MEDICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES: MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2015

Members Present:
- Dr. Thomas Drake (co-chair)
- Dr. Mark Noah (co-chair)
- Dr. Tomer Begaz
- Dr. Yvette Bordelon
- Dr. Braddock (Ex-Officio)
- Dr. Stephen Cannon
- Dr. Daphne Calmes
- Dr. Chris Cooper
- Dr. Ron Edelstein
- Dr. Neveen El-Farra
- Dr. Michael Gorin
- Dr. Ed Ha
- Dr. Lee Miller (Ex-Officio)
- Dr. Jessica O’Connell

Guests:
- Cynthia He
- Ben Lin (Class 2019)
- Dr. Theodore Hall
- Emily Miller (Class 2019)
- Dr. Ming Lee
- Dr. Margi Stuber
- Sharon Younkin

Staff:
- Amy Frazier
- Jo-Anne Smith
- Gezelle Miller
- Margaret Govea

Time Called to Order: 4:10PM
Time Adjourned: 6:18PM

AGENDA/NAME DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION ACTION
--- | --- | ---
Call to Order | Presenter | Mark Noah M.D. - Agenda | Informational
I. | Review of MEC Minutes (August 12, 2015) and Announcements- Thomas Drake M.D. and Mark Noah, M.D. |
II. | Charles R. Drew Update |
III. | MSTP Student Representative- Voting Status-Thomas Drake M.D. and Mark Noah, M.D. |
IV. | Shelf Exam Grading-Clarification regarding Exam performance delineation – |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA/NAME</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Topic I.**  
Review of MEC Minutes | **Review of MEC Minutes (August 12, 2015) and Announcements- Thomas Drake M.D. and Mark Noah, M.D.**  
- Minutes of the August 12, 2015 were reviewed.  
- Approved unanimously as submitted. | Minutes were approved. |
| **Topic II.**  
Charles R. Drew Update | **Presenter | Daphne Calmes, M.D.**  
- Expanded opportunities in the 3rd year Drew Longitudinal Preceptorship beyond primary care. Students can be assigned to specialists and sub-specialists. Focus remains on the urban underserved.  
- Drew is expanding the ultrasound curriculum to the clinical years. | Informational |
| **Topic III.**  
MSTP Student Representative-Voting Status | **Presenter | Thomas Drake M.D. and Mark Noah, M.D.**  
- Last spring MSTP students approached FEC leadership about representation on the MEC.  
- FEC supported having an MSTP representative serve on the MEC as a non-voting member pending further discussion by the MEC in regards to voting status. | Informational |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA/NAME</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Topic III.  | **Presentation Cynthia He -PhD2, MSTP MEC Representative**  
Initiative for voting-level MSTP representative on MEC  
- MSTP students number approximately 100 with more than 50 out of the traditional curriculum (and on LOA) pursuing their PhDs.  
- Since a significant number of MSTP students take extended leave, they are particularly affected by DGSOM curricular changes yet they are not represented while they are pursuing their PhDs.  
- Program is expanding from 15 to 18 matriculants per year so the size is increasing  
- Grading system change demonstrated a particular need for MEC representation for MSTP students. Curricular changes have a big impact on MSTP students.  
- MEC MSTP voting student representative would be an important symbolic gesture  
- Support for MSTP voting representation on the MEC from MSTP student body, MSTP Directors, Medical Student Council, and Faculty Executive Committee  

Precedent for voting-level MSTP representative is evidenced at other medical schools (UCSF, Stanford, University of Colorado, University of Rochester, and Yale)  
- MSTP directors - curriculum committee reps at 2 schools  
- MSTP students - curriculum committee reps at 4 schools  

Discussion  
- Will other student groups make a case for MEC representation (e.g. PRIME students, concurrent degree program students)? This outcome could set a precedent.  
- MEC does not have departmental or program quotas. |

Dr. Bordeloin read - *Medical Education Committee Bylaws (11/12/14) Section 2 -  
1. **This Committee shall be composed of 23 voting members and 3 non-voting members, as follows:**  
   B. The faculty representatives shall be chosen for their active interest and experience in undergraduate medical education, and shall collectively*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA/NAME</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>represent the broad range of the basic and clinical sciences. They are expected to be advocates for the curriculum at large rather than representatives of the interests of specific departments, divisions or courses.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Further Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Since each class of 180 students has one vote, MSTP (approx. 100) request one vote for representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can MEC consider an MSTP faculty representative? The MEC faculty looks for a wide variety to try to make sure they have a variety of representation for all groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add a 5th student vote to represent all students outside of the traditional curriculum who are in a structured program that culminates in an academic degree. Concurrent degree students, MSTP, and other PhD students who are also pursuing MD degree at DGSOM would be represented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would necessitate a change to the MEC bylaws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is the compelling principle for the change in student representation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Per MEC leadership, all voices whether voting or nonvoting, will be heard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Curriculum is managed day to day by the Dean’s Office Dr. Braddock gets regular reports from MSTP leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA/NAME</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic III.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Motion to add a voting member&lt;br&gt;Motion (Dr. Bordelon)&lt;br&gt;Add a voting member to the MEC representative for students outside of the curriculum in a dual degree awarded program.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Amended Motion: (Dr. Cooper)</strong>&lt;br&gt;The MEC shall include one student voting member chosen by and to represent students in extended study programs outside of the traditional four year curriculum.&lt;br&gt;• A vote was taken all members voted unanimously in favor. No members were opposed. The motion was passed.&lt;br&gt;• Next step – MEC Chairs will present to the FEC for approval and amendment to the MEC by-laws.</td>
<td>Vote was unanimously carried&lt;br&gt;Next step – MEC Chairs will present to the FEC for approval and amendment to the MEC by-laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic IV.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Shelf Exam Grading&lt;br&gt;Clarification regarding Exam performance delineation&lt;br&gt;Presenter</td>
<td>Mark Noah M.D.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Shelf Exam Grading—Clarification regarding Exam performance delineation</strong>&lt;br&gt;• FEC approved that Shelf exams be graded on a 3-tier system: Honors/Pass/Fail while clinical performance be evaluated on a 4-tier system (Honors/High Pass/Pass/Fail). Rationale for the 3-tier system was to de-emphasize exam performance.&lt;br&gt;  o Per faculty on the Grading Task Force, a clarification to the shelf-exam grading performance is requested as follows: Apply the 4-tier grading system for both Clinical performance and Shelf exam performance.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Motion: Unanimous agreement clarifying that the shelf exam performance would be graded on a 4-tier system.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• A vote was taken all members voted unanimously in favor. No members were opposed. The motion was passed.&lt;br&gt;• <strong>Next step:</strong> Take to FEC for clarification of the December 4, 2013 FEC minutes noting that exam performance will be applied on a 4-tier system: Honors/High Pass/Pass/Fail.</td>
<td>Vote was unanimously carried&lt;br&gt;Next step - Take to FEC for clarification of the December 4, 2013 FEC minutes noting that exam performance will be applied on a 4-tier system: Honors/High Pass/Pass/Fail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>