

**ARAC Committee  
October 25, 2018  
Meeting Minutes**

In person attendees: Anna (student), Annika (student), Cindy Elder, Dan Cabrera, Heidi Combs, Kelly (student), Lee McKoin (student), Leo Morales, Liz (student), Mark Snowden, Melinda Frank, Oliver (student), Raye Maestas, Stella Yee

(A second group met with Dr. Suzanne Allen via Zoom Video Conference and their notes are included on page 5.)

Dr. Snowden presented an PowerPoint overview and history of ARAC

- The student call to action
- Dr. Ramsey Formed the ARAC Committee
- ARAC submitted initial report and continued the committee to address ongoing topics

Dr. Combs introduced the new faculty who have been invited to the committee this year, to represent WWAMI and diverse background:

- Jordan Lewis in Alaska
- Cicely White and Janelle Clauser in Spokane
- Joshua Jauregui
- Dan Cabrera in Seattle

We have no Wyoming or Idaho faculty on the committee.

Dr. Allen is participating since the committee is formed under her office, but will not be the head of the committee since last year we noted that was concern about the power dynamic between the students and the deans.

How were these faculty identified? Do they have a specific race-lens or critical analysis?

Dr. Lewis is a Tribal member in Alaska. Dr. Cabrera is Latino. Janelle is the Underrepresented in Medicine Committee co-chair. Dr. Snowden was the only African American in his entering class and he is very active in these issues, although his professional identity is a geriatric psychiatrist. Dr. Combs works with mistreatment and this topic crosses over to underrepresented students. Dr. White focuses on improving learning environment and is African American. Dr. Maestas was the only Latina in her entering class.

(A student asked how many students were in the Seattle Cohort in previous years? 100 students for several years and the WWAMI groups have grown.)

And in the next meeting we look forward to hearing more about their reasons for wanting to participate.

It was asked how many MS2 and MS3s are involved in the committee? We have many MS1 students represented but many students had other events tonight but there was interest in the students groups.

Let's work with the students to make sure the meetings are accessible schedules and meaningful.

It was discussed that some MS2 students are no longer working with ARAC because of disillusion and feel like their efforts are being diffused. They feel the change not is happening fast enough, and that the faculty have a different view of the appropriate time frame for these results than the students. Dr.

Snowden agreed that to get measureable and timely results, we should focus the committee's attention.

Dr. Morales mentioned that we should think about what events would look like progress to us and how can we do to measure progress? Which are the items we can do in a year and which take longer?

Otherwise we cannot show the impact of the committee. We will look at the student recommendation and think about what do you think would look like progress? What are our goals that make us feel like our time was well spent.

If there is fracturing with our students, we want to communicate and shore up the support and reduce the tension. We also acknowledged that some students are working in different spheres. This committee is not the only way to get the work done. Its important for the students and faculty to hear about the many groups and options. A student mentioned that despite the various goals of different groups, one of the lessons from the CEDI Curriculum was that “What can threaten to divide, can bind” We want to focus on the ARAC’s accountability and impact. The students expressed concerns about immediate changes they would like to see.

- The Tuskegee lecture has been critiqued and talked about change for 3 years but has not happened
  - Even the short time the MS1s have been here they have a feeling of unanswered questions and unaccountability. The students acknowledged that there is a different perspective between the faculty and student generation, but the traditional atmosphere of medical school is the most difficult position they have been in. Most had a different experience in undergrad and while they recognize that major changes take time, it feels like the Curriculum seems like it could be fast. They understand that the faculty is on our side but it feels frustrating that they do not see the movement.
  - Dr. Cabrera acknowledged that it seems like some changes could happen rapidly. If there was a new medical treatment, it would be in the next year’s curriculum. A new drug would be mentioned or an old system would no longer be taught. Dr. Snowden mentioned that it does takes decades of preparation to make these changes. But if there is a new drug that is now finally out is now being rolled out to residents, it would be in the lectures in 1 year. For example, the new anti-coagulate drugs that are integrated.
  - The students mentioned it would be easy to at least mention it or change the PowerPoint slides, and that the students on the committee would be eager to help facilitate that if needed.
  - It was mentioned that is seems like, despite the advanced that have been made, the School of Medicine is 30 years behind, it seems like the students are stepping into 30 years back. The faculty sees the progress that they have made in this time, but the students feel like it still lags.
- Another example of changes the students hoped for, was that the lectures in Dermatology to show different skin tones. It has already been suggested but it still has not changed.
  - Dr. Maestas suggested a book in the Fam Med Residency Office that had images of dermatological diagnoses with African Americans. (*Atlas of Black Dermatology* by Theodore Rosen and Sandy Martin, available in the Health Science Library.)
  - The students were eager to help provide information for this change.
  - Dr. Snowden suggested that we could focus on who could be on the committee and who would be able to address the conversations in the future.

What do the students think are the best ways to join the committee?

General ideas to recruit the students:

- Include give them more information in the emails. An invitation more clear with a graphic history, 2 year plan, 10 year plan,
- Or a 2 minute presentation before class, more effective to have a student present this info
- Start with changes to one lecture, and then move on to the next.
- Show the work we have done
- Remind students information is on the CEDI website

- WWAMI region has no idea ARAC exists, what it does, so we should do easy to encapsulate chunks,
- MSA emails may be a good format to follow: Their emails go out with responsibilities and information so that if you are interested, you know how you join

It was also mentioned that perhaps we should be working with the Educational Quality Improvement Team and the Director of the Learning Environment. For rapid quality improvement using the standard format: Measure, plan, do, change, measure?

- Work with the EQI team lead by Dr. Kim to try to incorporate the real changes, instead of elevated goals,
- It would be great to get anonymized reports from the Learning Environment survey so students can express concerns for the ARAC committee

Then when we have the students who want to be member, so how many students should we aim for on the committee?

- Returning to the MSA comparison: what are the clear role for the students

We also want to make sure the peers trust the work of the committee.

- We could open nominations and individuals could self-nominate (volunteer) and send short statements to apply,
- Nominees generally anonymous except to contact them, we don't want to pressure anyone with a public list or elections.

Who would select the final committee?

- Dr. Snowden mentioned last year the committee envisions about 8 students throughout WWAMI.
- If we get to the point of too many applicants, we could then decide if we need to select.

The students emphasized the need for transparency and to establish a mechanism for all students to be heard, especially if you are going to limit the membership.

- Dr. Snowden emphasized that we plan to often have open meetings but we also want to have a voting body, to have constant connection to the students who they can address concerns

The Anonymous Learning Environment online tool could be very helpful because many of these concerns that don't feel comfortable talking to the committee face to face. This could be the same tool to send to ARAC for race, gender, oppression

- This link should be advertised more to the class.
  - Could have a check box "Do you want this brought to the ARAC Committee?" or "Check all that apply, is this mistreatment, race related, accuracy of information..."
    - The learning environment is already moving towards this 😊
  - This would help with transparency, and show the students that their feedback actually works, who it goes to a count released. This anonymized information could be extremely helpful to show ARAC's impact to all of the students, and close the loop with the class.
  - "Anonymous email" could also be created (like with Craigslist) if the Learning Environment still needed to contact you.

Can we track and publish this mistreatment information?

- It does exist. Starting next month, the Learning Environment is publishing numbers of reports made in general, and what is the percent per department, November 1st Newsletter, so stay tuned.
- However, the data is from before the EQI
- We could present the student Learning Environment at ARAC,
- Would also be important to present to the class

Mistakes can be helpful. It is not bad to make mistakes as long as you take responsibility for them and change them right away.

- The onion diagram was corrected in lecture next day. (I believe the slide show an incorrect definition of gender.)
- We recognize how hard it is to do that right away but it is so important to have that conversation the next day and show how to work through mistakes.

CPI component (continuing process improvement) is everywhere in medicine, but despite these concerns in med school, CPI seem to lag.

- Maybe we should have outside consultants

Dr. Maestas then presented some of the ARAC accomplishments because of the call to action last year.

The PowerPoint included:

- CEDI called recently admitted students to describe the URiM experiences and demographics, PreMat, mentoring,
- A new Associate Dean of Faculty Development focusing on diversity, and collaboration with the Center for Learning in Medical Education (CLIME)
- Faculty and Staff have undergone bias and anti-racism Training (including DiAngelo's training, the People's Institute Training, online bias training, Theater for Chagne and learning communities on race.)
- ARAC worked to identify faculty champions not just a foundation sites but through each clerkships. We are close to bringing champions together via zoom and connect students who are traveling to all these sites
- And support and safe spaces for many student groups

A student asked what is our definition of "Underrepresented"?

- The category is defined federally. Underrepresented in Medicine (URiM) is defined by UW more widely as most ethnic minorities are generally underrepresented, LGBTQ (no regular data is collected on those statistics so probably underrepresented but we don't know for sure) and most religious minorities, disability, rural, and many other categories if you self-define as URiM.
- URiM committee meets monthly and honors everyone who comes

We also talked about WWAMI students who have formed some groups like faculty support networks and pipeline projects

What the faculty training been included next? 40 training of regional deans completed this training, but this hasn't been done in the region that we are aware of. Many of our college faculty participated, but do not know if the other WWAMI faculty have completed it yet. The curriculum committee may have more information.

Funding for this faculty development was also mentioned. DiAngelo's training and the People's Institute Training were funded by the School of Medicine because we want to avoid that being a barrier.

The meeting time ended. We are eager to continue these conversations next time. We will work on legwork before next meeting:

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

- Confirm date of next meeting
- Prepare a Canvas survey for students to nominate others or volunteer themselves and
- Send open call email and flyer to student,
- Open nomination, and include the options for students to get credit

### **Zoom Meeting led by Dr. Allen**

There were 9 people on Zoom and we ran a mini ARAC meeting since we did not connect to the same Zoom room. We started talking about 6:10 pm after I tried and Kevin tried to text a few people in E308 with no response from anyone in E308.

Suzanne Allen – I led the meeting since I had a copy of the email with a draft agenda

Janelle Clauser – voting member

John McCarthy – Asst Dean for Rural Programs

Jacqueline Wilson – learning specialist in Montana

Pearl Nguyen – 1st year in Spokane

Rida Falima – 1st year in Wyoming

Laurie Bazan – 4th year in Seattle

Harveen Sandhu - 1st year in Spokane who is the Health Equity lead in Spokane

Kevin Chung – 2nd year in Seattle

I did not review the community contract since I did not have that in front of me and couldn't remember enough of it off the top of my head to feel like it would be helpful. I reviewed the past history as well as I could on short notice of ARAC. I reviewed the faculty who are going to be the voting members. One of the students asked if all of the faculty on ARAC have participated in the People's Institute to which I answered that I wasn't sure but could find out. Another student asked if the voting members of ARAC will go to the People's Institute. I shared that I think that could be a possibility if there is interest.

I was not prepared to go through all of the recommendations that were provided at the Town Hall meeting in February – completely my fault for not being prepared. I think we should share the minutes from your meeting with this Zoom group so they can see what you discussed.

We did talk about the grading disparities – I shared with them that there is work being done to look at the last two years of data now available from the last groups of students who completed the old curriculum. We'll get that information out as soon as it is available.

Pearl asked about how OMCA is able to provide services to students outside Seattle. (I think she thought there was an ARAC committee for Seattle and an ARAC committee outside of Seattle – I tried to correct that notion!) I let her know that we no longer have an Office of Multicultural Affairs but that we have the Center for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and that CEDI is for everyone across WWAMI. We discussed the URiM Zoom call that happens once a month – which apparently is on the 4th Thursday of the month – so they were going to reschedule that meeting but no one knew if that meeting got rescheduled.

There was general interest in having CEDI information more widely shared than just on the CEDI listserv. I'll talk with Leo about this.

We discussed the issue that was raised regarding the gender/sex assigned at birth, vegetarian microaggressions and the genetic lecture slide that perpetuated racism stereotypes. I discussed the work that is being done to correct areas such as this.

Pearl also mentioned that when she watched the class meeting from Seattle, one of the faculty apologized to the class for the microaggressions but did not explain what he was apologizing for. She hopes in the future if someone is going to apologize for something that is site specific they can mention

that as they are talking at the class meeting since all regional sites watch the class meeting recorded from Seattle.

We discussed the two opportunities available for the students to serve on the Foundations committee or the Grade Appeals Committee. We also discussed that students can become voting members of ARAC. I asked them to email me if they have any interest in any of these committees and I'll forward their information to the two of you.

And finally we talked about when is the next meeting going to be of ARAC. I said I would get them that information as soon as I found out.

Hopefully, we can figure out Zoom so that we don't run two parallel meetings next time! Hope things went well in Seattle. I think they went pretty well on Zoom.  
Suzanne