

CEPC Monthly Meeting

05.14.2018 05:00 PM - 06:30 PM

Purpose

Presenters Brower, Richard, Dankovich, Robin, Francis, Maureen, Hogg, Tanis

Note Taker Morales, Trinidad

Attendees Beinhoff, Lisa, Brower, Richard, Cervantes, Jorge, Dankovich, Robin, Francis, Mark, Francis, Maureen, Gajendran, Mahesh, Gest, Thomas, Hogg, Tanis, Kassir, Darine, Maldonado, Frankj, Perry, Cynthia, Pfarr, Curt, Saucedo, Dianne, Uga, Aghaegbulam H, Wojciechowska, Joanna

Absences carolina.blotte@ttuhsc.edu, daniel.welder@ttuhsc.edu, De-Lara, Veronica, douglas.weier@ttuhsc.edu, hilda.alarcon@ttuhsc.edu, justin.hartmann@ttuhsc.edu, kristoffer.gonzalez@ttuhsc.edu, Martin, Charmaine, Padilla, Osvaldo, roberto.l.garcia@ttuhsc.edu

Guests brittany.harper@ttuhsc.edu, maggie.scribner@ttuhsc.edu

Location MEB 1140

1. REVIEW PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Brower, Richard


The May 2018 CEPC meeting began with Dr. Brower apologizing for the quality of the previous meeting's minutes. He informed the CEPC he had reviewed the comments, but did not catch some of the errors. The attendee list was also incorrect as MeetingBooster did not reflect all correct attendees at previous meeting. Dr. Dankovich recommended attaching previous meeting's attendee log to the minutes in case this issue happens again. Also, some CEPC members had some comments on the previous meeting minutes, citing some inconsistencies in the minutes. Dr. Brower will review the minutes again and send out a corrected version very soon.

Decision

Trinidad sent Dr. Brower a copy of the April 30th meeting minutes and Dr. Brower will correct/edit/revise as needed and ask Trinidad to send out to the CEPC for review and approval.

Drs. De La Rosa, Lacy, and Ogden were present at this meeting. See attached attendance log.

Discussion

 MX-3070N_20180628_122658.pdf

2. SCEC REPORT

Brower, Richard

Dr. Brower asked the student representatives from each class to speak on any issues that have arisen since the last CEPC meeting. Only student representatives from MS3 were present.

2.1. MS1

Discussion

No students from this class were present.

2.2. MS2

Discussion

No students from this class were present.

2.3. MS3

maggie.scribner@ttuhsc.edu

Maggie Scriber, a student representative from MS3, mentioned there are issues with CANVAS, mainly students do not have access to CANVAS and assignments are due soon.

Dr. Francis interjected and said there are on-going issues with CANVAS and she had already spoken to IT, but students can alert the clerkship directors about the CANVAS issues whenever they arise. If students were on-call, they should have received an e-mail from the clerkship directors alerting students where they needed to be. Alerting students in this manner is not a new policy and is expected whenever CANVAS experiences technical issues.

Brower, Richard

Dr. Brower asked if there were any other issues. No other issues were discussed or brought up by the student representatives or members of the CEPC.

🔑 Decision

After the discussion on CANVAS and students' inability to access it lately, no other discussion followed.

2.4. MS4

Discussion


No students from this class were present.

3. OVERVIEW OF STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR THE PRE-CLERKSHIP PHASE (VIDEO)

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

Brower, Richard

Last CEPC Dr. Hogg and Ms. Cotera did not have time to discuss the overview of student course evaluation system for the pre-clerkship phase. However, a video with voiceover discussing the overview of the student course evaluation system for the pre-clerkship phase was created by Ms. Cotera and sent to the CEPC via e-mail by Trinidad in early May (see *attachment*). All CEPC members should have seen this video. The CEPC was asked if they had any questions on the video, any questions, was it understandable, did everyone understand the student feedback. The purpose of these reviews is to show the CEPC what happens in the background in regards to evaluation and assessment.

 Overview of student course evaluation system for the pre-clerkship phase (video).pdf

🔑 Decision

No questions were raised by the CEPC. Those in attendance confirmed their awareness of the video and those who viewed it had no questions on the overview. Dr. Brower let the CEPC know that any members who review the video in the near future are welcome to send any questions to Dr. Hogg and/or Ms. Cotera.

4. REVIEW RESULTS OF PILOT UNIT CONTENT MAPPING

Presenter(s): Hogg, Tanis

Hogg, Tanis

Dr. Hogg made a presentation on evaluating and mapping our pre-clerkship courses to objectives (*see attachment*). He informed the CEPC that it is difficult to analyze the objectives because some cannot be measured and some are very difficult to assess. During this analysis, Dr. Hogg found some misalignment in learning objectives and cognitive skills. Dr. Hogg mentioned he and Dr. Lacy plan to give faculty feedback sheets, which use keywords to try and connect the the pre-clerkship course objectives to the various levels of Bloom's taxonomy, allowing faculty to update and improve their course objectives. The pilot unit content mapping exposed lots of opportunities, exposing a need (opportunity) to map more thoroughly and improve alignment with assessment items (e.g., quizzes). However, it was relayed by Dr. Hogg that there is not a large team of people with the time to focus closely/solely on this alignment. The curriculum, particularly the Scientific Principles of Medicine course, should be closely linked to USMLE Step 1 and should serve as reliable preparation for USMLE Step 1. The School is also considering pursuing/purchasing Firecracker software, which can perform some of this mapping (appropriately connecting objectives from courses to the various levels of Bloom's taxonomy) using their proprietary algorithm. Otherwise, this type of work is labor intensive. Regarding mapping through our curriculum management system, other schools have directly adopted USMLE terms, other use more exhaustive lists of keywords.

Decision

Dr. Hogg will continue work on endeavour and showcase further results of the pilot unit content mapping at a future CEPC meeting. He will also work with the Year 1-2 committee to develop and direct a process for objective improvement (both in terms of objective quality and mapping).

5. SET EXPECTATIONS FOR CONTENT MAPPING IMPROVEMENT BASED ON PILOT

Presenter(s): Hogg, Tanis

Discussion

This item was discussed in Agenda Item #4 by Dr. Hogg.

5.1. APPROVE OBJECTIVE WRITING GUIDELINES

Presenter(s): Hogg, Tanis

Discussion

This was discussed briefly by Dr. Hogg in Agenda Item #4.

6. REVIEW PRE-CLERKSHIP PHASE KEY OUTCOMES, BENCHMARKS, AND TARGETS-CONSISTENT W/LCME AND IE

Presenter(s): Dankovich, Robin

Dankovich, Robin

Dr. Dankovich gave the CEPC a presentation on the *Institutional Effectiveness Plan* (*see attachment*), focusing on the educational program goals (Knowledge for Practice; Patient-Centered Care; Interpersonal and Communication Skills; and Professionalism). These four educational program goals align with four of the eight competencies. Her presentation showed all targets of the four goals were met (benchmarks were met and/or exceeded).

Goal 1 (Knowledge for Practice) was met with:

- 71.8% average CEYE score; and among those who were eligible to sit for the exam, 95% passed (calendar 2016).
- In regards to the USMLE STEP 1 first time pass rate, the target was met (95% of PLFSOM passed in 2016; 96% in 2017).

Goal 2 (Patient-Centered Care) was met with:

- 100% of students passing End of Year 2 Comprehensive OSCE in 2016-17 on their first attempt. During 2017-18, 99% passed on their first attempt (95% benchmark).
- 97% of students passed USMLE Step 2 CS on their first attempt in 2016-17 and 98% passed in 2017-18. During both years, the percentage of students passing exceed the 95% benchmark and also the national averages.

Goal 3 (Interpersonal & Communication) was met with:

- 100% of students in 2016-17 passed End of Year 3 Cumulative OSCE on their first attempt; same percentage passed in 2017-18 (exceeding the 95% benchmark).
- 100% of students in 2016-17 AND 2017-18 passed the USMLE Step 2 CS communication portion on their first attempt (exceeding the 95% benchmark).

Goal 4 (Professionalism)- to address this goal, the metric used was student narrative feedback and students very often received narrative feedback on their professionalism from their college masters.

Overall, students answered in the AAMC Graduation Questionnaire (GQ) that their preparation for clinical clerkships and electives was *good* or *excellent* (aggregated) in the sciences basic to medicine, although Gross Anatomy, Microbiology, and Physiology scored in low percentiles relative to the nation.

Finally, students reported in the GQ and the Y2Q (administered at the midpoint of medical school) high awareness of procedures related to the mistreatment of medical students and high awareness of mistreatment policies. The actual mistreatment of students ("I experienced offensive or negative behavior") was also low, low rates of self-reported incidents.

Dr. Dankovich's presentation also revealed 4 and 6 year graduation rates are above the 91% benchmark. Students are reporting high rates of cultural competence and desire to help those from different backgrounds and the underserved population. Overall, students are reporting high satisfaction with the quality of medical education at PLFSOM.

 Pre-clerkship Phase LCME_perspective.pdf

Decision

Dr. Dankovich will continue to monitor these data/indicators and report any anomalies/outliers/areas of concern to the CEPC immediately.

7. 4TH YEAR SYLLABUS UPDATES

Presenter(s): Francis, Maureen


Francis, Maureen

Dr. Francis presented to the CEPC proposed changes to the Year 4 syllabi. Most of the syllabi stayed the same with very minor changes, mostly in the assessment cards/forms (see attachment). Dr. Francis also relayed to the committee that the Common Clerkship Policies have been modified in response to proposing overnight calls twice during the 4-week OBGYN clerkship. Also, students have to create discharge orders and also make transitions of care during the OBGYN clerkship overnight calls. In the past, there have been no clerkships with overnight calls because students usually followed the intern scheduling rules. However, now with these rules (via the changes in the Common Clerkship Policies), OBGYN and Surgery propose to introduce limited requirements for overnight call.

In regards to Interprofessional Education Training available at The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) that focuses on

topics like refugee cases, UTEP is able to handle 30 additional PLFSOM students. However, PLFSOM does not want to overload UTEP. In regards to *lactation*, the Baby Cafe, which provided lactation training, closed, but a substitute was located and students are able to receive training at the new site.

Finally, radiology has been found to be a heavily subscribed elective and WBAMC has expressed a willingness to provide a radiology elective at their site.

 2018-2019 MS4 Syllabus updates.pptx

Decision

The CEPC approved Dr. Francis' proposed syllabi changes, it also approved using WBAMC as a radiology elective site, and sending more students to UTEP for the Interprofessional Education Training at UTEP, as long as IPE objectives at UTEP align with PLFSOM objectives.

8. DISCUSS EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 2018-19 AY BROCHURE

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

Brower, Richard

The *Educational Program Goals and Objectives, 2018-19 AY* brochure (see attachment) was given to the CEPC committee at the beginning of the meeting (not much changed from previous iteration (2017-18 AY)). Dr. Dankovich referred to this brochure during her presentation earlier in this CEPC meeting.

 Medical-Education-Brochure.pdf

Decision

The *Educational Program Goals and Objectives, 2018-19 AY* brochure was disseminated at the beginning of this CEPC meeting and any comments/questions/concerns from the CEPC will be forwarded to Dr. Brower.

9. PRE-CLERKSHIP PHASE REVIEW CONCLUDES (WORK ON ACTION ITEMS CONTINUES)

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

Brower, Richard

Using one slide (see attachment), Dr. Brower discussed how our curriculum developed such that a disconnect developed between the Bloom's taxonomy level of our learning objectives and the level of our assessment items (with assessment items generally being case-based and relatively high level, while most of the learning objectives are lower-level). This is a structural problem that we have to recognize and address, but overall, we are in good shape. Many other schools are grappling with related issues, with fewer resources. While this CEPC meeting concludes the formal CEPC pre-clerkship review, additional work will follow.

Regarding curriculum mapping, the Year 1-2 committee and the OME will consider team-based approaches to mapping and focusing the biomedical science curriculum on STEP 1 success -- thinking about what we need to teach, and what may be extraneous -- tailoring our objectives along the way.

In preparation for the recent LCME survey, we developed a three-year curriculum review cycle. This year we reviewed the pre-clerkship phase, and in AY 2018-19 we will review the clerkship phase. The post-LCME accreditation survey results are still pending, but the preliminary feedback by the survey team was generally good. The accreditation cycle affects planning, such that we are now in a brief window of opportunity to consider larger-scale curricular improvement. A series of 'curriculum retreat' events will begin in late June, with a presentation and workshop related to longitudinal integrated clerkships. In parallel, beginning in late July (the 24th) we will have a whole-day pre-clerkship curriculum event. While looking at curriculum improvement, we need to integrate preparation for class expansion (beginning in the near-term with about 125-135 new students per class, plus repeaters).

Discussion

During these closing remarks, Dr. Ogden stated the purpose/point of the CEPC is still not very clear (to him). The student input is not clear, nor is the governance of the CEPC (it should be a more faculty-led committee). And student input should be very important to the CEPC. Most of what is presented at the CEPC meetings should actually be presented and moved forward at the subcommittee level, then brought to CEPC for final approval. Elections to the CEPC are also not very clear, nor are the turnovers. But overall, relative to other institutions, this committee is not in bad shape, perhaps the functions of individuals in the CEPC should be formalized.

Brower, Richard

Dr. Brower concurred with Dr. Ogden's statements, agreeing that the CEPC must evolve away from a small, heavily-involved clique committee to one that is more led by faculty. Change is needed by the next LCME review as the CEPC cannot continue to function as it currently functions by the next LCME review.

Discussion

ACTION: Review of how CEPC functions will continue, Dr. Ogden will speak to Dr. Brower. No CEPC meeting in June, rather a workshop will be held.

Decision

A review of how the CEPC functions will continue and Dr. Ogden will speak to Dr. Brower about the current state of the CEPC and how it may change to be more faculty-led and also involving student input. No CEPC meeting in June, rather a workshop will be held.

Discussion

 Curriculum CQI Continues! RDBv14MAY2018.pptx

10. ROUNDTABLE

Presenter(s): Brower, Richard

Discussion

No additional topics were brought up during roundtable.

11. ADJOURN

Discussion

Meeting concluded around 6:45pm