

Meeting Information

Date: Thursday, October 30, 2014

Time: 11:00am – 12:00pm PDT

Location: D-310, Health Sciences

In Attendance: Jamey Cheek, Kellie Engle, Hugh Foy, Erika Goldstein, Robert Steiner, Mark Whipple, Evelyn Fenner-Dorrity

Absent: Darryl Potyk, Mike Spinelli

Minutes

Working Group Charge

Erika Goldstein reviewed the working group charge to determine the structure of the 12 week block between the Foundations Phase and the Patient Care Phase of the curriculum including three elements: (1) preparation for step 1 examination; (2) preparation for clerkships; and (3) activities related to student scholarship (with the charge letter recommending that a scientific research methods course be considered for inclusion in the 12 week block). It is the understanding of the group that the charge is to make recommendations regarding the overall structure of the 12 week block including the time devoted to each component, the format of each component, and where the components may take place. It is the group's assumption that individual working groups will be formed on the basis of these recommendations to develop the specific content of each component.

Action Item: Erika Goldstein will confirm that this understanding of the limits of our charge is correct.

Discussion on Remediation

There was initial discussion of remediation and the potential that some students may need to remediate during the 12 week block. It is unclear how many students this might involve and remediation plans will depend on the individual circumstances of each student. The group wants to highlight the importance of keeping remediation in mind as planning goes forward to ensure that there is adequate time for remediation for those students who need it. The importance of timely grade reporting to be able to plan adequately for remediation was also discussed. It was pointed out that there has apparently been some discussion of a comprehensive, no-fault test that may be given at the end of the Foundations Phase, or after break at the start of the 12 week block. If this is being considered, it will impact the structure of the block. Only one of the meeting participants was aware of this having been discussed.

Action Item: Erika Goldstein will try to obtain more information about any plans for a comprehensive exam at the end of the Foundations Phase.

Discussion on Boards Preparation

Jamey Cheek reviewed the current structure of the boards review program. Currently he starts the process at the end of 1st year with an introduction to the overall structure of the program. Throughout 2nd year review sessions are integrated with the curriculum and are recorded. The review sessions

increase in intensity from January through May. Jamey meets individually with students during this period to help them craft a personalized study plan, and he continues to assess the progress of individual students.

Jamey shared that 5-weeks of study seem to be optimal for the review period for step 1, with 8-10 hours per day of review. After 5 weeks, the scores tend to lower. Students may better prepare for boards by our new curriculum, but this will not be clear until at least 2-3 years into the new curriculum. The feeling of the group is that, at least for now, 5-6 weeks should be set aside for students to study and take the boards in order to provide adequate flexibility for all students. The group is also hopeful that more frequent assessments in the new curriculum will help identify students who are at risk of not passing early and working with them to ensure their success. Jamey shared that there should be adequate space in the testing centers to accommodate all of our students in this timeline.

The group discussed developing materials centrally in Seattle, yet allowing students to pursue the boards review program in the region. It will be important to tie credit to the boards review preparation in order for students to receive financial aid. An online, module based curriculum with credit earned for completion of modules would work well for this. The group assumed a separate working group will create these materials and refine the details of the overall boards review program.

Summary of tentative recommendations:

- The group recommends that 6 weeks of the 12 week block will be set aside for students to prepare and take step 1.
- The group recommends that an independent working group be charged with creating materials centrally for a region-wide boards review program and working with the curriculum office to develop the details of a credit bearing boards review course.

Discussion on Scholarship

The group first noted that much work remains to be done to clarify exactly what scholarship requirements will be in the new curriculum, and specifically what might be required and what might be optional. Given the timeline for implementation of the new curriculum and the priorities of developing the core content of the Foundations Phase, the group recommends that for at least the first year of the new curriculum, the current III structure and logistics for the scholarly requirement be continued.

The group discussed the charge to our committee to consider the role of a scientific methods course within the 12 week block. The committee feels that this is not the right timing for such a course, given that most students will need to be far along in their scholarly projects, if not completely done, by the time of this 12 week block. The group feels that the scientific methods course should be incorporated into the curriculum of the foundations blocks, specifically into the Clinical and Scientific Inference thread (which the group expects to include epidemiology, evidence based medicine, and life-long learning components of the curriculum) significant portions of which should be threaded throughout the foundations phase. This approach and content should be reviewed carefully to ensure that it meets the LCME requirements.

The group discussed the importance of robust mentoring for student scholarship. Mark Whipple and Robert Steiner described some of the preliminary work done by their subgroup on scholarship in the new curriculum. They envision a number of concentration areas with students working in groups from across the region with an identified mentor or mentors on a scholarly project in their area of concentration. Using the skills from the scientific methods curriculum (which could have modular, online

components) student teams from across the region would develop a project (possibly working in multiple sites), gather data, and then work together to analyze the data. They could work together virtually or in person, perhaps during intersessions and over the summer, as well as during 4 weeks set aside for this purpose in the 12 week block, to complete a paper and/or poster to fulfill the scholarly requirement. The group thought there should be 4-5 weeks set aside for this activity in the 12 week block, and that perhaps in the last week, all students could come to Seattle for a research symposium to share their work (based on the proposed calendar, this could potentially be scheduled to coincide with Match day). The group thought Seattle based students and faculty might host the regional students. This led to a brief conversation about how and whether the Carmel meeting might fit into this schedule or whether a Seattle based research symposium might replace participation in the Carmel meeting.

Tentative recommendations:

- The group recommends clarification of the scholarship requirement in the new curriculum.
- The group recommends that the research methods course not be included in the 12 week block, but rather that it be incorporated into the Clinical and Scientific Inference thread in conjunction with content in epidemiology, EBM, life-long learning, and scientific discovery.
- The group recommends that an independent working group be charged with determining the structure of the scholarship activity and favor multi-site student teams working on projects related to specific scholarly concentrations with close faculty mentoring.
- The group recommends that 4 weeks of the 12 week block be set aside for students to complete their scholarly projects.
- The group recommends consideration of the development of a research symposium in Seattle at the end of this 4 week component of the block at which projects will be presented.

Discussion on Transition to Clerkships

The group began a very brief discussion of the Transition to Clerkships component for the 12 week block. The group thinks this could take place during the final week of the block before the start of clerkships. They discussed whether this component should involve bringing all students to Seattle, or should occur in the region at each site using materials created collaboratively. The group also briefly considered whether there would be a Clinical Transition Ceremony at the end of this component and where this might occur.

Tentative recommendations:

- Further discussion is needed.

Closing Items and Action Items

At our next meeting:

- There will be an in depth discussion of the Transition to Clerkships component.
- The group will review the initial recommendations for each element of the proposed 12 week block and prepare the final recommendations.
- The group also needs to come up with a more appropriate name for this block (one thought: "Consolidation and Transition").

Evelyn Fenner-Dorrity will send out a doodle poll with possible times for our next meeting.