University of Central Florida
College of Medicine
M1/M2 Minutes

Meeting Date: 02/09/2018 Start Time: 3:05p Adjourn Time: 4:39p

Chair: Dr. Kibble

Attendance: Drs. Kibble, Berman, Harris, Davey, Gorman, Verduin, Dil, Selim, Daroowalla, Husain, Ebert, Cendan, Kauffman, Castiglioni, Beg, Phil Bellew, Amanda Blom, Bee Ben Khallouq, Andrea Berry, Meena Kanhai, Jason Day, Melissa Cowan, Dale Voorhees, Nadine Dexter, Deedra Walton

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
Approval of minutes	•	• Approved
Announcements	• IMS master's: summary of program, integration into HB-1 and HB-3; policy unclear whether those students who go on to attend COM as medical students will retake these courses • No new student reps for biostats program, it will start without them but they are still welcome	•
Student report	• M2: FIRE conference went well, wrapping up coursework with last weeks of S-6 and P-2 • M1: Met with Dr. Dil to provide real time feedback; C-1 course has started well	•
LCME update	• Six issues of concern, four with monitoring o Sufficiency of faculty o Financial resources o Diversity o Timely reporting of summative assessment in clerkship o Final authorities/committee selection for Admissions o SEPC policy	•

Small group task force update	Presentation from Dr. Kay on charge, process. Takeaways:
	• **Groups**: At least 4 (typically 5-8) students working together working to specifically generate something because of their interaction with each other.
	• Interdependence, efficiency, student and group ownership of learning
	• **Misalignment**:
	  o Assumptions about purposes
	  o Student vs faculty conceptualization (purpose and outcome). Meaningful interaction is shared between students/faculty, otherwise values often don't align.
	  o Epistemology
	  o Formal vs hidden curriculum (stated vs acted goals, assessment)
	• **Reasons to use**: Translation to clinical setting, encapsulation, clinical reasoning, deep conceptual knowledge acquisition/understanding, knowledge transfer.
	• **Purpose**: increase complexity of understanding where content is not novel. When introducing novel content (mixed opinions on whether small groups should), it should require interdependence to complete (if they can do it alone, that should probably be an option to them)
	• Utilize distributed cognition to support storage/retrieval of declarative knowledge, increase complexity of thought, shape identity (change learning habits/belief about learning, attain skill beyond passing standardized tests).
	• **Criteria**: Provide reason to access content, demonstrate evidence of negotiated understanding, shape professional identity development (with student interdependence and "more knowledgeable other" at right times)
	• **Faculty role**: Facilitator, content expert, and/or assessor/evaluator. Most faculty have training primarily as content experts. They should not interact with content or answer task-related questions directly.
	• **Instructional designer role**:
	  o **Group tasks –** significant, relevant, authentic, "ill-structured" (more than one right answer) problem or simulation that focuses on highest yield basic concepts, at appropriate complexity. Should include motivational trigger(s) such as emotional connection, hot cognition (controversial or ill-structured), want/need oriented
		•

	○ **Task** creates a gap in student knowledge so they need someone else in order to complete the task appropriately (students comment these tasks are frequently not challenging enough and they can be done individually) ○ **Accountability**: all members must be accountable to the team for something to achieve the group task ○ **Avoid**: Recall activities (cut/paste from slides), problems that can be done independently • **Assessment:** Self, peer, by faculty, of faculty ○ Scoring disparity on exams vs small groups, soft points on small groups ○ Inconsistency of feedback, issues with giving students correct answers ○ Assess gains in understanding, give a % of grade, personal accountability, the **group process itself** ○ Keep feedback & process consistent during/across modules, with goals/objectives ○ Clarify confusion, foster "doing" • **Long-term recommendations**: ○ Design/deploy small groups from only a selection of models to keep consistency ○ Standardize instructional methodology ○ Models have sufficient complexity, building on content and processes introduced in earlier courses/years ○ More opportunities for faculty to: develop skills in instructional design, partner with designers to develop events, develop skills with facilitation ○ Create a "small group facilitator" pool of faculty to serve as co designers for small group sessions and assist with facilitation Discussion on logistical issues, how representative cases are on MCQ exams, examples of ill-structured cases, predictive value if assigning more weight to small group sessions	
Attendance policy	• Official policy does not define what must be mandatory, just the process of attaining excused absences • Lectures may be mandatory in exceptional cases; small groups may be non-mandatory • Currently maintaining status quo pending reflection on small group task force information	•
	•	•