

### AY 2023-24 Clerkship Annual Report

Clerkship	CORE 3401 Surgery		
Timeframe under review	AY 2022-2023		
Length of clerkship 6 weeks			
	Robert Simon, MD - CC		
Clerkship Directors	Kevin El-Hayek, MD - MH		
Clerkship Directors	Emily Steinhagen, MD - UH		
	Jonathan Kwong, MD - VA		

Sections highlighted in blue require the Clerkship Director to complete related to the relevant site, and data highlighted in red indicate areas below the set benchmarks. Sections highlighted in green are to be completed working together with CDs from other sites at the Annual Fall Retreat when individual site reports will be combined into a comprehensive report for each discipline.

#### **Section A: Instructional methodology**

Explain where & how learning opportunities, events and teaching resources are created and mapped in the MD curriculum to achieve LOs.

1) Please provide the percentage of time that medical students spend in inpatient and ambulatory settings in each required clinical clerkship. Please also indicate the total number of didactic hours that students are required to attend.

Site	Clinical Experience - Ambulatory	Clinical Experience -Inpatient	<b>Student Didactics</b>
Site	(% of Total Clerkship Time)	(% of Total Clerkship Time)	(Total Hours)
CCF	10%	90%	10
MHMC	30%	70%	20
UH	20%	80%	32
VA	20%	80%	32

2) Please include a summary of all the Required Clinical Experiences.

Conditions	Site/#of students	% and # of students who completed on patients		% and # of students who did not complete
Abdominal Pain	All 18 clinica	al encounters or sk	ills using patients or a	ternate
Acute Pain Management	methods less than 20% of cases in aggregate or at a particular sit			particular site
Airway Management Breast Pain/Mass/Nipple Discharge				

Cancer	
Chest Pain	
Dysphagia/GERD	
Dyspnea	
ENT Emergency	
Fluid Resuscitation/Shock	
GI Bleeding	
Jaundice	
Nutrition	
Obesity	
Peri-operative Care	
Peripheral Vascular Disease	
Trauma/Acute MSK Emergency	
Wound Infections	

3) Please describe how faculty and Residents/fellows teaching and supervising medical students at each site were prepared for **teaching and assessment roles** (e.g., the learning objectives, system of student assessment, and required clinical encounters). Also describe how site leadership and faculty receive information about **student performance and satisfaction**. This narrative description may include major activities such as preparation meetings, debriefs, and monthly meetings.

Site	Participants (individual/group)	Topic	When/ Frequency	Activity/Outcomes
	Residents	Teaching/assessment	Once per year	The residents are given the goals and objectives at the beginning of each academic year (ie. July). This is reiterated every July throughout the duration of their residency.
CCF		Performance/satisfaction  Teaching/assessment	Twice per year	The residents meet with their staff mentor twice per year after each CCC meeting and go over how they are doing, which includes how they are doing from an educator standpoint. If issues come up in between the CCC that needs to be addressed sooner, then that is taken up on a case by case basis.  At the general surgery staff meetings,
	Faculty		Quarterly	updates are given to the staff about teaching requirements and teaching goals. In addition, this year we had an education retreat that emphasized our goals and objectives for educators.
		Performance/satisfac tion	Annually	They get their feedback once per year at their APR. We have developed a scorecard as well that is a summary of how the staff is doing and this is reviewed with them at their APR.

	Other clerkship directors, clinical assistant deans, or chairs and site leadership	Student performance and satisfaction	Annually	After each retreat we meet and go over the results to discuss areas for improvement.
	Residents	Teaching/assessment	4 times/year	Robust residents as teachers sessions as part of residency educational curriculum
		Performance/satisfac tion	Annually and ongoing as needed	Ongoing throughout the year after evaluations received/Clerkship review at Annual Educational Retreat
МНМС	Eaculty	Teaching/assessment	Quarterly	Grand rounds/M&M session on education
IVIHIVIC	Faculty	Performance/satisfac tion	Annually	Annual performance reviews with division/department chiefs
	Other clerkship directors, clinical assistant deans, or chairs and site leadership	Student performance and satisfaction	Annually	Annual Clerkship Review at Annual Educational Retreat
	Residents	Teaching/assessment	3x per year	Residents as Teachers Sessions
		Performance/satisfac tion	Annually	Clerkship Review/Updates Session
		Teaching/assessment	Quarterly	Faculty Development
UH	Faculty	Performance/satisfac tion	Annually	Clerkship Review/Updates Session
	Other clerkship directors, clinical assistant deans, or chairs and site leadership	Student performance and satisfaction	Annually or by request or need	Meetings/reports
	Residents	Teaching/assessment	3x/year	Residents as teachers sessions at UH
		Performance/satisfac tion	Annually	Clerkship review/Update session
		Teaching/assessment	Quarterly	Faculty development session with UH
VA	Faculty	Performance/satisfac tion	Annually	Performance evaluations with division and department chiefs
	Other clerkship directors, clinical assistant deans, or chairs and site leadership	Student performance and satisfaction	Annually or as needed	Meetings. Plan to move to quarterly during current academic year

**From UH report:** Faculty serve as preceptors on a rotating basis. Each time they are serving as a preceptor, they receive written information that includes the learning objectives, assessments, and clerkship requirements.

In addition, we provide an annual "Clerkship Update" at our Department Meeting (via Zoom). This information is also shared as part of the update. Information about student satisfaction with individual faculty member teaching is delivered at least annually as part of each faculty members' annual

performance review; in addition, specific compliments or concerns are addressed as they are brought up. Faculty are prepared to teach via required educational modules from the medical school, and by optional participation in quarterly faculty development workshops. All of the workshops are also available online for those who wish to view them asynchronously.

We have a robust Residents as Teachers Curriculum – there are 3 to 4 sessions per year that are directly relevant to preparing residents to teach and work with students. Topics vary year to year but may include Teaching on the Wards, Giving Feedback, Teaching through Questions, Addressing Mistreatment in the Surgical Learning Environment, Adult Learning, Teaching as a New Intern, etc. The educational format is usually an interactive workshop. In addition, the Annual Clerkship Update that is given to faculty is also given to residents, sharing information about learning objectives, requirements, student experience, and student satisfaction

# **Section B: Assessment and Evaluation Methodology**

Describe assessment/evaluation tools and indicate how each tool aligns with LOs (if applicable). For each tool, clarify how data were collected and analyzed, and explain how reliability and validity evidence has been sought.

Tool	Description/Mapping	Data collection & analysis	Purpose (S/F)	
NBME	Standardized, externally validated MCQ tests developed by NBME content experts to assess	NBME provided year-end reports, score reports, and content area IA/summary	Summative	
Subject	medical knowledge and patient care	report if there are 6 or more test takers	Summative	
	Assessment tool which assesses 8	Completed by CDs/designated		
EOB Clinical	competencies, comment boxes for each	preceptors at the end of the clerkship		
Performance	competency, final discipline decision, and the	vis CAS	Summative	
Rating	overall content box			
	A record of patient encounters that include	Documented by student about the types		
	conditions and procedures	of patient encounters and what the		
Case log		level of participation was involved with	Summative	
		each encounter. OCA keeping track of		
		the completion		
Surgery Oral	Required observation during clerkship	https://portal.cclcm.ccf.org/cclcm/eport	Summative	
Exam		folio/a_c2_assess.aspx?formid=329	Summative	
Abdominal	Required observation during clerkship	https://portal.cclcm.ccf.org/cclcm/eport	Summative	
Exam		folio/a_c2_assess.aspx?formid=260	Summative	
Formative	Log-based assessment tool assessing patient	Completed by preceptors during the		
Assessment/	care, knowledge, communication,	block via CAS and reviewed by		
Surgery	professionalism, teamwork, SBP, research, and	CDs/designated preceptors	Formative	
Cumulative	reflective practice. The form includes comment		Tormative	
Competency	boxes for each question as well an overall			
Assessment	comment box.			
Self	Four personal reflective questions regarding	Completed by students at the middle of		
Assessment	meeting requirements, strengths, areas for	the clerkship via CAS and reviewed by	Formative	
	improvement, and additional comments.	CDs/designated preceptors		
Mid-clerkship	Three major questions including summary,	Completed by CDs at the middle of the		
Assessment	satisfactory/unsatisfactory, and comments as	clerkship via CAS	Formative	
7.050551110110	well as students' self assessment			
	An evaluation survey eliciting student feedback	Completed by students at the end of		
Student	on the quality of their experience with a focus	each rotation (delivered in Qualtrics)		
Evaluation	on content delivery, required observations,	cash rotation (active ea in qualifies)	Summative	
of Clerkship	workload, the learning environment, and		Sammative	
or erement	strengths and areas for improvement			
Student	An evaluation survey requesting global ratings	Complete by students at the end of each		
Evaluation of	and comments for improvement for faculty	rotation; the number of required faculty	Company of the co	
Clinical	preceptors	evaluations varies by clerkship (student	Summative	
Faculty		expectation in CAS)		

## **Section C: Student Performance**

Illustrate data collected clearly & concisely (presentation of data) and include a narrative and table/figure with averages, percentages, and/or inferential statistics as appropriate to the tool.

1) Please complete the data for assessment methods for each site where students complete a rotation for the clerkship. You can find specific information in the Appendix A.

Assessment	Site	# of	Mean	CTDEV	# Docsing	# Honors	#	Remediation
tool	Site	student	iviean	Mean STDEV	# Passing	Eligible	remediation	results
6.1.	CCF	43	76.1	8.63	17 (40%)	26 (60%)		
	МНМС	59	75.8	9.03	23 (39%)	36 (61%)		
Subject	UH	57	74.8	7.64	24 (42%)	32 (56%)	1 (2%)	Passed
(Passing 50 /EFH 78)	VA	17	75.6	6.91	8 (47%)	9 (53%)		
	Metro LIC	4			2 (50%)	2 (50%)		
	Overall	180	75.5	8.27	74 (41%)	105 (58%)	1 (1%)	Passed

Provide comparability analysis and summarize patterns of strengths/area for improvement:

Site	# of	% Meets	% Above	% Outstanding	#	Remediation
Site	student	expectations	expectations	70 Outstanding	remediation	results
CCF	43	0	2 (5%)	41 (95%)		
MHMC	59	0	19 (32%)	40 (68%)		
UH	57	1 (1%)	26 (46%)	30 (53%)		
VA	17	0	3 (18%)	14 (82%)		
Metro LIC	4	1 (25%)	0	3 (75%)		
Overall	180	2 (1%)	50 (28%)	128 (71%)		
Site	# of	%	%	% CCD	% Honors	%
	student	Satisfactory	Commendable			Dissatisfaction
CCF	43	0	2 (5%)	16 (37%)	25 (58%)	
МНМС	59	0	19 (32%)	15 (25%)	25 (42%)	
UH	57	1 (1%)	26 (46%)	7 (12%)	23 (40%)	
VA	17	0	3 (18%)	5 (29%)	9 (53%)	
Metro LIC	4	1 (25%)	0	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	
Overall	180	2 (1%)	50 (28%)	44 (24%)	84 (47%)	
CCLC	Met Exp	ectations	31 (100%)	Unsatisfactory	0	
	MHMC UH VA Metro LIC Overall Site CCF MHMC UH VA Metro LIC Overall	Site         student           CCF         43           MHMC         59           UH         57           VA         17           Metro LIC         4           Overall         180           Site         # of student           CCF         43           MHMC         59           UH         57           VA         17           Metro LIC         4           Overall         180	Site         student         expectations           CCF         43         0           MHMC         59         0           UH         57         1 (1%)           VA         17         0           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)           Overall         180         2 (1%)           Site         # of % student         Satisfactory           CCF         43         0           MHMC         59         0           UH         57         1 (1%)           VA         17         0           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)           Overall         180         2 (1%)	Site         student         expectations         expectations           CCF         43         0         2 (5%)           MHMC         59         0         19 (32%)           UH         57         1 (1%)         26 (46%)           VA         17         0         3 (18%)           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)         0           Overall         180         2 (1%)         50 (28%)           Site         # of student         %         %           Satisfactory         Commendable           CCF         43         0         2 (5%)           MHMC         59         0         19 (32%)           UH         57         1 (1%)         26 (46%)           VA         17         0         3 (18%)           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)         0           Overall         180         2 (1%)         50 (28%)	Site         student         expectations         % Outstanding           CCF         43         0         2 (5%)         41 (95%)           MHMC         59         0         19 (32%)         40 (68%)           UH         57         1 (1%)         26 (46%)         30 (53%)           VA         17         0         3 (18%)         14 (82%)           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)         0         3 (75%)           Overall         180         2 (1%)         50 (28%)         128 (71%)           Site         # of student         %         % CCD           CCF         43         0         2 (5%)         16 (37%)           MHMC         59         0         19 (32%)         15 (25%)           UH         57         1 (1%)         26 (46%)         7 (12%)           VA         17         0         3 (18%)         5 (29%)           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)         0         1 (25%)           Overall         180         2 (1%)         50 (28%)         44 (24%)	Site         student         expectations         % Outstanding remediation           CCF         43         0         2 (5%)         41 (95%)           MHMC         59         0         19 (32%)         40 (68%)           UH         57         1 (1%)         26 (46%)         30 (53%)           VA         17         0         3 (18%)         14 (82%)           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)         0         3 (75%)           Overall         180         2 (1%)         50 (28%)         128 (71%)           Site         # of student         %         % CCD         % Honors           CCF         43         0         2 (5%)         16 (37%)         25 (58%)           MHMC         59         0         19 (32%)         15 (25%)         25 (42%)           UH         57         1 (1%)         26 (46%)         7 (12%)         23 (40%)           VA         17         0         3 (18%)         5 (29%)         9 (53%)           Metro LIC         4         1 (25%)         0         1 (25%)         2 (50%)           Overall         180         2 (1%)         50 (28%)         44 (24%)         84 (47%)

Provide comparability analysis and summarize patterns of strengths/area for improvement:

2) Regarding student mid-clerkship feedback, please indicate who is responsible and the method used to meet with students from each site during the rotation.

	% of	Person/title who communicated with	Approach that communication was
Site	completion	students (e.g., clerkship director,	completed (e.g., in person, phone,
	(from CAS)	designate preceptors, etc.)	video conference)
CCF	100%	Morning report preceptors	Phone and video conference

МНМС	100%	Clerkship coordinator schedules/Clerkship director meets with students	In person, (video conference if student requests based on location assignment)
UH/VA	85%	UH: Clerkship director meets with students. Students also meet with preceptor and chief resident. I am not clear if this number is low due to combining the sites. I meet with every student. VA: Clerkship director	UH: Typically in person, scheduled by clerkship coordinator and time assigned and given to students prior to clerkship. Select students meet via Zoom at their request. VA: In person

3) Please provide the average and the minimum/maximum number of weeks it took for students to receive final grades in LMS during the timeframe under review for each site.

Site	Minimum	Maximum	Average	EOR posted in LMS within 6 weeks (%)
CCF	4.4	6.0	4.8	100%
MHMC	4.4	4.4	4.4	100%
UH/VA	4.4	5.0	4.6	100%

#### **Section D: Evaluation Outcomes**

Reflect on the aggregated quantitative and qualitative data from the End of Rotation Survey results (Appendix B) during the prior academic year. Quantitative data are provided in the table below indicating Good/Excellent or Agree/Strongly Agree. Reflect and summarize student feedback on the strengths and areas of improvement for each clerkship site.

		RR 100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
i		Overall	CCF	МНМС	UH	VA
The overa	all quality of your educational experience during	86	80	91	86	94
this clerks	ship (Good or Excellent).					
The clerks	ship was well organized.	94	90	100	91	94
The clerks	ship director clearly explained the expectations for	96	95	95	97	100
medical s						
	ship provided me with sufficient opportunities to	90	86	89	93	100
achieve th	he stated goals and objectives.					
I was satis	sfied with the clinical skills instruction I received	89	84	90	89	100
during the	e clerkship.					
Grading p	procedures were clear.	89	92	81	89	100
I was satis	sfied with the amount of formative feedback (e.g.,	73	63	81	74	75
	ship) I received during the clerkship.					
	sfied with the quality of formative feedback (e.g.,	77	70	84	80	75
	ship) I received during the clerkship.					
	rovided effective teaching.	86	81	85	95	87
Residents	and Fellows provided effective teaching.	89	85	90	91	94
Please su	mmarize and discuss the students' narrative comme	nts related t	o the Str	engths of	the clerk	ship:
CCF	This clerkship provided students with extensive hands-on experience, supported by knowledgeable and encouraging residents, fellows, and staff. Students appreciated the diverse variety of surgical cases and the opportunity to work across different subspecialties, which enhanced their learning of core clinical conditions. The ability to take responsibility and work independently from early on, particularly in the OR, was highlighted, alongside the strong teaching from preceptors and the clear expectations set for the rotation. Additionally, the flexibility in tailoring electives and exposure to a wide range of procedures and pathologies contributed to a well-rounded educational experience. Students felt prepared for future roles with improved clinical reasoning, surgical skills, and confidence in managing patients in both					
	with improved clinical reasoning, surgical skills, ar surgical and non-surgical settings.	nd confidenc	e in mar	•		roles
МНМС	surgical and non-surgical settings.  Well organized. Kind residents and faculty. Focus of subspecialty blocks. Exposure to technical skill device leadership approachable and helpful.	on education velopment s	n. Breadi uch as su	th of cases	ents in k . Ability erkship	roles ooth
MHMC UH	surgical and non-surgical settings.  Well organized. Kind residents and faculty. Focus of subspecialty blocks. Exposure to technical skill deviated by the subspecial structure of the subspecial structure.	on education velopment s	n. Breadi uch as su	th of cases	ents in k . Ability erkship	roles ooth
	surgical and non-surgical settings.  Well organized. Kind residents and faculty. Focus of subspecialty blocks. Exposure to technical skill devileadership approachable and helpful.  The clerkship is relatively well organized with good expectations and teching quality.  Faculty and residents were supportive of learning	on education velopment so d experience	n. Breadi uch as su es. Stude	th of cases uturing. Cle	ents in k  . Ability erkship stand	roles ooth to do
UH VA	surgical and non-surgical settings.  Well organized. Kind residents and faculty. Focus of subspecialty blocks. Exposure to technical skill devided leadership approachable and helpful.  The clerkship is relatively well organized with good expectations and teching quality.  Faculty and residents were supportive of learning students to tailor their experience.	on education velopment so d experience . Diverse pa	n. Breadt uch as su es. Stude thology.	th of cases uturing. Cla ents unders	ents in k  . Ability erkship stand lence giv	to do
UH VA Please su	surgical and non-surgical settings.  Well organized. Kind residents and faculty. Focus a subspecialty blocks. Exposure to technical skill devided leadership approachable and helpful.  The clerkship is relatively well organized with good expectations and teching quality.  Faculty and residents were supportive of learning students to tailor their experience.  mmarize and discuss the students' narrative comments.	on education velopment so dexperience.  Diverse pants related to	n. Breadi uch as su es. Stude thology.	th of cases uturing. Cla ents unders Independe	ents in k  . Ability erkship stand lence giv	roles both to do  yen for
UH VA	surgical and non-surgical settings.  Well organized. Kind residents and faculty. Focus of subspecialty blocks. Exposure to technical skill devided leadership approachable and helpful.  The clerkship is relatively well organized with good expectations and teching quality.  Faculty and residents were supportive of learning students to tailor their experience.	on education velopment so dexperience.  Diverse pants related to tion and incl	n. Breadi uch as su es. Stude thology. o the Are usion fro	th of cases uturing. Cla ents unders Independents eas for Importances	. Ability erkship stand lence giverovements, such	to do  ven for  as

	through different services, which would offer broader learning opportunities. There were calls for increased didactics and structured teaching sessions, as well as clearer expectations for their roles in both clinic and OR settings.  Students also noted challenges with the workload and lack of study time, particularly when balancing long clinical hours with preparation for exams. They suggested setting clear end times to allow for sufficient self-study and improving the balance between clinical learning and exam preparation. There was frustration with inconsistent feedback from faculty and limited opportunities to develop hands-on skills, especially when working with certain services or teams.  Logistical issues, such as the availability of parking and the disorganized structure of some services, further hindered their experience. Students emphasized the importance of establishing continuity with preceptors and fostering a more inclusive learning environment.
MHMC	Improving frequency and quality of feedback. A few faculty were noted to have negative
	operating room environments. Variability of oral exam grading. Many comments about possibly having too many learners per service, which lowers opportunities to scrub in the OR.
UH	Grading procedures were unclear to students and students want more formative feedback.
VA	More structured mid clerkship feedback.

# **Section E: Action Plan I – Implementation of Past Improvements** List planned actions from previous cycle, status & outcomes of the implementation

Site	AY2022-23	Accomplished?	Outcomes or Reason
Site	Planned Change	(Yes/No)	not accomplished
CCF	Update the didactic topics	No	The list has been made and sent out, still waiting to for people to complete their lectures and send them in.
CCF	Encourage more resident teaching (informal and formal)	Yes	We have encouraged residents to teach more and the feedback has been positive.
CCF	Teach residents how to work with medical students (get them engaged, give them tasks, teach, don't gossip about other medical students)	Yes	We gave them some tips/tricks/goals/objectives at the beginning of the year. We are developing a coaching system and a longitudinal didactic session.
CCF	Set up a boot camp for incoming third years to help prepare them for their clerkships	Yes	We had our first one this year and it was a success. We are already planning for next year with the intention of this being a regular boot camp.
МНМС	Added Oral Exam Preparation didactic to help oral exam skills	Yes	Students appreciate this didactic
МНМС	Added NG/OG placement requirement as observed skill	Yes	It is optional, but heavily encouraged
МНМС	Continued residents as teachers curriculum and oversight	Yes	This continues as led by the residency leadership.
UH	Didactic attendance by faculty – I implemented a new system for faculty to sign up for didactics and to have reminders sent to them; also asked clerkship coordinator to notify me when didactic are cancelled	Yes	Seems to be improved
UH	Student to Student Guide to the Surgery Clerkship – designed to help with several things that came up including switching services, evaluations, expectations; most of these were one off comments but I think this will improve the experiences of students and offer some near-peer advice. This is in progress.	Yes	Students are given the guide at the start of the clerkship
UH	Coordinator improvement – working with department leadership on improving quality of communication, reliability, consistency. We are also	Yes	New coordinator with clear systems to document whether didactics occurred and evaluation completion.

	hoping to gather data regarding things like evaluation completion rates, didactic cancellation rates if feasible, which will help with other goals.		
VA	Improve orientation and include clear learning objectives	Yes	Survey results indicate that students knew the expectations and were able to complete the goals and objectives for the rotation
VA	Improve communication for when didactics were cancelled	Yes	Not mentioned as a problem on survey this year

# Section F: Action Plan II – Use of Results for Future Program Improvements

Strategies planned for program improvement; actions designed to improve instruction & curriculum; rationale for action is based on data & analysis of results.

Site	Proposed action	Responsible party
CCF	<ul> <li>Update the didactics;</li> <li>improve staff engagement with the medical students</li> </ul>	Clerkship Director (Rob Simon)
МНМС	<ol> <li>Improved standardization of oral exam grading</li> <li>Improve educational experience in the OR by decreasing access to negative environments</li> <li>Add ethics debrief didactic to provide opportunity to discuss various ethical issues that arise during clerkship (traumatic patient outcomes, stressful situations, etc)</li> </ol>	1. MH Faculty (will address standardization strategies at annual educational retreat) 2. Surgery Chair/Clerkship Director identify opportunities to teach faculty and residents when issues arise. 3. Dr. Shirokauer to facilitate confidential didactic with each cohort of students
UH	<ul> <li>Plan to work on evaluation comment quality with faculty to improve usefulness.</li> <li>Updated the preceptor model to encourage more interactions.</li> <li>Will summarize grading procedures more clearly in written clerkship documents and review prior to end of rotation.</li> <li>Improve quantity of feedback by augmenting the mid-rotation procedure (currently gather feedback from chief resident; will add at least one other member of team and preceptor to requirements).</li> </ul>	Clerkship director for all, but ultimately rests on faculty to implement
VA	<ul> <li>More formal approach to mid clerkship feedback improving both the consistency and quality of the feedback sessions</li> <li>More clarity in grading procedures to be explained during orientation</li> </ul>	Clerkship Director

Appendix A: NBME Subject Exam Year-End Report

Appendix B: End of Block Student Evaluation of Clerkship