Minutes: Meeting of February 9, 1998

Present:
Drs. Carol Berkowitz, Bruce Chernof, Peter Coggan (for Michael Stemerman), Kenneth Dorshkind, Ron Edelstein, Dohn Glitz, Theodore Hall, Lewis Hamilton, Carol Hodgson, Baxter Larmon, Alan Robinson, Magaret Stuber, Ronald Tompkins, John Tormey (Co-Chair), and LuAnn Wilkerson.
Students: Alea Eusebio, Aaron Kaplan, Mouhsin Shafi and Andrew Watson.
Guest: Joyce Fried.

LCME Site Visit Report, Dr. Alan Robinson

The LCME Site Visit Team met with Provost Levey, Vice Provost Robinson and Chancellor Carnesale on the day of departure. Although the final report is still to be submitted later to the LCME, they reported that they were well pleased with the School; they found the leadership visionary and dynamic, the student body superb and the faculty outstanding. The level of education at UCLA, Drew, and UCRiverside BMSP was excellent. Other strengths included the collaboration between the College of Letters and Science and the School of Medicine, geographical location of an undergraduate campus, outstanding programs such as "STAR", et al. The Team cited a lack of understanding as well as differences in application of the Letter of Distinction in the grading system as a weakness, which the MEC will need to address. They also recommended that a Librarian be added to the MEC membership. Subjects of general concern to all schools nationally were addressed, such as that managed care will mean decreased reimbursement for clinical activities leading to decreased time to teach Students requested a better health insurance program and dental coverage for spouses; the Team’s position was that if the curriculum is stressing health promotion, the School should be practicing it for our students. The School community can be proud to have achieved full accreditation, although the final report has not been received.

Warm appreciation and kudos were extended to Joyce Fried to outstanding coordination of the self-study period, the report writing and the Team Visit. Thanks and admiration were expressed to Drs. Tormey and Robinson.

Task Force Updates, Dr. Tormey

The Medical Colleges Task Force has met several times and is discussing structure and function for medical colleges which might have focuses such as primary care, structural biology, et al.

The Core Clerkship Task Force has been reviewing all the clerkships via reports from the course chair or other representative. Student feedback has been sought to supplement each course report. This will provide an information foundation on which to make recommendations. A report is expected in April.
The Human Biology and Disease Task Force is reviewing all courses in years 1 and 2 via reports from course chairs or representatives.

Report on Survey of Graduates, Dr. Carol Hodgson

A survey instrument was sent to all graduates in classes one, five and ten years post graduation. For the Class of 1996, now residents, the response rate was good (~50% from Drew program, ~46% UCR program and 33% UCLA) and the information gathered was generally very positive. As a group, they felt they needed more training about managed care, working in a team, applying population perspectives and lifelong learning; they read journal articles weekly, don’t do too much computer-based searching. About 98% were very happy with their medical education at UCLA.

For the Classes of 1986 and 1991 (response rates were ~50% Drew, 48% UCR and 35% UCLA), they felt they needed more instruction in CQI, managed care, and leadership issues; they continue to read journal articles. In scholarly activities, 23% have grants, 46% have presented a paper, and 5% have served as an editor. There is an indication that the number of graduates entering academic medicine is increasing; this needs to be looked at more closely and interpreted. Ninety-six percent were very well satisfied with their medical education.

The information was very interesting and useful. As graduates 1, 5 and 10 years out are surveyed each year, the comparative information will be extremely useful. New questions of interest are invited, however, some questions will have to remain constant for comparative purposes.

Telephone Evaluation System, Dr. Carol Hodgson

It has been difficult to evaluate clinical courses and their faculty because of the geographical distances, students are very busy, students return late, etc. It is hoped that a "call-in" system will improve feedback and lead to course improvements. The program was introduced to third year students at their 4th year scheduling meeting; instructions will be mailed to fourth year students. Students appreciate the fact that they will have more information to base selection decisions on.

A WWW-based evaluation system is being designed for 1st and 2nd year instruction. A database separate from the evaluation data to be caught will determine who is eligible to evaluate and when, e.g., first year students can only evaluate first year courses and an instructor cannot be evaluated before he/she has actually taught. This will prevent accidental entries, double entries, etc. The Web version is expected to be tested in March. All programs (i.e., Drew, Riverside and UCLA) will be included.

There was a discussion of data collected for small numbers of students in elective courses or small groups. The information will be available for course improvement, but should only be in dossiers in aggregate in be representative.
Dr. Baxter Larmon, chair of the Electives Subcommittee, has used evaluation data collected to encourage faculty to look carefully at their courses in light of the new feedback.

**Graduation Questionnaire, Dr. LuAnn Wilkerson**

A very high response rate was attained. Sixty-three percent of UCLA students reported completing a research project; it is a requirement for Drew students. Inadequately covered subject areas included: nutrition (improved, but still less than nationally), cost effectiveness (better than national average) and geriatrics. Several item reported on should be of specific interest to the current Task Forces looking at the curriculum; it was suggested that copies be sent to all Task Force chairs.

Dr. Edelstein noted that 70% of Drew students reported that they plan to practice in underserved areas. This figure is much higher than the national average and is important to fulfilling the mission of the School.

**Length of Semesters, Years 1 and 2, Dr. LuAnn Wilkerson**

Students have asked why there is not a "dead week" or study period before exam weeks. The current one reading day prior to each exam period and mid-term exam weeks free of instruction were carved from instruction time several years back. An actual "dead week" does exist prior to the final exam period at the end of the spring semester. Students suggest more efficient use of curricular time to create reading periods, however, there should be guidelines about how and what to delete from lectures/instruction (e.g., very research-oriented lectures). With exams nearly every day of exam week, especially in the fall semester, they feel they need a little more time to assimilate and review content. Even if there were fewer hours of instruction per week, student representatives felt there should be a reading week to consolidate. They added that reviews by faculty are ok, but not always as helpful as they would seem.

This topic will need to be studied further by year committees and revisited.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:17 p.m.