

EC members present	Pat Schommer	
Chris Fallert	Heather Thompson Buom	
Nathan Stratton	Kirby Clark	
Yoji Shimizu	John Andrews	
Bob Englander	Kaz Nelson	
Anne Pereira	Dimple Patel	
James Nixon	Michael Aylward	
Michael Kim	Ray Christensen	
Scott Slattery	Robin Michaels	
Claudio Violato	Arlen Severson	
David Bernlohr	Katherine (Betsy) Murray	
Jennifer Neufeld		
David Power		
Joe Oppedisano		
Maggie Flint		
Nersi Nikakhtar		

March minutes approved

Presentations

I. Highlights from Student Services over the last year Michael Kim, Scott Slattery (30 minutes)

Objective: Updates on the current initiatives and status of the Student Affairs office

- ❖ LCME citation update
- ❖ Develop academic advisor program
- ❖ Develop clinical coaching program
- ❖ Improve Step 2 CS preparation (CCA, resource changes)
- ❖ Add Career and Prof Development position
- ❖ Explore academic houses
- ❖ Expand wellbeing (years 3/4, interprofessional, longitudinal)
- ❖ Focus on Sexual Misconduct prevention

- ❖ What are the differences between a faculty advisor, academic advisor, and the director of learner development?
 - Faculty advisor: has experience in professional identity development; guides students through career planning
 - Director of learner development (Scott Slattery): Clinical psychologist + learner development track; Identifying students' best approach to test taking, studying, etc.
 - Academic advisor: logistical advising and answering general student questions; consultation referrals

- This group will provide student support as a team based effort
- ❖ How are the academic houses different from faculty advisor groups? Do other institutions do this?
 - These are a smaller subset of the entire class which will each contain 4-5 advisor groups of about 60 students
 - The goal is to create increased opportunities for longitudinal relationships within and across years
 - The team has and continues to look at other institutions to see how they are forming smaller learning communities

Materials

II. Match Update

Michael Kim (25 minutes)

Objective: 1) Review of the 2017 Match results and data (powerpoint attached)

- ❖ A future discussion will take place after a root cause analysis has taken place

Materials

III. Year 2 Questionnaire (Y2Q) Update minutes)

Claudio Violato (25

Objective: 1) Review of the Y2Q data for MS2 students

- ❖ We have about a 2/3 response rate
- ❖ Data includes information regarding Duluth, Twin Cities, and the national average regarding:
 - Overall satisfaction with quality of medical education
 - Professional behaviors/attitudes of faculty
 - Learning environment
 - Empathic concern and perspective
 - QOL - Overall, mental, physical, emotional, spiritual well-being
 - Perceived stress
 - Oldenburg burnout inventory
- ❖ Empathic concern and perspective data pertains to the students themselves
- ❖ In the majority of areas of the survey, Duluth is typically average or above average compared to the national mean and Twin Cities is generally at average or below
 - Duluth believes the faculty turnover and understaffing may be the cause of Duluth's dip in satisfaction for 2016

- ❖ How are we addressing burnout in Years 1 & 2?
 - We have eliminated grades in Years 1 & 2 and faculty are working to decrease content in courses to decrease cognitive overload

[Materials](#)