2012 INDEPENDENT STUDENT ANALYSIS

Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center

Paul L. Foster School of Medicine

Co-Directors:

Michael Osborn and Joshua Reber

Contributors:

Kallie Appleton
Grace Cruz
Chester Donnally
Christian Eccles
Lowell Ellerbrook
Joshua Gaines
Laura Hahn
Nadine Haykal
Saadi Imam
Jay Jackson
Amanda Jenson
Jillian Junkes-Sanford
Danby Kang
Jonathan Lavezo
Rica Mauricio
Jeffrey Mohlman
Lisa Montgomery
Grace Ng
Chetna Pande
Jarad Peranteau
Cory Rasmussen
Monica Rettenmier
Jessica Schancupp
Michael Sippel
Iris Tomas
Cathy Tsin
Bailey Wilson
Jessica White
Laura Wise

Faculty Advisor:

Tammy Salazar, Ph.D., Director of Academic Support

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW & EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM 4

- Master's Colloquium (MC) 6
- Medical Skills (MS) 9
- Scholarly Activity and Research Program (SARP) 11
- Scientific Principles of Medicine (SPM) 13
- Society Community and The Individual (SCI) 15
- Family Medicine & Surgery Block 17
- Internal Medicine & Psychiatry Block 20
- Obstetrics/Gynecology & Pediatrics Block 23

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES 26

MEDICAL STUDENT SERVICES 28

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT 30

- Professionalism 32
- Faculty & Administration 34

APPENDIX/TABLES 36

Introduction

The following report contains the results of an independent student analysis conducted in January 2012 at Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center-Paul L. Foster School of Medicine in El Paso, Texas. The report was conducted in an effort to satisfy the requirement of the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) for each medical education program seeking accreditation to conduct an independent student analysis of the institution, as outlined in the document "The Role of Students in the Accreditation of Medical Education Programs in the U.S. and Canada," published by the LCME.

Executive Summary

The results from the 2012 survey indicate a high level of overall satisfaction on the part of the student body with Paul L. Foster School of Medicine (PLFSOM). Most notable is the general improvement from the 2010 survey in almost all categories. The specific concerns identified in 2010 included: financial aid and debt counseling, professionalism instruction, and the Society, Community and the Individual (SCI) course. Although some of these remain concerns, the level of satisfaction with these areas has increased in the current survey, indicating progress.

In addition to the changes noted from the previous survey, the 2012 survey demonstrated three notable trends in weaknesses and strengths. In regards to weaknesses, the first trend is dissatisfaction with specific components of the curriculum. These include the pharmacology, anatomy, and microbiology components of the Scientific Principles of Medicine (SPM) course and the epidemiology, biostatistics, and Spanish components of the SCI course. The second trend is concerns about growth and space. All of the questions regarding space (for studying, relaxation, parking, and storage) received a significant amount of dissatisfied responses. Additionally, with the growth of the campus there was some dissatisfaction with the audiovisual and information technology resources being limited. Specifically, students expressed concerns about lecture recording, projector and/or sound difficulties in classrooms, and Internet access and speed problems. Many comments expressed additional concern that with the expected growth of the student body, these issues would become exacerbated in the years to come. With the transition of the first class into their clinical years, concerns that were not previously apparent concerning space (storage and study) in the clinical facilities have now manifested. The third trend is a desire of students in each class to receive more feedback. In each of the courses surveyed, including the third year clerkships, feedback consistently received a large proportion of dissatisfied responses. Students expressed desire for more feedback on all aspects of their training including coursework (such as strengths and weaknesses within the course), clinical skills, and professional behavior. Based on these trends and because these issues appear throughout each section of the following report, it is recommended that a plan be constructed by the administration to address each concern based on the specific suggestions within each corresponding section.

Despite the trends that indicate areas in need of improvement, there were many areas that received high marks. The majority of questions regarding overall quality of courses or curriculum returned high levels of satisfaction. Additionally, questions regarding the balance between coursework within the curriculum, outside study time, and personal time, were rated with high levels of satisfaction, demonstrating an overall high-quality medical school experience. Specifically, three areas received notably high marks, the first area being the integration and clinical relevance of the curriculum. The scheme-based approach is well liked by students and most feel it helps them integrate and apply the material clinically. The Medical Skills course specifically was noted to help students integrate material and apply it in a clinical scenario.

This course had the highest overall satisfaction rate and continues to be a hallmark of PLFSOM. Additionally, Worked Case Example (WCE) sessions were rated with a high level of satisfaction, students feeling the sessions worked synergistically with the academic material to present a complete clinical picture. The second area that demonstrated a high level of satisfaction is the overall environment and setting of the medical school. Students were highly satisfied with the facilities and their various amenities. Students also demonstrated satisfaction with the opportunities for involvement within the school and community, including satisfaction with research opportunities and service learning activities. The third area of high approval was the faculty and staff, including student services. Students gave high marks to the availability of faculty and their willingness to assist in student learning. Students also were satisfied with the support available through student services, including career, personal, and financial counseling. These three areas highlight the many strengths of PLFSOM, and the general satisfaction of students with their medical school experience.

Survey Process

Tammy Salazar, Ph.D. served as the faculty advisor to those involved with the analysis. Co-directors and contributing committee members were appointed and assembled at the beginning of the 2011 academic school year. The formed committees were then charged with creating clear, purposeful questions that would assess the institution in regards to the standards for accreditation of medical education programs as outlined in the document "Functions and Structure of a Medical School," published by the LCME. Committees were also asked to include questions on any other topics found to be important or unique to our institution as determined by the committee members. A number of rounds of editing and feedback between the committees, the co-directors, and our faculty advisor were conducted to ensure coverage of the LCME standards as well as the quality and clarity of the questions. The final survey instrument was assembled into an electronically accessible format by the Paul L. Foster Information Technology department, and distributed to students from January 10-17, with an extension of three days given to the MSIII students. The individual committees were then given the responsibility of analyzing the collected data and writing a summary of their findings, which then went through a process of editing and review. The individual committee reports are presented hereafter.

Survey Respondents

All first through third-year medical students at PLFSOM were invited to participate in the survey. Of 83 first-year medical students, 82 responded for a response rate of 99%, 100% of the 57 second-year students completed the survey, and 29 out of 40 third-year medical students responded for a response rate of 73%. Overall, 168 of the 180 students participated for a response rate of 93%.

Educational Program

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Overall quality of the first-year curriculum	1%	0%	4%	31%	63%
Coordination/integration of content in the first-year	1%	2%	4%	27%	67%
Overall quality of the second-year curriculum	1%	1%	30%	19%	49%

Coordination/integration of content in the second-year	1%	1%	29%	20%	49%
Opportunities to engage in self-directed, independent learning in the first and second years	1%	1%	7%	25%	66%
Overall workload in the first and second years	1%	1%	11%	26%	62%
Balance between school activities and personal life	1%	4%	7%	30%	58%
Educational program as a whole in preparing me to become a good physician	1%	1%	3%	21%	75%

Table 1. Reported high and low satisfaction points regarding the educational program portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 168.

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with the educational program. Of all individual responses to the educational program questions (n=1,333), 86% were either somewhat or very satisfied. The educational program, as a whole, in preparing students to become good physicians showed a 96% satisfaction rate. Half of the educational program topics addressed in the survey returned a satisfaction rate over 90%. No questions returned greater than a 5% dissatisfaction rate (somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied).

There was an 88% satisfaction rate with regards to a quarter of the questions. These questions dealt specifically with time management and student workload. All of these statistics indicate a strong overall student perception of the educational program.

The remaining quarter of the questions asked in the educational program section pertained to the second year curriculum. An error occurred with the survey administration that allowed MSIs to respond to these questions. Their responses skewed the data toward the neutral column. However, when MSI responses are removed there is an 89% satisfaction rate among MSIIs and MSIIIs.

Weaknesses

This section did not demonstrate any areas with a high level of dissatisfaction.

Strengths

Altogether the responses to the educational program section of the survey showed several strong points. Questions regarding the first-year curriculum carried a 94% satisfaction rate. It is worth noting that the overall satisfaction rate of all questions within the educational program showed an increase of 12% in satisfaction between the MSIIIs and current MSIIs. This could indicate that many of the previous issues experienced by the current MSIIIs were resolved.

We also learned that students felt positively regarding their opportunities to engage in self-directed, independent learning in the first and second years, with 91% of students indicating they were satisfied. This might be due to the amount of outside study time that students are allotted, the SARP project, as well as the number of sessions that are designated as “self-study.” Balance between school activities and personal time received an 88% satisfaction rate, with a 5% dissatisfaction rate (this was the highest

dissatisfaction rate within this section of the survey), demonstrating an overall satisfaction with the workload and balance of time within the curriculum. This is further reflected by an 88% satisfaction rate with overall workload in the first and second years.

The item that scored the highest satisfaction rate, at 96%, within the educational program section was the question pertaining to the curriculum preparing students to become good physicians. The high approval rating reflects the effectiveness of the integrated curriculum to cohesively incorporate the basic sciences, clinical skills, cultural perspectives and sensitivity into a seamless academic program.

Masters' Colloquium

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Overall Course Satisfaction	1%	3%	10%	32%	53%
Clarity of learning objectives	1%	2%	11%	36%	49%
Course content addressing the learning objectives	1%	2%	10%	36%	50%
Relationship between learning objectives and exam material	2%	2%	15%	34%	46%
Representation of course content on exams	2%	3%	19%	27%	49%
Exams as a fair representation of your learning	0%	4%	19%	30%	48%
Speed at which grades are reported	1%	3%	12%	33%	50%
Grading criteria	0%	3%	12%	31%	54%
Quality of feedback on your coursework	1%	5%	14%	30%	50%
Course organization	2%	1%	11%	33%	54%
Use of allotted time	3%	5%	17%	28%	46%
Teaching methods	1%	4%	9%	31%	55%
Quality of teaching	1%	2%	8%	28%	61%
Assigned reading material	1%	1%	16%	27%	55%
Active learning opportunities	1%	4%	13%	27%	55%
Course content in preparing you for the USMLE exams	4%	4%	21%	30%	41%
Relationship between SPM and Masters' Colloquium content	4%	4%	21%	30%	41%
Environment as a safe place for expressing opinions	1%	3%	5%	23%	68%
Topics addressed being up-to-date	1%	0%	6%	23%	70%
Variety of topics	0%	0%	6%	23%	71%
Writing assignments	2%	10%	11%	32%	44%
Instruction on ethics	2%	1%	9%	29%	59%

Table 2. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the Masters' Colloquium portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 167

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with the Masters' Colloquium (MC) course, indicated by a satisfaction level of 85% while only 4% reported being dissatisfied. Individual topics addressed in the survey had satisfaction rates of >71% and dissatisfaction rates of <12%.

In this survey, no differentiation was made between the four colleges instructed by different professors/masters. Differences in responses may vary from college to college but no formal inquiry has been made into the matter.

Weaknesses

Dissatisfaction rates for individual questions concerning MC ranged from 0-12%. The components with the highest dissatisfaction rates were writing assignments (12%), use of allotted time (8%), USMLE preparation (8%), relationship between SPM and MC content (8%), and quality of feedback (6%).

The writing assignments and quality of feedback sections show some concern from students. While students acknowledged that the writing assignments are useful in developing analytical writing skills, they often expressed that there is a lack of proper feedback on their papers. Students also stated that the grading criteria for the written assignments are unclear. Suggestions for improvement include more thorough evaluation of the written papers by the professors and more concise and clear guidelines concerning what is expected for each assignment.

Another thing we learned is that use of allotted time continues to be an issue for students. Among the students surveyed in the spring of 2010, 21% of students felt that the time spent in MC was not being used efficiently. This rate has dropped to 8% in the current survey. Student comments state that the two hours allotted to MC each week is too much time. They feel that a single hour is adequate time to address the material effectively and that as long as the course is structured appropriately, the learning experience would be just as efficient.

For the USMLE preparation section, students feel that they have not received enough practice with USMLE style ethical questions. Students suggest that providing a few ethical questions during each class session would help in their preparation. Students also requested more guidance on how to approach ethical questions in order to reach the appropriate conclusion.

Lastly, the relationship between SPM and MC received an 8% dissatisfaction rate from students. Currently, many of the topics discussed in MC are very relevant and introduce current issues that are important for the medical profession. However, the topics often do not follow the current SPM unit. Incorporating issues that relate directly to SPM units would allow the two courses to complement each other.

Strengths

There were many positive responses concerning MC survey questions. The variety of topics and up-to-date nature of issues discussed particularly pleased students, receiving 94% and 93% satisfaction levels, respectively. Students appreciated the ethical and medical issues that MC brought forward to discuss, especially topics that are not particularly evident to students but are integral in to their future success.

Also, students felt that the MC environment was a nurturing, safe place to express their individual opinions (91%), particularly noting that their master (one for each of the four colleges) effectively fostered the student-mentor relationship. No distinction was made concerning the leadership between the colleges. It should be noted that the MSIII class deviated from the overall 91% response rate for MC being a safe place to express opinions, with only 75% responding as either being very satisfied or somewhat satisfied. At least one student commented on their opinions being used inappropriately by their fellow students outside of the MC environment. No additional inquiry was made concerning this deviation.

Medical Skills

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Clarity of learning objectives	0%	0%	4%	12%	84%
Course content addressing the learning objectives	0%	0%	4%	11%	84%
Quality of feedback on your coursework	1%	2%	8%	17%	71%
Course organization	0%	0%	4%	13%	84%
Use of allotted time	0%	1%	5%	9%	85%
Teaching methods	0%	0%	4%	12%	84%
Quality of teaching	0%	0%	3%	10%	87%
Assigned reading material	0%	0%	5%	15%	80%
Active learning opportunities	0%	0%	4%	11%	85%
Overall course quality	0%	0%	2%	8%	89%
Course content in preparing you for the USMLE exams	0%	0%	12%	18%	70%
Relationship between SPM and Medical skills content	0%	0%	5%	11%	84%
Preparatory materials	0%	1%	4%	13%	83%
Skill building sessions	0%	1%	4%	14%	82%
Standardized patient encounters	0%	1%	4%	16%	80%
Feedback from the standardized patients	1%	2%	4%	26%	68%
Instruction on how to communicate with patients	0%	1%	4%	14%	81%
Instruction on how to communicate with other health care professionals	0%	1%	9%	23%	66%
Preparation for clinical clerkships	0%	1%	6%	12%	81%

Table 3. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the Medical Skills portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 167.

Summary

Overall, students are extremely satisfied with the Medical Skills (MS) course. All individual responses to each question asked pertaining to MS (n=4,165) received high marks, with 95% of respondents being either somewhat or very satisfied. Overall course satisfaction showed a 97% satisfaction rate. Most MS topics addressed in the survey returned an average satisfaction rate of 94%, while the dissatisfaction rate was <5%, indicating no truly definitive weak points in the course. As such, further analysis of these questions has been omitted from this report to allow for further discussion of the more pertinent negative or positive points.

Weaknesses

The most notable items in terms of lower satisfaction rates (<90%) or higher dissatisfaction rates (>1%) are the speed at which grades are reported (dissatisfaction=5%, satisfaction=86%), the quality of feedback

on coursework (dissatisfaction=3%, satisfaction=88%), the course content in preparing students for the USMLE exams (dissatisfaction=0%, satisfaction=88%), and feedback from the standardized patients (dissatisfaction=3%, satisfaction=93%). Most comments centered on inadequate feedback from standardized patients and faculty and the desire for more constructive criticism. Student suggestions for improvement included the desire for "real advice and feedback from standardized patients that is honest and candid", as well as more feedback on individual performance from the supervising physicians following standardized patient encounters. Regarding the course preparing students for the USMLE exams, the satisfaction rates across the student bodies was examined more closely (MSI=91%, MSII=88%, MSIII=82%), and MSIII percentages are used as the primary focus as they have completed the USMLE STEP 1 Exam. Although the satisfaction rate amongst the MSIII class received an 82%, there was no dissatisfaction (0%) noted. Possible solutions proposed by the MSIIIs were also made by the MSI and MSII years, and included extending MS sessions to more than one day per week, more allotted time for skills practice, and more explanations on the tasks performed in MS sessions.

Strengths

Many strong points were observed among the MS survey questions. The quality, content, and instruction of the course received very high marks, carrying satisfaction rates >95% with only two items carrying a 1% dissatisfaction rate. Compared with the previous study, substantial improvement between MSI and MSIII years has been noted in multiple areas including overall course quality (93% among MSIIIs; 99% for MSIs), preparatory materials (89% to 98%), skill building sessions (89% to 100%), standardized patient encounters (89% to 99%), and instruction on how to communicate with patients (89%-97%). Such drastic changes can only be viewed as evidence that changes to the curriculum have resulted in notable improvements in the quality and effectiveness of the course. Overall, comments made by students relayed the importance of this course and its necessity to learning important skills especially as applied to third and fourth years. Furthermore, faculty and course organization were lauded as strengths, aiding students in navigating and learning a complicated and diverse array of topics. Students feel that the course "is a great way to incorporate the knowledge learned from SPM course and apply it to 'real life situations'" and that it is "flawlessly executed" which "provides a good simulation for future patient encounters and a good method to learn skills needed in the clinical setting." Third year students, now in their rotations, added that the "Entire course [was] very well organized and highly valued. Everything learned in the first two years was either cemented in the sessions or a direct result of the teaching efforts."

Scholarly Activity Research Program

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Overall Course Satisfaction	0%	1%	28%	27%	45%
Funding opportunities for your SARP project	3%	8%	38%	21%	29%
Resources available at all stages of your SARP project	1%	4%	26%	26%	43%

Clarity of learning objectives	1%	4%	24%	32%	39%
Course content addressing the learning objectives	1%	2%	28%	28%	41%
Grading as a fair representation of your learning	1%	2%	33%	20%	43%
Grading criteria	0%	2%	31%	24%	43%
Level of feedback provided at each phase of your project	1%	4%	33%	22%	40%
Quality of feedback on your coursework	1%	4%	34%	23%	40%
Active learning opportunities	0%	1%	28%	22%	49%
Course as an introduction to research methods	1%	5%	23%	27%	45%
Timetable to complete your SARP project	2%	3%	17%	27%	51%
Communication with SARP course directors	0%	4%	18%	22%	56%
Variety of research topics available	1%	3%	18%	22%	56%

Table 4. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the SARP portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 167.

Summary

The Scholarly Activity Research Program (SARP) is a course that asks the student to develop, investigate and present any type of research question that has medical significance. The student must present this research topic during the school's annual seminar in December. The student has up to four years to complete the SARP course.

Due to the "overall course satisfaction" rate being over 72%, we can confidently state that the students' view of the SARP course is favorable. In fact, most of the SARP topics addressed in the survey returned a satisfaction rate above 70%.

It's important to initially note that the student's SARP can span any or all of the student's four years in medical school, therefore, at the time of this survey many of the second and third-year students, as well as all of the first-year students had not fully completed their SARP project. We believe that this incomplete status may explain the large number of *neutral* ratings in the survey. That being said, many of the survey questions address the overall process including the initial stages, to which all students have been exposed. Moreover, 60% of the MSIIIs and 81% of the MSIIs responded favorably when asked about the overall course quality, indicating that those groups that have completed their SARP were much more likely to rate it as favorable.

Weaknesses

A weakness of the SARP course may be the limited funding opportunities as indicated by an 11% dissatisfaction rate. This rate increased to 17% in the MSIIIs and 12% in the MSIIs, again indicating that those with longer SARP experience may feel differently than those who have had less time to develop their projects. While TTUHSC does provide financial incentives if the student is involved in a program based at the El Paso campus, the school does not provide aid for those performing SARP projects at other institutions. However, we do not believe that the low approval rate is due to PLFSOM's lack of

reimbursement of students conducting research at other institutions, but instead may be indicative of the students who conduct their research at PLFSOM merely desiring greater financial aid. A solution to this might be to encourage the students to seek private donations or request additional funds from individual mentors that they work under.

Strengths

Perceived strengths of the SARP course included the variety of research opportunities (78% overall satisfaction with 56% very satisfied), timetable to complete the project (78% overall satisfaction with 51% very satisfied), and the availability of active learning opportunities (71% overall satisfaction with 49% very satisfied). We believe this supports the course directors' desire for the SARP to be a student led initiative into exploring any field of research that he or she might find interesting. Moreover, high rates of satisfactory responses regarding the timetable to complete the SARP exemplifies an important goal of this course, which is for the student to independently conduct and complete the project at their convenience. It is important that students do not view SARP as a burden. Given the large percentage of favorable responses, we believe the students are very pleased with the overall freedom this course allows, specifically, that it grants students the entire four years to complete the project.

Scientific Principles of Medicine

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Overall Course Quality	0%	1%	4%	28%	66%
Integration of disciplines	0%	1%	5%	20%	74%
Work Case Examples	0%	1%	3%	11%	86%
Formative Exams	1%	1%	4%	20%	75%
Instruction in Biochemistry	0%	1%	3%	22%	74%
Instruction in Immunology	0%	1%	4%	19%	77%
Instruction in Pathology	0%	0%	1%	11%	87%
Small Group Anatomy Sessions	5%	10%	17%	33%	35%
Gross Anatomy Lab	5%	9%	18%	34%	34%
Microbiology Labs	2%	10%	22%	31%	35%
Instruction in Embryology	2%	12%	13%	38%	35%
Instruction in Gross Anatomy	6%	11%	12%	37%	34%
Instruction in Microbiology	5%	14%	12%	29%	40%
Instruction in Pharmacology	12%	17%	19%	30%	23%

Table 5. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the SPM portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 167.

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with the Scientific Principles of Medicine (SPM) course. Of all individual responses of all questions asked for SPM (n=6837), 85% were either somewhat or very satisfied. Overall course quality showed a 94% satisfaction rate. Many SPM topics addressed in the survey returned a satisfaction rate near 85% without a great (5%) dissatisfaction rate, indicating neither an exceptionally strong nor weak point in the course, and as such have been omitted from this report to allow for further discussion of the more pertinent negative or positive points.

Weaknesses

Of concern are two of the labs that contribute to SPM, namely gross anatomy and microbiology. These components of the course had a 68% and 66% satisfaction rating, respectively, with notable dissatisfaction rates of 14% and 12%, respectively. For gross anatomy labs, student felt that learning objectives lacked clarity. Proposals were made to change learning objectives from broad objectives like “discuss the brain” to more defined objectives such as “identify and discuss the function of each lobe of the brain.” Other comments centered on the need for improvement of the “students teaching students” program, specifically in regards to student teachers lacking the requisite knowledge to adequately teach the subject. Upon further questioning of our fellow students, we have received suggestions to require verification and instruction from professors on top of the “students teaching students” program. Microbiology lab complaints included comments such as “they’re way too in depth” and “not time efficient.” Instruction in microbiology is also a notable weakness, having a dissatisfaction rate of 19%. Instruction in microbiology was also criticized as being “way too in depth.” In the future, microbiology instruction could be refined to mainly include information that is pertinent to our medical careers.

Small group anatomy sessions and instruction in gross anatomy had a 68% and 71% satisfaction rate, respectively, and a 15% and 17% dissatisfaction rate, respectively. Both of these categories represent similar problems and solutions as those aforementioned in the gross anatomy lab category. Instruction in embryology held a 14% dissatisfaction rate and comments fixated on the lack of clear direction and organization. Just as anatomy objectives need more defined direction, instruction and learning objectives in embryology would benefit from similar improvements.

Of greatest concern is instruction in pharmacology, carrying a 53% satisfaction rate and a dissatisfaction rate of 29%. One student remarked, “It is often unclear which medications we will be held responsible for.” The solution to this problem would be for the professor(s) teaching pharmacology to plainly list the medications on which to focus our studies.

It must be noted that although each of these categories represent the highest dissatisfaction rates for the SPM portion of the student self report, some of these weak categories have increased in satisfaction rate and/or decreased in dissatisfaction rate from MSIIIs to MSIIs to MSIs. Instruction in pharmacology has improved from a 40% dissatisfaction rate for MSIIIs to 19% for MSIs. Instruction in embryology has improved from a 20% dissatisfaction rate for MSIIIs to 14% dissatisfaction rate for MSIs. Instruction in gross anatomy improved from a 16% dissatisfaction rate for MSIIIs to a 14% dissatisfaction rate for MSIs.

Strengths

Many strong points were observed among the SPM survey questions. Worked Case Examples carry a 97% satisfaction rate, 86% identifying themselves as being very satisfied and no students responding as being strongly dissatisfied. Also of note is the overall (MSI-MSIII) satisfaction rate of 94% for the integration of disciplines within SPM. The satisfaction rate has grown from 82% among MSIIIs to 98% for MSIs, indicating that changes to the curriculum over the years have had a positive impact on discipline integration. There were numerous positive comments concerning the discipline integration, such as “I really like that each week's material is related and often we see overlap of the same concept but through a different perspective from each discipline.” Formative exams are another strength with an overall 95% satisfaction rate. One student remarked, “I enjoy our weekly formatives and don't know how I would monitor my learning progress without them,” while another said, “Formative exams are very helpful in keeping you on track and affirming the material that you have learned.” Instruction in immunology has also improved from 86% satisfaction amongst MSIIIs to 98% and 97% for MSIIs and MSIs, respectively. Instruction in pathology also continues to improve and be a strong point, with 92% of MSIIIs being satisfied while 100% of both MSIIs and MSIs report being satisfied. Instruction in biochemistry has shown great improvement as well, growing to an overall satisfaction rate of 96%, from an 85% satisfaction rate among MSIIIs to a 98% and 99% satisfaction rate among MSIIs and MSIs, respectively. Overall, SPM course quality received a 94% satisfaction rate, reinforcing the fact that PLFSOM is constantly monitoring and improving the quality of our education.

Society, Community and the Individual

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Overall course quality	6%	8%	18%	35%	33%

Speed at which grades are reported	2%	2%	7%	39%	49%
Clinic experiences	2%	2%	10%	26%	60%
Instruction on understanding cultural diversity	4%	2%	9%	30%	55%
Instruction on how to communicate with a diverse patient population	5%	1%	10%	36%	48%
Instruction on addressing violence and abuse	4%	2%	10%	34%	50%
Instructions on how to recognize our own cultural and gender bias	5%	2%	13%	33%	48%
Grading criteria	9%	10%	9%	34%	38%
Quality of teaching	10%	7%	19%	31%	33%
Course organization	8%	9%	19%	30%	34%
Use of allotted time	12%	12%	15%	31%	31%
Teaching methods	10%	8%	20%	30%	31%
Relationship between the SPM and SCI content	8%	9%	28%	34%	21%
Course content in preparing you for the USMLE exams	9%	5%	37%	22%	27%
Spanish Courses	7%	9%	11%	36%	37%

Table 6. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the SCI portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 167.

Summary

Overall, the satisfaction rate for the Society, Community and the Individual (SCI) course is high, and shows improvement from the 2010 LCME survey. Of the 4146 individual responses concerning the course, 73% are either somewhat or very satisfied with no topic returning a satisfaction rate below 60%. When asked about the overall course quality, students report a 68% satisfaction rate. There are several topics that show significantly lower or higher rates of satisfaction, as well as changes across the MSI to MSIII classes, which are discussed in more detail below.

Weaknesses

To begin, students report only 49% satisfaction with the degree the SCI course prepares them for the USMLE with 14% being dissatisfied. When this topic is stratified by class, MSI dissatisfaction is at 7%, with values increasing with each subsequent class to 19% and 22%, respectively. The disparity between classes is likely due to students' frustration with the organization and teaching of the biostatistics and epidemiology portions that predominate in the second year, and are the most relevant topics to the USMLE Step 1 exam. Another content related point of concern is the relationship between the SPM and the SCI course, where only 55% of students were satisfied, indicating that the courses could be better integrated. Additionally, there was a high level of dissatisfaction (19%) with the course's grading criteria. The most prevalent complaint being that the testing format does not accurately reflect student's ability to apply their knowledge in a relevant setting.

Other points that need to be addressed are the quality of teaching and teaching methods for the SCI course, which had dissatisfaction rates of 17% and 18%, respectively. When stratified among classes the MSII and MSIII class were more likely to be dissatisfied with the quality of teaching than the MSI class.

This is also likely due to the difference in course content in the second year, primarily biostatistics. In the optional comments, several students stated that biostatistics was “disjointed and frustrating” in its presentation. Concerning the methods of teaching, another common complaint is that teaching methods are often aimed at purely academic applications and not practical for clinical use. This complaint may also explain the lower level of satisfaction (27%, including neutral responses) with the Spanish courses. Many feel these courses need to be more practical rather than academic, suggesting that there be more opportunities to practice using the language. This is also related to the 24% dissatisfaction rate regarding the use of allotted time. Though this number remains high, it has improved significantly from the 40% dissatisfaction rate in the 2010 survey.

Strengths

Many strong points were observed among the SCI survey questions including the topics of grading, clinic experiences, and instruction on cultural/behavioral issues in healthcare. The speed at which grades were reported had the highest rating with 89% satisfaction. The clinic experience also rated highly overall (86%) and continues to be high when stratified by classes. Students have noted that their clinic experiences are positive overall and any dissatisfaction with the experience is likely due to inconsistencies between preceptors. Students also agreed that the course was helpful in providing instruction on how to communicate with a diverse patient population, how to address violence and abuse, and also furthered their understanding of behavioral and socioeconomic topics, cultural diversity, and recognizing their own cultural and gender biases. These topics received satisfaction rates between 80-85% overall, but did drop among the MSIII class. This is most likely indicative of a change in instruction from previous years, or a change in perception about the level of preparation needed before entering clinical training.

Family Medicine & Surgery Block

Family Medicine

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
General clerkship organization	0%	20%	0%	40%	40%
Quality of faculty teaching	0%	10%	10%	40%	40%
Professionalism of faculty	10%	0%	10%	50%	30%
Quality of end-of-rotation OSCE	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%
Quality of electives/selectives	0%	0%	10%	10%	80%
Opinion of expectations for call	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%
Availability of clerkship director	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%
Availability of clerkship coordinator	10%	20%	20%	20%	30%
Variety of patient experiences	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
Level of involvement in patient care	0%	0%	10%	50%	40%
Fairness of exams and grading	0%	10%	10%	30%	50%
Speed at which grades are reported	10%	10%	20%	10%	50%
Year 1 and 2 preparing you for this clerkship	0%	20%	20%	20%	40%
Overall clerkship quality	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%
Integration of the 2 clerkships in this block	0%	22%	22%	22%	33%

Table 7. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the family medicine block portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 10.

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with the family medicine portion of the family medicine-surgery block. For example, of all individual responses of all questions asked for family medicine (n=279), 73% were either somewhat or very satisfied. Similarly, general clerkship organization showed an 80% satisfaction rate. Many family medicine topics addressed in the survey returned a satisfaction rate near 70% without a great dissatisfaction rate (<10% in most cases), indicating a trend of satisfaction with this portion of the combined clerkship.

Weaknesses

As mentioned above, students were generally satisfied with the family medicine clerkship. One area of dissatisfaction was noted however, in the availability of the clerkship coordinator, with 30% of students expressing such an opinion. Feedback from students revolved around the coordinator's lack of ability to disseminate equal information to all students on the clerkship concerning required materials.

Strengths

Clerkship strength's included the variety of the patient experiences (100% satisfaction rate), level of involvement in patient care, quality of electives/selectives, and the quality of the end of rotation OSCE, all three of which received a 90% satisfaction rate. Overall, 11 out of 14 categories were rated above 80%, supporting the assertion that students are generally satisfied with this rotation.

Surgery

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
General clerkship organization	0%	20%	0%	40%	40%
Quality of faculty teaching	0%	10%	10%	40%	40%
Professionalism of faculty	10%	0%	10%	50%	30%
Quality of end-of-rotation OSCE	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%
Quality of electives/selectives	0%	0%	10%	10%	80%
Opinion of expectations for call	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%
Availability of clerkship director	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%
Availability of clerkship coordinator	10%	20%	20%	20%	30%
Variety of patient experiences	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
Level of involvement in patient care	0%	0%	10%	50%	40%
Fairness of exams and grading	0%	10%	10%	30%	50%
Speed at which grades are reported	10%	10%	20%	10%	50%
Overall clerkship quality	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%
Year 1 and 2 preparing you for this clerkship	0%	20%	20%	20%	40%

Table 8. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the surgery block portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 10.

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with the surgery portion of the family medicine-surgery block as evidenced by Table 8, which shows that 10 out of 14 categories received above an 80% satisfaction rate without a great dissatisfaction rate (<10% in most cases), indicating a trend of satisfaction with this portion of the combined clerkship.

Weaknesses

Students again expressed dissatisfaction with the availability of the clerkship coordinator, with 30% of respondents expressing either being somewhat or strongly dissatisfied. Feedback from students involved the coordinator's general difficulty with being well-informed and disseminating correct information to students regarding the clerkship in a timely manner.

Strengths

Notably, student satisfaction with most areas of the clerkship was high, with the variety of the patient experiences again receiving a 100% satisfaction rate. Other strengths of note were the level of involvement in patient care, quality of the electives/selectives, and quality of the end-of-rotation OSCE, all of which received a 90% satisfaction level. Students expressed a 70% satisfaction rate for the overall quality of the surgery clerkship.

Internal Medicine & Psychiatry Block

Internal Medicine

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Overall Clerkship quality	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%
Variety of patient experiences	0%	0%	0%	17%	83%
Professionalism of residents	0%	0%	0%	54%	46%
Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	0%	0%	0%	54%	46%
Level of involvement in patient care	0%	0%	0%	54%	46%
Quality of faculty teaching	0%	0%	8%	31%	62%
Professionalism of faculty	0%	0%	8%	31%	62%
Quality of electives/selectives	0%	0%	8%	38%	54%
Feedback about performance during the clerkship	0%	0%	8%	46%	46%
Speed at which grades are reported	0%	8%	38%	31%	23%
Instruction in basic sciences and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	0%	15%	15%	46%	23%
Timeliness of student evaluations	0%	15%	23%	38%	23%
Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	8%	15%	8%	46%	23%
Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	15%	31%	15%	15%	23%

Table 9. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the IM Clerkship portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 13.

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with the internal medicine clerkship (IM). Of all the responses provided for the IM questions asked (n=359), 83% were either somewhat or very satisfied. Overall course satisfaction showed an 83% satisfaction rate. Many IM topics addressed in the survey returned a satisfaction rate near 80% with a dissatisfaction rate of 8% or less, indicating neither an exceptionally strong nor weak point in the course. Questions that fit these criteria have been omitted from this report to allow for further discussion of the more pertinent negative and positive points.

Weaknesses

Of concern is the balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time, as well as the helpfulness in preparing for the NBME shelf exam. These two components of the course had a 38% and 69% satisfaction rating, respectively, with notable dissatisfaction rates of 46% and 23%, respectively. Student comments in these sections centered on time spent nonproductively waiting and on time required to fill out the necessary paperwork for the rotation. Students felt this took away from productive studying time and decreased the helpfulness of the clerkship in preparing them for the shelf exam.

Upon further questioning of our fellow students, we received the following feedback. Regarding the large amounts of paperwork, third-year students noted that some efforts have already been made to simplify patient logs, which has decreased the time needed to input patient information. Additionally, requirements have also been decreased regarding the amount of faculty feedback sheets required during the rotation. A suggestion to further minimize paperwork would be to decrease the number of handwritten full history and physicals from the 15 currently required. Regarding time spent waiting, some IM faculty members have demanding schedules, which can often delay the start of rounding from 8 a.m. to sometimes as late as 11 a.m. As students, we cannot leave the floor, and as such, a student study area would allow us to efficiently make use of downtime and reduce non-productive time spent waiting.

Strengths

Many strong points were observed among the IM survey questions. Overall, students agreed that the clerkship provided a variety of patient experiences (100% satisfaction rate; 83% stating they were very satisfied; no students responding as being dissatisfied) with ample levels of involvement in patient care and plenty of faculty and resident supervision (both areas receiving 100% satisfaction rates). As this is the first group of MSIII students to go through the PLFSOM curriculum, there is no prior year comparison available.

Psychiatry

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
General Clerkship Organization	0%	0%	0%	15%	85%
Quality of faculty teaching	0%	0%	0%	15%	85%
End-of-rotation OSCE	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%
Quality of electives/selectives	0%	0%	8%	8%	85%
Availability of the Clerkship Director	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%
Availability of the Clerkship Coordinator	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%
Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%
Variety of patient experiences	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%
Avenues for completing all patient encounters (std. pts, online encounters, or paper cases)	0%	0%	0%	23%	77%
Level of involvement in patient care	0%	0%	8%	15%	77%
Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	0%	0%	8%	15%	77%
Feedback about your performance during the clerkship	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%
Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%
Overall clerkship quality	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%

Table 10. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the psychiatry clerkship portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 13

Summary

MSIII students were 100% satisfied with the overall quality of the psychiatry clerkship. Students found the clerkship to be well organized and were particularly satisfied with the faculty, support staff, and residents. Overall, there was an average 98.3% satisfaction rate for the entire psychiatry clerkship with 0% dissatisfaction.

Weaknesses

While there was a 0% dissatisfaction rate, there are two areas where students had neutral opinions. The first such area included the quality of electives/selectives. On a certain day during the week, students are required to spend an afternoon at their selective. Selectives include activities such as participating in group therapy, engaging in inpatient therapy sessions, and answering ER calls with a team of psychiatrists. Some of the activities are deemed more helpful in preparation for the shelf exams than others. Another area that received neutral responses was the level of involvement in patient care. When seeing patients in the inpatient portion of the rotation, the student's role is often limited to shadowing and observing. In order to improve this section, it is suggested that residents gain an understanding that students should be given opportunities to ask patients questions and actively engage in the therapeutic relationship. In other MSIII blocks, students are given the opportunity to follow a single patient for the entire 16 week block. It is recommended that a similar longitudinal psychiatry patient experience be developed and implemented in this block to allow students more of an opportunity to engage in the therapeutic relationship. The last area that contained neutral responses included faculty and resident supervision of patient care activities.

Strengths

One student describes the psychiatry clerkship as, "the most organized clerkship I have experienced so far." Students found weekly expectations of time reasonable, and were able to study a sufficient amount. They also found their experiences in psychiatry to be helpful in preparation for the wards. Of particular aid were the weekly quizzes over assigned readings and PRITE question sessions. The clerkship director and coordinator both received 100% satisfaction in that they were consistently available to students.

Obstetrics/Gynecology & Pediatrics Block

Obstetrics/Gynecology

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Clarity and appropriate use of objectives	0%	0%	22%	22&	56%
General clerkship organization	22%	11%	0%	22%	44%
Quality of end-of-rotation OSCE	0%	0%	33%	11%	56%
Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%
Quality of lectures	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%
Opinion of schedules	11%	11%	22%	22%	33%
Variety of patient experiences	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%
Level of involvement in patient care	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%

Independent study time	0%	11%	22%	33%	33%
Emphasis and feedback on development of clinical skills	0%	22%	11%	22%	44%
Performance feedback during the clerkship	22%	11%	0%	22%	44%
Helpfulness in preparation for NBME shelf exam	0%	11%	22%	22%	44%
Speed at which grades were reported	11%	11%	33%	11%	33%
Overall clerkship quality	0%	11%	22%	11%	56%

Table 11. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the OB/Gyn Clerkship portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 9.

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with the obstetrics and gynecology clerkship. Generally, most components of the survey resulted in students reporting 70% or higher satisfaction without significant dissatisfaction rates.

Weaknesses

Of greatest concern is the amount of performance feedback provided during the clerkship. 33% of students reported dissatisfaction with the amount of feedback given to them. Some students reported that they did not get their performance evaluations until after the NBME exam was taken, which is one week after clerkship duties have ended. In addition, 33% of students reported dissatisfaction with the overall organization of the clerkship. This may be due to the scheduling of required activities, as there was only a 55% satisfaction rate with scheduling, likely due to this being the first run-through of the clerkship. Hopefully this will improve with time, and it is recommended that the clerkship directors evaluate ways to provide more feedback in a timely manner, and improve their scheduling.

Strengths

Student responses and remarks consistently identified the following strengths: variety of patient encounters, the level of involvement in patient care, the faculty/resident supervision of these patient care activities, and the quality of lectures throughout the clerkship. Each of these components of the OB/Gyn survey received an 89% satisfaction rate. In addition, 78% of students were satisfied with the clarity and use of objectives in the clerkship. These core strengths likely account for the high overall satisfaction with this clerkship.

Pediatrics

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Overall Clerkship quality	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%
Variety of patient experiences	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%
Professionalism of residents	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%
Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%

Level of involvement in patient care	0%	0%	13%	75%	13%
Quality of faculty teaching	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%
Professionalism of faculty	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%
Quality of electives/selectives	13%	0%	38%	25%	25%
Feedback about performance during the clerkship	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%
Speed at which grades are reported	13%	0%	38%	38%	13%
Instruction in basic sciences and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%
Timeliness of student evaluations	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%
Integration of the 2 clerkships in this block	22%	0%	0%	44%	33%
Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	0%	0%	13%	63%	25%
Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%

Table 12. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the pediatrics clerkship portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 8.

Summary

Overall, students are broadly satisfied with the pediatrics clerkship. Of all the responses provided for the questions asked for pediatrics (n=250), 83% were either somewhat or very satisfied. Overall course satisfaction showed an 88% satisfaction rate with no students reporting dissatisfaction. No particular shortcomings are noted.

Weaknesses

One noted concern in the pediatrics survey is seen in the quality of electives/selectives. In fact, the pediatrics/OB-Gyn block is the only clerkship which does not provide students with the opportunity to pick an additional rotation in an area of particular interest. This is likely why only 50% of students are satisfied with the current arrangement. With many subspecialties in pediatrics, it is recommended that opportunities for further exploration be provided through an elective/selective experience.

In addition to the lack of elective/selective experiences, two individuals (22%) were strongly dissatisfied with the integration of the two clerkships within this block. This may be skewed due to the small sample size, but warrants mentioning. Another issue of note is the speed at which grades are reported, with only 50% being satisfied at the current wait time. A possible explanation for both could arise from a general lack of organization as noted in the OB-Gyn section, and will hopefully improve with time.

Strengths

Broadly speaking, the pediatrics clerkship survey revealed consistent levels of satisfaction. This indicates that the clerkship is generally well-planned and designed with little dissatisfaction reported. The areas receiving the highest satisfaction rates are feedback about performance, level of involvement in patient care, and quality of faculty teaching.

Educational Resources

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Length of library checkout periods	2%	4%	10%	20%	64%
Quality of library services	1%	0%	3%	15%	81%
Adequacy of computer learning resources	0%	1%	4%	18%	77%
Adequacy of library holdings and instructional resources	1%	1%	7%	19%	73%
Ease of access to library holdings and instructional resources	0%	1%	7%	14%	79%
Utility of school or departmental websites	1%	2%	6%	22%	69%
Student study space on campus	1%	11%	7%	22%	60%
Student relaxation space on campus	1%	5%	5%	24%	65%
Amenities available to students in the student lounge and gym	0%	3%	4%	21%	72%
Testing facilities	1%	2%	6%	23%	68%
Small group teaching space	0%	1%	2%	21%	76%
Parking	2%	8%	6%	23%	60%
Access to secure storage space for belongings	1%	7%	8%	15%	68%
Adequacy of systems for personal safety	0%	1%	7%	23%	70%

Table 13. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the educational resources portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 168.

Summary

There is a general sense of satisfaction with the educational resources available to students. None of the survey components in this section had less than an 80% satisfaction rate, and most components had over 90% satisfaction. Overall, students were satisfied with the library hours and offerings and the classroom, lab, and testing facilities. The most notable weaknesses are access to secure storage, adequacy of student study space on campus, and parking.

Weaknesses

We identified three limitations of educational resources through the student survey. The first concern was access to secure storage. Although overall this received a satisfaction score of 83%, the MSIIIs were only 55% satisfied and 17% dissatisfied with this component. This may be due to a lack of storage space for belongings in the hospital while doing third and fourth-year clinical rotations. Perhaps a set of lockers specific for the rotating students could be established in a convenient location. Another resource limitation was parking, with an overall satisfaction rate of 83% and a dissatisfaction rate of 10%. There were suggestions written about creating a parking garage. The third concern of educational resources was the adequacy of student study space on campus, with 83% of students being satisfied and 12% reporting being dissatisfied. This is likely due to the limited amount of individual and small group study rooms. There are worries that the parking and study spaces are going to be even more limited as the school

rapidly grows. Perhaps a tour could be arranged for current and new students showing the study areas, specifically the library, and overflow parking areas on the other side of campus that students are not currently aware of. If student dissatisfaction with study space continues, perhaps lockers could be added to the carrels in the library space and students only could be allowed badge access to this area through the current emergency exit. Additionally, the current reading room could be turned into a mini student lounge, or could also be partitioned into 4-6 separate, 1-2 person private reading rooms. Some of the most popular study rooms are the ones located outside the library entrance on the second floor, and similarly sized rooms would help students be more satisfied with study space. These rooms could be located anywhere on campus, but preferably in the Medical Education Building.

Strengths

Multiple strengths were observed in the area of educational resources. One of those strengths is the accessibility and quality of library services. Students had an average 96% satisfaction rate this year compared to the last survey which had an overall 70-80% satisfaction rate. Adequacy of computer learning resources and adequacy and accessibility of library computers also had high satisfaction rates of 95%. Students are also strongly satisfied with lab facilities, lecture hall space, and small group teaching space. Each of these points had at least a 96% satisfaction rate.

Medical Student Services

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Academic counseling	1%	0%	19%	20%	60%
Financial aid services	0%	0%	7%	21%	72%
Confidentiality of counseling	1%	2%	16%	17%	64%
Refund policies for fees, tuitions and payments	0%	1%	17%	19%	63%
Accessibility of student financial records	0%	1%	14%	19%	67%
Access to student health services	1%	5%	18%	18%	57%
Adequacy of student health services	1%	6%	19%	18%	57%
Student health insurance	2%	13%	29%	13%	43%
Disability insurance	1%	2%	43%	9%	45%
Universal precaution education	1%	2%	19%	17%	62%
Immunization policies	1%	2%	7%	25%	66%
Accessibility to immunizations	2%	3%	7%	24%	64%
Clarity of student advancement and graduation policies	1%	2%	7%	26%	64%
Fairness of student advancement and graduation policies	1%	2%	7%	26%	64%
Clarity of policies and procedures for disciplinary action	1%	2%	10%	22%	65%
Fairness of policies and procedures for disciplinary action	1%	2%	8%	24%	65%
Clarity of standards of conduct for faculty and students	2%	2%	7%	24%	65%
Access to student records for review and challenge	1%	2%	19%	17%	61%

Table 14. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the medical student services portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 168.

Summary

Overall, students are satisfied with student services. Of all individual responses of all questions asked for student services (n=3852), 80% were either somewhat or very satisfied. Five topics addressed in the survey returned a satisfaction rate near 70% without a great (<5%) dissatisfaction rate, indicating neither exceptionally strong nor weak points in the service, and as such, have been omitted from this report to allow for further discussion of the more pertinent negative or positive points.

Weaknesses

Of concern are three areas of student health services, namely access to student health services, adequacy of student health, and student health insurance. These components of student services had a 76%, 74%,

and 56% satisfaction rating, respectively, with dissatisfaction rates of 6%, 7%, and 15%, respectively. For the student health insurance and accessibility, comments have been made regarding limited number of available clinics and the inconvenience of scheduling appointments. Additional comment has been made to point out a lack of coverage for HIV in the student health insurance. Dissatisfaction rates regarding adequacy of student health was uniform among MSI-MSIIIs. However, dissatisfaction rates regarding student health insurance for MSIs has decreased from 20-21% for MSIIs and MSIIIs, to 9% for MSIs, indicating that changes have been made to the student health insurance policy to accommodate student needs.

Strengths

While most students showed satisfaction towards student services, particular strengths appear to be in financial aid services, immunization policies, and clarity of standards of conduct for faculty and students, with each area receiving a 90% or higher approval rating. Notably, financial aid services has shown constant improvement, growing from 87% approval for MSIIIs, to 93% for MSIIs, to 95% for MSIs with 0% dissatisfaction rate in all three groups. In addition, satisfaction rates for clarity of standards of conduct for faculty and students have grown from 86% for MSIIIs to 92% for MSIs. Dissatisfaction rates for the same item have decreased from 8% in MSIIs to 1% in MSIs, indicating that successful efforts have been made to address student concerns regarding ambiguities in standards of conduct.

Learning Environment

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Diversity of students, faculty, and other staff	2%	4%	8%	28%	59%
Environment conducive to culturally competent health care	1%	1%	3%	28%	67%
Environment helps students to understand health disparities and create solutions	1%	0%	5%	28%	67%
Opportunity for interaction with other medical disciplines	2%	6%	14%	29%	49%
Research participation encouraged	1%	1%	4%	23%	71%
Student-initiated research projects encouraged	2%	0%	5%	25%	67%
On-site research opportunities	1%	4%	13%	22%	61%
Service learning opportunities encouraged	0%	0%	9%	26%	65%
Service learning opportunities	0%	3%	10%	30%	57%
Information about community and volunteer opportunities	1%	1%	6%	29%	63%

Table 15. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the learning environment portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 168.

Summary

Overall, students are quite satisfied with their learning environment. Of all individual responses of all questions asked for the learning environment section (n=2005), 88% were either somewhat or very satisfied. Using a variety of survey scales, student respondents were asked to disclose their opinions regarding the learning environment, diversity of the school, and the research and service learning opportunities.

Weaknesses

Of some concern is student satisfaction with the level of interaction with other medical disciplines such as nursing or pharmacy. The satisfaction rate for this particular component of the learning environment still had an overall 78% satisfaction rate with only 8% of students being dissatisfied. However, the interaction of medical students with nursing students will likely increase due to the recent establishment of the Gayle Greve Hunt Nursing School as part of the Texas Tech Health Sciences Center at El Paso in September 2011. Also of note is the discrepancy between classes; 86% of the MSIII students were satisfied with interdisciplinary interaction versus 72% of the MSI students. This is likely due to the increased exposure to other staff and students that occurs during clinical rotations in the third and fourth years.

While students are generally satisfied (87%) with the diversity among members of the academic community, 6% were dissatisfied. One student noted, “I enjoy seeing the diversity that we have here; even still, I would like to see more diversity; it would be great to learn and work beside a few African-

Americans in future classes." This suggestion will be passed on as a recommendation to our admissions committee in an attempt to increase our diversity.

Strengths

There are several aspects of the learning environment with which the students are very satisfied. Approximately 95% of students are satisfied that the learning environment helps them to understand the principles of culturally competent health care and to recognize and address health disparities. The vast majority of students (94%) feel that the school encourages them to conduct research, with 71% of respondents being very satisfied. The institution also encourages student-initiated research projects as reflected by the 92% student satisfaction rate.

Service learning opportunities are defined as structured learning experiences that combine community service with preparation and reflection, and are very popular among students. Ninety-one percent of students feel encouraged to pursue service learning opportunities and 87% are satisfied that there are sufficient opportunities available. One particular student commented, "I feel we are very involved in our local community. Volunteer opportunities are available almost on a weekly basis, in whatever you are drawn to, whether it's the local women's shelters, helping students in the Pre-Med program at UTEP (our local university), or even speaking for career day at an elementary school. It's hard not to get caught up in the spirit of our school."

Professionalism

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The guidelines for professionalism are made clear to me	2%	3%	7%	26%	63%
Professionalism evaluations are helpful to me	3%	7%	16%	26%	48%
The methods for evaluating me are fair	2%	6%	11%	31%	49%
I know where to go for help in the case of student mistreatment	1%	1%	6%	32%	60%
I know where to go for help in the case of sexual harassment	0%	1%	7%	32%	61%
The educational activities to prevent student mistreatment are adequate	2%	1%	5%	31%	61%
The educational environment foster collegiality and respect	1%	1%	3%	22%	73%
The policies against discrimination are adequate and appropriate	1%	0%	4%	22%	73%
The school presents clear guidelines for behavior during pre-clinical years	1%	1%	5%	21%	72%
The school presents clear guidelines for behavior during clinical years	1%	0%	16%	20%	63%
I have been mistreated during medical school	73%	7%	6%	2%	11%
I have witnessed the mistreatment of another student during medicals school	63%	9%	9%	6%	13%

Table 16. Selected high and low satisfaction points from the professionalism portion of the student self study report. Number of response = 168.

Summary

Overall, students are aware of and in agreement with what is expected of their professional behavior. Professionalism topics addressed in the survey returned an agreeable rate near 74% without a great (<5%) disagreeable rate. Two questions were asked about mistreatment during medical school, and of all the individual responses (n=335), 76% of students report that they have not been mistreated nor witnessed mistreatment.

Weaknesses

One important area of concern is reported mistreatment of students during medical school. The three year combined response indicates 13% of students report mistreatment and 19% report witnessing mistreatment. Individual class responses demonstrate higher mistreatment incidence in MSII and MSIII classes as compared to the MSI class. While the MSI class (n=82) reports that 6% have been mistreated, there is a threefold increase in MSII and MSIII classes. Similar trends exist with students that have witnessed mistreatment among classmates. These high numbers could be attributed to the ambiguous and broad definition of the word “mistreatment” or some students could have subconsciously substituted the word “not” into the question resulting in a reversed response. In order to understand the nature of this mistreatment, it will be necessary to ask more focused questions in the future or re-word the questions. Upon further questioning of our fellow students concerning how to improve the topic of

professionalism, students wish to have a greater ability to respond to and challenge their own professionalism profile. Furthermore, students would like to have more focused and detailed feedback from the faculty and staff regarding their professional behavior and other attributes displayed beyond exam performance. Finally, there was a small increase in the MSIII students who were not as aware of the guidelines for professionalism, which can possibly be attributed to their transition into the third-year clinical setting where new professionalism standards are required.

Strengths

Many strong points were observed among the professionalism survey questions. Collectively, 89% of students (n=167) either agree or strongly agree that professionalism guidelines are made clear to them. In addition, 92% of students reported that they know where to go for help in the case of student mistreatment, and 95% of students agree that the educational environment fosters both collegiality and respect. Despite the small reported incidence of mistreatment, 95% of the student response reported that policies regarding forms of discrimination were adequate and appropriate. In the previous report, 15.8% of students felt the administration did not do a good job of presenting clear and adequate guidelines of expected behavior during the pre-clinical years; however, in the most recent survey, only 2% of the students reported feeling unclear, suggesting that efforts to make pre-clinical behavior expectations more transparent have been successful. Overall, a majority of the professionalism questions resulted in an agreeable response of >90% with a disagreeable rate <5%, indicating a strong satisfaction with the professionalism component of medical school.

Faculty & Administration

	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
The administration is aware of student concerns	1%	2%	4%	25%	68%
The administration responds appropriately to student concerns and feedback	2%	2%	6%	29%	60%
There is adequate representation on key medical school committees	1%	1%	5%	23%	70%
End of unit evaluations allow me to communicate my views and concerns	1%	1%	4%	28%	65%
I am given adequate opportunities to provide feedback about student life	1%	0%	7%	29%	63%
There are enough faculty to meet students' needs	1%	3%	3%	26%	67%
The medical school faculty are available to me	0%	0%	2%	18%	80%
The medical school administration are available to me	1%	0%	2%	21%	76%
I feel comfortable talking to the administration	2%	1%	2%	24%	71%
The administration maintains open communication with the student body	1%	1%	4%	21%	73%
The administration has a genuine desire for students to succeed	1%	1%	2%	16%	80%

Table 17. Reported high and low satisfaction points regarding the faculty and administration portion of the student self study report. Number of responses = 168.

Summary

Overall, students were extremely satisfied with the faculty and administration. Of all individual responses to the faculty and administration questions (n=1842), 94% were either somewhat or very satisfied. This was embodied by a single student comment, "I could not have imagined a more caring and helpful faculty. Every single professor I have talked with shows genuine concern about students' wellbeing and their feelings toward the curriculum."

Weaknesses

Although the overall satisfaction of the faculty and administration was positive, the current MSIIs did have an overall dissatisfaction rate of 5%, ranking the amount of faculty (11% dissatisfaction), the perception of administration's genuine desire for students to succeed (8% dissatisfaction), and the opinion that the administration responds appropriately to student concerns and feedback (7% dissatisfaction) lower than other categories. There were no comments reflecting the reasons for these ratings, and based on the low level of dissatisfaction no changes are recommended.

Strengths

As stated in the summary, the overall satisfaction of the faculty and administration was 94% (no item ranked under 90% satisfaction). Specifically, the availability of the faculty and administration rated with 98% and 97% satisfaction, respectively. This response rate owes itself to the fact that the professors and administrators have such a great open door policy and are genuinely invested in the success of the students.

APPENDIX A- COMPLETE SURVEY DATA

Educational Program

In regards to your overall experience, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

1. Overall quality of the first-year curriculum	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	2% (2)	26% (21)	71% (58)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	0% (0)	33% (19)	61% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	39% (11)	43% (12)
Combined	167	1% (2)	1% (2)	4% (7)	31% (51)	63% (105)
2. Coordination/integration of content in the first year						
MSI	80	0% (0)	1% (1)	3% (2)	20% (16)	76% (61)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	0% (0)	32% (18)	63% (36)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	36% (10)	46% (13)
Combined	165	1% (1)	2% (3)	4% (7)	27% (44)	67% (110)
3. Overall quality of the second-year curriculum						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	54% (44)	6% (5)	40% (32)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	0% (0)	33% (19)	61% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	29% (8)	50% (14)
Combined	166	1% (2)	1% (1)	30% (50)	19% (32)	49% (81)
4. Coordination/integration of content in the second year						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	52% (42)	7% (6)	41% (33)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	2% (1)	32% (18)	61% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	32% (9)	50% (14)
Combined	166	1% (2)	1% (1)	29% (48)	20% (33)	49% (82)
5. Opportunities to engage in self-directed, independent learning in the first and second years						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (8)	18% (15)	72% (59)
MSII	56	2% (1)	4% (2)	0% (0)	25% (14)	70% (39)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	46% (13)	39% (11)
Combined	166	1% (1)	1% (2)	7% (12)	25% (42)	66% (109)
6. Overall workload in the first and second years						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (10)	21% (17)	67% (55)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	4% (2)	32% (18)	60% (34)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	29% (8)	50% (14)
Combined	167	1% (2)	1% (1)	11% (18)	26% (43)	62% (103)
7. Balance between school activities and personal time						
MSI	82	0% (0)	5% (4)	6% (5)	29% (24)	60% (49)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	2% (1)	32% (18)	61% (35)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	17% (5)	31% (9)	48% (14)
Combined	168	1% (1)	4% (7)	7% (11)	30% (51)	58% (98)
8. Educational program as a whole in preparing me to become a good physician						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	17% (14)	80% (66)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	0% (0)	21% (12)	75% (43)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	31% (9)	59% (17)
Combined	168	1% (1)	1% (1)	3% (5)	21% (35)	75% (126)

Masters' Colloquium

In regards to your overall experience (MSI/II) in the *Masters' Colloquium* course, please indicate your level of

satisfaction with the following items:

	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. Clarity of learning objectives						
MSI	81	1% (1)	1% (1)	14% (11)	36% (29)	48% (39)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (4)	39% (22)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	11% (3)	14% (4)	32% (9)	43% (12)
Combined	166	1% (1)	2% (4)	11% (19)	36% (60)	49% (82)
2. Course content addressing the learning objectives						
MSI	77	1% (1)	1% (1)	10% (8)	34% (26)	53% (41)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	7% (4)	42% (24)	49% (28)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	18% (5)	32% (9)	43% (12)
Combined	162	1% (1)	2% (4)	10% (17)	36% (59)	50% (81)
3. Relationship between learning objectives and exam material						
MSI	81	2% (2)	2% (2)	17% (14)	32% (26)	46% (37)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	11% (6)	39% (22)	49% (28)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	7% (2)	18% (5)	29% (8)	43% (12)
Combined	166	2% (4)	2% (4)	15% (25)	34% (56)	46% (77)
4. Representation of course content on exams						
MSI	81	2% (2)	2% (2)	20% (16)	28% (23)	47% (38)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	14% (8)	30% (17)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	11% (3)	25% (7)	14% (4)	46% (13)
Combined	166	2% (4)	3% (5)	19% (31)	27% (44)	49% (82)
5. Exams as a fair representation of your learning						
MSI	81	0% (0)	2% (2)	20% (16)	31% (25)	47% (38)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	16% (9)	35% (20)	49% (28)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	14% (4)	25% (7)	14% (4)	46% (13)
Combined	166	0% (0)	4% (6)	19% (32)	30% (49)	48% (79)
6. Speed at which grades are reported						
MSI	81	2% (2)	2% (2)	11% (9)	31% (25)	53% (43)
MSII	56	0% (0)	4% (2)	9% (5)	39% (22)	48% (27)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	21% (6)	29% (8)	46% (13)
Combined	165	1% (2)	3% (5)	12% (20)	33% (55)	50% (83)
7. Grading criteria						
MSI	81	0% (0)	1% (1)	11% (9)	31% (25)	57% (46)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	9% (5)	33% (19)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	21% (6)	25% (7)	46% (13)
Combined	166	0% (0)	3% (5)	12% (20)	31% (51)	54% (90)
8. Quality of feedback on your coursework						
MSI	81	0% (0)	5% (4)	14% (11)	30% (24)	52% (42)
MSII	57	4% (2)	4% (2)	12% (7)	30% (17)	51% (29)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	18% (5)	32% (9)	43% (12)
Combined	166	1% (2)	5% (8)	14% (23)	30% (50)	50% (83)
9. Course organization						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (11)	31% (25)	56% (45)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	5% (3)	35% (20)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	14% (4)	32% (9)	46% (13)
Combined	166	2% (3)	1% (2)	11% (18)	33% (54)	54% (89)
10. Use of allotted time						

MSI	81	1% (1)	6% (5)	19% (15)	23% (19)	51% (41)
MSII	57	5% (3)	5% (3)	16% (9)	33% (19)	40% (23)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	18% (5)	32% (9)	43% (12)
Combined	166	3% (5)	5% (9)	17% (29)	28% (47)	46% (76)
11. Teaching methods						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	11% (9)	34% (28)	52% (43)
MSII	57	2% (1)	7% (4)	5% (3)	26% (15)	60% (34)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	11% (3)	32% (9)	54% (15)
Combined	167	1% (1)	4% (7)	9% (15)	31% (52)	55% (92)
12. Quality of teaching						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	7% (6)	29% (24)	62% (51)
MSII	56	2% (1)	2% (1)	7% (4)	27% (15)	63% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	11% (3)	29% (8)	57% (16)
Combined	166	1% (1)	2% (3)	8% (13)	28% (47)	61% (102)
13. Assigned reading material						
MSI	81	0% (0)	1% (1)	16% (13)	22% (18)	60% (49)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	14% (8)	32% (18)	53% (30)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	21% (6)	32% (9)	43% (12)
Combined	166	1% (1)	1% (2)	16% (27)	27% (45)	55% (91)
14. Active learning opportunities						
MSI	81	0% (0)	2% (2)	12% (10)	27% (22)	58% (47)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	11% (6)	30% (17)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	11% (3)	21% (6)	18% (5)	50% (14)
Combined	166	1% (2)	4% (6)	13% (22)	27% (44)	55% (92)
15. Overall course quality						
MSI	82	1% (1)	2% (2)	10% (8)	30% (25)	56% (46)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	4% (2)	40% (23)	51% (29)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	25% (7)	21% (6)	50% (14)
Combined	167	1% (2)	3% (5)	10% (17)	32% (54)	53% (89)
16. Course content in preparing you for the USMLE exams						
MSI	82	4% (3)	1% (1)	29% (24)	28% (23)	38% (31)
MSII	56	5% (3)	4% (2)	11% (6)	36% (20)	45% (25)
MSIII	27	4% (1)	15% (4)	15% (4)	26% (7)	41% (11)
Combined	165	4% (7)	4% (7)	21% (34)	30% (50)	41% (67)
17. Relationship between SPM and Masters' Colloquium content						
MSI	82	4% (3)	1% (1)	21% (17)	33% (27)	41% (34)
MSII	57	4% (2)	5% (3)	23% (13)	28% (16)	40% (23)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	11% (3)	18% (5)	25% (7)	43% (12)
Combined	167	4% (6)	4% (7)	21% (35)	30% (50)	41% (69)
18. Environment as a safe place for expressing opinions						
MSI	81	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (4)	17% (14)	77% (62)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	4% (2)	30% (17)	65% (37)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	11% (3)	11% (3)	25% (7)	50% (14)
Combined	166	1% (1)	3% (5)	5% (9)	23% (38)	68% (113)
19. Topics addressed being up-to-date						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (4)	19% (15)	77% (62)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	4% (2)	26% (15)	68% (39)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	29% (8)	57% (16)
Combined	166	1% (1)	0% (0)	6% (10)	23% (38)	70% (117)
20. Variety of topics						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (4)	17% (14)	78% (63)

MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (3)	25% (14)	70% (40)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	36% (10)	54% (15)
Combined	166	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (10)	23% (38)	71% (118)
21. Writing assignments						
MSI	82	1% (1)	11% (9)	7% (6)	33% (27)	48% (39)
MSII	57	5% (3)	9% (5)	14% (8)	28% (16)	44% (25)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	11% (3)	14% (4)	39% (11)	36% (10)
Combined	167	2% (4)	10% (17)	11% (18)	32% (54)	44% (74)
22. Instruction on ethics						
MSI	82	1% (1)	0% (0)	9% (7)	24% (20)	66% (54)
MSII	57	4% (2)	4% (2)	5% (3)	33% (19)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	32% (9)	50% (14)
Combined	167	2% (3)	1% (2)	9% (15)	29% (48)	59% (99)

Medical Skills

In regards to your overall experience (MSI/II) in the ***Medical Skills*** course, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

1. Clarity of learning objectives	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	13% (11)	85% (70)
MSII	56	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (3)	13% (7)	82% (46)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	7% (2)	82% (23)
Combined	166	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (7)	12% (20)	84% (139)
2. Course content addressing the learning objectives						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	11% (9)	87% (71)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (2)	14% (8)	82% (47)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	7% (2)	82% (23)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (7)	11% (19)	84% (141)
3. Relationship between learning objectives and exam material						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	10% (8)	89% (73)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (2)	14% (8)	82% (47)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	7% (2)	79% (22)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (7)	11% (18)	85% (142)
4. Representation of course content on exams						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	13% (11)	85% (70)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	4% (2)	16% (9)	79% (45)
MSIII	27	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (4)	4% (1)	81% (22)
Combined	166	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (7)	13% (21)	83% (137)
5. Exams as a fair representation of your learning						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	17% (14)	82% (67)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (2)	25% (14)	72% (41)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	7% (2)	82% (23)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (6)	18% (30)	78% (131)
6. Speed at which grades are reported						
MSI	82	0% (0)	5% (4)	6% (5)	22% (18)	67% (55)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	16% (9)	23% (13)	56% (32)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	7% (2)	18% (5)	71% (20)
Combined	167	1% (1)	4% (7)	10% (16)	22% (36)	64% (107)
7. Grading criteria						

MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	15% (12)	83% (68)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (4)	16% (9)	77% (44)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	18% (5)	75% (21)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (8)	16% (26)	80% (133)
8. Quality of feedback on your coursework						
MSI	81	0% (0)	4% (3)	9% (7)	20% (16)	68% (55)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	7% (4)	18% (10)	72% (41)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	11% (3)	79% (22)
Combined	166	1% (1)	2% (4)	8% (14)	17% (29)	71% (118)
9. Course organization						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	11% (9)	87% (71)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	18% (10)	81% (46)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	7% (2)	82% (23)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (6)	13% (21)	84% (140)
10. Use of allotted time						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	10% (8)	88% (72)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	7% (4)	9% (5)	82% (47)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	7% (2)	82% (23)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (9)	9% (15)	85% (142)
11. Teaching methods						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	9% (7)	89% (73)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	18% (10)	81% (46)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	11% (3)	79% (22)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (6)	12% (20)	84% (141)
12. Quality of teaching						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	5% (4)	93% (75)
MSII	56	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	16% (9)	82% (46)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	11% (3)	82% (23)
Combined	165	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (5)	10% (16)	87% (144)
13. Assigned reading material						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	13% (11)	83% (68)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (3)	18% (10)	77% (44)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	14% (4)	75% (21)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (9)	15% (25)	80% (133)
14. Active learning opportunities						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	10% (8)	89% (73)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (2)	14% (8)	82% (47)
MSIII	27	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	11% (3)	78% (21)
Combined	166	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (6)	11% (19)	85% (141)
15. Overall course quality						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (4)	94% (77)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	14% (8)	84% (48)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	7% (2)	86% (24)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (4)	8% (14)	89% (149)
16. Course content in preparing you for the USMLE exams						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (8)	20% (16)	71% (58)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (7)	14% (8)	74% (42)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	21% (6)	61% (17)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (20)	18% (30)	70% (117)
17. Relationship between SPM and Medical skills content						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	10% (8)	87% (71)

MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (2)	11% (6)	86% (49)
MSIII	27	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	15% (4)	74% (20)
Combined	166	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (8)	11% (18)	84% (140)
18. Preparatory materials						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	1% (1)	11% (9)	87% (71)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (2)	18% (10)	79% (45)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	7% (2)	82% (23)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (6)	13% (21)	83% (139)
19. Skill building sessions						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (10)	88% (71)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	5% (3)	16% (9)	77% (44)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	14% (4)	75% (21)
Combined	166	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (6)	14% (23)	82% (136)
20. Standardized patient encounters						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	16% (13)	83% (67)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	4% (2)	16% (9)	79% (45)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	14% (4)	75% (21)
Combined	166	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (6)	16% (26)	80% (133)
21. Feedback from the standardized patients						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	2% (2)	24% (20)	72% (59)
MSII	57	2% (1)	5% (3)	2% (1)	30% (17)	61% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	21% (6)	68% (19)
Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (4)	4% (6)	26% (43)	68% (113)
22. Instruction on how to communicate with patients						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	1% (1)	12% (10)	85% (70)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (3)	18% (10)	77% (44)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	14% (4)	75% (21)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (7)	14% (24)	81% (135)
23. Instruction on how to communicate with other health care professionals						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	6% (5)	26% (21)	67% (55)
MSII	56	0% (0)	2% (1)	9% (5)	21% (12)	68% (38)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	21% (6)	61% (17)
Combined	166	0% (0)	1% (2)	9% (15)	23% (39)	66% (110)
24. Preparation for clinical clerkships						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (5)	11% (9)	83% (68)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	4% (2)	12% (7)	82% (47)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	14% (4)	75% (21)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	6% (10)	12% (20)	81% (136)
25. Confidence in performing the skills learned in the course						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	23% (19)	76% (62)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	2% (1)	30% (17)	67% (38)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	21% (6)	68% (19)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	3% (5)	25% (42)	71% (119)

Scholarly Activity and Research Program

In regards to your overall experience in the *Scholarly Activity and Research Program*, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

1. Clarity of learning objectives	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	28% (23)	27% (22)	44% (36)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	18% (10)	37% (21)	42% (24)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	14% (4)	25% (7)	39% (11)	18% (5)
Combined	167	1% (1)	4% (7)	24% (40)	32% (54)	39% (65)
2. Course content addressing the learning objectives						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	30% (25)	22% (18)	46% (38)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	16% (9)	35% (20)	46% (26)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	43% (12)	32% (9)	18% (5)
Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (4)	28% (46)	28% (47)	41% (69)
3. Grading as a fair representation of your learning						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	42% (34)	14% (11)	44% (36)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	19% (11)	25% (14)	53% (30)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	7% (2)	36% (10)	32% (9)	21% (6)
Combined	166	1% (1)	2% (4)	33% (55)	20% (34)	43% (72)
4. Speed at which grades are reported						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	46% (38)	16% (13)	38% (31)
MSII	56	0% (0)	4% (2)	27% (15)	23% (13)	46% (26)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	43% (12)	25% (7)	25% (7)
Combined	166	0% (0)	2% (4)	39% (65)	20% (33)	39% (64)
5. Grading criteria						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	39% (32)	16% (13)	45% (37)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	18% (10)	28% (16)	51% (29)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	36% (10)	39% (11)	18% (5)
Combined	167	0% (0)	2% (4)	31% (52)	24% (40)	43% (71)
6. Level of feedback provided at each phase of your project						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	43% (35)	15% (12)	42% (34)
MSII	57	0% (0)	11% (6)	11% (6)	32% (18)	47% (27)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	46% (13)	25% (7)	21% (6)
Combined	166	1% (1)	4% (7)	33% (54)	22% (37)	40% (67)
7. Quality of feedback on your coursework						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	44% (36)	15% (12)	41% (34)
MSII	57	0% (0)	9% (5)	12% (7)	32% (18)	47% (27)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	46% (13)	29% (8)	18% (5)
Combined	167	1% (1)	4% (6)	34% (56)	23% (38)	40% (66)
8. Course organization						
MSI	82	1% (1)	2% (2)	28% (23)	21% (17)	48% (39)
MSII	57	2% (1)	9% (5)	12% (7)	33% (19)	44% (25)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	11% (3)	43% (12)	29% (8)	18% (5)
Combined	167	1% (2)	6% (10)	25% (42)	26% (44)	41% (69)
9. Quality of instruction						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	28% (23)	17% (14)	52% (43)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	18% (10)	32% (18)	46% (26)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	11% (3)	43% (12)	29% (8)	18% (5)
Combined	167	1% (1)	4% (7)	27% (45)	24% (40)	44% (74)
10. Active learning opportunities						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (27)	12% (10)	54% (44)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	18% (10)	25% (14)	56% (32)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	32% (9)	43% (12)	21% (6)

Combined	166	0% (0)	1% (2)	28% (46)	22% (36)	49% (82)
11. Overall course quality						
MSI	81	0% (0)	1% (1)	31% (25)	20% (16)	48% (39)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	19% (11)	30% (17)	51% (29)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	36% (10)	39% (11)	21% (6)
Combined	166	0% (0)	1% (2)	28% (46)	27% (44)	45% (74)
12. Course as an introduction to research methods						
MSI	81	0% (0)	1% (1)	28% (23)	21% (17)	49% (40)
MSII	57	2% (1)	5% (3)	9% (5)	33% (19)	51% (29)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	14% (4)	36% (10)	32% (9)	18% (5)
Combined	166	1% (1)	5% (8)	23% (38)	27% (45)	45% (74)
13. Timetable to complete your SARP project						
MSI	81	2% (2)	1% (1)	21% (17)	21% (17)	54% (44)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	7% (4)	33% (19)	56% (32)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	11% (3)	29% (8)	32% (9)	29% (8)
Combined	166	2% (3)	3% (5)	17% (29)	27% (45)	51% (84)
14. Communication with SARP course directors						
MSI	82	0% (0)	4% (3)	(16)	16% (13)	61% (50)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	11% (6)	25% (14)	61% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	29% (8)	36% (10)	29% (8)
Combined	167	0% (0)	4% (7)	18% (30)	22% (37)	56% (93)
15. Variety of research topics available						
MSI	82	1% (1)	1% (1)	18% (15)	20% (16)	60% (49)
MSII	56	2% (1)	4% (2)	11% (6)	23% (13)	61% (34)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	32% (9)	25% (7)	36% (10)
Combined	166	1% (2)	3% (5)	18% (30)	22% (36)	56% (93)
16. Resources available at all stages of your SARP project						
MSI	82	0% (0)	4% (3)	28% (23)	21% (17)	48% (39)
MSII	56	2% (1)	5% (3)	16% (9)	30% (17)	46% (26)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	39% (11)	32% (9)	25% (7)
Combined	166	1% (1)	4% (7)	26% (43)	26% (43)	43% (72)
17. Funding opportunities for your SARP project						
MSI	82	2% (2)	6% (5)	45% (37)	16% (13)	30% (25)
MSII	57	4% (2)	9% (5)	23% (13)	30% (17)	35% (20)
MSIII	29	3% (1)	14% (4)	48% (14)	21% (6)	14% (4)
Combined	168	3% (5)	8% (14)	38% (64)	21% (36)	29% (49)

Scientific Principles of Medicine

In regards to your overall experience (MSI/II) in the *Scientific Principles of Medicine* course, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

1. Clarity of learning objectives	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	28% (23)	68% (56)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	5% (3)	33% (19)	60% (34)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	25% (7)	32% (9)	36% (10)
Combined	167	0% (0)	2% (3)	8% (13)	31% (51)	60% (100)
2. Course content addressing the learning objectives						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	35% (28)	63% (51)
MSII	56	0% (0)	4% (2)	2% (1)	38% (21)	57% (32)

MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	14% (4)	46% (13)	32% (9)
Combined	165	0% (0)	2% (4)	4% (7)	38% (62)	56% (92)
3. Relationship between learning objectives and exam material						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (3)	24% (20)	71% (58)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	5% (3)	35% (20)	56% (32)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	14% (4)	46% (13)	36% (10)
Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (3)	6% (10)	32% (53)	60% (100)
4. Representation of course content on exams						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	6% (5)	34% (28)	59% (48)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	2% (1)	39% (22)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	14% (4)	39% (11)	39% (11)
Combined	167	1% (1)	3% (5)	6% (10)	37% (61)	54% (90)
5. Exams as a fair representation of your learning						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	6% (5)	26% (21)	66% (54)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	5% (3)	33% (19)	56% (32)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	18% (5)	39% (11)	39% (11)
Combined	167	1% (1)	3% (5)	8% (13)	31% (51)	58% (97)
6. Speed at which grades are reported						
MSI	81	1% (1)	2% (2)	9% (7)	37% (30)	51% (41)
MSII	57	2% (1)	7% (4)	16% (9)	35% (20)	40% (23)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	11% (3)	14% (4)	36% (10)	36% (10)
Combined	166	2% (3)	5% (9)	12% (20)	36% (60)	45% (74)
7. Grading criteria						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	20% (16)	79% (64)
MSII	55	0% (0)	4% (2)	4% (2)	36% (20)	56% (31)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	25% (7)	61% (17)
Combined	164	0% (0)	1% (2)	4% (7)	26% (43)	68% (112)
8. Quality of feedback on your coursework						
MSI	82	0% (0)	5% (4)	9% (7)	29% (24)	57% (47)
MSII	57	4% (2)	9% (5)	7% (4)	33% (19)	47% (27)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	21% (6)	36% (10)	36% (10)
Combined	167	1% (2)	7% (11)	10% (17)	32% (53)	50% (84)
9. Course organization						
MSI	82	1% (1)	2% (2)	2% (2)	38% (31)	56% (46)
MSII	57	0% (0)	9% (5)	0% (0)	40% (23)	51% (29)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	25% (7)	32% (9)	36% (10)
Combined	167	1% (1)	5% (9)	5% (9)	38% (63)	51% (85)
10. Use of allotted time						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	5% (4)	34% (28)	59% (48)
MSII	57	0% (0)	14% (8)	7% (4)	39% (22)	40% (23)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	21% (6)	39% (11)	32% (9)
Combined	167	0% (0)	7% (12)	8% (14)	37% (61)	48% (80)
11. Teaching methods						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	37% (30)	61% (50)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	9% (5)	39% (22)	49% (28)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	50% (14)	29% (8)
Combined	167	1% (1)	1% (1)	8% (13)	40% (66)	51% (86)
12. Quality of teaching						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	33% (27)	66% (54)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	4% (2)	47% (27)	44% (25)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	14% (4)	43% (12)	39% (11)

Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (3)	4% (7)	40% (66)	54% (90)
13. Assigned reading material						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (9)	30% (25)	59% (48)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	11% (6)	39% (22)	47% (27)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	14% (4)	18% (5)	36% (10)	29% (8)
Combined	167	1% (1)	4% (6)	12% (20)	34% (57)	50% (83)
14. Active learning opportunities						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (6)	23% (19)	69% (56)
MSII	56	0% (0)	2% (1)	4% (2)	36% (20)	59% (33)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	14% (4)	43% (12)	39% (11)
Combined	165	0% (0)	1% (2)	7% (12)	31% (51)	61% (100)
15. Overall course quality						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	21% (17)	78% (64)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	2% (1)	32% (18)	63% (36)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	43% (12)	39% (11)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (2)	4% (7)	28% (47)	66% (111)
16. Course content in preparing you for the USMLE exams						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (8)	26% (21)	65% (53)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	9% (5)	49% (28)	39% (22)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	11% (3)	21% (6)	46% (13)	21% (6)
Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (4)	11% (19)	37% (62)	49% (81)
17. Balance between scheduled and independent study time						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	2% (2)	21% (17)	74% (61)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (3)	26% (15)	68% (39)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (7)	32% (9)	43% (12)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (2)	7% (12)	25% (41)	67% (112)
18. Integration of disciplines						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	13% (11)	85% (70)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	5% (3)	18% (10)	75% (43)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	14% (4)	43% (12)	39% (11)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (2)	5% (8)	20% (33)	74% (124)
19. Lecture sessions						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (4)	33% (27)	61% (50)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	4% (2)	42% (24)	53% (30)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	54% (15)	25% (7)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (2)	7% (12)	40% (66)	52% (87)
20. Self-study sessions						
MSI	82	0% (0)	4% (3)	11% (9)	44% (36)	41% (34)
MSII	57	4% (2)	7% (4)	5% (3)	37% (21)	47% (27)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	18% (5)	36% (10)	39% (11)
Combined	167	1% (2)	5% (9)	10% (17)	40% (67)	43% (72)
21. Worked case examples						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	1% (1)	9% (7)	89% (73)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	9% (5)	89% (51)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	21% (6)	68% (19)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	3% (5)	11% (18)	86% (143)
22. Small group anatomy sessions						
MSI	82	4% (3)	10% (8)	13% (11)	43% (35)	30% (25)
MSII	57	5% (3)	5% (3)	18% (10)	23% (13)	49% (28)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	21% (6)	29% (8)	25% (7)	18% (5)
Combined	167	5% (8)	10% (17)	17% (29)	33% (55)	35% (58)

23. Gross Anatomy labs						
MSI	81	4% (3)	7% (6)	12% (10)	41% (33)	36% (29)
MSII	57	7% (4)	7% (4)	21% (12)	25% (14)	40% (23)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	18% (5)	29% (8)	32% (9)	14% (4)
Combined	166	5% (9)	9% (15)	18% (30)	34% (56)	34% (56)
24. Microbiology labs						
MSI	82	1% (1)	10% (8)	17% (14)	35% (29)	37% (30)
MSII	57	0% (0)	5% (3)	28% (16)	25% (14)	42% (24)
MSIII	28	11% (3)	18% (5)	25% (7)	29% (8)	18% (5)
Combined	167	2% (4)	10% (16)	22% (37)	31% (51)	35% (59)
25. Physiology labs						
MSI	82	1% (1)	4% (3)	26% (21)	34% (28)	35% (29)
MSII	57	0% (0)	11% (6)	19% (11)	28% (16)	42% (24)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	21% (6)	43% (12)	29% (8)
Combined	167	1% (1)	7% (11)	23% (38)	34% (56)	37% (61)
26. Pre-lecture recordings						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	10% (8)	18% (15)	71% (58)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	4% (2)	23% (13)	72% (41)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	18% (5)	39% (11)	39% (11)
Combined	167	1% (1)	1% (2)	9% (15)	23% (39)	66% (110)
27. Post-lecture recordings						
MSI	82	7% (6)	6% (5)	21% (17)	15% (12)	51% (42)
MSII	56	4% (2)	4% (2)	13% (7)	27% (15)	54% (30)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	46% (13)	36% (10)
Combined	166	5% (8)	4% (7)	17% (29)	24% (40)	49% (82)
28. Clinical schemes						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	12% (10)	84% (69)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	7% (4)	28% (16)	63% (36)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	14% (4)	43% (12)	39% (11)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (2)	7% (11)	23% (38)	69% (116)
29. Formative exams						
MSI	82	1% (1)	0% (0)	2% (2)	12% (10)	84% (69)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	0% (0)	21% (12)	77% (44)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	39% (11)	46% (13)
Combined	167	1% (1)	1% (1)	4% (6)	20% (33)	75% (126)
30. Instruction in Behavioral Sciences						
MSI	82	1% (1)	2% (2)	24% (20)	28% (23)	44% (36)
MSII	57	4% (2)	9% (5)	21% (12)	30% (17)	37% (21)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	14% (4)	54% (15)	29% (8)
Combined	167	2% (3)	5% (8)	22% (36)	33% (55)	39% (65)
31. Instruction in Biochemistry						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	12% (10)	87% (71)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	0% (0)	28% (16)	70% (40)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	39% (11)	46% (13)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	3% (5)	22% (37)	74% (124)
32. Instruction in Embryology						
MSI	82	1% (1)	7% (6)	6% (5)	44% (36)	41% (34)
MSII	57	4% (2)	16% (9)	14% (8)	33% (19)	33% (19)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	18% (5)	29% (8)	29% (8)	21% (6)
Combined	167	2% (4)	12% (20)	13% (21)	38% (63)	35% (59)
33. Instruction in Genetics						

MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	7% (6)	34% (28)	57% (47)
MSII	57	0% (0)	5% (3)	5% (3)	44% (25)	46% (26)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	7% (2)	11% (3)	43% (12)	39% (11)
Combined	167	0% (0)	4% (6)	7% (12)	39% (65)	50% (84)
34. Instruction in Gross Anatomy						
MSI	82	5% (4)	9% (7)	11% (9)	44% (36)	32% (26)
MSII	57	7% (4)	9% (5)	11% (6)	32% (18)	42% (24)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	25% (7)	18% (5)	25% (7)	25% (7)
Combined	167	6% (10)	11% (19)	12% (20)	37% (61)	34% (57)
35. Instruction in Histology						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	24% (20)	72% (59)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	5% (3)	30% (17)	63% (36)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	21% (6)	39% (11)	36% (10)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (2)	7% (12)	29% (48)	63% (105)
36. Instruction in Immunology						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	13% (11)	84% (69)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	0% (0)	16% (9)	82% (47)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	43% (12)	43% (12)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (6)	19% (32)	77% (128)
37. Instruction in Microbiology						
MSI	82	2% (2)	15% (12)	11% (9)	33% (27)	39% (32)
MSII	57	7% (4)	7% (4)	12% (7)	25% (14)	49% (28)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	25% (7)	14% (4)	29% (8)	25% (7)
Combined	167	5% (8)	14% (23)	12% (20)	29% (49)	40% (67)
38. Instruction in Neuroanatomy						
MSI	82	4% (3)	7% (6)	11% (9)	33% (27)	45% (37)
MSII	57	5% (3)	2% (1)	5% (3)	33% (19)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	14% (4)	18% (5)	29% (8)	39% (11)
Combined	167	4% (6)	7% (11)	10% (17)	32% (54)	47% (79)
39. Instruction in Pathology						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (8)	90% (74)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	9% (5)	91% (52)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	21% (6)	71% (20)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (2)	11% (19)	87% (146)
40. Instruction in Pharmacology						
MSI	82	6% (5)	13% (11)	12% (10)	40% (33)	28% (23)
MSII	57	21% (12)	19% (11)	25% (14)	19% (11)	16% (9)
MSIII	28	11% (3)	21% (6)	25% (7)	21% (6)	21% (6)
Combined	167	12% (20)	17% (28)	19% (31)	30% (50)	23% (38)
41. Instruction in Physiology						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	22% (18)	76% (62)
MSII	57	4% (2)	4% (2)	11% (6)	47% (27)	35% (20)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	7% (2)	36% (10)	54% (15)
Combined	167	1% (2)	2% (3)	6% (10)	33% (55)	58% (97)

Society, Community and the Individual

In regards to your overall experience (MSI/II) in the *Society, Community and the Individual* course, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

1. Clarity of learning objectives	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	82	1% (1)	2% (2)	15% (12)	34% (28)	48% (39)
MSII	56	7% (4)	9% (5)	13% (7)	36% (20)	36% (20)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	7% (2)	18% (5)	36% (10)	32% (9)
Combined	166	4% (7)	5% (9)	14% (24)	35% (58)	41% (68)
2. Course content addressing the learning objectives						
MSI	82	2% (2)	5% (4)	10% (8)	34% (28)	49% (40)
MSII	56	7% (4)	9% (5)	9% (5)	41% (23)	34% (19)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	7% (2)	14% (4)	39% (11)	32% (9)
Combined	166	5% (8)	7% (11)	10% (17)	37% (62)	41% (68)
3. Relationship between learning objectives and exam material						
MSI	82	1% (1)	5% (4)	10% (8)	26% (21)	59% (48)
MSII	56	7% (4)	9% (5)	13% (7)	39% (22)	32% (18)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	4% (1)	25% (7)	32% (9)	32% (9)
Combined	166	4% (7)	6% (10)	13% (22)	31% (52)	45% (75)
4. Representation of course content on exams						
MSI	80	3% (2)	5% (4)	6% (5)	29% (23)	58% (46)
MSII	56	7% (4)	7% (4)	18% (10)	30% (17)	38% (21)
MSIII	27	7% (2)	7% (2)	22% (6)	33% (9)	30% (8)
Combined	163	5% (8)	6% (10)	13% (21)	30% (49)	46% (75)
5. Exams as a fair representation of your learning						
MSI	82	4% (3)	6% (5)	15% (12)	21% (17)	55% (45)
MSII	56	11% (6)	11% (6)	16% (9)	30% (17)	32% (18)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	7% (2)	25% (7)	32% (9)	29% (8)
Combined	166	7% (11)	8% (13)	17% (28)	26% (43)	43% (71)
6. Speed at which grades are reported						
MSI	82	2% (2)	1% (1)	6% (5)	37% (30)	54% (44)
MSII	56	2% (1)	4% (2)	5% (3)	43% (24)	46% (26)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	11% (3)	39% (11)	43% (12)
Combined	166	2% (4)	2% (4)	7% (11)	39% (65)	49% (82)
7. Grading criteria						
MSI	81	7% (6)	14% (11)	7% (6)	31% (25)	41% (33)
MSII	55	13% (7)	9% (5)	11% (6)	31% (17)	36% (20)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	11% (3)	50% (14)	32% (9)
Combined	164	9% (14)	10% (17)	9% (15)	34% (56)	38% (62)
8. Quality of feedback on your coursework						
MSI	82	6% (5)	6% (5)	13% (11)	29% (24)	45% (37)
MSII	56	4% (2)	11% (6)	18% (10)	34% (19)	34% (19)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	11% (3)	18% (5)	43% (12)	25% (7)
Combined	166	5% (8)	8% (14)	16% (26)	33% (55)	38% (63)
9. Course organization						
MSI	82	7% (6)	5% (4)	18% (15)	33% (27)	37% (30)
MSII	56	13% (7)	11% (6)	20% (11)	21% (12)	36% (20)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	18% (5)	18% (5)	36% (10)	25% (7)
Combined	166	8% (14)	9% (15)	19% (31)	30% (49)	34% (57)
10. Use of allotted time						
MSI	82	12% (10)	12% (10)	9% (7)	34% (28)	33% (27)
MSII	55	13% (7)	11% (6)	18% (10)	25% (14)	33% (18)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	14% (4)	25% (7)	32% (9)	21% (6)

Combined	165	12% (19)	12% (20)	15% (24)	31% (51)	31% (51)
11. Teaching methods						
MSI	82	11% (9)	9% (7)	13% (11)	33% (27)	34% (28)
MSII	56	11% (6)	4% (2)	30% (17)	25% (14)	30% (17)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	18% (5)	21% (6)	32% (9)	25% (7)
Combined	166	10% (16)	8% (14)	20% (34)	30% (50)	31% (52)
12. Quality of teaching						
MSI	82	10% (8)	5% (4)	11% (9)	37% (30)	38% (31)
MSII	56	11% (6)	9% (5)	29% (16)	23% (13)	29% (16)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	11% (3)	25% (7)	32% (9)	25% (7)
Combined	166	10% (16)	7% (12)	19% (32)	31% (52)	33% (54)
13. Assigned reading material						
MSI	81	4% (3)	7% (6)	22% (18)	33% (27)	33% (27)
MSII	56	4% (2)	7% (4)	23% (13)	32% (18)	34% (19)
MSIII	28	11% (3)	14% (4)	21% (6)	25% (7)	29% (8)
Combined	165	5% (8)	8% (14)	22% (37)	32% (52)	33% (54)
14. Active learning opportunities						
MSI	82	2% (2)	4% (3)	11% (9)	27% (22)	56% (46)
MSII	56	4% (2)	5% (3)	14% (8)	32% (18)	45% (25)
MSIII	28	11% (3)	4% (1)	21% (6)	36% (10)	29% (8)
Combined	166	4% (7)	4% (7)	14% (23)	30% (50)	48% (79)
15. Overall course quality						
MSI	81	5% (4)	6% (5)	19% (15)	32% (26)	38% (31)
MSII	56	9% (5)	9% (5)	16% (9)	39% (22)	27% (15)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	11% (3)	25% (7)	32% (9)	29% (8)
Combined	165	6% (10)	8% (13)	19% (31)	35% (57)	33% (54)
16. Course content in preparing you for the USMLE exams						
MSI	82	6% (5)	1% (1)	38% (31)	21% (17)	34% (28)
MSII	57	12% (7)	7% (4)	35% (20)	26% (15)	19% (11)
MSIII	28	11% (3)	11% (3)	39% (11)	18% (5)	21% (6)
Combined	167	9% (15)	5% (8)	37% (62)	22% (37)	27% (45)
17. Relationship between the SPM and SCI content						
MSI	82	6% (5)	6% (5)	29% (24)	34% (28)	24% (20)
MSII	57	12% (7)	11% (6)	19% (11)	42% (24)	16% (9)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	14% (4)	43% (12)	14% (4)	21% (6)
Combined	167	8% (14)	9% (15)	28% (47)	34% (56)	21% (35)
18. Public Health instruction						
MSI	81	4% (3)	4% (3)	20% (16)	32% (26)	41% (33)
MSII	57	5% (3)	0% (0)	19% (11)	40% (23)	35% (20)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	32% (9)	29% (8)	32% (9)
Combined	166	4% (7)	2% (4)	22% (36)	34% (57)	37% (62)
19. Instruction on behavioral and socioeconomic topics						
MSI	80	4% (3)	5% (4)	10% (8)	33% (26)	49% (39)
MSII	57	4% (2)	4% (2)	11% (6)	40% (23)	42% (24)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	0% (0)	32% (9)	36% (10)	29% (8)
Combined	165	4% (6)	4% (6)	14% (23)	36% (59)	43% (71)
20. Instruction on how to communicate with a diverse patient population						
MSI	82	5% (4)	1% (1)	10% (8)	32% (26)	52% (43)
MSII	57	4% (2)	0% (0)	7% (4)	37% (21)	53% (30)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	4% (1)	18% (5)	46% (13)	25% (7)
Combined	167	5% (8)	1% (2)	10% (17)	36% (60)	48% (80)

21. Instruction on addressing violence and abuse						
MSI	82	2% (2)	4% (3)	9% (7)	30% (25)	55% (45)
MSII	57	5% (3)	0% (0)	5% (3)	35% (20)	54% (31)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	4% (1)	21% (6)	43% (12)	29% (8)
Combined	167	4% (6)	2% (4)	10% (16)	34% (57)	50% (84)
22. Instruction on demonstrating cultural sensitivity						
MSI	80	4% (3)	1% (1)	10% (8)	23% (18)	63% (50)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	5% (3)	33% (19)	58% (33)
MSIII	28	11% (3)	4% (1)	14% (4)	46% (13)	25% (7)
Combined	165	4% (7)	2% (3)	9% (15)	30% (50)	55% (90)
23. Instruction on how to recognize your own cultural and gender biases						
MSI	81	5% (4)	1% (1)	10% (8)	28% (23)	56% (45)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	7% (4)	37% (21)	51% (29)
MSIII	28	7% (2)	4% (1)	32% (9)	36% (10)	21% (6)
Combined	166	5% (8)	2% (3)	13% (21)	33% (54)	48% (80)
24. Spanish courses						
MSI	82	7% (6)	11% (9)	9% (7)	34% (28)	39% (32)
MSII	57	5% (3)	7% (4)	14% (8)	33% (19)	40% (23)
MSIII	28	11% (3)	7% (2)	11% (3)	46% (13)	25% (7)
Combined	167	7% (12)	9% (15)	11% (18)	36% (60)	37% (62)
25. Clinic experiences						
MSI	82	2% (2)	2% (2)	7% (6)	22% (18)	66% (54)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	7% (4)	32% (18)	58% (33)
MSIII	28	4% (1)	0% (0)	21% (6)	29% (8)	46% (13)
Combined	167	2% (4)	2% (3)	10% (16)	26% (44)	60% (100)

Family Medicine-Surgery Block

In regards to your overall experience in the *Family Medicine-Surgery Block*, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

Family Medicine	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. Clarity and appropriate use of objectives	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	33% (3)	56% (5)
2. General clerkship organization	8	0% (0)	13% (1)	0% (0)	13% (1)	75% (6)
3. Quality of faculty teaching	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	11% (1)	78% (7)
4. Professionalism of faculty	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
5. Quality of resident teaching	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	67% (6)
6. Professionalism of residents	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
7. End-of-rotation OSCE	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
8. Quality of electives/selectives	9	11% (1)	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	78% (7)
9. Lectures	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	67% (6)
10. Schedules	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
11. Call expectations	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
12. Availability of the Clerkship Director	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	89% (8)
13. Availability of the Clerkship Coordinator	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	89% (8)

14. Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	89% (8)
15. Variety of patient experiences	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	11% (1)	78% (7)
16. Avenues for completing all patient encounters (std. pts, online encounters, or paper cases)	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
17. Level of involvement in patient care	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
18. Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	89% (8)
19. Emphasis and feedback on development of clinical skills	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
20. Observation of clinical skills	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	67% (6)
21. Feedback about your performance during the clerkship	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	89% (8)
22. Fairness of exams and grading	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
23. Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	11% (1)	67% (6)
24. Speed at which grades are reported	9	22% (2)	11% (1)	11% (1)	11% (1)	44% (4)
25. Timeliness of student evaluations	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	67% (6)
26. Instruction in basic science and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)
27. Year 1 and 2 curriculum in preparing you for this clerkship	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (3)	67% (6)
28. Overall clerkship quality	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	78% (7)
Surgery						
1. Clarity and appropriate use of objectives	10	0% (0)	20% (2)	0% (0)	30% (3)	50% (5)
2. General clerkship organization	10	0% (0)	20% (2)	0% (0)	40% (4)	40% (4)
3. Quality of faculty teaching	10	0% (0)	10% (1)	10% (1)	40% (4)	40% (4)
4. Professionalism of faculty	10	10% (1)	0% (0)	10% (1)	50% (5)	30% (3)
5. Quality of resident teaching	10	10% (1)	30% (3)	20% (2)	10% (1)	30% (3)
6. Professionalism of residents	10	10% (1)	20% (2)	20% (2)	20% (2)	30% (3)
7. End-of-rotation OSCE	10	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (1)	30% (3)	60% (6)
8. Quality of electives/selectives	10	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (1)	10% (1)	80% (8)
9. Lectures	10	0% (0)	30% (3)	10% (1)	10% (1)	50% (5)
10. Schedules	10	0% (0)	10% (1)	30% (3)	20% (2)	40% (4)
11. Call expectations	10	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (2)	20% (2)	60% (6)
12. Availability of the	10	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (2)	20% (2)	60% (6)

Clerkship Director						
13. Availability of the Clerkship Coordinator	10	10% (1)	20% (2)	20% (2)	20% (2)	30% (3)
14. Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	10	0% (0)	30% (3)	10% (1)	30% (3)	30% (3)
15. Variety of patient experiences	10	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (5)	50% (5)
16. Avenues for completing all patient encounters (std. pts, online encounters, or paper cases)	10	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (2)	30% (3)	50% (5)
17. Level of involvement in patient care	10	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (1)	50% (5)	40% (4)
18. Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	10	0% (0)	10% (1)	20% (2)	30% (3)	40% (4)
19. Emphasis and feedback on development of clinical skills	10	0% (0)	30% (3)	10% (1)	20% (2)	40% (4)
20. Observation of clinical skills	10	0% (0)	20% (2)	0% (0)	40% (4)	40% (4)
21. Feedback about your performance during the clerkship	10	10% (1)	10% (1)	20% (2)	0% (0)	60% (6)
22. Fairness of exams and grading	10	0% (0)	10% (1)	10% (1)	30% (3)	50% (5)
23. Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	10	0% (0)	10% (1)	20% (2)	30% (3)	40% (4)
24. Speed at which grades are reported	10	10% (1)	10% (1)	20% (2)	10% (1)	50% (5)
25. Timeliness of student evaluations	10	10% (1)	10% (1)	10% (1)	10% (1)	60% (6)
26. Instruction in basic science and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	10	10% (1)	10% (1)	10% (1)	30% (3)	40% (4)
27. Year 1 and 2 curriculum in preparing you for this clerkship	10	0% (0)	20% (2)	20% (2)	20% (2)	40% (4)
28. Overall clerkship quality	10	0% (0)	10% (1)	20% (2)	30% (3)	40% (4)
29. Integration of the two clerkships in this block	9	0% (0)	22% (2)	22% (2)	22% (2)	33% (3)

Internal Medicine-Psychiatry Block

In regards to your overall experience in the *Internal Medicine-Psychiatry Block*, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

Internal Medicine	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. Clarity and appropriate use of objectives	12	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	50% (6)	42% (5)
2. General clerkship organization	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	15% (2)	38% (5)	38% (5)

3. Quality of faculty teaching	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	31% (4)	62% (8)
4. Professionalism of faculty	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	31% (4)	62% (8)
5. Quality of resident teaching	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	46% (6)	38% (5)
6. Professionalism of residents	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	54% (7)	46% (6)
7. End-of-rotation OSCE	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	54% (7)	31% (4)
8. Quality of electives/selectives	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	38% (5)	54% (7)
9. Lectures	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	46% (6)	38% (5)
10. Schedules	12	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (2)	42% (5)	42% (5)
11. Call expectations	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	0% (0)	54% (7)	38% (5)
12. Availability of the Clerkship Director	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	31% (4)	54% (7)
13. Availability of the Clerkship Coordinator	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	31% (4)	38% (5)	31% (4)
14. Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	13	15% (2)	31% (4)	15% (2)	15% (2)	23% (3)
15. Variety of patient experiences	12	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (2)	83% (10)
16. Avenues for completing all patient encounters (std. pts, online encounters, or paper cases)	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	15% (2)	69% (9)
17. Level of involvement in patient care	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	46% (6)	54% (7)
18. Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	46% (6)	54% (7)
19. Emphasis and feedback on development of clinical skills	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	38% (5)	46% (6)
20. Observation of clinical skills	12	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	42% (5)	42% (5)
21. Feedback about your performance during the clerkship	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	46% (6)	46% (6)
22. Fairness of exams and grading	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	0% (0)	77% (10)	15% (2)
23. Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	13	8% (1)	15% (2)	8% (1)	46% (6)	23% (3)
24. Speed at which grades are reported	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	38% (5)	31% (4)	23% (3)
25. Timeliness of student evaluations	13	0% (0)	15% (2)	23% (3)	38% (5)	23% (3)
26. Instruction in basic science and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	13	0% (0)	15% (2)	15% (2)	46% (6)	23% (3)
27. Year 1 and 2 curriculum in preparing you for this clerkship	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	31% (4)	54% (7)
28. Overall clerkship quality	12	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (2)	33% (4)	50% (6)
Psychiatry						
1. Clarity and appropriate use	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)

of objectives						
2. General clerkship organization	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	85% (11)
3. Quality of faculty teaching	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	85% (11)
4. Professionalism of faculty	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
5. Quality of resident teaching	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
6. Professionalism of residents	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
7. End-of-rotation OSCE	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
8. Quality of electives/selectives	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	85% (11)
9. Lectures	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
10. Schedules	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
11. Call expectations	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
12. Availability of the Clerkship Director	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
13. Availability of the Clerkship Coordinator	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
14. Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
15. Variety of patient experiences	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
16. Avenues for completing all patient encounters (std. pts, online encounters, or paper cases)	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	23% (3)	77% (10)
17. Level of involvement in patient care	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	15% (2)	77% (10)
18. Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	15% (2)	77% (10)
19. Emphasis and feedback on development of clinical skills	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	85% (11)
20. Observation of clinical skills	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
21. Feedback about your performance during the clerkship	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
22. Fairness of exams and grading	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)	85% (11)
23. Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)
24. Speed at which grades are reported	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	85% (11)
25. Timeliness of student evaluations	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	85% (11)
26. Instruction in basic science and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	12	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (11)
27. Year 1 and 2 curriculum in preparing you for this clerkship	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (1)	15% (2)	69% (9)
28. Overall clerkship quality	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	92% (12)

29. Integration of the two clerkships in this block	13	0% (0)	8% (1)	15% (2)	15% (2)	62% (8)

Obstetrics and Gynecology-Pediatrics Block

In regards to your overall experience in the *Obstetrics and Gynecology-Pediatrics Block*, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

Obstetrics and Gynecology	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. Clarity and appropriate use of objectives	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	22% (2)	56% (5)
2. General clerkship organization	9	22% (2)	11% (1)	0% (0)	22% (2)	44% (4)
3. Quality of faculty teaching	9	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (0)	22% (2)	56% (5)
4. Professionalism of faculty	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	11% (1)	22% (2)	56% (5)
5. Quality of resident teaching	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	22% (2)	44% (4)
6. Professionalism of residents	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	56% (5)
7. End-of-rotation OSCE	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (3)	11% (1)	56% (5)
8. Quality of electives/selectives	9	11% (1)	0% (0)	33% (3)	11% (1)	44% (4)
9. Lectures	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	33% (3)	56% (5)
10. Schedules	9	11% (1)	11% (1)	22% (2)	22% (2)	33% (3)
11. Call expectations	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (3)	22% (2)	44% (4)
12. Availability of the Clerkship Director	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	33% (3)	56% (5)
13. Availability of the Clerkship Coordinator	9	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	44% (4)	44% (4)
14. Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	33% (3)	33% (3)
15. Variety of patient experiences	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	33% (3)	56% (5)
16. Avenues for completing all patient encounters (std. pts, online encounters, or paper cases)	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	44% (4)	44% (4)
17. Level of involvement in patient care	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	33% (3)	56% (5)
18. Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	33% (3)	56% (5)
19. Emphasis and feedback on development of clinical skills	9	0% (0)	22% (2)	11% (1)	22% (2)	44% (4)
20. Observation of clinical skills	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	33% (3)	44% (4)
21. Feedback about your performance during the clerkship	9	22% (2)	11% (1)	0% (0)	22% (2)	44% (4)
22. Fairness of exams and grading	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	22% (2)	44% (4)
23. Helpfulness in preparing	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	22% (2)	44% (4)

you for the NBME shelf exam						
24. Speed at which grades are reported	9	11% (1)	11% (1)	33% (3)	11% (1)	33% (3)
25. Timeliness of student evaluations	9	11% (1)	0% (0)	22% (2)	33% (3)	33% (3)
26. Instruction in basic science and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	22% (2)	56% (5)
27. Year 1 and 2 curriculum in preparing you for this clerkship	9	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	33% (3)	44% (4)
29. Overall clerkship quality	9	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	56% (5)
Pediatrics						
1. Clarity and appropriate use of objectives	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	50% (4)	38% (3)
2. General clerkship organization	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	50% (4)	38% (3)
3. Quality of faculty teaching	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
4. Professionalism of faculty	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
5. Quality of resident teaching	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	75% (6)	13% (1)
6. Professionalism of residents	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
7. End-of-rotation OSCE	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	38% (3)	25% (2)	38% (3)
8. Quality of electives/selectives	8	13% (1)	0% (0)	38% (3)	25% (2)	25% (2)
9. Lectures	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (2)	38% (3)	38% (3)
10. Schedules	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
11. Call expectations	7	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (1)	43% (3)	43% (3)
12. Availability of the Clerkship Director	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
13. Availability of the Clerkship Coordinator	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	38% (3)	63% (5)
14. Balance between clinical responsibilities and independent study time	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	50% (4)	38% (3)
15. Variety of patient experiences	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	50% (4)	38% (3)
16. Avenues for completing all patient encounters (std. pts, online encounters, or paper cases)	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
17. Level of involvement in patient care	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	75% (6)	13% (1)
18. Faculty/resident supervision of patient care activities	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
19. Emphasis and feedback on development of clinical skills	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
20. Observation of clinical skills	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
21. Feedback about your performance during the clerkship	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)

22. Fairness of exams and grading	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
23. Helpfulness in preparing you for the NBME shelf exam	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	63% (5)	25% (2)
24. Speed at which grades are reported	8	13% (1)	0% (0)	38% (3)	38% (3)	13% (1)
25. Timeliness of student evaluations	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	50% (4)	38% (3)
26. Instruction in basic science and ethical principles of clinical and translational research	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (2)	38% (3)	38% (3)
27. Year 1 and 2 curriculum in preparing you for this clerkship	8	13% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (4)	38% (3)
28. Overall clerkship quality	8	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)
29. Integration of the two clerkships in this block	9	22% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	44% (4)	33% (3)

Educational Resources

In regards to your overall experience, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

1. Length of library checkout periods	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	13% (11)	13% (11)	71% (58)
MSII	57	2% (1)	7% (4)	11% (6)	25% (14)	56% (32)
MSIII	29	7% (2)	3% (1)	0% (0)	31% (9)	59% (17)
Combined	168	2% (3)	4% (7)	10% (17)	20% (34)	64% (107)
2. Library faculty/staff						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (8)	10% (8)	80% (66)
MSII	56	2% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	16% (9)	82% (46)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	17% (5)	79% (23)
Combined	167	1% (1)	0% (0)	5% (9)	13% (22)	81% (135)
3. Accessibility of library services						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (4)	16% (13)	78% (64)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (12)	77% (44)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	17% (5)	79% (23)
Combined	168	1% (1)	1% (1)	3% (5)	18% (30)	78% (131)
4. Quality of library services						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (4)	14% (11)	81% (66)
MSII	56	2% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (11)	79% (44)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (1)	11% (3)	86% (24)
Combined	165	1% (1)	0% (0)	3% (5)	15% (25)	81% (134)
5. Adequacy of library holdings and instructional resources						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (6)	16% (13)	77% (62)
MSII	56	2% (1)	0% (0)	5% (3)	25% (14)	68% (38)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	7% (2)	17% (5)	72% (21)
Combined	166	1% (1)	1% (1)	7% (11)	19% (32)	73% (121)
6. Ease of access to library holdings and instructional resources						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (6)	9% (7)	84% (69)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	5% (3)	23% (13)	70% (40)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	14% (4)	79% (23)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (1)	7% (11)	14% (24)	79% (132)

7. Adequacy and accessibility of library computers						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	9% (7)	7% (6)	84% (69)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	0% (0)	23% (13)	74% (42)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	21% (6)	76% (22)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (2)	5% (8)	15% (25)	79% (133)
8. Adequacy of computer learning resources						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (5)	11% (9)	83% (68)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	2% (1)	25% (14)	72% (41)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	24% (7)	72% (21)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (7)	18% (30)	77% (130)
9. Utility of school or departmental websites						
MSI	82	2% (2)	1% (1)	6% (5)	22% (18)	68% (56)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	7% (4)	18% (10)	74% (42)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	3% (1)	31% (9)	62% (18)
Combined	168	1% (2)	2% (3)	6% (10)	22% (37)	69% (116)
10. Student study space on campus						
MSI	82	0% (0)	6% (5)	9% (7)	17% (14)	68% (56)
MSII	57	2% (1)	16% (9)	7% (4)	25% (14)	51% (29)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	14% (4)	3% (1)	31% (9)	52% (15)
Combined	168	1% (1)	11% (18)	7% (12)	22% (37)	60% (100)
11. Student relaxation space on campus						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	2% (2)	21% (17)	74% (61)
MSII	56	4% (2)	9% (5)	5% (3)	25% (14)	57% (32)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	10% (3)	31% (9)	55% (16)
Combined	167	1% (2)	5% (8)	5% (8)	24% (40)	65% (109)
12. Amenities available to students in the student lounge and gym						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (4)	15% (12)	79% (65)
MSII	57	0% (0)	7% (4)	4% (2)	23% (13)	67% (38)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	34% (10)	62% (18)
Combined	168	0% (0)	3% (5)	4% (7)	21% (35)	72% (121)
13. Testing facilities						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (5)	16% (13)	78% (64)
MSII	57	2% (1)	5% (3)	4% (2)	30% (17)	60% (34)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	10% (3)	28% (8)	59% (17)
Combined	168	1% (1)	2% (4)	6% (10)	23% (38)	68% (115)
14. Lab facilities						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	10% (8)	88% (72)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (2)	33% (19)	63% (36)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	28% (8)	59% (17)
Combined	168	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (8)	21% (35)	74% (125)
15. Lecture hall space (1100, 1200)						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	10% (8)	88% (72)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	0% (0)	19% (11)	77% (44)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	28% (8)	69% (20)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (2)	2% (3)	16% (27)	81% (136)
16. Small group teaching space						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	15% (12)	83% (68)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	0% (0)	26% (15)	72% (41)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	28% (8)	66% (19)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (1)	2% (4)	21% (35)	76% (128)
17. Parking						

MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	5% (4)	13% (11)	79% (65)
MSII	57	7% (4)	14% (8)	7% (4)	35% (20)	37% (21)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	14% (4)	7% (2)	28% (8)	52% (15)
Combined	168	2% (4)	8% (14)	6% (10)	23% (39)	60% (101)
18. Access to secure storage space for belongings						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	12% (10)	84% (68)
MSII	56	4% (2)	13% (7)	5% (3)	16% (9)	63% (35)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	17% (5)	28% (8)	21% (6)	34% (10)
Combined	166	1% (2)	7% (12)	8% (14)	15% (25)	68% (113)

Student Services

In regards to your overall experience, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:

	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. Tutoring program						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (27)	11% (9)	56% (46)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	23% (13)	23% (13)	54% (31)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	45% (13)	14% (4)	41% (12)
Combined	168	0% (0)	0% (0)	32% (53)	15% (26)	53% (89)
2. Academic counseling						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (18)	12% (10)	65% (53)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	14% (8)	26% (15)	58% (33)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	31% (9)	48% (14)
Combined	167	1% (1)	0% (0)	19% (32)	20% (34)	60% (100)
3. Personal and family counseling						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	32% (26)	9% (7)	59% (48)
MSII	56	2% (1)	0% (0)	18% (10)	23% (13)	57% (32)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	41% (12)	17% (5)	41% (12)
Combined	166	1% (1)	0% (0)	29% (48)	15% (25)	55% (92)
4. Medical career advising						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	24% (20)	20% (16)	56% (46)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	11% (6)	30% (17)	58% (33)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	17% (5)	34% (10)	45% (13)
Combined	168	1% (1)	1% (1)	18% (31)	26% (43)	55% (92)
5. Financial aid services						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (4)	13% (11)	82% (67)
MSII	56	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (4)	29% (16)	64% (36)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	28% (8)	59% (17)
Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (12)	21% (35)	72% (120)
6. Debt management counseling						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	27% (22)	12% (10)	60% (49)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	23% (13)	21% (12)	56% (32)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	32% (9)	21% (6)	46% (13)
Combined	167	0% (0)	1% (1)	26% (44)	17% (28)	56% (94)
7. Confidentiality of counseling						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	17% (14)	13% (11)	68% (56)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	12% (7)	19% (11)	63% (36)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	21% (6)	24% (7)	52% (15)
Combined	168	1% (2)	2% (3)	16% (27)	17% (29)	64% (107)
8. Refund policies for fees, tuitions and payments						

MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (16)	15% (12)	66% (54)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	12% (7)	25% (14)	61% (35)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	21% (6)	59% (17)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (1)	17% (29)	19% (32)	63% (106)
9. Accessibility of student financial records						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	16% (13)	12% (10)	71% (58)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (6)	25% (14)	65% (37)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	28% (8)	59% (17)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (1)	14% (23)	19% (32)	67% (112)
10. Access to student health services						
MSI	82	1% (1)	6% (5)	17% (14)	12% (10)	63% (52)
MSII	57	2% (1)	5% (3)	16% (9)	25% (14)	53% (30)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	24% (7)	24% (7)	48% (14)
Combined	168	1% (2)	5% (9)	18% (30)	18% (31)	57% (96)
11. Adequacy of student health services						
MSI	82	0% (0)	6% (5)	20% (16)	12% (10)	62% (51)
MSII	57	2% (1)	5% (3)	18% (10)	25% (14)	51% (29)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	7% (2)	21% (6)	21% (6)	52% (15)
Combined	168	1% (1)	6% (10)	19% (32)	18% (30)	57% (95)
12. Cost of student health services						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	26% (21)	10% (8)	62% (51)
MSII	57	0% (0)	2% (1)	19% (11)	18% (10)	61% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	25% (7)	25% (7)	46% (13)
Combined	167	0% (0)	2% (4)	23% (39)	15% (25)	59% (99)
13. Student health insurance						
MSI	82	0% (0)	9% (7)	28% (23)	12% (10)	51% (42)
MSII	57	5% (3)	16% (9)	28% (16)	12% (7)	39% (22)
MSIII	29	3% (1)	17% (5)	34% (10)	17% (5)	28% (8)
Combined	168	2% (4)	13% (21)	29% (49)	13% (22)	43% (72)
14. Disability insurance						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	44% (36)	7% (6)	48% (39)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	39% (22)	12% (7)	44% (25)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	52% (15)	7% (2)	38% (11)
Combined	168	1% (1)	2% (4)	43% (73)	9% (15)	45% (75)
15. Universal precaution education						
MSI	82	1% (1)	1% (1)	17% (14)	10% (8)	71% (58)
MSII	56	0% (0)	2% (1)	18% (10)	21% (12)	59% (33)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	24% (7)	31% (9)	41% (12)
Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (3)	19% (31)	17% (29)	62% (103)
16. Immunization policies						
MSI	82	1% (1)	2% (2)	4% (3)	21% (17)	72% (59)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (4)	30% (17)	63% (36)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	14% (4)	28% (8)	55% (16)
Combined	168	1% (1)	2% (3)	7% (11)	25% (42)	66% (111)
17. Accessibility to immunizations						
MSI	82	4% (3)	2% (2)	7% (6)	20% (16)	67% (55)
MSII	57	0% (0)	4% (2)	5% (3)	23% (13)	68% (39)
MSIII	29	3% (1)	3% (1)	7% (2)	41% (12)	45% (13)
Combined	168	2% (4)	3% (5)	7% (11)	24% (41)	64% (107)
18. Clarity of student advancement and graduation policies						
MSI	82	1% (1)	1% (1)	11% (9)	15% (12)	72% (59)

MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	2% (1)	33% (19)	61% (35)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	7% (2)	43% (12)	46% (13)
Combined	167	1% (2)	2% (3)	7% (12)	26% (43)	64% (107)
19. Fairness of student advancement and graduation policies						
MSI	80	0% (0)	3% (2)	8% (6)	16% (13)	74% (59)
MSII	57	4% (2)	4% (2)	2% (1)	32% (18)	60% (34)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	41% (12)	45% (13)
Combined	166	1% (2)	2% (4)	7% (11)	26% (43)	64% (106)
20. Clarity of policies and procedures for disciplinary action						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	9% (7)	15% (12)	76% (62)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	7% (4)	28% (16)	60% (34)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	21% (6)	31% (9)	45% (13)
Combined	168	1% (1)	2% (4)	10% (17)	22% (37)	65% (109)
21. Fairness of policies and procedures for disciplinary action						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	6% (5)	17% (14)	76% (62)
MSII	56	4% (2)	4% (2)	5% (3)	30% (17)	57% (32)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	31% (9)	48% (14)
Combined	167	1% (2)	2% (3)	8% (14)	24% (40)	65% (108)
22. Clarity of standards of conduct for faculty and students						
MSI	82	1% (1)	0% (0)	6% (5)	18% (15)	74% (61)
MSII	57	4% (2)	4% (2)	5% (3)	26% (15)	61% (35)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	10% (3)	38% (11)	48% (14)
Combined	168	2% (3)	2% (3)	7% (11)	24% (41)	65% (110)
23. Access to student records for review and challenge						
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	18% (15)	13% (11)	66% (54)
MSII	56	2% (1)	2% (1)	16% (9)	16% (9)	64% (36)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	28% (8)	31% (9)	41% (12)
Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (3)	19% (32)	17% (29)	61% (102)

Educational Environment

In regards to your overall experience, please rate your agreement with each statement:

1. There is appropriate diversity among students, faculty, staff, and other members of the academic community.	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	9% (7)	27% (22)	64% (52)
MSII	57	5% (3)	5% (3)	9% (5)	28% (16)	53% (30)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	10% (3)	3% (1)	28% (8)	59% (17)
Combined	167	2% (3)	4% (6)	8% (13)	28% (46)	59% (99)
2. The school environment helps me learn the basic principles of culturally competent health care.						
MSI	81	0% (0)	1% (1)	2% (2)	23% (19)	73% (59)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	35% (20)	63% (36)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	4% (1)	11% (3)	29% (8)	57% (16)
Combined	166	1% (1)	1% (2)	3% (5)	28% (47)	67% (111)
3. The school environment teaches me to recognize health care disparities and develop solutions to such burdens.						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (4)	25% (20)	70% (57)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	2% (1)	32% (18)	65% (37)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	28% (8)	62% (18)
Combined	167	1% (1)	0% (0)	5% (8)	28% (46)	67% (112)

4. There is adequate opportunity for interaction with other medical disciplines (nursing, pharmacy, etc).

MSI	81	0% (0)	7% (6)	20% (16)	28% (23)	44% (36)
MSII	57	5% (3)	5% (3)	9% (5)	26% (15)	54% (31)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	10% (3)	34% (10)	52% (15)
Combined	167	2% (3)	6% (10)	14% (24)	29% (48)	49% (82)

5. Participation in research is encouraged by the institution.

MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	15% (12)	81% (66)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	4% (2)	30% (17)	63% (36)
MSIII	29	3% (1)	0% (0)	3% (1)	34% (10)	59% (17)
Combined	167	1% (2)	1% (1)	4% (6)	23% (39)	71% (119)

6. The institution encourages student-initiated research projects.

MSI	80	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (5)	19% (15)	75% (60)
MSII	57	4% (2)	0% (0)	2% (1)	33% (19)	61% (35)
MSIII	29	3% (1)	0% (0)	10% (3)	28% (8)	59% (17)
Combined	166	2% (3)	0% (0)	5% (9)	25% (42)	67% (112)

7. Adequate opportunities exist for students who wish to perform research on site.

MSI	81	0% (0)	2% (2)	11% (9)	15% (12)	72% (58)
MSII	56	2% (1)	5% (3)	13% (7)	27% (15)	54% (30)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	17% (5)	31% (9)	48% (14)
Combined	166	1% (1)	4% (6)	13% (21)	22% (36)	61% (102)

8. A variety of research topics are available to pursue.

MSI	81	1% (1)	4% (3)	7% (6)	20% (16)	68% (55)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	11% (6)	28% (16)	58% (33)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (5)	21% (6)	62% (18)
Combined	167	1% (2)	2% (4)	10% (17)	23% (38)	63% (106)

9. I am encouraged to pursue service learning opportunities (structured learning experience that combines community service with preparation and reflection).

MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (5)	21% (17)	73% (60)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (8)	30% (17)	56% (32)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	34% (10)	59% (17)
Combined	168	0% (0)	0% (0)	9% (15)	26% (44)	65% (109)

10. There are sufficient opportunities to pursue service learning.

MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	6% (5)	27% (22)	66% (54)
MSII	57	0% (0)	7% (4)	12% (7)	37% (21)	44% (25)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	28% (8)	59% (17)
Combined	168	0% (0)	3% (5)	10% (16)	30% (51)	57% (96)

11. The service learning opportunities help me understand my civic responsibility as a physician.

MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	10% (8)	21% (17)	68% (56)
MSII	57	2% (1)	4% (2)	16% (9)	30% (17)	49% (28)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	10% (3)	34% (10)	52% (15)
Combined	168	1% (1)	2% (4)	12% (20)	26% (44)	59% (99)

12. Information about community and volunteer opportunities is available to me.

MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (4)	22% (18)	72% (59)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	9% (5)	37% (21)	51% (29)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	34% (10)	62% (18)
Combined	168	1% (1)	1% (2)	6% (10)	29% (49)	63% (106)

Professionalism

In regards to your overall experience, please rate your agreement with each statement:

1. The guidelines for professionalism are made clear to me.	Total Responses	Strongly Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	23% (19)	74% (61)
MSII	56	4% (2)	4% (2)	7% (4)	25% (14)	61% (34)
MSIII	29	3% (1)	10% (3)	17% (5)	34% (10)	34% (10)
Combined	167	2% (3)	3% (5)	7% (11)	26% (43)	63% (105)
2. Professionalism evaluations are helpful to me.						
MSI	82	2% (2)	2% (2)	10% (8)	23% (19)	62% (51)
MSII	57	5% (3)	7% (4)	25% (14)	28% (16)	35% (20)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	17% (5)	17% (5)	31% (9)	34% (10)
Combined	168	3% (5)	7% (11)	16% (27)	26% (44)	48% (81)
3. The methods for evaluating professionalism are fair.						
MSI	82	1% (1)	0% (0)	7% (6)	26% (21)	66% (54)
MSII	57	5% (3)	9% (5)	14% (8)	40% (23)	32% (18)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	17% (5)	17% (5)	28% (8)	38% (11)
Combined	168	2% (4)	6% (10)	11% (19)	31% (52)	49% (83)
4. I know where to go for help in the case of student mistreatment.						
MSI	82	1% (1)	1% (1)	2% (2)	27% (22)	68% (56)
MSII	56	2% (1)	0% (0)	9% (5)	36% (20)	54% (30)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	38% (11)	52% (15)
Combined	167	1% (2)	1% (1)	6% (10)	32% (53)	60% (101)
5. I know where to go for help in the case of sexual harassment.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	2% (2)	26% (21)	71% (58)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (4)	40% (23)	53% (30)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (5)	31% (9)	52% (15)
Combined	168	0% (0)	1% (1)	7% (11)	32% (53)	61% (103)
6. The educational activities to prevent student mistreatment are adequate.						
MSI	82	1% (1)	1% (1)	4% (3)	23% (19)	71% (58)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	5% (3)	37% (21)	53% (30)
MSIII	28	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	39% (11)	50% (14)
Combined	167	2% (3)	1% (2)	5% (9)	31% (51)	61% (102)
7. I have been mistreated during medical school.						
MSI	82	87% (71)	5% (4)	2% (2)	0% (0)	6% (5)
MSII	57	63% (36)	9% (5)	7% (4)	4% (2)	18% (10)
MSIII	29	55% (16)	10% (3)	14% (4)	7% (2)	14% (4)
Combined	168	73% (123)	7% (12)	6% (10)	2% (4)	11% (19)
8. I have witnessed the mistreatment of another student during medical school.						
MSI	82	80% (66)	9% (7)	4% (3)	1% (1)	6% (5)
MSII	56	46% (26)	13% (7)	13% (7)	9% (5)	20% (11)
MSIII	29	45% (13)	3% (1)	17% (5)	14% (4)	21% (6)
Combined	167	63% (105)	9% (15)	9% (15)	6% (10)	13% (22)
9. The educational environment fosters collegiality and respect.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	16% (13)	83% (68)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	4% (2)	25% (14)	67% (38)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	34% (10)	59% (17)
Combined	168	1% (2)	1% (1)	3% (5)	22% (37)	73% (123)
10. The policies against discrimination are adequate and appropriate.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	15% (12)	83% (68)
MSII	57	4% (2)	0% (0)	5% (3)	26% (15)	65% (37)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	34% (10)	59% (17)

Combined	168	1% (2)	0% (0)	4% (7)	22% (37)	73% (122)
11. The school presents clear guidelines for behavior during pre-clinical years.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	15% (12)	83% (68)
MSII	57	2% (1)	2% (1)	2% (1)	28% (16)	67% (38)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (6)	28% (8)	52% (15)
Combined	168	1% (1)	1% (1)	5% (9)	21% (36)	72% (121)
12. The school presents clear guidelines for behavior during clinical years.						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (18)	11% (9)	67% (54)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	7% (4)	28% (16)	63% (36)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	31% (9)	55% (16)
Combined	167	1% (1)	0% (0)	16% (26)	20% (34)	63% (106)

Faculty and Administration

In regards to your overall experience, please rate your agreement with each statement:

1. The administration is aware of student concerns.	Total Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
MSI	82	0% (0)	2% (2)	2% (2)	16% (13)	79% (65)
MSII	56	2% (1)	2% (1)	2% (1)	39% (22)	55% (31)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	24% (7)	62% (18)
Combined	167	1% (1)	2% (3)	4% (7)	25% (42)	68% (114)
2. The administration responds appropriately to student concerns and feedback.						
MSI	81	0% (0)	2% (2)	2% (2)	19% (15)	77% (62)
MSII	57	5% (3)	2% (1)	7% (4)	40% (23)	46% (26)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	3% (1)	14% (4)	38% (11)	45% (13)
Combined	167	2% (3)	2% (4)	6% (10)	29% (49)	60% (101)
3. There is adequate student representation on key medical school committees.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	4% (3)	15% (12)	80% (66)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	4% (2)	30% (17)	61% (35)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	34% (10)	55% (16)
Combined	168	1% (2)	1% (2)	5% (8)	23% (39)	70% (117)
4. End of unit evaluations allow me to communicate my views and concerns.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	2% (2)	22% (18)	74% (61)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	4% (2)	28% (16)	63% (36)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	45% (13)	45% (13)
Combined	168	1% (2)	1% (2)	4% (7)	28% (47)	65% (110)
5. I am given adequate opportunities to provide feedback about student life.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (4)	23% (19)	72% (59)
MSII	56	4% (2)	0% (0)	4% (2)	34% (19)	59% (33)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (5)	34% (10)	48% (14)
Combined	167	1% (2)	0% (0)	7% (11)	29% (48)	63% (106)
6. There are enough faculty members to meet the student's needs.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	24% (20)	73% (60)
MSII	57	2% (1)	9% (5)	4% (2)	28% (16)	58% (33)
MSIII	29	3% (1)	0% (0)	3% (1)	28% (8)	66% (19)
Combined	168	1% (2)	3% (5)	3% (5)	26% (44)	67% (112)
7. The medical school faculty are available to me.						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	12% (10)	86% (70)
MSII	57	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	18% (10)	81% (46)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	34% (10)	62% (18)

Combined	167	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (3)	18% (30)	80% (134)
8. The medical school administration is available to me.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	18% (15)	80% (66)
MSII	57	2% (1)	0% (0)	4% (2)	19% (11)	75% (43)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	34% (10)	62% (18)
Combined	168	1% (1)	0% (0)	2% (4)	21% (36)	76% (127)
9. I feel comfortable talking to the administration.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	1% (1)	1% (1)	22% (18)	76% (62)
MSII	57	5% (3)	0% (0)	4% (2)	21% (12)	70% (40)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	38% (11)	59% (17)
Combined	168	2% (3)	1% (1)	2% (4)	24% (41)	71% (119)
10. The administration maintains open communication with the student body.						
MSI	82	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (3)	15% (12)	82% (67)
MSII	57	4% (2)	2% (1)	2% (1)	21% (12)	72% (41)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	41% (12)	52% (15)
Combined	168	1% (2)	1% (1)	4% (6)	21% (36)	73% (123)
11. The administration has a genuine desire for students to succeed.						
MSI	81	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	11% (9)	86% (70)
MSII	56	4% (2)	4% (2)	0% (0)	18% (10)	75% (42)
MSIII	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	24% (7)	72% (21)
Combined	166	1% (2)	1% (2)	2% (3)	16% (26)	80% (133)