Foundations Phase Committee Minutes

Date	April 22, 2024
Time	4:00 – 5:30PM PT
Attendees ☒ QUORUM REACHED:	***Academic Chair:*** *Matt Cunningham;* ***Executive Chair:*** *Edith Wang* ***Voting Members:*** *Edith Wang, Matt Cunningham, Serena Brewer, Cassie Cussick, Gerald Groggel, Natahsa Hunter, Sarah Murphy, Michel Stephens, Ryan Thomas, Shannon Uffenbeck, Leo Wang, Holly Martinson* ***Guests:*** *Alyssa Stephens, Derrick Phillips, Gerald Tolbert, Gina Campelia, Heather McPhillips, Julien Goulet, Karan Segerson, Karen McDonough, Kathy Young, Kellie Engle, Kurt Weaver, Laura Gumz, Meghan Kiefer, Micheal Campion, Sarah Gerrish, Doug Schaad*
Regrets	***Voting members:*** *Alexis Baranoff, Amanda Kost*

Agenda

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	Approve March minutes	Edith Wang	5 min	Attachment A	Decision
2	Mind, Brain, Behavior Lessons Learned	Leo Wang	25 Min	Attachment B	Decision
3	MHS 2 Lessons Learned Presentation	Sarah Gerrish/ Gina Campelia/ Karen Segerson	25 Min	Attachment C	Decision
4	E-22 Foundations End of Phase Report	Matt Cunningham	30 Min	Attachment D	Discussion

1. Approve Meeting Minutes		
Discussion: The committee reviewed the previous meeting's minutes.		
☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[8] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The Foundations Phase Committee approved the March meeting minutes.		

2. Mind, Brain, Behavior, Lessons Learned		
Discussion: **Summary** The Committee discussed various improvements and adjustments to the curriculum in response to student feedback and logistical challenges faced during the academic year. The primary focus was on enhancing the coherence of the educational narrative and making strategic adjustments in areas such as psychiatry and chronic pain management. **Questions and Concerns Raised** • Concern about the disproportionate number of assessment questions assigned to specific blocks compared to the hours allocated. • Queries regarding the realignment of course content to better form a cohesive narrative. • Discussion on whether the changes made to the curriculum were substantial enough to address the feedback effectively. • Inquiries about the integration of clinical pharmacology and how it's taught compared to other blocks. **Resolutions for Questions and Concerns** • It was decided to hold a separate discussion outside of the meeting to address and possibly recalibrate the distribution of assessment questions. • The committee agreed on the necessity to realign course content to ensure a smoother educational narrative, and adjustments were made to better integrate psychiatry and chronic pain topics. • Reassurance was provided that although the changes might seem minor (such as adjusting the schedule of sessions), they were based on a strategic review of student feedback and course objectives. • The integration of clinical pharmacology will be enhanced by clarifying its role and differences in teaching methods compared to other blocks, ensuring that students understand the unique content delivery in this area. **Conclusion** The Committee carefully considered extensive student feedback to make calculated adjustments to the curriculum, specifically targeting improvements in psychiatry and chronic pain management to enhance overall coherence. They also discussed the importance of a course roadmap to help students understand the structure and rationale behind curriculum decisions, aiming to improve both engagement and comprehension. These changes are expected to positively impact student learning experiences and outcomes.		
☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[10] VOTES FOR	[1] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The Foundations Phase Committee approved the Lessons Learned changes for the Mind, Brain, Behavior Block		

3. MHS 2 Lessons Learned Presentation
Discussion: The Committee discussed implementing comprehensive changes across various aspects of the medical curriculum, focusing on enhancing the integration of AI, ethics, equity, and health systems. Key changes included adjusting assessments, streamlining content, and introducing significant new elements such as AI competency development. **Questions and Concerns Raised** • There were concerns about the timing and integration of AI content early in the medical education process. • Queries were raised about the potential overcrowding of the curriculum with new AI content and what might be displaced as a result. • Discussion on how to best deliver the new content across different learning sites and formats. • Concerns about ensuring early exposure to AI ethics and usage guidelines for new medical students. **Resolutions for Questions and Concerns** • It was decided to explore opportunities to introduce AI content earlier in the educational process, potentially during orientation or initial phases of the curriculum. • The committee discussed redistributing some AI educational elements across different courses and utilizing existing sessions to introduce relevant AI topics. • Plans were made to enhance cross-regional delivery of new content using a mix of synchronous and asynchronous methods to ensure uniform learning experiences. • A proposal was made to integrate discussions of AI ethics and usage into the orientation sessions for new students, ensuring early awareness and understanding. **Conclusion** The Committee has made strategic curriculum changes to better incorporate emerging technologies like AI, while also refining the teaching of ethics and equity to align with current educational goals. These changes aim to equip students with the necessary skills and knowledge to navigate the evolving medical landscape effectively. Plans to integrate these topics earlier in the educational timeline were considered essential to align with the rapid pace of technological advancement in medicine.

☒ DECISION REQUIRED?	[11] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
Decision: The Foundations Phase Committee approved the changes for Medicine Health and Society II Lessons Learned.		

4. E-22 Foundations End of Phase Report
Discussion: Summary The Committee discussed the End of Foundations Report for the E22 student cohort, noting this cohort was the first to experience the revised curriculum, thereby resetting historical data for some blocks. The report is rich with data potentially useful for those involved in specific blocks. Questions and Concerns Raised

- Concerns were raised about performance variance among different foundational sites, particularly the consistently lower scores at one site.
- Discussions touched on the potential influences on block failure rates, including the impact of changes to the USMLE Step 1 exam's scoring system.
- Inquiries were made about the optimal pass rate for block exams and whether current rates are too high compared to USMLE Step 1 pass rates.

Resolutions for Questions and Concerns
- It was noted that changes in students' usage of external resources might impact performance, and fluctuations in block fail rates could be influenced by this factor.
- The Committee suggested integrating discussions on AI ethics and usage into orientation sessions for new students to ensure early awareness.
- Proposals were discussed to address the variance in site performances and explore why certain cohorts might be underperforming.
- The possibility of adjusting the curriculum to ensure it remains predictive of USMLE Step 1 success while adequately supporting all students was discussed.

Conclusion

The Committee reviewed the End of Foundations Report in depth, discussing various data points indicating how well students met program objectives. Concerns about the variance in performance among different sites and the implications of recent changes to the USMLE Step 1 were central topics. The discussion suggested a continued effort to align the curriculum with exam requirements and student needs, emphasizing the potential need for early integration of certain topics like AI and ethics into the student orientation process.

☐ DECISION REQUIRED?	[] VOTES FOR	[] VOTES AGAINST