The Medical Student Education Committee of the Quillen College of Medicine met on Tuesday, July 10, 2012 at 4:15 p.m. in the Academic Affairs Conference Room, Stanton-Gerber Hall.

**1. Approval of Minutes**
The minutes from the 6-26-12 meeting were approved as distributed.

**2. Topics**

**a. [ED-46] Systematic evaluation of the extent to which commencement objectives are being met**

Report – Outcomes Subcommittee [Drs. McGowen, Lura & Monaco]

- Subcommittee reviewed the content and purpose of the standard and its relationship to curriculum management and MSEC’s oversight role
- Goal: To find meaningful and practical ways to evaluate and document accomplishment of curriculum objectives
- Method: Use of nomenclature from Medbiquitous (Curriculum Inventory Standards) for assessment strategies and ED-46 standard to identify indicators of educational program effectiveness
- Composite document was submitted – Excerpt from Medical Knowledge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Objective – Medical Knowledge</th>
<th>Outcome Measures / Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students will acquire the body of knowledge and thinking processes necessary to becoming a competent physician. | - 80% of students will achieve a grade of 80% or higher on institutionally developed end of course/clerkship assessments  
- 50% of students will score at or above the national mean on NBME Subject Exams |
| Students will:  
1.1 Apply basic science principles…  
1.2 Acquire the scientific knowledge…  
1.3 Demonstrate an understanding… | Assessment Methods  
- Exam: Institutionally developed, written or computer-based  
- Exam: Nationally normed NBME Subject Exam |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ED-46 indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student scores on internally developed exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results from … national exams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the composite document, subcommittee noted assessment techniques that are not currently in place, but they recommend for consideration including portfolio-based assessment and multisource assessment = faculty, peer, self

MSEC reviewed the composite document in detail for each domain [1-Medical Knowledge, 2-Patient Care, 3-Practice-Based Learning and Improvement, 4-Interpersonal Communication Skills, 5-Professionalism, 6- Systems-Based Practice]

Members’ discussion regarded:

- Metric for determining whether the domain objectives were accomplished – how many outcome measures to use, which were best for each domain; also, the acceptable thresholds for each
  - MSEC modification included – for Medical Knowledge and Patient Care domains: From “80% of students will achieve a grade of 80% or higher..” to “95% of students will achieve a passing grade on institutionally developed end of course/clerkship assessments” – The rationale for this change was to indicate that most students should demonstrate sufficient mastery to pass courses, but at the same time not wanting to drive grade inflation.

- Sub-domain assessment options; MSEC decisions included:
  - Developing and placing more emphasis on narrative and peer assessment methods; also, methods for assessing professionalism
  - Not using outcome data from a (subcommittee recommended) milestone exam or NBME Comprehensive Basic Science Exam – MSEC decided it would not be useful to add these as required exams, but is still considering their use as a review for Step I.
  - Not using (adding) student responses on AAMC Graduation Questionnaire (GQ); this information will be reviewed in the course/curriculum evaluation process

On a motion by Dr. Blackwelder and seconded by Dr. Monaco, MSEC approved the subcommittee plan as amended to use Quillen educational program outcome data to systematically evaluate the extent to which commencement objectives are being met. Final document will be brought back to the 7/24 meeting.

b. [ED-33, ED-1] Curricular Report: M1-3 Institutional Objectives Mapped to Course – Cindy Lybrand & Cathy Peeples

MSEC reviewed the initial phase of curriculum mapping, a summary of which sub-domain objectives [1.1 – 6.7] are covered in which courses. Most, but not all course directors have submitted their new objectives (plus corresponding educational and assessment methodologies). Report spreadsheet makes it readily apparent if and how often the institutional objectives are being addressed; all have already been cited at least once.

Report with next layer – milestone objectives by course – will be available for MSEC review at the 7/24 meeting.
3. Recent documents / topics {Linked or on file in Academic Affairs – contact myers@etsu.edu}


Example: List of Diseases (as method of organizing curricular content)

[ED-33, ED-1] Curricular Report: M1-3 Institutional Objectives Mapped to Course

[ED-1] (Again) Examples: Revised Objectives and Mapping of LCME Content – M1-Medical Human Gross Anatomy & Embryology, M3-Psychiatry

4. Announcements

The next meeting will be on July 24, 2012.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.