

## Foundation Committee Minutes

<b>Date</b>	July 29, 2020
<b>Time</b>	9:00am-10:30am
<b>Location and/or connection info</b>	<a href="https://uw-phi.zoom.us/j/255260274">https://uw-phi.zoom.us/j/255260274</a>
<b>Governance Website</b>	<a href="http://blogs.uw.edu/somcurr4/committees/">http://blogs.uw.edu/somcurr4/committees/</a>
<b>Co-Chairs</b>	Michael Ryan Tim Chestnut
<b>Attendees</b>	<p><b>Executive Chair:</b> Michael Ryan</p> <p><b>Voting members:</b> Bruce Silverstein, Catrin Pittack, Chris Hague, Cierra Dauenhauer, Cindy Knall, Craig McGowan, Karen McDonough, Mark Whipple, Matt Cunningham, Rebekah Burns, Sreejayan Nair, Timothy Chestnut (12)</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Jeff Seegmiller, Kelley Goetz, Marilyn Cope, Maggie Tarnawa, Elizabeth Garcia, Gerald Tolbert, Kellie Engle, Doug Schaad, Teresa Jewell, Edith Wang, Kristen Hayward, Peter Fuerst, Martin Teintze, John Willford, Esther Chung, Nick Cheung, Marj Wenrich, Tim Robinson, Bill Sayres, Raye Maestas, Julie Calcavecchia, Michael Champion, Maya Sardesai, Kathy Young</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QUORUM REACHED Quorum: >50%: 10 >60% 11	
<b>Regrets</b>	<b>Voting members:</b> Aaron Robertson, Alyssa Stephenson-Famy, Amanda Kost, Bill Harris, George Hodges, Haya Jamali

## Agenda

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT(S)	ACTION
1	Approve June Minutes	Michael Ryan	5 min	Attachment A	Decision
2	Block level objective for participation in Foundations small groups	Edith Wang	10 min	See below	Decision
3	Foundations Attendance Policy	Edith Wang	15 min	Attachment B	Decision
4	Guidelines for Grading and Assessment	Edith Wang / Matt Cunningham	10 min	Attachment C	Decision
5	PEAC: Foundations Assessment Update	Matt Cunningham / Edith Wang	50 min	Attachment D	Decision

<b>1. Approval of June Minutes</b>		
<b>Discussion:</b> The committee voted to approve the June meeting minutes.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[12] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<b>Decision:</b> The committee approved the June meeting minutes.		

<b>2. Block level objective for participation in Foundations small groups</b>		
<b>Discussion:</b>		
Background:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the past, there have been grades linked to small group attendance which is not allowed by the University of Washington policy for the syllabus.</li> <li>Courses do want a way to encourage student participation.</li> <li>We cannot grade on attendance, but we can grade on participation if we have a learning objective.</li> </ul>		
Proposed Block Level Objective for participation in Foundations small groups:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Demonstrate effective communication by interacting with patients and/or other medical colleagues to analyze, breakdown, or solve clinical cases.”</li> <li>All blocks may use this BLO if they want to. Blocks do not need approval to add this BLO if it is approved.</li> </ul>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[12] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
<b>Decision:</b> The committee approved the proposed participation Block Level Objective.		

<b>3. Foundations Attendance Policy</b>		
<b>Discussion:</b>		
See updated Foundations Attendance Policy for details.		
Key changes to the policy:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated policy only applies to 2020-2021.</li> <li>We will not track attendance. It is too much work for the staff. The “teeth” to this policy is assessing against the proposed BLO (above agenda item).</li> </ul>		
Additional suggestions and changes to the policy:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a disclaimer that indicates both virtual and in-person labs/meetings are required.</li> <li>Suggestions to include in the disclaimer at the top of the policy:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the word “present” applies to both in-person or online.</li> <li>For the attendance policy, specifics will depend on the requirements at a specific site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>FCM would like to make the following changes:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offer remote asynchronous alternatives to in-person sessions for students with health or other concerns.</li> <li>Under “Hospital Tutorials”, edit that students with mild illness should <u>not</u> participate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>There is a separate health and safety policy being drafted, so we should keep the details related to illness more general in the attendance policy and reference the health and safety policy for details.</li> <li>For the Clinical Attendance Policy, we kept most of the policy unchanged since it applies from year to year. The COVID exceptions are indicated at the top of the policy. Perhaps the Foundations Attendance Policy could do the same.</li> </ul>		

- Suggested wording: “Students who cannot attend due to illness or safety concerns (reference local guidelines) will work with FCM and College Mentors to make up the missed work.” Use something general like this rather than listing out specific health situations. This can apply to Clinical Skills Workshops, Hospital Tutorials, and PCP.
- FCM’s Suggested wording: “All FCM Clinical Skills Workshops, Hospital Tutorials, and Primary Care Practicum sessions are required. Students unable to attend must contact the appropriate faculty member in advance and complete assigned makeup activities.”

In general, we have our UWSOM guidelines and policies and sites may have their own. Whichever is the stricter one is the one that applies.

**Action:** Send an eVote with the updated version of the Foundations Attendance policy with track changes. Include the non-voting members in the email so they can see the updated policy.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[NA] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
--	----------------	-------------------

**Decision:** The committee will eVote on the revised version of the Foundations Attendance Policy.

#### 4. Guidelines for Grading and Assessment

**Discussion:**

Key changes to the Guidelines document:

- Changed “attendance” to “participation” throughout the document.
- Added a sentence that indicates a thread score of 70% is required for demonstration of mastery.
- Added that Exemplify/Examsoft exams are proctored.

Additional changes needed:

- The title should indicate it is for E20 students, not E19s.
- Under FCM, update the third bullet which originally says, “Evaluations by your College Mentor, PCP preceptor, and other FCM faculty.”
  - We want to emphasize that feedback from college mentors is to help with student growth rather than and “evaluation.
  - We only receive about 50% of PCP preceptors.
  - No formal assessment process for FCM faculty.
  - Proposed update: “**Satisfactory progress in clinical skills development as assessed by FCM faculty in the clinical setting.**”

There has been talk about including the Foundations OSCEs as a component of passing FCM. This has not yet been fully discussed across the region.

**Motion:** Approve the Guidelines for Grading Assessment with the third bullet under FCM updated to the listed proposed wording.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECISION REQUIRED?	[12] VOTES FOR	[0] VOTES AGAINST
--	----------------	-------------------

**Decision:** The committee approved the Guidelines for Grading Assessments with the third bullet under FCM updated to the listed proposed wording.

## 5. PEAC: Foundations Assessment Update

### Discussion:

#### Background:

- Recommendations #1, #5, #6, #7, #10 were approved at the Curriculum Committee meeting.
- PEAC recommendations were reviewed in our last meeting. Curriculum Committee wanted input from Foundations Committee on remaining recommendations.
- Our committee also wanted to gather additional input on the remaining recommendations. Edith Wang and Tim Chestnut gathered input at the Block/Theme/Thread Leader meeting and reached out to people individually.
- We (the Foundations Committee) will provide input to Curriculum Committee who will review our feedback and vote on a decision for the remaining recommendations.

#### See Foundations Input document for summary of gathered input.

#2: Cumulative final exams should be implemented in all blocks longer than 3 weeks.

- Three large blocks (E&H, MBB, CPR) expressed practical challenges to implementing final exams based on the current schedule.
- Question comes down to how the group weighs the benefit of students having cumulative finals, to the disruption to the course in order to implement cumulative finals.
- If we wait until Foundations 2022, could we use other ways (e.g., NBME exams) to help students review?
- One opinion is that other long blocks have been able to find a way to implement cumulative finals. Could all blocks find a way? Would like to not wait until 2023 for some blocks to have cumulative finals.
- One opinion is that cumulative exams should not be required until blocks are made to be somewhat equivalent lengths (i.e., 3-5 weeks in length).
- There is debate over whether blocks could be broken down to have cumulative exams at the end of each major topic and how that translates for an integrated curriculum. The debate continued into what integration means and how it is/is not effective.
- There is agreement in favor of the concept of a cumulative final. The disagreement is over when the blocks could feasibly implement it.
- **Straw poll** to approve this recommendation for 2020: **YES (3), NO (8)**.

#8 Requirements for student mastery of thread content outside of the context of block grades should be reduced or eliminated.

- Matt Cunningham, Edith Wang, and Shobha Stack interviewed many schools to understand how they handled thread mastery. All the schools they spoke with had thread grades integrated with block grades rather than a separate thread mastery requirement. Many of these schools had strong relationships between block leaders and thread leaders.
- One opinion is that threads need more control over content, increased assessment questions, and a better relationship with block leaders.
- WY as a group feels very strongly that they want to keep thread mastery requirement.
- Double jeopardy: If a student does poorly on a thread, it is counted against them twice – once for the block, and again for the thread mastery requirement.
- Some students end up taking block remediation and thread remediation. The block remediations should include the thread content.
- Students find it difficult to keep track of their thread mastery.

- Removing a thread mastery requirement does not mean we don't track it. However, if we track it but have no consequences, then how does that lead to improvement?
- Clarification is brought up that we don't have thread "grades". There are thread "scores" which are incorporated into the block grade.
- Student Affairs says one of the biggest concerns from students is that it feels like there is a thread "grade". When students don't "pass" a thread, it's not considered a grade or course, but they end up having to pay tuition for a remediation course.
- **Group supports the idea that in a double jeopardy case where a student needs to remediate a block and a thread for that corresponding block, the student should be able to remediate the block and thread together.** (This is not a formal vote.)
- Student commented that she initially had a hard time figuring out how to track her thread scores but figured out a way. Suggestion that administration communicate an easy way of tracking thread scores to students. Perhaps this can be communicated after the first exam, so students have context on what thread score tracking means.
- **Straw poll** on the recommendation: **YES (1), NO (8).**

#9: Blocks should have specific block learning objectives (BLOs) for thread content covered in the block.

- One opinion is that this recommendation depends on what happens with #8. If we do away with thread grades, then we need more robust BLOs.
- One opinion is that BLOs do not have much of an impact on thread mastery. BLOs for Pharmacology are the same across all blocks/sessions (except for MCBBD).
- One opinion is that more robust BLOs are needed irrespective of #8.

Adjourn: 10:30 AM PST