

**Part I: Cover Page**  
**School of Medicine**  
**Academic Programs Assessment Report Template**  
**Record for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**  
**The University of New Mexico**

**Academic Year: 2016-17**

**Department/Program: Medicine – Undergraduate Medical Education**

**Degree program: MD**

**Person(s) preparing report: Edward Fancovic MD**

**Date submitted: 10/20/17**

**Describe the actions and/or revisions that were implemented during the previous reporting period. (Appendix 1—attach relevant evidence, i.e., updated syllabi, curricular updates, program initiatives, etc.)**

**Part II: Body**

1. List the student learning outcomes, assessment measures, setting(s) for the assessments, etc. in the table below.

<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>UNM Goals K/S/R</b>	<b>HSC/SOM</b>	<b>SPA*</b>	<b>Description of Assessment Measures</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b>	<b>No. of Students Assessed</b>	<b>I/D &amp; Setting</b>	<b>When Assessed (Timeframe)</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Results Achieved</b>
A. Medical knowledge, integration & critical reasoning A-1. Identify, define, and apply the scientific principles and knowledge necessary for the practice of medicine	K/S	SOM	LCME 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written (MCQ, supply answer) and</li> <li>performance exams</li> <li>Tutor narratives</li> <li>Block/course grades (Phase 1 GPA)</li> <li>US Medical Licensing Exams (USMLE) Step 1 and Step 2 CK</li> <li>Postgraduate evaluation by residency program directors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>85% student success, first attempt Step 1 and 2 CK</li> <li>Majority of SOM graduates rated in top first or second quartile on Residency Director Survey</li> </ul>	Class of 2018: 89  Class of 2017: 92 for Step 1, 87 for Step 2  Class of 2015 (response to Residency Director Survey): 74	Direct: Step 1 and Step 2 CK: national computer testing center  Indirect: Residency Director Survey: residency program	Step 1: after 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of curriculum Step 2: after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum  Residency Director Survey: 1 year post-graduation	Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)	Class of 2018: Step 1: 97%  Class of 2017: Step 1: 97% Step 2 CK: 99%  Class of 2015 (Residency Director Survey): 64%
B. Patient care B-1. Gather data from patient history, physical examination and technical investigations and apply clinical problem-solving skills to make accurate diagnostic judgments	K/S/R	SOM	LCME 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clinical performance - PRIME rubric</li> <li>Phase I &amp; II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>Nationally standardized clinical subject examinations</li> <li>Course/Clerkship grades</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>85% student success, first attempt Step 2 CK</li> </ul>	Class of 2017: 87	Direct: Step 2 CK: national computer testing center Step 2 CS: national performance	Step 2: after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum	Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)	Class of 2017: Step 2 CK: 99% Step 2 CS: 97%

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USMLE - Step 2 CK and CS</li> <li>• Postgraduate evaluation by residency program directors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Majority of SOM graduates rated in top first or second quartile on Residency Director Survey</li> </ul>	Class of 2015 (response to Residency Director Survey): 74	<p>nce testing center</p> <p>Indirect: Residency Director Survey: residency program</p>	Residency Director Survey: 1 year post-graduation		Class of 2015 (Residency Director Survey): 64%
B-2. Make informed decisions, recommendations, and interventions to further patient evaluation, treatment planning and health maintenance	K/S/R	SOM	6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.8, 7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clinical performance - PRIME rubric</li> <li>• Phase I &amp; II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>• Nationally standardized clinical subject examinations</li> <li>• Course/Clerkship grades</li> <li>• USMLE - Step 2 CK and CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85% student success, first attempt Step 2 CK</li> <li>• 94% student success, first attempt Step 2 CS</li> </ul>	Class of 2017: 87	Direct: national norm-referenced examinations	after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum 5/2016-4/201764	Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)	Step 2 CK: 99% Step 2 CS: 97%
C. Practice-based learning & improvement C-1. Reflect on and evaluate one's own knowledge, skills, attitudes, and outcomes and work toward ongoing improvement	K/S/R	SOM	LCME 6.1, 6.3, 7.3, 7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tutor and preceptor narratives</li> <li>• Nationally standardized clinical subject examinations</li> <li>• Clinical performance - PRIME rubric</li> <li>• Course/Block/Clerkship grades</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85% student success, first attempt Step 1 and 2 CK</li> <li>• 94% student success, first</li> </ul>	Class of 2018: 89  Class of 2017: 92 for Step 1, 87 for Step 2	Direct: national norm-referenced examinations	Step 1: after 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of curriculum Step 2: after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum	Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)	Class of 2018: Step 1: 97%  Class of 2017: Step 1: 97% Step 2 CK: 99% Step 2 CS: 97%

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase I &amp; II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>US Medical Licensing Exams - Step 1, 2 CK, 2 CS</li> </ul>	attempt Step 2 CS					
C-2. Locate, appraise, and apply evidence from clinical studies of diagnostic and treatment effectiveness	K/S/R	SOM	LCME 7.3, 7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tutor narratives</li> <li>Nationally standardized preparatory and clinical subject examinations</li> <li>Phase II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>US Medical Licensing Exam - Step 2 CK</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students must meet minimum tutorial and OSCE performance standards</li> <li>85% student success, first attempt Step 2 CK</li> </ul>	Class of 2017: 87	Direct: a) narrative evaluations performed by faculty in tutorial b) standardized, structured, observed, performance testing of patient care skills (history taking and physical examination) and communication skills (OSCE)	Tutorial: first 2 years of curriculum OSCE: 3 <sup>rd</sup> year Step 2: after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum	Tutorial: Office of Program Evaluation, Education and research (Roger Jerabek, Rebecca Hartley PhD) OSCE: Office of Assessment & Learning (Allen Veitch, Edward Fancovic MD) Step 2 CK: Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sandra Hickey MD)	Tutorial: 100% meet standards OSCE: 100% meet standards Step 2 CK: 99%

							c) national norm- referenc ed examinat ions (Step 2 CK)			
D. Communication skills D-1. Demonstrate effective communication behaviors/skills and interpersonal relationships with patients and colleagues	S/R	SOM	LCME 7.6, 7.8, 7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tutor and preceptor narratives</li> <li>• Clinical performance - PRIME rubric</li> <li>• Phase I &amp; II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>• US Medical Licensing Exam - Step 2 CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94% student success, first attempt Step 2 CS</li> <li>• 85% meet criterion-referenced standard-communication skills</li> </ul>	<p>Class of 2018: 89</p> <p>Class of 2017: 87</p>	a) standardized, structured, observed, performance testing of communication skills using criterion-referenced internal standard (OSCE) b) national norm-referenced examinations (Step 2 CS)	Step 2 CS: after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum OSCE: during 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum	Step 2 CK: Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)  OSCE: Office of Assessment & Learning (Allen Veitch, Edward Fancovic MD)	<p>Class of 2018: OSCE communication score: 64% passing</p> <p>Class of 2017: Step 2 CS: 97%</p> <p>OSCE communication score: 58% passing</p>

E. Professionalism and Ethics E-1. Identify, define, and apply ethical principles in the diverse and complex context of patient care	K/S/R	SOM	LCME 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tutor and preceptor narratives</li> <li>• Clinical performance - PRIME rubric</li> <li>• Phase I &amp; II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>• US Medical Licensing Exam - Step 2 CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94% student success, first attempt Step 2 CS</li> </ul>	Class of 2017: 87	Direct: national norm-referenced examinations	after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum 5/2016-4/2017	Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)	Class of 2017: Step 2 CS: 97%
E-2. Identify, demonstrate, and practice ethical virtues (altruism, compassion, accountability, etc.) with fellow students, teachers, patients, society, and the profession	K/S/R	SOM	LCME 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tutor and preceptor narratives</li> <li>• Clinical performance - PRIME rubric</li> <li>• Phase I &amp; II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>• US Medical Licensing Exam - Step 2 CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94% student success, first attempt Step 2 CS</li> </ul>	Class of 2017: 87	Direct: national norm-referenced examinations	after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum 5/2016-4/2017	Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)	Class of 2017: Step 2 CS: 97%
F. Systems Based Practice F-1. Describe the impact of the social determinants of health in order to assist patients in dealing with complex systems and to advocate for integrated, quality care	K/S/R	SOM	LCME 6.6, 7.5, 7.6, 7.8, 7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tutor and preceptor narratives</li> <li>• Clinical performance - PRIME rubric</li> <li>• Phase I &amp; II objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE)</li> <li>• US Medical Licensing Exam - Step 2 CS</li> <li>• PIE Community Project</li> <li>• Continuity Clinic narratives</li> <li>• Phase III Medicine in NM paper and presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94% student success, first attempt Step 2 CS</li> <li>• All students must meet minimum performance standards for SOM courses listed here</li> </ul>	Class of 2017: 87	Direct: national norm-referenced examinations (Step 2 CS) Faculty narrative evaluations (PIE, Continuity Clinic, Medicine in NM)	Continuity Clinics: spring year 1, fall year 2, all of year 3 PIE: end of year 1 Medicine in NM: 4 <sup>th</sup> year  Step 2 CS: after 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of curriculum 5/2016-4/2017	Step 2 CS: Office of Medical Student Affairs (Davette De la O-Sandoval, Sheila Hickey MD)  Continuity Clinic/PIE/Medicine in NM: Preceptorship Office /Curriculum Support Center (Kim Halsten,	Class of 2017: Step 2 CS: 97%  100% of students met standard for the courses listed

									Daniel Stulberg MD)	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------	--

**\*The SPA is your specialized professional accreditation standards that are addressed with the student learning outcomes/objectives.**

**2. Respond to the following questions:**

**a. Were all students assessed or a sample? (Provide rationale for sampled population.)**

All students were assessed. The Residency Program Directors Survey was sent out to all graduates' programs but there is not a 100% return..

**b. Based on the results achieved, which SLOs were met?**

A-1, B-1, B-2, C-1, C-2, E-1, E-2, F-1

**c. Based on the results achieved, which SLOs were partially met?**

D-1

**d. Based on the results achieved, which SLOs were not met?**

N/A

**3. Describe the analysis of the results. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.**

Students in the MD program are acquiring the knowledge and skills they need to succeed when compared to national norm-referenced testing standards (USMLE Step I and Step II CK and CS exams).

Our MD graduates are also performing at or above standard in the opinion of residency programs directors when evaluated during their first year after completing the MD degree.

Our internal assessments of communication skills during the clerkship year have shown improvement since last year but the results still do not meet our definition of success (D-1 above). See item 5 below for further discussion.

**4. Describe the departmental process by which faculty reviewed the assessment procedures and results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were indicated by them. (Appendix 2—attach relevant evidence, i.e., meeting agendas, minutes, emails, etc.)**

**5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that will be implemented in response to the assessment processes and results.**

The Doctoring course (which extends throughout all 4 years) has restructured the curriculum for teaching communication skills and has included specific curriculum in the first 2 years around sharing information and reaching agreement on treatment plans during the clinical encounter, which are the areas identified as the main low-scoring areas on our communication skills scale. The third-year Doctoring curriculum also includes workshops on specific areas of difficulty in communication skills, such as in breaking bad news. The clerkship directors in the third year are actively planning to increase direct observation of students interviewing and examining patients. The Office of Assessment and Learning continues to work with all stakeholders to ensure that performance assessments remain aligned with curriculum taught in the preclinical years, and with expectations of clinical faculty in the clerkship year. Assessment and Learning also completed a standard-setting exercise for communication skills across the first 3 years of

the curriculum and the revised standards have been put into effect effective August 2017 (report attached), ensuring that the standards remain aligned with the curricular expectations in the Doctoring courses and the clerkships.

- 6. Given the assessment activities and results to date, describe your assessment plans for the next year. If significant changes have been made to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy, please clearly describe. (Remember that half of all assessment measures must be direct measures of student learning.)**

No changes have been made in learning objectives this year. The Curriculum Committee has reviewed and revised the curricular learning objectives and has decided on new methods of assessment of curricular success (see attachments); these will go into effect for the next curricular year and will be reflected in next year's report.

**Evaluative Rubric for Annual Reports on Assessment of Student Learning**

Degree Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Doctor of Medicine \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ 11/1/16 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Department: \_\_\_\_\_ College: \_\_\_\_\_ School of Medicine \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Report Elements</b>	<b>Exemplary 3</b>	<b>Acceptable 2</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Score</b>
<i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed during the year</i>	SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition.	Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms.	No SLOs were listed.	
<i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i>	Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO.	At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO.	Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed.	
<i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are direct measures, and at least one direct measure is applied to each SLO.)</i>	At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO.	No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year.	No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year.	
<i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i>	Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described.	Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity.	Participants were not identified.	
<i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified.	The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity.	The timeframe was not specified.	
<i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified.	The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity.	The setting or forum was not specified.	
<i>Results</i>	Results were described for each SLO that was assessed.	Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed.	

<i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i>	The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described.	The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment.	
<i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i>	Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results.	Specific actions or revisions were described but the report or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There were no specific actions or revisions described.	
<i>Description of plans for the coming year (2011-12), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i>	Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.	Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.	No description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.	

**Feedback on Annual Progress Report from the College Assessment Review Committee**

**Assessment Report for (Academic Year) status: Approved \_\_\_\_ Revise and Resubmit \_\_\_\_**

Strengths of report and progress on assessment “loop”:

Concerns/Questions:

Suggestions for future reports or assessment approaches:

Other comments: