

Meeting Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021
Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Zoom
Approval: March 16, 2021
Recorded By: Jillian Marcus

Attendance

Present = X, Absent = 0

Faculty Voting Members

Ahmed, Nayla (Clinical-Medicine)	X	Boardman, Maureen (Preclinical & Clinical- Family Medicine, Community Preceptor Rep)	X	Chow, Vinca (Clinical-Anesthesiology)	0	Crockett, Sarah (Clinical-Emergency Medicine)	X
Hanissian, Paul (Preclinical & Clinical- Obstetrics and Gynecology)	X	Hartford, Alan (Clinical-Medicine)	X	Homeier, Barbara (Preclinical- Pediatrics)	X	Loo, Eric (Preclinical-Pathology)	X
Matthew, Leah (Clinical-Family Medicine)	X	Myers, Larry (Preclinical- Medical Education)	X	Nelson, Bill (Preclinical - TDI)	X	Robey, R, Brooks (Preclinical & Clinical- Medicine; Faculty Council Rep)	X
Saunders, James (Clinical-Surgery)	X	Sorensen, Meredith (Clinical-Surgery)	0	Weinstein, Adam (Chair; Preclinical & Clinical- Medical Education)	X		

Student Voting Members

Year 1

Carhart, Briggs	X	Fitzsimmons, Emma	X	Thomson, Chris	X	Xu, Jane	0
------------------------	---	--------------------------	---	-----------------------	---	-----------------	---

Year 2

Banerji, Sarah	0	Cheema, Amal	X	Hanley, Meg	0	Morris, Linda	0
-----------------------	---	---------------------	---	--------------------	---	----------------------	---

Year 3

Bertalan, Mia	0	Demsas, Falen	0	Lindqwister, Alexander	0	Minichiello, Joe	X
Sramek, Michael	0						

Year 4

Bachour, Kinan	0	Bessen, Sarah	0	Bhushan, Vivian	0	Del Favero, Natalie	0
Guerra, Sylvia	0	Morgan, Allie	0	Stanko, Kevin	0	Warren, Celestine	0

MD/PhD

Chidawanyika, Tamutenda	0	Kamal, Yasmin	0	Keim, Abigail	X	Reiner, Timothy	X
--------------------------------	---	----------------------	---	----------------------	---	------------------------	---

Non-Voting Members

Albright, Amanda (Instructional Designer)	X	Borges, Nicole (Chair, Dept. of Medical Education)	0	Dick III, John (Interim, Senior Associate Dean for Medical Education)	X	Dick III, John (Clinical - Associate Dean Clinical Curriculum)	X
---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---

Eastman, Terri (Preclinical - Director, Preclinical Curriculum)	X	Eidson, Bill (Director, Learning Services)	0	Fountain, Jennifer (Assessment)	X	Holmes, Alison (Associate Dean, Student Affairs)	0
Jaeger, Mikki (Registrar)	X	Kerns, Stephanie (Director, Biomedical Libraries)	X	Lyons, Virginia (Preclinical - Associate Dean Preclinical Curriculum)	X	Marcus, Jillian (Administrative Support, UME Affairs)	X
McAllister, Steve (Director, Educational Technology)	0	Montalbano, Leah (Director, Assessment & Evaluation)	X	Mullins, David (Associate Dean, Biomedical Science Integration)	0	Mullins, David (Chair, Geisel Academy of Master Educators)	0
Pinto-Powell, Roshini (Associate Dean, Admissions)	0	Reid, Brian (Associate Director, Educational Technology)	0	Ricker, Alison (Clinical - Director, Clinical Curriculum)	X	Vacant (Associate Dean, Diversity, and Inclusion)	0
Shoop, Glenda (Associate Dean, Evaluation and Assessment)	X						

**Student Non-Voting Members
Diversity and Inclusion & Community Engagement (DICE)**

Tersio, Isabelle	0	Conn, Stephen	0				
Vice Chairs for Academics – Student Government							
Guerra, Sylvia	0	Lindqwister, Alexander	0				

Guest(s)

Nick Ryan	Lin Brown	Jamie Ames		

Call to Order

Adam Weinstein, MD

Adam Weinstein, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Announcements

Adam Weinstein, MD

Adam announced that since there is no longer the test for USMLE Step 2 CS, they would like to remove the requirement for students to take the test from the policy.

Mia Bertalan made a motion to approve the update to UME-CNTRL-0002 USMLE Step 2 Policy. The motion was seconded by Eric Loo. The motion passed by a unanimous vote with an abstention.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Adam Weinstein, MD

Approval of January meeting minutes.

Tim Renier made a motion to approve the January 2021 MEC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Leah Matthew. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Student Issues & Feedback

None.

Consent Agenda

- Endocrine course objectives

Brooks Robey made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Bill Nelson. The motion passed by a unanimous vote with an abstention.

Old Business

1. GAOC Charge – Glenda Shoop, PhD

- i. Glenda summarized the updates to the charge.
- ii. Discussion
 - a. A member voiced how the current GAOC has not been following the practice listed on the charge: “Require collaborative input from the course, longitudinal curricula, clerkship, and elective directors, as applicable, on all major policy decisions,” and asked if this were the intention, would it be enforced?
 - Adam mentioned that in the charge, the GAOC reports to the MEC so if there were concerns, this could be brought to the MEC.
 - b. A member also asked if a GAOC decision were made that a course leader was not happy with, would there be an appeal process more rapid than bringing it to the MEC.
 - c. It was pointed out that the new GAOC members the voting members would be selected by the Phase and LC leaders to represent them. The functioning and communication of the GAOC will be quite different and colleagues will be making assessment decisions collaboratively, rather than decisions from a committee that is currently mostly deans or administration. At some point we have to trust our colleagues who we’ve appointed. If someone or the process is not working well, we can bring it to the MEC to discuss how to improve it again.
 - d. Voting was discussed on who should be voting and who should not be within the GAOC. We could either codify abstention into the policy or trust that individuals will abstain when appropriate. Multiple members supported having individuals abstain when they feel it is appropriate.

- e. One member asked about the benefit of having the Associate Dean of Evaluation and Assessment, and the Director of Evaluation and Assessment listed as non-voting members in the GAOC charge. Glenda mentioned that they were structuring their voting/non-voting members similarly to how the MEC does it. Likewise, this would allow those with expertise to share insights and best practices with the committee members, while also allowing the GAOC, an MEC committee, to have decisions voted/decided upon by the faculty and students.
- f. Leah Montalbano mentioned that this is a working committee, and by having 24 people on the committee, it raises to question who is doing what work. Discussion focused on a smaller group (voting members and select administration) attend every working meeting, but a more extended administrative group attend quarterly meetings which may be bigger picture and program based.
- g. A member brought up concern on the statement, "Due to potential conflict of interest, students will have a vote on procedural matters related to assessment but not the assessment tools."
 - Many matters related to assessment tools or grading decisions relate to assessments students have not taken yet or could impact necessary privacy of student information.
 - It was also mentioned there were not a lot of votes on assessment questions or these tools, and rather feedback given.
 - There was discussion that more senior students who have already taken these assessments and passed the courses could contribute to these discussions, including vetting so the charge could be adjusted to be clearer that students on the GAOC could participate on these aspects when there are not such conflicts of interest.

New Business

1. **Derm-Rheum-Ortho** – *Lin Brown, MD, Jamie Ames, MD, and Denise Aaron, MD*
 - i. Virginia Lyons summarized the strengths and recommendations.
 - ii. Lin Brown discussed the Course Leaders' plans based on those.

Brooks Robey made a motion to approve MDFD 251 Derm-Rheum-Ortho. The motion was seconded by James Saunders. The motion passed by a unanimous vote with an abstention.

Old Business

1. Preclinical Contact Hours Policy – Virginia Lyons, PhD

- i. Virginia summarized the discussion from the ad hoc committee and the proposed updates to the policy.
- ii. Discussion
 - a. A member expressed concern about the attendance policy revision, proposing that 12 students in a small group session would be the cutoff for required attendance. The member suggested having a minimum of 15 or 20 students for each small group sessions. A member responded that they agreed with 15 students being the minimum, with the intention of small groups to have a conversation as opposed to a lecture.
 - b. There are other pedagogies not listed in the proposal, for example workshop-style learning, and it is more whether the learning is active in format and if students benefit and learn the material best by participating (or whether it can be reproduced equally by reading/viewing the session after). For large group workshops, this change could also impact the pedagogy and learning harmfully.
 - c. To reconcile this, and deliberately note the list was not fully inclusive, it was suggested to include the phrase, “This could also apply to truly interactive sessions as judged by the course leader.”
 - d. A member brought up the note that “Required non-course related activities (e.g., Orientation activities, NBME Cumulative exams) will count as 0.5 contact hours for every 1 hour of required attendance.” The point of concern the member brought up was, *if you are doing this for 1 hour, why is it only counting for 30 minutes?*
 - i. A member explained the thought behind this was to allow for more academic contact hours since they did not want to create a situation where there was not enough time to schedule academic content.
 - ii. Another member expressed that curricular activities require preparation work and review/study, whereas these orientation activities and NBME assessments do not require non-classroom hours per se, and they wanted to honor that difference somehow.
 - iii. It was noted Coaching does require some non-classroom time, so would not fit exactly in the current policy or update.
 - iv. There was discussion about what would count towards the curriculum contact hours, and what would be considered additional activities (coaching sessions, student affairs activities, etc.).
 - v. One member suggested adding language about course hours being scheduled per the policy, and non-curriculum hours being able to be added to the schedule only in the weeks where there is time remaining (e.g., the curricular hours are below the thresholds). This idea may form the basis behind a proposed revision.

Eric Loo made a motion to table. The motion was seconded by Paul Hanissian. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

New Business

2. Professionalism Competency Domain Review – John Dick, MD

- i. Adam summarized the power point and recommendations from the ad hoc MEC subcommittee assigned to review the Professionalism Competency.
- ii. Discussion
 - a. One member asked about using the word “socioeconomic,” versus “social,” in the proposed recommendations for #P5.

James Saunders made a motion to approve the Professionalism Competency Domain Review. The motion was seconded by Alan Hartford. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

3. Fluids, Electrolytes, and Renal Medicine – Thomas Kaneko, MD, Brooks Robey, MD, & Adam Weinstein, MD

- i. Virginia summarized the course review document.
- ii. Brooks summarized the Course Leaders plan based on the strengths and recommendations.

Tim Renier made a motion to approve MDFD 252 Fluids Electrolytes, and Renal Medicine. The motion was seconded by Nayla Ahmed. The motion passed by a unanimous vote with 2 abstentions.

4. General Subl Objectives – Campbell Levy, MD

- i. Adam summarized the objectives to the committee.
- ii. Discussion
 - a. One member suggested adding “with appropriate supervision,” to the end of objective #6 under “Clinical Care” objectives.
 - b. A member asked about mapping of the objectives. Adam said that different members of the MEC are going to follow up with Campbell Levy about the implementation of the mapping.
 - c. John Dick brought up that when students do not complete Subl’s at Geisel, they do not necessarily complete these general objectives. John continued to explain that when they get the description from other institutions about the Subl, they try to see what objectives fit for that certain Subl the student is completing.

Brooks Robey made a motion to approve the General Sub I Objectives. The motion was seconded by Nayla Ahmed. The motion passed by a unanimous vote with an abstention.

Adam Weinstein, MD

Adam Weinstein, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 6:00 P.M.

Ongoing Business

- Evaluation Oversight Committee
- Assessment Oversight Committee
- LCME Oversight Committee
- ABG Interpretation
- Phase 3 Subcommittee

Future Meetings

MEC meetings are the 3rd Tuesday of each month from 4:00 - 6:00 p.m.

- March 16, 2021
- April 20, 2021
- May 18, 2021
- June 15, 2021
- July 20, 2021
- August 17, 2021