



EDUCATIONAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time: December 6, 2022 PST | 1:00 PM - 2:30 PM PST

Location: Zoom <https://uw-phi.zoom.us/j/5962096962>

SharePoint: <https://uwnetid.sharepoint.com/sites/EQI/EQISPC/>

Minutes Taken By: Jung Lee and Rhea Fagnan

<p>Attendees: Darryl Potyk (Co-Chair), Mark Whipple (Co-Chair), Sara Kim (ex-officio), Kellie Engle, Tania Bardyn, Karen Segerson, Martin Teintze, David Sherman, Bessie Young, Sarah Busch</p>
<p>Regrets: Zachary Matsko, Joshua Kern, Sangeetha Thevuthasan, Cole Hanselle, Emma Ryan, Kiran Gill, Hart Edmonson, Margaret Isaac, Cindy Hamra, Rhea Fagnan</p>
<p>Staff: Jung Lee, Rachel Liao</p>
<p>Quorum: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> (A quorum is 50%+1 of the voting membership or 10)</p>

Committee Business

- **Meeting Minutes: November 2022**
 - Previous meeting minutes were approved.
 - 1/3 Meeting will be cancelled due to the holidays/quiet weeks

EQI

- **Updates**
 - Sara’s Presentation on LCME Citations LCME update presentation
 - Sara reviewed the past LCME status report outcomes for the 2018, 2020, 2021 and 2022 findings and reviewed the compliance level for each element between satisfactory, satisfactory with a need for monitoring and unsatisfactory.
 - To address the four citations, Dr. Allen will form an executive committee composed with faculty and students.
 - Sara, Dr. Allen and Dr. Dellit will be speaking with the LCME Secretariat to gain some clarification so we can communicate the clear expectations regarding how we can address these citations.

Discussion Items

- **LCME Citations:**
 - Sara went through each of the individual elements that there were citations.
 - **Element 3.2 Community of Scholars/Research Opportunities: *Unsatisfactory***
 - A medical education program is conducted in an environment that fosters the intellectual challenge and spirit of inquiry appropriate to a community of scholars and provides sufficient opportunities, encouragement, and support for medical student participation in the research and other scholarly activities of its faculty.

- Issue:
 - Persistent student dissatisfaction with research opportunities.
 - Problems:
 - Focused on Scholarship of Discovery and Integration (excluding RUOP, GHIP)
 - MS1 data below average -> New challenges
 - Central oversight of Triple I operations and data monitoring
 - Required Data:
 - Satisfaction with ease of access to research opportunities
 - Satisfaction with sufficiency of information about research opportunities
 - Required Narrative:
 - Root causes of ongoing dissatisfaction at the campus level
 - Ongoing modifications/enhancements being planned
- **Element 5.11 Study/Lounge/Storage Space/Call Rooms: *Unsatisfactory***
- A medical school ensures that its medical students have, at each campus and affiliated clinical site, adequate study space, lounge areas, personal lockers or other secure storage facilities, and secure call rooms if students are required to participate in late night or overnight clinical learning experiences.
 - Issue:
 - Uneven student satisfaction across campuses.
 - Problems:
 - 2022 data reflect student experiences during the COVID era
 - New facilities in Seattle and Spokane not reflected in the submitted data
 - Required Data:
 - Satisfaction with study space/relaxation space
 - Inventory of buildings across WWAMI: Total number of health sciences learners, facility open dates
 - Required Narrative:
 - Enhancements/modifications to Seattle, Spokane, and Wyoming
 - Rest of regional campuses
- **Element 11.1 Academic Advising: *Satisfactory with a need for monitoring***
- A medical school has an effective system of academic advising in place for medical students that integrates the efforts of faculty members, course and clerkship directors, and student affairs staff with its counseling and tutorial services and provides medical students academic counseling only from individuals who have no role in making assessment or promotion decisions about them.
 - Issue:
 - Student dissatisfaction with Montana academic advising
 - Problems:
 - Change in Montana personnel led to lower than average student satisfaction
 - Required Data:
 - Satisfaction with availability of academic advising
 - Satisfaction with quality of academic advising
 - Required Narrative:
 - Root causes of challenges at campuses including Montana
 - Modifications to academic advising tied to addressing root causes
- **Element 12.4 Student Access to Health Care Services: *Unsatisfactory***

- A medical school provides its medical students with timely access to needed diagnostic, preventive, and therapeutic health services at sites in reasonable proximity to the locations of their required educational experiences and has policies and procedures in place that permit students to be excused from these experiences to seek needed care.
 - Issue:
 - Worsened student satisfaction with the school's guidance on accessing healthcare. (MS3: 31%; MS4: 36%)
 - Problems:
 - Lack of mandate to require health insurance
 - Inadequate coverage across states -> students foregoing prenatal, dental, and preventative care
 - Clerkship learning environment culture not conducive to requesting time off for healthcare needs
 - Required Data:
 - Satisfaction with adequacy of guidance about accessing healthcare when on rotations
 - Required Narrative:
 - Root causes + modifications
- Discussion was held on how the scope of the issue is narrower than the element based on the required data and required narrative. It is important to prepare for the future as well, versus just living in the past. Status reports are not a sufficient document to prepare the whole school to meet the element.
- Citations and their possible barriers were discussed in-depth.
- **Discussion on Element 3.2:**
 - There are financial and geographical challenges that were discussed.
 - It was discussed how we could get back to the topic of good governance and how we can get back to transparency and communication as areas that could help address some of these persistent issues such as housing challenges.
 - Triple I and possible financial barriers were discussed, including if there are possibilities to allow students to stay remote in which case would help address some of the housing and financial barriers.
 - Resources for research opportunities and where they are listed were discussed. Opportunities are available to students, but it is not laid out in a central depository the way students would like to see. Finding the information can be a barrier and something we could improve upon.
 - Kellie had surveyed the national listserv to see which other medical schools have a required summer research program and if they offer a stipend. Of those that responded, most of those had an optional summer research program - some of which provided a stipend and some had NIH funding.

- The options for scholarly research activities that are available to students for graduation were discussed. Triple I is required for graduation through the current curriculum.
 - In 2017/2018 it was decided that all students (except for the MD/PHD students) were required to complete Triple I, and the waiver option was removed.
 - A potential area of dissatisfaction from students could be that they are getting mixed messaging. Through a lens of good governance, it is crucial for us to ensure that the messaging is consistent and if it is not consistent, there needs to be clarity as to why.
 - Student representative Sarah Busch provided her recent experience looking for research projects. She met with a career advisor (Linh Ngo) and had a very good experience getting plugged into research opportunities. During the meeting, Linh had sent her a full database of people who were in the field that she was interested in, showed her how to navigate the website, how to find potential PI's that were in the related field, and to reach out if there were any issues getting connected with someone. Sarah reviewed the options and sent an email to the faculty member she was interested in working with and within 2 days they responded with multiple project options available for Sarah that she could be added to. As a remote student – it was a very smooth and easy process.
 - Discussion was held regarding the quality improvement role – these scholarly activity opportunities are much more available in the clinical realm in patient care. There was an idea to create more space for this type of work in the patient care phase and explore and focus phase to meet this requirement, rather than the summer after foundations phase when they do not have the clinical connections at that time.
 - It is important to discuss what we mean by research/scholarship and make it less stringent. For example, service learning was a citation because we only counted the school sponsored projects as service-learning projects. We may have an internal standard that we aspire our students to meet – but it is important to stay thinking in a flexible and creative manner.
 - Being able to efficiently identify projects, as the problem and opportunity have grown larger than one person was discussed. In addition, the timeline of research opportunities was discussed. For example, the list opens in October, students have until December to find a mentor and then until March to put together a project.
 - Reaching out to interested faculty in January and asking if they will have a research opportunity in the summer was discussed.
 - Annual goals for citation 3.2 - our annual goal is to move the citation from unsatisfactory to satisfactory with a need for monitoring, and then take it to satisfactory in the second year, given all the interlocking pieces that need to be put in place.
 - Central oversight is crucial so we can get to that ease of access and transparency to truly make an improvement on citation 3.2.
- Element 11.1 – Academic Advising: there was learning specialist turnover in Montana which is part of the reason this citation was received. There was a new learning specialist hired, however in terms

of central oversight – the Seattle central academic advising team does not have a say in recruitment and hiring of the regional learning specialists. The Montana students seem happy with the new learning specialist and there should be a change in the data over the next year.

- **Student Committee Member Recruitment**

- Martin has provided great feedback and we will reach out to the committee for additional feedback to revise our recruitment communication to students prior to reaching out to students in January for new members.

Adjourned: 2:30pm