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Background

- Request from leadership
- Reduction in staff and budget
- Student working groups
- Exploring facilitation options
Learning Environment

“The learning environment includes the social, psychological, and physical contexts that affect or are affected by academic activities.”

Key Evaluation Questions

- What positive and negative experiences do students describe as impacting the learning environment?

- What aspects of the learning environment do students find most troubling?

- What recommendations do students have for improving the learning environment?
Criteria for alternative

- Reduce costs for transcription
- Reduce staff time with coding and analysis
- Represent the student voice adequately
- Produce a quality deliverable for leadership
Interactive Evaluation Practice (IEP)

“The intentional act of engaging people in making decisions, taking action, and reflecting while conducting an evaluation study”

Grounded in two key ideas:
1. Personal factor: engaging stakeholders
2. Interpersonal factor: facilitation of the interactions with and between stakeholders

Facilitated Evaluation Working Sessions

“...the process of bringing together, engaging, and following up with stakeholders resulting in new insights, perspectives, and potential actions, which (a) in all likelihood would have not otherwise occurred and (b) advance the interests of the stakeholder group.”

Learning Environment Domains

Modified from internal Long Learning Environment Survey (LLES)

LLES originally modified from Medical Student Learning Environment Survey (MSLES)

LLES internally used since 1994.

Learning Environment Domains

1. Emotional Climate
2. Flexibility and Student Voice
3. Student-Student Interaction
4. Meaningful Learning Experience
5. Faculty-Student Interaction
6. Fair Assessment and Exams
7. Extra-Curricular Activities
8. Other
Supportive Learning Environment Project

Three 90-minute sessions:

1\textsuperscript{st} year medical students (MS2020)
2\textsuperscript{nd} year medical students (MS2019)
3\textsuperscript{rd} year medical students (MS2018)

Students received lunch/dinner, $20 Lobocash, and Letter of Commendation (by request of students) for their student file
1. Participants generate + and – aspects of learning environment
2. Facilitator helps participants to group + and - aspects into domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Climate</th>
<th>Student-Student Interaction</th>
<th>Faculty-Student Interaction</th>
<th>Extra Curricular Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility &amp; Student Voice</td>
<td>Meaningful Learning Environment</td>
<td>Fair Assessments &amp; Exams</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Post-it notes on the board represent aspects that are grouped into different domains.
3. Facilitator helps participants create problem statements/themes

Examples:

Lack of alignment between block exams and Step 1

Use of PRIME not standardized which leads to variable evaluations

Repetition of curriculum components and course content
4. Participants vote on most important problem statements/themes

- Lack of alignment between block exams and Step I (10)
- Mixed messages on institution level about how to approach Step I (1)
- OAES support inconsistent (2)
- Pros and cons for delaying Step I (5)
- Lack of explanation of curriculum (2)
  - (Describing) students don't understand why it's in curriculum
  - EP/BIOSTAT
- Repetition of curricular components (e.g., ICM/HCWA) (3)
- Added stress to Nearest Art course, mandatory course (6)
- Mismatch of study space and quiet study spaces (2)
5. Participants work in small groups to generate suggestions to address
6. Small groups come together to discuss in a large group

7. Facilitators generate report based on recommendations.
Results – 1\textsuperscript{st} Year Medical Students

Positive Aspects

- Accessibility of faculty
- Recorded lectures
- Learning Communities
- CQI Process to facilitate feedback
- Question Banks for students
- Integrated curriculum

Negative Aspects

- Variable teaching
- Variable assessments among blocks and Step 1
- Step 1 preparation
Variable teaching

- Block chair reviews sessions beforehand
- Different method to evaluate presenters
- Acknowledge mistakes

Variable assessments among blocks and Step 1

- Step-focused lectures and practice questions
- Standardization of Doctoring performance exams
- Quality standards for test questions across courses
- Flexibility with problematic test questions
Results – 2nd Year Medical Students

Positive Aspects

- Pass/Fail grading system
- Leadership receptive to feedback
- Accessibility of faculty
- Learning Communities
- Support amongst peers
- Anatomy lab
- Early clinical exposure
- Extra-curricular activities

Negative Aspects

- Lack of alignment between block exams and Step 1
- Lack of explanation of curriculum; students don’t understand why some curricular components are included
- Repetition of curriculum components and course content
Lack of alignment between block exams and Step 1
- Collaboration between block chairs for best practices in curriculum
- Collaboration between students and block chairs
- Require students to complete question banks

Non-science curricula not adequately justified to students
- Course directors should address how courses prepare for Step 1 and clinic
- Use Step 1 content as discussion topics for teaching

Repetition of curricular components
- Increase communication between block chairs
- Examine need for redundancies (Doctoring)
- Examine need for multiple components of courses (for example, epi-biostats)
Results – 3rd Year Medical Students

Positive Aspects

- Sense of community amongst students
- Faculty/mentor and student relationships
- Access to learning facilities and resources
- CQI process to facilitate feedback
- Extra-curricular activities

Negative Aspects

- Use of PRIME not standardized which leads to variable evaluations
- Operational support for struggling students
- No standardized role for students on clinical teams
- Lack of dedicated study space
Use of PRIME not standardized which leads to variable evaluations

- Shorten and simplify PRIME
- Clarify student role on clinical teams
- Clinical grades 50% of total grade
- More verbal/informal feedback during clinic

Operational support for struggling students

- Interdisciplinary team
- Advocate of student’s choice
- Advocate will work with appropriate entities to formulate plan
- Increased communication between entities
Lessons Learned - Negatives

Increased time for preparation

Variable facilitation

Variable group dynamics

Increased time and energy required from students

Time constraints
Lessons Learned - Positives

Less spending

Less staff time

Provides instant verification or “check” of findings

Provides an authentic student voice

Allows students to be part of the solution

Positive reception from students
Questions?