)	5 (4)

<sup>a</sup>assessed on the follow-up survey

Ease of access to library resources and holdings

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.80	1 (1)	3 (3)	11 (10)	85 (79)	8 (7)
Second year students	3.83	0 (0)	2 (2)	13 (13)	86 (83)	3 (3)
Third year students	3.80	1 (1)	0 (0)	15 (16)	74 (80)	2(2)
Fourth year students	3.83	0 (0)	2 (2)	12 (13)	78 (83)	2 (2)
Total	3.81	2 (1)	7 (2)	51 (13)	323 (81)	15 (4)

Ease of logging hours in the clinical years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.53	3(3)	6(7)	22(24)	61(66)	(0)
Fourth year students	3.40	6 (6)	8 (9)	22 (23)	57 (61)	1 (1)
Total	3.46	9 (5)	14 (8)	44 (24)	118 (63)	1 (1)

Quality of library support and services

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.87	1 (1)	0 (0)	11 (10)	93 (86)	3 (3)
Second year students	3.84	0 (0)	2 (2)	12 (12)	86 (83)	4 (4)
Third year students	3.84	0 (0)	1 (1)	13 (14)	77 (83)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.80	0 (0)	1 (1)	17 (18)	75 (80)	1 (1)
Total	3.84	1 (0)	4(1)	53 (13)	331 (83)	9 (2)

Utility of student portal (Blackboard/CHAMP/Canvas)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.28	3 (3)	17 (16)	34 (31)	53 (49)	1 (1)
Second year students	2.95	10 (10)	22 (21)	34 (33)	37 (36)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.46	1 (1)	12 (13)	23 (25)	56 (61)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.43	2 (2)	10 (11)	26 (28)	54 (57)	2 (2)
Total	3.27	16 (4)	61 (15)	117 (29)	200 (50)	4(1)

#### STUDENT SERVICES, organized alphabetically

Accessibility of personal counseling

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.88	1 (1)	1 (1)	5 (5)	77 (71)	24 (22)
Second year students	3.70	4 (4)	2 (2)	9 (9)	68 (65)	21 (22)
Third year students	3.66	2 (2)	2 (2)	14 (15)	52 (56)	22 (24)
Fourth year students	3.66	1 (1)	5 (5)	10 (11)	52 (55)	26 (28)
Total	3.73	8 (2)	10 (3)	38 (10)	249 (63)	93 (23)

Accessibility of student health services

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.77	1 (1)	3 (3)	13 (12)	77 (71)	14 (13)
Second year students	3.71	3 (3)	3 (3)	11 (1)	73 (70)	14 (14)
Third year students	3.74	0 (0)	4 (4)	14 (15)	66 (72)	8 (9)
Fourth year students	3.54	1 (1)	10 (11)	15 (16)	56 (60)	12 (13)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.69	5 (1)	20 (5)	53 (13)	272 (68)	48 (12)

Accessibility to immunizations / PPD's & associated records

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.91	1 (1)	2 (2)	2 (2)	99 (92)	4 (3)
Second year students	3.72	2 (2)	5 (5)	13 (13)	83 (80)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.79	1 (1)	2 (2)	12 (13)	75 (82)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.67	1 (1)	8 (9)	11 (12)	70 (75)	4 (4)
Total	3.78	5 (1)	17 (4)	38 (10)	327 (82)	11 (3)

Adequacy of career counseling

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.86	1 (1)	0 (0)	9 (8)	74 (69)	14 (13)
Second year students	3.64	3 (3)	2 (2)	18 (17)	62 (60)	19 (18)
Third year students	3.66	1 (1)	3 (3)	18 (20)	52 (57)	12 (13)
Fourth year students	3.58	1 (1)	6 (6)	19 (20)	54 (57)	14 (15)
Total	3.68	6 (2)	11 (3)	64 (16)	248 (62)	69 (17)

Adequacy of counseling about elective choices

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	5 (5)	68 (63)	34 (31)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Second year students	3.66	1 (1)	5 (5)	8 (8)	47 (45)	41 (43)
Third year students	3.58	1 (1)	5 (5)	19 (21)	52 (57)	15 (16)
Fourth year students	3.49	3 (3)	7 (7)	20 (21)	55 (59)	9 (10)
Total	3.65	6 (2)	17 (4)	52 (13)	222 (56)	101(25)

Adequacy of debt management counseling<sup>a</sup>

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.32	2 (3)	7 (11)	14 (22)	27 (42)	15 (23)
Second year students	3.30	0 (0)	9 (12)	19 (26)	25 (34)	20 (27)
Third year students	3.24	2 (3)	6 (9)	24 (35)	23 (34)	13 (19)
Fourth year students	3.00	1 (2)	11 (21)	19 (36)	13 (25)	9 (17)
Total	3.22	5 (2)	33 (13)	76 (29)	88 (34)	57 (22)
<sup>a</sup> assessed on the follow	-up survey					

# Adequacy of education about prevention and exposure to infectious and environmental hazards

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	8 (7)	95 (88)	4 (4)
Second year students	3.87	0 (0)	1 (1)	11 (11)	87 (84)	5 (5)
Third year students	3.78	0 (0)	0 (0)	20 (22)	70 (76)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.76	0 (0)	0 (0)	21 (22)	68 (72)	5 (5)
Total	3.83	1 (0)	1 (0)	60 (15)	320 (80)	16 (4)

Availability of academic counseling

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.90	1 (1)	1 (1)	5 (5)	89 (82)	12 (11)
Second year students	3.84	1 (1)	0 (0)	12 (12)	82 (79)	9 (9)
Third year students	3.65	3 (3)	3 (3)	15 (16)	65 (71)	6 (7)
Fourth year students	3.73	0 (0)	3 (3)	17 (18)	64 (68)	10 (11)
Total	3.78	5 (1)	7 (2)	49 (12)	300 (75)	37 (9)

Availability of career counseling

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.84	1 (1)	0 (0)	11 (10)	77 (71)	19 (18)
Second year students	3.62	2 (2)	5 (5)	20 (19)	68 (65)	9 (9)
Third year students	3.67	0 (0)	4 (4)	19 (21)	58 (63)	11 (12)
Fourth year students	3.62	1 (1)	4 (4)	20 (21)	56 (60)	13 (14)
Total	3.69	4 (1)	13 (3)	70 (18)	259 (65)	52 (13)

Availability of disability insurance

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.90	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (3)	57 (53)	47 (44)
Second year students	3.84	1 (1)	1(1)	4 (4)	49 (47)	49 (47)
Third year students	3.73	1(1)	1(1)	8(9)	38(41.3)	44 (48)
Fourth year students	3.87	1 (1)	0 (0)	4 (4)	49 (52)	40 (43)
Total	3.84	4 (1)	2 (1)	19 (5)	193 (48)	180(45)

Availability of mental health services

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	6 (6)	75 (69)	26 (24)
Second year students	3.73	5 (5)	1 (1)	4 (4)	68 (65)	26(25)
Third year students	3.67	2 (2)	2 (2)	13 (14)	53 (58)	22 (24)
Fourth year students	3.65	2 (2)	5 (5)	8 (9)	53 (56)	26 (28)
Total	3.74	10 (3)	8 (2)	31 (8)	249 (63)	100(25)

Availability of programs to support student well-being

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.83	1 (1)	1 (1)	11 (11)	83 (77)	12 (11)
Second year students	3.58	5 (5)	3 (3)	20 (20)	69 (66)	7 (7)
Third year students	3.62	1 (1)	8 (9)	14 (15)	64 (70)	5 (5)
Fourth year students	3.60	2 (2)	7 (7)	12 (13)	60 (64)	13 (14)
Total	3.66	9 (2)	19 (5)	57 (14)	276 (69)	37 (9)

Availability of student health insurance

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.84	1 (1)	0 (0)	12 (11)	82 (76)	13 (12)
Second year students	3.68	2 (2)	4 (4)	15 (14)	69 (66)	14 (13)
Third year students	3.66	2 (2)	1 (1)	18 (19)	56 (61)	15 (16)
Fourth year students	3.66	3 (3)	2 (2)	14 (15)	61 (65)	14 (15)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.72	8 (2)	7 (2)	59 (15)	268 (67)	56 (14)

Availability of tutorial help

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.92	1 (1)	0 (0)	5 (5)	92 (85)	10 (9)
Second year students	3.82	1 (1)	2 (2)	10 (10)	80 (77)	11 (11)
Third year students	3.68	0 (0)	5 (5)	17 (18)	62 (67)	8 (9)
Fourth year students	3.80	0 (0)	2 (2)	12 (13)	66 (70)	14 (15)
Total	3.81	2 (1)	9 (2)	44 (11)	300 (75)	43 (11)

Clarity of policies and procedures for disciplinary action

<u> </u>			•			
Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.88	1 (1)	0 (0)	10 (9)	93 (86)	4 (4)
Second year students	3.79	3 (3)	7 (7)	13 (13)	79 (76)	2 (2)
Third year students	3.77	0 (0)	4 (4)	16 (18)	69 (75)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.76	0 (0)	1 (1)	17 (18)	68 (72)	8 (9)
Total	3.76	4 (1)	12 (3)	56 (14)	309 (78)	17 (4)

Clarity of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the clinical years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.70	1 (1)	4 (4)	17 (18)	70 (76)	(0)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.80	1 (1)	2 (2)	11 (12)	78 (83)	2 (2)
Total	3.75	2 (1)	6 (3)	28 (15)	148 (80)	2 (1)

Clarity of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the pre-clinical years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.92	1 (1)	1 (1)	4 (4)	100 (93)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.78	3 (3)	1 (1)	12 (11)	87 (84)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.72	1 (1)	3 (3)	17 (18)	71 (77)	0(0)
Fourth year students	3.84	1 (1)	1 (1)	9 (10)	79 (84)	4 (4)
Total	3.82	6 (2)	6 (2)	42 (11)	337 (85)	7 (2)

Confidentiality of mental health services

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.92	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (3)	70 (65)	34 (31)
Second year students	3.82	2 (2)	3 (3)	0 (0)	68 (65)	31 (30)
Third year students	3.78	1 (1)	1 (1)	8 (9)	49 (54)	33 (36)
Fourth year students	3.88	0 (0)	2 (2)	3 (3)	55 (59)	34 (36)
Total	3.85	4 (1)	6 (2)	14 (4)	242 (61)	132(33)

**Confidentiality of personal counseling** 

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.91	1 (1)	0 (0)	4 (4)	72 (67)	31 (29)
Second year students	3.82	2 (2)	3 (3)	1 (1)	68 (65)	30(29)
Third year students	3.86	0 (0)	1 (1)	7 (8)	56 (61)	28 (30)
Fourth year students	3.80	1 (1)	3 (3)	4 (4)	58 (62)	28 (30)
Total	3.85	4 (1)	7 (2)	16 (4)	254 (64)	117(29)

Fairness of policies and procedures for disciplinary action

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	8 (7)	93 (86)	6 (6)
Second year students	3.62	2 (2)	8 (8)	16 (15)	73 (70)	5 (5)
Third year students	3.70	0 (0)	4 (4)	18 (20)	66 (72)	4 (4)
Fourth year students	3.79	1 (1)	1 (1)	13 (14)	70 (75)	9 (10)
Total	3.75	4 (1)	13 (3)	55 (14)	302 (76)	24 (6)

Fairness of standards of conduct and professionalism for student in the clinical years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.66	0 (0)	5 (5)	21 (23)	66 (72)	(0)
Fourth year students	3.76	1 (1)	3 (3)	13 (14)	75 (80)	2 (2)
Total	3.71	1 (1)	8 (4)	34 (18)	141 (76)	2 (1)

Fairness of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the pre-clinical years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.91	1 (1)	1 (1)	5 (5)	100 (93)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.73	3 (3)	2 (2)	15 (14)	83 (80)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.72	1 (1)	6 (7)	18 (20)	67 (73)	0(0)
Fourth year students	3.84	1 (1)	1 (1)	13 (14)	76 (81)	3 (3)
Total	3.77	6 (2)	10 (3)	51 (13)	326 (82)	5 (1)

Knowledge of protocol following exposure to infectious or environmental hazards

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	9 (8)	95 (88)	3 (3)
Second year students	3.79	0 (0)	3 (3)	15 (14)	81 (79)	5 (5)
Third year students	3.77	0 (0)	1 (1)	19 (21)	71 (77)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.76	1 (1)	1 (1)	16 (17)	71 (76)	5 (5)
Total	3.80	2 (1)	5 (1)	59 (15)	318 (80)	14 (4)

Overall debt management counseling

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.72	2 (2)	3 (3)	13 (12)	71 (66)	19 (18)
Second year students	3.67	3 (3)	2 (2)	16 (15)	66 (64)	17 (16)
Third year students	3.61	0 (0)	4 (4)	22 (24)	51 (55)	15 (16)
Fourth year students	3.65	1 (1)	3 (3)	18 (19)	56 (60)	16 (17)
Total	3.72	6 (2)	12 (3)	69 (17)	244 (61)	67 (17)

Quality of academic counseling

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.93	1 (1)	0 (0)	4 (4)	89 (82)	14 (13)
Second year students	3.83	1 (1)	1 (1)	10 (10)	78 (75)	14 (14)
Third year students	3.62	3 (3)	3 (3)	17 (18)	61 (66)	8 (9)
Fourth year students	3.68	0 (0)	3 (3)	20 (21)	58 (62)	13 (14)
Total	3.77	5 (1)	7 (2)	51 (13)	286 (72)	49 (12)

Quality of financial aid administrative services

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.88	1 (1)	0 (0)	9 (8)	87 (81)	11 (10)
Second year students	3.81	2 (2)	1 (1)	10 (10)	82 (79)	9 (9)
Third year students	3.75	1 (1)	3 (3)	12 (13)	68 (74)	8 (9)
Fourth year students	3.79	0 (0)	1 (1)	16 (17)	68 (72)	9 (10)
Total	3.81	4 (1)	5 (1)	47 (12)	305 (77)	37 (9)

Quality of tutorial help

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.84	1 (1)	2 (2)	8 (7)	85 (79)	12 (11)
Second year students	3.74	3 (3)	2 (2)	9 (9)	72 (69)	18 (17)
Third year students	3.71	0 (0)	4 (4)	14 (15)	58 (63)	16 (17)
Fourth year students	3.77	0 (0)	2 (2)	13 (14)	60 (64)	19 (20)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.77	2 (1)	10 (3)	44 (11)	275 (69)	65 (16)

Sense of community within your class

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.95	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	105 (97)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.71	2 (2)	6 (6)	12 (12)	84 (81)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.59	1 (1)	5 (5)	25 (27)	61 (66)	0 (0)
Fourth year students	3.73	1 (1)	2 (2)	18 (19)	72 (77)	1 (1)
Total	3.75	5 (1)	13 (3)	57 (14)	322 (81)	1 (0)

#### MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM, organized alphabetically

Access to patients during the third year clerkships

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.65	2 (2)	2 (2)	20 (22)	61 (66)	7 (8)
Fourth year students	3.68	1 (1)	3 (3)	21 (22)	68 (72)	1 (1)
Total	3.66	3 (2)	5 (3)	41 (22)	129 (69)	8 (4)

Adequacy of education in caring for patients from different backgrounds

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.91	1 (1)	0 (0)	7 (6)	99 (92)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.68	2 (2)	4 (4)	19 (18)	78 (75)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.67	1 (1)	2 (2)	22 (24)	64 (70)	3 (3)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.66	2 (2)	3 (3)	19 (20)	68 (72)	2 (2)
Total	3.74	6 (2)	9 (2)	67 (17)	309 (78)	7 (2)

Adequacy in education in disease prevention

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.77	1 (1)	3 (3)	15 (14)	87 (81)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.65	1 (1)	3 (3)	27 (26)	73 (70)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.60	1 (1)	4 (4)	24 (26)	59 (64)	4 (4)
Fourth year students	3.69	2 (2)	1 (1)	21 (22)	69 (73)	1 (1)
Total	3.68	5 (1)	11 (3)	87 (22)	288 (72)	7 (2)

Adequacy of education in health maintenance

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.78	1 (1)	3 (3)	14 (13)	87 (81)	3 (3)
Second year students	3.63	2 (2)	4 (4)	24 (23)	73 (70)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.60	1 (1)	4 (4)	24 (26)	59 (64)	4 (4)
Fourth year students	3.66	2 (2)	2 (2)	22 (23)	67 (71)	1 (1)
Total	3.67	6 (2)	13 (3)	84 (21)	286 (72)	9 (2)

Adequacy of education to diagnose disease

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.89	1 (1)	0 (0)	9 (8)	98 (91)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.74	1 (1)	0 (0)	24 (23)	79 (76)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.60	2 (2)	3 (3)	23 (25)	60 (65)	4 (4)
Fourth year students	3.72	0 (0)	2 (2)	22 (23)	69 (73)	1 (1)
Total	3.68	4 (1)	5 (1)	78 (20)	306 (77)	5 (1)

Adequacy of education to manage disease

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.80	1 (1)	0 (0)	18 (17)	87 (81)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.51	2 (2)	8 (8)	29 (28)	65 (63)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.60	2 (2)	7 (8)	23 (25)	55 (60)	5 (5)
Fourth year students	3.60	0 (0)	8 (9)	21 (22)	64 (68)	1 (1)
Total	3.61	5 (1)	23 (6)	91 (23)	271 (68)	8 (2)

Adequacy of experiences with electronic medical records

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.54	4 (4)	3 (3)	23 (25)	59 (64)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.48	4 (4)	9 (10)	18 (19)	62 (66)	1 (1)
Total	3.51	8 (4)	12 (6)	41 (22)	121 (65)	4 (2)

Adequacy of USMLE preparation

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.17	7 (7)	13 (14)	26 (28)	42 (46)	4 (4)
Fourth year students	3.35	1 (1)	11 (12)	35 (37)	46 (49)	1 (1)
Total	3.27	8 (4)	24 (13)	61 (33)	88 (47)	5 (3)

Amount and quality of formative feedback in the first and second years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.84	1 (1)	0 (0)	14 (13)	93 (86)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.61	4 (4)	3 (3)	23 (22)	74 (71)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.60	1 (1)	3 (3)	27 (30)	60 (65)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.62	0 (0)	6 (6)	23 (24)	64 (68)	1 (1)
Total	3.67	6 (2)	12 (3)	87 (22)	291 (73)	2 (1)

Amount and quality of formative feedback in the third year

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.43	3 (3)	8 (9)	23 (25)	50 (54)	8 (9)
Fourth year students	3.46	4 (4)	9 (10)	18 (19)	58 (62)	5 (5)
Total	3.45	7 (4)	17 (9)	41 (22)	108 (58)	13 (7)

Appropriateness of methods to assess achievement in the first year

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.86	1 (1)	1 (1)	10 (9)	93 (86)	3 (3)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Second year students	3.68	1 (1)	3 (3)	24 (23)	76 (73)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.66	1 (1)	1 (1)	26 (28)	63 (68)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.68	1 (1)	1 (1)	25 (27)	66 (70)	1 (1)
Total	3.72	4 (1)	6 (2)	85 (21)	298 (75)	5 (1)

Clarity of policies for advancement/graduation

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.90	1 (1)	0 (0)	8 (7)	97 (90)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.73	1 (1)	4 (4)	17 (16)	81 (78)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.65	0 (0)	4 (4)	23 (25)	62 (67)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.75	0 (0)	2 (2)	19 (20)	70 (74)	3 (3)
Total	3.76	2 (1)	10 (3)	67 (17)	310 (78)	9 (2)

Clarity of the grading policies in the clerkship years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.42	3 (3)	8 (9)	25 (27)	50 (54)	6 (7)
Fourth year students	3.59	2 (2)	3 (3)	26 (28)	62 (66)	1 (1)
Total	3.51	5 (3)	11 (6)	51 (27)	112 (60)	7 (4)

Clinical skills instruction in the first and second years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.87	1 (1)	0 (0)	11 (10)	96 (89)	0 (0)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Second year students	3.88	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (13)	91 (88)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.69	0 (0)	2 (2)	24 (26)	65 (71)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.74	0 (0)	2 (2)	20 (21)	71 (76)	1 (1)
Total	3.80	1 (0)	4 (1)	68 (17)	323 (81)	2 (1)

Clinical skills assessment in the third/fourth years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.58	1 (1)	4 (4)	23 (25)	52 (57)	12(13)
Fourth year students	3.59	0 (0)	7 (7)	24 (26)	62 (66)	1 (1)
Total	3.58	1 (1)	11 (6)	47 (25)	114 (61)	13 (7)

Coordination/integration of content in the first year

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.86	1 (1)	1 (1)	10 (9)	96 (89)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.73	1 (1)	2 (2)	21 (20)	80 (77)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.71	0 (0)	3 (3)	20 (22)	68 (74)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.61	1 (1)	4 (4)	25 (27)	63 (67)	1 (1)
Total	3.73	3 (1)	10 (3)	76 (19)	307 (77)	2 (1)

Coordination/integration of content in the first/second years<sup>a</sup>

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.67	0 (0)	1 (2)	19 (29)	43 (66)	2 (3)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)	
Second year students	3.33	3 (4)	5 (7)	30 (41)	35 (48)	0 (0)	
Third year students	3.37	1 (1)	6 (9)	28 (41)	33 (49)	0 (0)	
Fourth year students	3.53	0 (0)	3 (6)	19 (36)	31 (58)	0 (0)	
Total	3.46	4 (2)	15 (6)	96 (37)	142 (55)	2 (1)	
<sup>a</sup> assessed on the follow-up survey							

Each clerkship follows the common clerkship policies

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.68	1 (1)	1 (1)	21 (23)	59 (64)	10(11)
Fourth year students	3.66	0 (0)	4 (4)	24 (26)	65 (69)	1 (1)
Total	3.67	1 (1)	5 (3)	45 (24)	124 (67)	11 (6)

#### Ease of access to student academic records

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.85	2 (2)	0 (0)	9 (8)	91 (84)	6 (6)
Second year students	3.80	2 (2)	0 (0)	14 (13)	85 (82)	3 (3)
Third year students	3.75	0 (0)	3 (3)	15 (16)	65 (71)	9 (10)
Fourth year students	3.76	0 (0)	1 (1)	19 (20)	69 (73)	5 (5)
Total	3.79	4 (1)	4(1)	57 (14)	310 (78)	23 (6)

Educational resources available at hospitals and clinics

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.64	1 (1)	1 (1)	26 (28)	58 (63)	6 (7)
Fourth year students	3.55	3 (3)	6 (6)	20 (21)	62 (66)	3 (3)
Total	3.59	4 (2)	7 (4)	46 (25)	120 (65)	9 (5)

## End of block evaluations in the clinical years allowed me to communicate my feedback, views, and concerns

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.68	2 (2)	1 (1)	17 (18)	59 (64)	13(14)
Fourth year students	3.63	1 (1)	2 (2)	27 (29)	62 (66)	2 (2)
Total	3.65	3 (2)	3 (2)	44 (24)	121 (65)	15 (8)

## End of the unit evaluations in the pre-clinical years allowed me to communicate my feedback, views, and concerns

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.85	2 (2)	1 (1)	7 (6)	93 (86)	5 (5)
Second year students	3.53	1 (1)	16 (15)	13 (13)	72 (69)	2 (2)
Third year students	3.78	0 (0)	1 (1)	17 (18)	68 (74)	6 (7)
Fourth year students	3.63	1 (1)	3 (3)	25 (27)	64 (68)	1 (1)
Total	3.70	4 (1)	21 (5)	62 (16)	297 (75)	14 (4)

#### Faculty in the clinical years adhere to student's clerkship requirements

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.63	1 (1)	3 (3)	23 (25)	59 (64)	6 (6)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.62	0 (0)	5 (5)	25 (27)	63 (67)	1 (1)
Total	3.63	1 (1)	8 (4)	48 (26)	122 (66)	7 (4)

Fairness of grading policies in the clerkship years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.44	4 (4)	6 (7)	21 (23)	50 (54)	11(12)
Fourth year students	3.41	4 (4)	9 (10)	25 (27)	55 (59)	1 (1)
Total	3.43	8 (4)	15 (8)	46 (25)	105 (56)	12 (6)

Fairness of summative assessment in the first and second years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.76	1 (1)	1 (1)	20 (19)	83 (77)	3 (3)
Second year students	3.48	1 (1)	6 (6)	39 (38)	58 (56)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.62	0 (0)	3 (3)	29 (32)	59 (64)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.77	0 (0)	1 (1)	19 (20)	72 (77)	2 (2)
Total	3.66	2 (1)	11 (3)	107 (27)	272 (68)	6 (2)

Fairness of summative assessment in the third year

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.53	1 (1)	5 (5)	23 (25)	48 (52)	15(16)
Fourth year students	3.52	2 (2)	7 (7)	24 (26)	58 (62)	3 (3)
Total	3.52	3 (2)	12 (6)	47 (25)	106 (57)	18(10)

Integration of Spanish resources in the curriculum

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.81	2 (2)	0 (0)	14 (13)	92 (85)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.61	5 (5)	3 (3)	18 (17)	75 (72)	3 (3)
Third year students	3.64	1 (1)	6 (7)	18 (20)	66 (72)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.53	3 (3)	5 (5)	25 (27)	60 (64)	1 (1)
Total	3.65	11 (3)	14 (4)	75 (19)	293 (74)	5 (1)

Opportunities for self-directed learning in the first and second years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.84	1 (1)	0 (0)	14 (13)	92 (85)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.60	2 (2)	9 (9)	17 (16)	74 (71)	2 (2)
Third year students	3.62	0 (0)	3 (3)	28 (30)	59 (64)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.74	0 (0)	0 (0)	24 (26)	68 (72)	2 (2)
Total	3.70	3 (1)	12 (3)	83 (21)	293 (74)	7 (2)

Overall workload in the first year

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.69	3 (3)	1 (1)	23 (21)	81 (75)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.68	1 (1)	3 (3)	24 (23)	76 (73)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.74	0 (0)	2 (2)	20 (22)	69 (75)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.72	0 (0)	2 (2)	22 (23)	68 (72)	2 (2)
Total	3.70	4 (1)	8 (2)	89 (22)	294 (74)	3 (1)

Overall workload in the first/second years<sup>a</sup>

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.45	0 (0)	5 (8)	26 (40)	34 (52)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.22	2 (3)	10 (14)	30 (41)	30 (41)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.45	1 (1)	1 (1)	31 (46)	33 (49)	2 (3)
Fourth year students	3.68	0 (0)	2 (4)	13 (25)	38 (72)	0 (0)
Total	3.43	3 (1)	18 (7)	100 (39)	135 (52)	3 (1)
<sup>a</sup> assessed on the follow-	up survey					

Quality of self-directed learning activities in the first and second years

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.79	1 (1)	3 (3)	13 (12)	89 (82)	2 (2)
Second year students	3.46	3 (3)	11 (11)	25 (24)	65 (63)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.62	0 (0)	2 (2)	30 (33)	58 (63)	2 (2)
Fourth year students	3.65	0 (0)	3 (3)	27 (29)	63 (67)	1(1)
Total	3.63	4 (1)	19 (5)	95 (24)	275 (69)	5 (1)

Quality of the first year

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.84	1 (1)	2 (2)	10 (9)	94 (87)	1 (1)
Second year students	3.80	1 (1)	3 (3)	12 (12)	88 (85)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.68	0 (0)	3 (3)	23 (25)	65 (71)	1 (1)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.60	0 (0)	5 (5)	27 (29)	61 (65)	1 (1)
Total	3.74	2 (1)	13 (3)	72 (18)	308 (77)	3 (1)

Quality of the fourth year required clerkships

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.73	0 (0)	3 (3)	16 (17)	63 (67)	12 (13)
Total	3.73	0 (0)	3 (3)	16 (17)	63 (67)	12 (13)

Quality of the second year

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.78	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	20 (19)	85 (79)
Second year students	3.57	1 (1)	8 (8)	25 (24)	69 (66)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.57	1 (1)	4 (4)	28 (31)	58 (63)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.60	0 (0)	5 (5)	27 (29)	61 (65)	1 (1)
Total	3.60	3 (1)	17 (4)	82 (21)	208 (52)	88 (22)

Quality of the third year clerkships

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.47	3 (3)	5 (5)	26 (28)	51 (55)	7 (8)
Fourth year students	3.41	2 (2)	11 (12)	27 (29)	53 (56)	1 (1)
Total	3.44	5 (3)	16 (9)	53 (28)	104 (56)	8 (4)

Satisfaction with having integrated third year clerkship rotations

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.35	7 (8)	5 (5)	23 (25)	48 (52)	9 (10)
Fourth year students	3.03	13 (14)	16 (17)	19 (20)	45 (48)	1 (1)
Total	3.18	20 (11)	21 (11)	42 (23)	93 (50)	10 (5)

**Satisfaction with the college system** 

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.93	1 (1)	0 (0)	5 (5)	102 (94)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.67	2 (2)	3 (3)	13 (13)	83 (80)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.80	0 (0)	1 (1)	16 (17)	74 (80)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.73	1 (1)	2 (2)	18 (19)	70 (74)	3 (3)
Total	3.81	4 (1)	6 (2)	52 (13)	332 (83)	4 (1)

Satisfaction with third year scheduling

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.35	3 (3)	9 (10)	29 (32)	45 (49)	6 (7)
Fourth year students	3.41	5 (5)	7 (8)	26 (28)	55 (59)	1 (1)
Total	3.38	8 (4)	16 (9)	55 (30)	100 (54)	7 (4)

School responsiveness to student feedback on courses and teaching

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.84	1 (1)	2 (2)	10 (9)	92 (85)	3 (3)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Second year students	3.40	7 (7)	8 (8)	25 (24)	64 (62)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.62	1 (1)	7 (8)	17 (18)	64 (70)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.52	2 (2)	4 (4)	27 (29)	53 (56)	8 (9)
Total	3.60	11 (3)	21 (5)	79 (20)	273 (69)	14 (4)

School responsiveness to student feedback on courses / clerkships<sup>a</sup>

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.66	1 (2)	3 (5)	12 (18)	45 (69)	4 (6)
Second year students	2.88	6 (8)	19 (26)	26 (36)	22 (30)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.32	1 (1)	7 (10)	28 (41)	30 (44)	2 (3)
Fourth year students	3.18	1 (2)	9 (17)	20 (38)	20 (38)	3 (6)
Total	3.24	9 (4)	38 (15)	86 (33)	117 (45)	9 (4)
<sup>a</sup> assessed on the follow-	up survey					

Sense of preparedness for residency interview / match process

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.52	0 (0)	3 (3)	37 (39)	49 (52)	5 (5)
Total	3.52	0 (0)	3 (3)	37 (39)	49 (52)	5 (5)

Sense of preparedness for skills required during internship year / residency

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Fourth year students	3.52	1 (1)	5 (5)	30 (32)	53 (56)	5 (5)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.52	1 (1)	5 (5)	30 (32)	53 (56)	5 (5)

Utility of the educational program objectives to support learning

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.81	1 (1)	1 (1)	15 (14)	91 (84)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.68	1 (1)	3 (3)	24 (23)	75 (72)	1 (1)
Third year students	3.68	0 (0)	3 (3)	23 (25)	65 (71)	1 (1)
Fourth year students	3.62	1 (1)	4 (4)	24 (26)	63 (67)	2 (2)
Total	3.70	3 (1)	11 (3)	86 (22)	294 (74)	4 (1)

Utility of the first and second years as preparation for clinical clerkships

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.54	2 (2)	7 (8)	21 (23)	59 (64)	3 (3)
Fourth year students	3.62	0 (0)	3 (3)	29 (31)	61 (65)	1 (1)
Total	3.58	2 (1)	10 (5)	50 (27)	120 (65)	4 (2)

Utility of the student daily calendar

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
First year students	3.68	2 (2)	3 (3)	23 (21)	80 (74)	0 (0)
Second year students	3.56	3 (3)	9 (8)	19 (18)	73 (70)	0 (0)
Third year students	3.53	2 (2)	8 (9)	19 (21)	59 (64)	4 (4)
Fourth year students	3.46	6 (6)	6 (6)	19 (20)	59 (63)	4 (4)

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Total	3.56	13 (3)	26 (7)	80 (20)	271 (68)	8 (2)

Workload in the third year clerkships

Respondents	Mean	Very dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N(%)	Somewhat satisfied N(%)	Very satisfied N(%)	N/A N(%)
Third year students	3.56	1 (1)	3 (3)	28 (30)	53 (58)	7 (8)
Fourth year students	3.56	3 (3)	5 (5)	22 (23)	63 (67)	1 (1)
Total	3.56	4 (2)	8 (4)	50 (27)	116 (62)	8 (4)

#### APPENDIX B: 2016 LCME ISA SURVEY TOTAL STUDENT BODY RESULTS

Table 1.1. Total Student Body Responses to All Categories Concerning the Office of the Assistant Dean of Students, organized by descending means

Students, organized by descending means							
	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)	
Confidentiality	3.94	4 (1)	3 (1)	26 (7)	346 (87)	19 (5)	
Accessibility	3.90	2 (1)	2 (1)	40 (10)	342 (86)	12 (3)	
Awareness of student concerns	3.77	6 (2)	6 (2)	66 (17)	317 (80)	3 (1)	
Responsiveness to student problems	3.76	6 (2)	10 (3)	61 (15)	317 (80)	4 (1)	
Responsiveness to student feedback	3.75	5 (1)	12 (3)	65 (16)	312 (78)	4 (1)	
Total	3.82	23 (1)	33 (2)	258 (13)	1634 (82)	42 (2)	

Table 2.2. Total Student Body Responses to All Categories Concerning the Office of the Assistant Dean for Medical Education, organized by descending means

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
The administration has genuine desire for students to succeed	3.86	2 (1)	7 (2)	36 (9)	346 (87)	7 (2)
The medical school faculty are readily available to me	3.83	2 (1)	3 (1)	55 (14)	328 (82)	10 (3)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Accessibility of medical school faculty	3.82	1 (0)	4 (1)	56 (14)	318 (80)	19 (5)
Participation of students on key medical school committees	3.80	2 (1)	7 (2)	53 (13)	301 (76)	35 (9)
Accessibility (of the Office of the Associate Dean for Medical Education)	3.78	1 (0)	6 (2)	63 (16)	288 (72)	40 (10)
The administration maintains open communication with the student body	3.75	4 (1)	9 (2)	68 (17)	306 (77)	11 (3)
Awareness of student concerns	3.75	2 (1)	12 (3)	65 (16)	302 (76)	17 (4)
I feel comfortable talking to the administration	3.74	9 (2)	6 (2)	61 (15)	314 (79)	8 (2)
Responsiveness to student problems	3.67	2 (1)	16 (4)	87 (22)	275 (69)	18 (5)
Total	3.78	25 (1)	70 (2)	544 (15)	2778 (78)	165 (5)

Table 3.2. Total Student Body Responses to All Categories Concerning the Learning Environment & Facilities, organized by descending means

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Adequacy of the school's discrimination policy	3.89	2 (1)	5 (1)	28 (7)	352 (88)	11 (3)
Opportunities to participate in service learning	3.87	1 (0)	4 (1)	41 (10)	347 (87)	5 (1)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Adequacy of safety and security on campus and all other instructional sites	3.87	2 (1)	6 (2)	32 (8)	355 (89)	3 (1)
Adequacy of the school's student mistreatment policy	3.87	2 (1)	4 (1)	33 (8)	328 (82)	31 (8)
Environment conducive to culturally competent health care	3.85	7 (2)	5 (1)	27 (7)	354 (89)	5 (1)
Adequacy of the mechanisms to report mistreatment	3.85	2 (1)	5 (1)	40 (10)	316 (79)	35 (9)
The learning environment in the pre- clinical years fosters collegiality and respect	3.84	1 (0)	9 (2)	44 (11)	343 (86)	1 (0)
Adequacy of the testing facilities and environment	3.82	3 (1)	8 (2)	47 (12)	339 (85)	1 (0)
Adequacy of school activities to prevent mistreatment	3.82	2 (1)	8 (2)	46 (12)	322 (81)	20 (5)
Administration and faculty diversity	3.80	7 (2)	5 (1)	45 (11)	329 (83)	12 (3)
Adequacy of lecture halls, large group classroom facilities	3.77	3 (1)	13 (3)	58 (15)	322 (81)	2 (1)
Student diversity	3.74	6 (2)	11 (3)	60 (15)	314 (79)	7 (2)
Adequacy of small group teaching spaces on campus	3.70	6 (1)	13 (3)	74 (19)	301 (76)	4 (1)
Opportunity for interaction with other medical disciplines	3.69	3 (1)	15 (4)	84 (21)	293 (74)	3 (1)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Opportunities to participate in research	3.68	4 (1)	22 (6)	68 (17)	293 (74)	11 (3)
Amenities available to students in the student lounge and gym	3.61	9 (2)	17 (4)	95 (24)	275 (69)	2 (1)
Adequacy of student relaxation space	3.55	10 (3)	30 (8)	86 (22)	269 (68)	3 (1)
Adequacy of educational/ teaching spaces at hospitals <sup>a</sup>	3.53	5 (3)	12 (6)	48 (26)	119 (64)	2 (1)
Access to secure storage space for personal belongings	3.52	18 (5)	34 (9)	70 (18)	274 (69)	2 (1)
Adequacy of parking for 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> year clinical rotations <sup>a</sup>	3.52	7 (4)	16 (9)	34 (18)	126 (68)	3 (2)
Adequacy of student study space	3.29	17 (4)	54 (14)	123 (31)	202 (51)	2 (1)
Adequacy of parking in the pre-clinical years	2.86	64 (16)	73 (18)	115 (29)	144 (36)	2 (1)
Total	3.68	181 (2)	369 (4)	1298 (16)	6317 (76)	167 (2)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students (n=186)

Table 4.2. Total Student Body Responses to All Categories Concerning the Library & Information Resources, organized by descending means

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Quality of library support and services	3.84	1 (0)	4 (1)	53 (13)	331 (83)	9 (2)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Ease of access to electronic learning materials on campus <sup>a</sup>	3.81	2 (1)	2 (1)	25 (13)	153 (82)	4 (2)
Ease of access to library resources and holdings	3.81	2 (1)	7 (2)	51 (13)	323 (81)	15 (4)
Adequacy of computer learning resources	3.80	2 (1)	8 (2)	54 (14)	322 (81)	12 (3)
Accessibility of computer support	3.70	7 (2)	16 (4)	62 (16)	301 (76)	12 (3)
Ease of logging hours in the clinical years <sup>a</sup>	3.46	9 (5)	14 (8)	44 (24)	118 (63)	1 (1)
Access to student portal (Blackboard / Canvas)	3.42	11 (3)	47 (12)	104 (26)	234 (59)	2 (1)
Ease of access to electronic learning materials <sup>b</sup>	3.31	4 (2)	29 (11)	107 (41)	117 (45)	2 (1)
Utility of student portal (Blackboard / Canvas)	3.27	16 (4)	61 (15)	117 (29)	200 (50)	4 (1)
Ease of access to electronic learning materials in hospitals and clinics <sup>c</sup>	3.01	9 (7)	14 (12)	60 (50)	33 (27)	5 (4)
Total	3.59	63 (2)	202 (6)	677 (22)	2132 (68)	66 (2)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students (n=186) <sup>b</sup>Assessed on the follow-up survey (n=259) <sup>c</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students on the follow-up survey (n=121)

Table 5.2. Total Student Body Responses to All Categories Concerning the Student Services, *organized by descending means* 

	Mean	Very dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Confidentiality of personal counseling	3.85	4 (1)	7 (2)	16 (4)	254 (64)	117 (29)
Confidentiality of mental health services	3.85	4 (1)	6 (2)	14 (4)	236 (59)	138 (35)
Availability of disability insurance	3.84	4 (1)	2 (1)	19 (5)	193 (48)	180 (45)
Adequacy of education about prevention and exposure to infectious and environmental hazards	3.83	1 (0)	1 (0)	60 (15)	320 (80)	16 (4)
Clarity of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the preclinical years	3.82	6 (2)	6 (2)	42 (11)	337 (85)	7 (2)
Quality of financial aid administrative services	3.81	4 (1)	5 (1)	47 (12)	305 (77)	37 (9)
Availability of tutorial help	3.81	2 (1)	9 (2)	44 (11)	300 (75)	43 (11)
Knowledge of protocol following exposure to infectious or environmental hazards	3.80	2 (1)	5 (1)	59 (15)	318 (80)	14 (4)
Accessibility to immunizations / PPD's & associated records	3.78	5 (1)	17 (4)	38 (10)	327 (82)	11 (3)
Availability of academic counseling	3.78	5 (1)	7 (2)	49 (12)	300 (75)	37 (9)
Fairness of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the preclinical years	3.77	6 (2)	10 (3)	51 (13)	326 (82)	5 (1)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Quality of academic counseling	3.77	5 (1)	7 (2)	51 (13)	286 (72)	49 (12)
Quality of tutorial help	3.77	4 (1)	10 (3)	44 (11)	275 (69)	65 (16)
Clarity of policies and procedures for disciplinary action	3.76	4 (1)	12 (3)	56 (14)	309 (78)	17 (4)
Sense of community within your class	3.75	5 (1)	13 (3)	57 (14)	322 (81)	1 (0)
Clarity of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the clinical years <sup>a</sup>	3.75	2 (1)	6 (3)	28 (15)	148 (80)	2 (1)
Fairness of policies and procedures for disciplinary action	3.75	4 (1)	13 (3)	55 (14)	302 (76)	24 (6)
Availability of mental health services	3.74	10 (3)	8 (2)	31 (8)	249 (63)	100 (25)
Accessibility of personal counseling	3.73	8 (2)	10 (3)	38 (10)	249 (63)	93 (23)
Availability of student health insurance	3.72	8 (2)	7 (2)	59 (15)	268 (67)	56 (14)
Fairness of standards of conduct and professionalism for students in the clinical years <sup>a</sup>	3.71	1 (1)	8 (4)	34 (18)	141 (76)	2 (1)
Availability of career counseling	3.69	4 (1)	13 (3)	70 (18)	259 (65)	52 (13)
Accessibility of student health services	3.69	5 (1)	20 (5)	53 (13)	272 (68)	48 (12)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Adequacy of career counseling	3.68	6 (2)	11 (3)	64 (16)	248 (62)	69 (17)
Availability of programs to support student wellbeing	3.66	9 (2)	19 (5)	57 (14)	276 (69)	37 (9)
Overall debt management counseling	3.66	6 (2)	12 (3)	69 (17)	244 (61)	67 (17)
Adequacy of counseling about elective choices	3.65	6 (2)	17 (4)	52 (13)	222 (56)	101 (25)
Adequacy of debt management counseling <sup>b</sup>	3.22	5 (2)	33 (13)	76 (29)	88 (34)	57 (22)
Total	3.75	135 (1)	294 (3)	1333 (13)	7374 (70)	1445 (14)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students (n=186) <sup>b</sup>Assessed on the follow-up survey (n=259)

Table 6.2. Total Student Body Responses to All Categories Concerning the Medical Education Program, organized by descending means

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Satisfaction with the College system	3.81	4 (1)	6 (2)	52 (13)	332 (83)	4 (1)
Clinical skills instruction in the first and second years	3.80	1 (0)	4 (1)	68 (17)	323 (81)	2 (1)
Ease of access to student academic records	3.79	4 (1)	4 (1)	57 (14)	310 (78)	23 (6)
Clarity of policies for advancement/graduati on	3.76	2 (1)	10 (3)	67 (17)	310 (78)	9 (2)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%
Adequacy of education to diagnose disease	3.75	4 (1)	5 (1)	78 (20)	306 (77)	5 (1)
Quality of the first year	3.74	2 (1)	13 (3)	72 (18)	308 (77)	3 (1)
Adequacy of education in caring for patients from different backgrounds	3.74	6 (2)	9 (2)	67 (17)	309 (78)	7 (2)
Coordination/integration of content in the first year	3.73	3 (1)	10 (3)	76 (19)	307 (77)	2 (1)
Quality of the fourth year required clerkships <sup>d</sup>	3.73	0 (0)	3 (3)	16 (17)	63 (67)	12 (13
Appropriateness of methods to assess achievement in the first year	3.72	4 (1)	6 (2)	85 (21)	298 (75)	5 (1)
Overall workload in the first year	3.70	4 (1)	8 (2)	89 (22)	294 (74)	3 (1)
Utility of the educational program objectives to support learning	3.70	3 (1)	11 (3)	86 (22)	294 (74)	4 (1)
Opportunities for self- directed learning in the first and second years	3.70	3 (1)	12 (3)	83 (21)	293 (74)	7 (2)
End of the unit evaluations in the pre- clinical years allowed me to communicate my feedback, views, and concerns	3.70	4 (1)	21 (5)	62 (16)	297 (75)	14 (4
Adequacy in education in disease prevention	3.68	5 (1)	11 (3)	87 (22)	288 (72)	7 (2)

Amount and quality of	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
formative feedback in the first and second years	3.67	6 (2)	12 (3)	87 (22)	291 (73)	2 (1)
Adequacy of education in health maintenance	3.67	6 (2)	13 (3)	84 (21)	286 (72)	9 (2)
Each clerkship follows common clerkship policies <sup>a</sup>	3.67	1 (1)	5 (3)	45 (24)	124 (67)	11 (6)
Fairness of summative assessment in the first and second years	3.66	2 (1)	11 (3)	107 (27)	272 (68)	6 (2)
Access to patients during third-year clerkships <sup>a</sup>	3.66	3 (2)	5 (3)	41 (22)	129 (69)	8 (4)
Integration of Spanish resources in the curriculum	3.65	11 (3)	14 (4)	75 (19)	293 (74)	5 (1)
End of the block evaluations in the clinical years allowed me to communicate my feedback, views, and concerns <sup>a</sup>	3.65	3 (2)	3 (2)	44 (24)	121 (65)	15 (8)
Quality of self-directed learning activities in the first and second years	3.63	4 (1)	19 (5)	95 (24)	275 (69)	5 (1)
Faculty in the clinical years adhere to students' clerkship requirements <sup>a</sup>	3.63	1 (1)	8 (4)	48 (26)	122 (66)	7 (4)
Adequacy of education to manage disease	3.61	5 (1)	23 (6)	91 (23)	271 (68)	8 (2)
School responsiveness to student feedback on courses and teaching	3.60	11 (3)	21 (5)	79 (20)	273 (69)	14 (4)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Quality of the second year*	3.60 3.57*	3 (1) 1 (1)*	17 (4) 9 (5)*	82 (21) 54 (29)*	208 (52) 119 (64)*	88 (22) 2 (1)*
Educational resources available at hospitals and clinics <sup>a</sup>	3.59	4 (2)	7 (4)	46 (25)	120 (65)	9 (5)
Utility of the first and second years as preparation for clinical clerkships <sup>a</sup>	3.58	2 (1)	10 (5)	50 (27)	120 (65)	4 (2)
Clinical skills assessment in the third/fourth years <sup>a</sup>	3.58	1 (1)	11 (6)	47 (25)	114 (61)	13 (7)
Workload in the third year clerkships <sup>a</sup>	3.56	4 (2)	8 (4)	50 (27)	116 (62)	8 (4)
Utility of the student daily calendar	3.56	13 (3)	26 (7)	80 (20)	271 (68)	8 (2)
Sense of preparedness for residency interview/ match process <sup>d</sup>	3.52	0 (0)	3 (3)	37 (39)	49 (52)	5 (5)
Sense of preparedness for skills required during internship year/ residency <sup>d</sup>	3.52	1 (1)	5 (5)	30 (32)	53 (56)	5 (5)
Fairness of summative assessment in the third year <sup>a</sup>	3.52	3 (2)	12 (6)	47 (25)	106 (57)	18 (10)
Clarity of grading policies in the clerkship years <sup>a</sup>	3.51	5 (3)	11 (6)	51 (27)	112 (60)	7 (4)
Adequacy of experiences with electronic medical records <sup>a</sup>	3.51	8 (4)	12 (6)	41 (22)	121 (65)	4 (2)
Coordination/integration n of the content in the first/second years b	3.46	4 (2)	15 (6)	96 (37)	142 (55)	2 (1)

	Mean	Very Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Dissatisfied N (%)	Somewhat Satisfied N (%)	Very Satisfied N (%)	N/A N (%)
Amount and quality of formative feedback in the third year <sup>a</sup>	3.45	7 (4)	17 (9)	41 (22)	108 (58)	13 (7)
Quality of the third year clerkships <sup>a</sup>	3.44	5 (3)	16 (9)	53 (28)	104 (56)	8 (4)
Overall workload in the first/second years <sup>b</sup>	3.43	3 (1)	18 (7)	100 (39)	135 (52)	3 (1)
Fairness of grading policies in the clerkship years <sup>a</sup>	3.43	8 (4)	15 (8)	46 (25)	105 (56)	12 (6)
Satisfaction with third- year scheduling <sup>a</sup>	3.38	8 (4)	16 (9)	55 (30)	100 (54)	7 (4)
Adequacy of USMLE preparation <sup>a</sup>	3.27	8 (4)	24 (13)	61 (33)	88 (47)	5 (3)
School responsiveness to student feedback on courses/ clerkships <sup>b</sup>	3.24	9 (4)	38 (15)	86 (33)	117 (45)	9 (4)
Satisfaction with having integrated third-year clerkship rotations <sup>a</sup>	3.18	20 (11)	21 (11)	42 (23)	93 (50)	10 (5)
Total	3.63	218 (2)	569 (4)	2982 (22)	9171 (69)	435 (3)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Only assessed for third and fourth year students (n=186) <sup>b</sup>Assessed on the follow-up survey (n=259) <sup>d</sup>Only assessed for fourth year students (n=94) \*Recalculated excluding first year class