SUMMARY

APPROVED MOTIONS
1. Motion made, seconded, and approved to create an interest group about the health Effects and treatment of IPV, Sexual Violence, and Childhood Abuse
2. Motion made, seconded, and approved to give $480 to the MSFC Group to attend the annual MSFC conference.

SHOUT OUTS
1. Khushboo to contact SNAP reps and previous graduates to seek out more information about “behaviors experienced” identified on the AAMC questionnaire.
2. Alex Orfanos and Ian Engler volunteered to examine how other student governments function at Dartmouth. If other students are interested in this effort, please contact Khushboo.
3. M1s, please contact Alex Orfanos if you are interested in learning more about the role of Social Chair and/or helping plan and execute social events.
4. Student Government reps, please spread the word about upcoming social events among classmates.
5. All students, please check the current list of SG Interest Groups before starting new interest groups to prevent overlap.
6. All students, there are still opportunities to become involved with One Dartmouth if you are interested.

UPCOMING EVENTS
1. Wednesday, October 14 – One Dartmouth Kickoff Dinner
2. Friday, October 16 – Heart Rounds, Fall Themed at DOC House
3. TBD, October – Second series of Town Hall meetings about Geisel Strategic Planning
4. Monday, October 26 – Newly approved Interest Group about IPV/Sexual Violence/Childhood Abuse to host first event
5. Saturday, October 31 – Halloween Social with all Dartmouth graduate schools
6. Friday, November 6 – Tailgate at Remsen before Dartmouth Football game

******

MEETING AGENDA

1. First Year Rep Welcome
   a. Class Reps
      i. Elizabeth Hoffman
      ii. TR Harris
      iii. Kevin Dore
   b. Financial Aid Reps
      i. Andrew Blake
      ii. David Leander
   c. Curriculum Reps
      i. Josh Ramos
      ii. Natasha Merali
2. Graduate Questionnaire review (Dr. Ogrinc)
   a. Dr. Ogrinc reviewed results from the yearly questionnaire sent by the AAMC to 134 U.S. Medical Schools. The Geisel response rate was 82% (75/91). Most questions were rated on 1 (low) to 4 or 5 (high) scale, and these values were then compared to the national average and previous ratings from Geisel students.
   b. The AAMC highlighted the following general findings
      i. Decrease in VA experience
      ii. Increase in structured service learning
      iii. Growing percentage of students affirming benefits of diversity
      iv. Increasing percentage of students have no medical debt
   c. Geisel Selected Findings
      i. Diversity of student population remains strong
         1. Self-identified demographic data is on par with national averages
         2. Reflects work of admissions committee
      ii. Very good ratings of biomedical courses (compared to National average)
         1. Almost all are rated at or above the national average
         2. Basic science coursework had sufficient clinical relevance
         3. Required clerkships integrate basic science content
      iii. Very good ratings of clinical clerkships
         1. Most close or above the national average for overall quality
         2. High percentage (96-100%) of students report receiving mid-clerkship feedback
         3. Quality of teaching rated high in all clerkships
      iv. Mixed rating of White River Junction VA experience
         1. Uptick in students who rated the experience as “poor” but do not know which clerkships
      v. Lower structured service learning than prior years
         1. Geisel at 37% compared to 54% for all schools
      vi. Strong reporting of interprofessional learning
         1. Higher than other schools (96% compared to 79%)
vii. Excellence preparedness for beginning residency
   1. Clinical skills, common conditions, communication, evidence based medicine skills, issues in social sciences, professionalism, care for patients from different backgrounds

viii. Mixed ratings of deans, students support, facilities, financial aid
   1. Dean's office, Dean of Students office, and Curricular Affairs all rated 3.9 or high
   2. Tutoring and academic counseling were rated lower
   3. Financial aid and debt counseling rated very high (4.5-4.7)
   4. Computer resource center, library, student study space, and student relaxation space rated lower than all schools
   5. Student health services on par with all schools
   6. Student health insurance and student mental health services rated lower than all schools

ix. Medical School Debt
   1. Average of $166,000 at Geisel compared to $170,000 at all schools

x. Concerning reports of behaviors experienced during medical school
   1. 100% GSM students aware of mistreatment policy, and 96% GSM students aware how to report mistreatment
   2. Physical Harm
      a. 4.5% harmed once at Geisel compared to 1.8% at all schools
   3. Subjected to Offensive Sexist Remarks
      a. 5.9% once, 5.9% occasionally, 1.5% frequently compared to national averages of 5.9%, 7.6%, and 0.6%, respectively
   4. Denied opportunities for training based on gender
      a. 2.9% once, 1.5% occasionally compared to national averages of 2.7%, 3.2%, respectively
   5. Subject to unwanted sexual advances
      a. 1.5% once, 4.4% occasionally compared to national averages of 2.6%, 2.2%, respectively
   6. Offensive remarks/names related to sexual orientation
      a. 1.5% once, 0% occasionally, 1.5% frequently
   7. Racially or ethnically offensive remarks
      a. 8.8% once, 2.9% occasionally, 0% frequently compared to national averages of 3.5%, 3.4%, and 0.3% respectively
   8. Lower evaluations solely because of race or ethnicity
      a. 3.0% once, 3.0% occasionally, 0% frequently compared to national averages of 1.5%, 1.2%, and 0.3% respectively
   9. Sources of behavior experienced
      a. 8.8% Pre-clerkship faculty
      b. 5.9% Clerkship faculty (Classroom)
      c. 25% Clerkship faculty (Clinical)
      d. 12% Other employee (administrative staff, faculty)
      e. 13.2% Students

   d. Next Steps
      i. Will review qualitative data when it arrives, which may help shape action plan
      ii. Review data with leadership groups and departments at DHMC
          1. Dean's Academic Board
          2. Academic Deans Group
          3. Drs. Pinto-Powell and Duncan sharing with departments
          4. Student Government
      iii. How to develop an action place for the concerning behaviors experienced
          1. Will depend if the behaviors are targeted to certain sites or departments
          2. May consider unconscious bias training for all students, faculty, staff
      e. Student Government Response
         i. Q: Can this information be shared with the LCME for identified areas for improvement?
            1. A: Yes
         ii. Q: Could this data be correlated with the student mistreatment surveys given after 3rd year clerkships?
            1. A: Hard to tell without the qualitative data
         iii. Q: Does this data correlate to increasing diversity at Geisel?
            1. A: It is not clear
         iv. Q: Does this data correlate to reported incidents?
            1. A: Hard to tell without the qualitative data
         v. Q: Is this data surprising based on student experiences in the past 4 years?
            1. A: Some data shows that we have made a point to address it. It is not clear if we have made students more comfortable with reporting/
         vi. Q: What are conversations like when a department is confronted about mistreatment?
            1. A: Departments take this behavior very seriously. For example, four to five years ago, data emerged about a specific clerkship, and that clerkship was completely redesigned, including a change in leadership.
2. A: Sufficient data from is requested Dr. Lyons so that the appropriate sites and departments can be contacted.

vii. Q: Is there data about when the student-student interactions occurred?
   1. A: There are not specifications about when this behavior happened. There is no difference between events occurring during the first week of school vs. during another point in a student's time at Geisel.

viii. Q: Is there anything that SG can do to delve further into the student/student interactions?
   1. A: The degree or interactions vary from year to year, and the grading schemes change between years. Having more information about the “when” would be helpful to determine appropriate interventions
   2. A: First year class reps recently sent out a survey. Among 32 respondents, there are already concerns about sexist/racist bias. It did not specify whether these interactions were student/student vs. student/faculty vs. something else.
   3. A: Informal surveys among classmates may be a way to access these student experiences
   ix. Q: What current options are in the place now to help with resolutions between students?
      a. A: SNAP reps, student affairs and advising deans, ombudsperson, etc
      x. Suggestion to incorporate exit interviews with students
     xi. Suggestion to investigate our site specifically if the qualitative
     xii. New end of year 1 and end of year 3 surveys will be conducted internally by Student Affairs

3. Quick Notifications
   a. Travel Budget Update
      i. Received an anonymous alumni donation of $7000 for the travel fund that can be rolled over. Requesting quarterly/monthly lists of student abstracts funded by this gift.
      ii. It is important to continue engaging with this donor in a positive way.
      iii. Alumni Relations are working on creating a rolling fund for travel budget
   iv. Student Government Response
      1. Q: Will this donation change the reimbursement structure?
         a. A: No!
   b. Election Committee
      i. Over the past few years, we have moved to electronic forms for record keeping and elections. For the 2019 SG Representational election, the election link was sent in such a way that it could be opened multiple times by one person. After discovering this problem, the link was sent out a second time without this issue.
      ii. In response to this incident, SG would like to form a group to investigate how other SGs run their elections and SG meetings.
      1. Alex Orfanos and Ian Engler volunteered to take part in this initiative
   c. Student Printer/Copier in Remsen
      i. For several years, there have been repeated discussions about installing a printer/copier in Remsen for student use.
      ii. Per Tina Wilcox, this printer/copier installation would cost a few hundred dollars. While the printer is a fixed cost, the paper and ink are variable costs. One suggestion would be to have these variable costs drawn from the first and second year SG budgets because those classes would be closest to this printer/copier and likely to use it more frequently.
      iii. Student Government Response
         1. Q: Wouldn’t GreenPrint factor in the cost of ink and paper?
            a. A: Yes, but there were previous delays in installing a GreenPrint printer because GreenPrint recently changed printer manufacturers.
            2. Q: Julia Litzsky has a printer that she could be willing to donate but it would not be hooked up to GreenPrint
            3. Q: Could someone from Green Print come talk to Student Government directly to discuss costs?
               a. A: Will work to have specific costs or a representative available at the next SG meeting in November

4. Climate Study Working Group (Spencer Hatch)
   a. Spencer is the graduate/professional student on the climate study working group
   b. In response to events among undergraduates within the last 3-4 years, a survey was recently sent out to establish a baseline for the climate at Dartmouth as an institution.
   i. Data will be re-distributed with some data available on a school-by-school basis

5. One Dartmouth (Spencer Hatch)
   a. One Dartmouth is a student organization with 160 members from EVERY school on campus
      i. The largest fraction is undergraduates
      ii. Members are divided into smaller “family” units that are expected to have several events per year
      iii. Because of the variability in family planning, the goal is to have more community-wide events this year
      iv. The opening dinner will take place on October 14th
   b. Manny Aryee (GSM student) is a member of the executive committee
   c. Dr. Lee Witters is a faculty advisor to this organization
6. AAMC National Conference (Auriel August)
   a. Auriel is Geisel’s rep for the AAMC OSR, and she is the Northeast Regional Rep.
      i. AAMC provides services for students to take the MCAT, apply to medical school, and participate in the The Match
      ii. Auriel can share best practices from Geisel and learn about best practices from other schools
      iii. Auriel will be running two business meetings with Northeast Region with “table topics”
   b. What feedback should Auriel share with and seek from other schools?
      i. How do students prepare for Step 1, Step 2 CK, and Step 2 CS?
      ii. Are other schools in charge of their own budgets and the allocation of funds?
      iii. How do other schools handle travel funding?
      iv. What resources exist and what training do faculty receive in regard to racial and sexual misconduct?
      v. How do other medical schools address topics such as IPV, Sexual Violence, and Childhood Abuse within their curriculums?

7. Student Interest Groups
   a. Health Effects and Treatment of IPV, Sexual Violence, and Childhood Abuse (Julia Litsky et al)
      i. October is National Domestic Violence Awareness month. This group has an event planned for October 26th that will feature a physician from BWH. Another future event will include a panel of practitioners who deal with child abuse – how to identify, treat, and talk to patients about this topic. They will also share data about adverse effects of childhood abuse.
      ii. Dr. Pinto-Powell would serve as a faculty advisor. This group would plan to work closely with On-Doctoring to improve student opportunities to practice interview skills relevant to these topics.
      iii. This group could be used as a platform to interact with other communities at or around Dartmouth
   b. SG is trying to consolidate interest groups
      i. We encourage students to check the current list of interest groups before creating a new interest group

8. Update on Strategic Planning (Duane Compton)
   a. Since the student-only Town Hall, Dr. Compton has been running focus groups of faculty, staff, and students to seek input on proposed models for Geisel’s strategic plan. He appreciates the input from medical students who have served on these focus groups
   b. He has received substantial feedback on the reorganization of the basic sciences. There may be a reorganization of existing departments rather than three main divisions as was proposed at the Town Hall Meeting
   c. He will be assimilating feedback within the next week followed by a second series of town hall meetings.
   d. Will present plan to Trustees during the first week of November to receive an endorsement
   e. The first of the year (2016) will probably be when the first changes are enacted

9. Social Chair Updates (Alex Orfanos)
   a. Upcoming events – see beginning of minutes. Class Reps should “spread the Gospel” about these social events
   b. Alex previously proposed a selected apprenticeship of the social chair position because there is a lot of administrative burden when planning and running events. Ideally, it would be a student interested in the position.
      i. Student Government Response
         1. Q: Would it have to be a SG rep?
            a. A: Last year, the position was offered to the entire student body
         2. Q: When do elections for Social Chair happen?
            a. A: Elections happen at the end of the year with the exception of SNAP and ODI. Pre-Social Chair would be a non-voting member of SG.
         3. Suggestion to create a regularly meeting Social Committee to provide regular feedback and planning. Candidates could be vetted through that venue

Student Government Response
1. Q: This seems like a basic competency rather than a special interest. Why start with an interest group?
   a. Ideally, these topics would fit in the curriculum. The advantage of starting groups like this would allow for pilot testing of curricular activities. They may help us to examine the current curriculum
   b. They are not specific to a certain specialty.
2. How many students are interested in the group?
   a. Around 9 students would be interested in being active participants
   b. At least 40 students have signed up to attend the first event
3. Auriel could speak on this topic at the AAMC OSR meetings to see how these topics are covered at other medical schools
   v. Motion made by Kris; Seconded by Sarah
   b. SG is trying to consolidate interest groups
      i. We encourage students to check the current list of interest groups before creating a new interest group
10. Medical Students for Choice (Ashley Hamel and Sumitha Raman)
   a. MSFC is an internationally recognized group for medical students interested in reproductive health and family planning. In the setting of recent events, it is an important time to discuss reproductive health and justice. The National Medical Students for Choice meeting is taking place in Philadelphia, PA this coming weekend.
   b. The cost per person is $150 (conference fees) + $80 (hotel) + $20 (transportation) = $250 per person.
      i. Eight students plan to attend, so the total cost would be $2000.
      ii. They have already received a group student discount for conference fees.
      iii. They will contribute $40 per person from MSFC funds they have received, so the need is $210 per person.
   c. Travel funds allow $50 per individual attending a conference. Above three individuals makes them eligible to dip into discretionary funds.
   d. Student Government Response
      i. Comment that it is a helpful/informative conference.
      ii. Comment that an event should be set-up after the conference to share the information will all Geisel students.
      iii. Q: How much money is currently in discretionary?
         1. A: ~$10,000. This money can be used each year or can be rolled over for larger projects.
      iv. Q: Would these eight individuals still be eligible for travel funding?
         1. A: Any funding received for group conferences from discretionary funds would be subtracted on a per person basis from subsequent funding from travel funds for an individual.
   e. Motion made and seconded to provide $60 per person from discretionary funds.