Medical Education Committee Review of:

GAM

(Geriatric and Ambulatory Medicine)

Tom Finn

DMS IV Curriculum Representative
GAM REVIEW

- Quantitative Results
- Qualitative evaluations
- Recommendations
GAM REVIEW

- Quantitative Results
- Qualitative evaluations
- Recommendations
The GAM clerkship received lower scores across most general categories in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Value in learning about care of geriatric pts</th>
<th>Patient volume</th>
<th>Diagnosis variety</th>
<th>SocEcon diversity of patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 mean</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 SD</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses/Conclusions:
- declining scores trend breaches clerkship barriers → “debbie downer” effect?
- regardless of reason, all scores >3.5, most close to 4 (very good)
The GAM clerkship received lower scores across most general categories in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cultural &amp; ethnic diversity of patients</th>
<th>Clarity of grading policy</th>
<th>Opps to practice hands-on skills</th>
<th>Willingness of attg to offer feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 mean</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 SD</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses/Conclusions:
- declining scores trend breaches clerkship barriers → “debbie downer” effect?
- “hands-on” varies a lot from site-to-site
- no ethnic diversity of patients → difficult to address but large variation (New Rochelle, NY = 4.33 (n=3); Health Access Network – Lincoln, ME = 1.00 (n=1))
The GAM clerkship received lower scores for all genres of feedback in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ongoing feedback</th>
<th>Midway feedback</th>
<th>Final feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses/Conclusions:
- declining scores trend breaches clerkship barriers → “debbie downer” effect?
- most sites excellent but some less so (WRJ VA only 64% received ongoing or final feedback)
- opportunity for improvement in midway feedback → clerkship coordinator could email preceptor and students at 2-week mark?
Students were generally happy with the amount and quality of GAM didactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too much didactics</th>
<th>Too little didactics</th>
<th>Just right amount of didactics</th>
<th>Quality of didactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses/Conclusions:
- students are more happy with frequency and quality of didactics than in the past despite diversity of clinical sites
GAM students generally perceive teaching to be enthusiastic and of high quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality of teaching</th>
<th>Enthusiasm for teaching</th>
<th>Availability of faculty for questions/ career counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 mean</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 SD</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses/Conclusions:
- declining scores trend breaches clerkship barriers → “debbie downer” effect?
- teaching quality and enthusiasm for teaching on this clerkship is generally ‘very good’ to ‘excellent’
- teaching fairly consistent across sites
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Students generally enjoyed didactics on Friday

“The Friday didactics are really great. I like this format far more than lectures. It’s cool to see our classmates interact and discuss and learn from each other.”

“Loved the Friday presentations! People picked great topics and did a really great job! Journal club was slightly less useful.”

“I really enjoyed the Friday didactics sessions, especially the journal club.”

“The length of didactics was perfect.”

“There’s really too much Friday stuff to do: journal club, presentation, case presentation, write-ups”

“Doing four days in the clinic and the didactics on Friday is a good system, especially with student presentations in the morning and then the afternoon off”
Students in general felt that PowerPoint presentations on Blackboard were less helpful

“The PPTs online need work. They’re not all easily used for studying. Many of the slides simply do not make sense.”

“[The PPTs] were very disorganized and not very good as far as presenting the topics in a clear manner”

“[The PPTs] online currently were not very helpful in studying for the exam and are very disorganized in general”

“The PPTs on Blackboard can be difficult to follow if they’re not reviewed during didactics, which does not always occur”
In general, site distance and housing quality was a consistent issue

“Y’all should **reimburse for gas.** It’s outrageous to drive an hour each way, daily. I honestly think it **cost me $20/day just to go to the site.**”

“I generally **spent about 2.5 hours a day driving.**... It felt like a huge waste of time to be spending so long each day in the car, and it was exhausting.”

“Housing was 45 minutes away from the site and site was over an hour from home. **Too much driving within one week.**”

“I **had to wait until the last minute** to find out where I’d been assigned”

“I **found out 2 weeks prior to my clerkship I would not be in the Upper Valley.** A lot of us have families/lives here, and it is difficult to pick up and leave for a month without much prior notice”
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Several key recommendations emerge from student evaluations

1. Consider reimbursement for gas for students at distant sites (>20 minute drive each way?)

2. Consider advanced notice so all students know assignment at least 1 month prior to start of block

3. Improve PowerPoints ➔ Make the same information available to students at near and far sites

4. Continue active student participation in didactics

5. Stronger effort to give students feedback at 2 weeks (e-mail to preceptors at this mark to remind?)
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