Minutes: Meeting of August 14, 2000

Present
Drs. Janice Contini, Thomas Drake, Ronald Edelstein, Carol Hodgson, Baxter Larmon, Neil Parker, Margaret Stuber, John Tormey (Co-Chair), Richard Usatine, and LuAnn Wilkerson.
Guests: Drs. Sue Baillie and Randolph Steadman.
Students: Jen Carnell (MSII), Apoor Patel (MSIII), and Erik Waldman (MSIV).

Minutes

Minutes from the July 10th meeting were approved as written.

FEC Actions on First-Year Selectives

Dr. Tormey presented the MEC recommendations on Selectives from the June MEC meeting to the FEC, viz., that the MEC voted unanimously that the Medical Scholars Program (MSP) should continue, but not for academic credit. Additionally, the Committee voted to change the name to something more descriptive of the Program.

The FEC overturned the recommendation and instead voted that students may choose to take an MSP course for credit in addition to a required Selective. The FEC agreed that the name of the course should be changed. Dr. Parker informed the MEC that the name has been changed to Master Study Program (MSP). An MSP does not meet the Selective requirement.

Course Evaluations

The MEC previously asked the Leadership Group to review a compilation of three years of course evaluations, through 1998-99. The Leadership Group noted that many deficiencies in years 1 and 2 have already been addressed since the data was compiled. However, the Group did identify issues that needed to be addressed with the clerkship course directors. No final decision was reached regarding publishing this data. Dr. Hodgson commented that the data provides important trend information. Dr. Drake suggested that the MEC Leadership Group be asked to resolve the publication issue.

Dr. Larmon commented that there has been an undertone from students that the feedback they provide is not used by the faculty or the School, and that few changes are made. They would be interested in reviewing changes made to the courses based on student suggestions. It was noted that course chairs in years one and two are asked to submit a commentary on the changes to their courses in to response to student feedback.

Dr. Wilkerson recommended that the MEC Leadership Group finalize these issues and make recommendations to the MEC in October, at which time there will be more student representation.

Neuroscience & Musculoskeletal System Block - Dr. Stuber
The Task Force had a difficult time, but after substantial struggling and revisions, an eight-week Neuroscience and Musculoskeletal Systems curriculum was developed.

The first week will be Introduction and the curriculum will be organized according to function rather than structure. The first year will have a systems based organization and will predominantly, but not exclusively, cover normal structure and function.

The Year 1 neurosciences and musculoskeletal system 8-week framework is:

- Week 1: Introduction
- Weeks 2-3: Sensory
- Weeks 4-6 Motor
- Weeks 7-8: Regulatory

The second year eight-week block is organized around the pathology of the systems. Members of the Task Force planned for more integration of structure and function in each year. The planning group limited the number of lectures to two hours per day. Other teaching formats will include laboratories and small group sessions. They propose to start lectures at 10:00 a.m., though this needs to be discussed with the other planning teams. Lectures will be from 10 am – 12 noon with a lunch break from 12-1 pm. Laboratory and small group sessions will run from 1-5 pm Monday through Thursday, with Friday afternoons unscheduled.

The members of the Planning Team agreed that the following topics should be covered in this block:

- arm - as reading assignments or in laboratory sessions
- reflexes
- joints
- muscles
- normal function
- limb anatomy
- muscles that are connected with the nerves
- ophthalmology (eyes and ears)
- bone cell biology
- muscle cell biology
- musculoskeletal neoplasms
- some biochemistry - covering signal transduction
- electrophysiology - not in great detail here, but thoroughly in Block 2
- autonomic nervous system - not in great detail

Similarly, members agreed that the following topics should not be covered in the Neurosciences/Musculoskeletal block:

- generic neurons - should be covered in Block 2
- action potential - should be covered Block 2
- conduction - should be covered in Block 2
- osteoporosis - is included in Block 3
immunology - is included in Blocks 1 and 3
cartilage
bone metabolism

There was general consensus in the Planning Group that the curriculum can be accomplished in eight weeks in each year, with about 25 contact hours per week, including Doctoring topics. Some details will need to be brokered between the blocks.

One exam at the end of the block was suggested. A student representative suggested having additional ways of assessing performance, e.g., short quizzes in laboratories or small groups. Dr. Wilkerson noted that one school has a midterm in the middle of the eight-week block and another has an exam every Friday. There are different models regarding exams that should be reviewed. Another student suggested that weekly tests would not be popular with students under the Pass/Fail system. Dr. Drake suggested giving students the option of not taking the final exam when they have done very well throughout the course. Dr. Stuber recommended that examination structure should be similar across the four blocks. A few days’ reading period prior to each exam should be built into the schedules.

The Planning Group wanted to have more clinical application in the first year as well as more physical examination skills. One of the goals of the planning team was to provide instruction that moves from the basic science to application within a day preferably, or within a week at most. A student representative was enthusiastic about additional physical diagnosis in the first year.

Dr. Stuber will submit a draft report to the MEC, to be posted with the minutes from this meeting. (Not yet available, 9/12.) Questions regarding the integration and evaluation of clinical aspects of the curriculum still need to be addressed in detail.

**Alumni Survey - Dr. Hodgson**

Two survey instruments were created at the time of the last LCME Review; a longer version that is sent to graduates 5- and 10-years post graduation, and a similar, but shorter version for one-year post-graduation. The surveys are sent each April and a follow up request is send a few weeks later. Data from graduates 1, 5 and 10 years out provide useful comparative data. A response rate for this type of survey is generally around 50-60%. Response rates for these surveys specifically are:

1986/91 -- 60%; 1987/92 -- 54%; 1988/93 -- 49%; 1998 -- 55%

Cohorts that graduated in 1993 and prior did not experience Doctoring, which began in 1993. Dr. Hodgson reviewed analyses of some of the collected data (please see **PowerPoint attachment** for details).

This is a very large database, and it is important for faculty to know that it exists; perhaps the data can be used for other studies. Dr. Wilkerson suggested following up on items of concern with qualitative data, e.g., they could provide support information for student research or thesis projects.
MEC By-Laws

The by-laws of the MEC need periodic review with updates and recommendations to the FEC. This matter was deferred to a future meeting.

Education Council - Faculty and Student Evaluations - Dr. Wilkerson

The Deans’ Education Council is comprised primarily of Deans in positions relating to student programs, including representatives from Drew and Riverside. At today's Education Council meeting, members reviewed selected policies and procedures. Particular attention was given to (1) the policy that requires all students to participate in evaluating the curriculum and faculty and (2) the recommendation that procedures for faculty evaluation of students should be improved. Following a review and discussion of current policy, the Council recommended the following:

1. Require course directors in Years 1 and 2 to provide written mid-course evaluations to students (grade, midterm, videotape review, etc.). This will be an issue for courses such as FCM, Doctoring 2 and PPD.
2. Require a 10-calendar day deadline from the end of the course examination for submission of grades. The current deadline for Riverside is 24 hours and the deadline at UCLA is two weeks. However, there are courses that do not meet this two-week deadline.
3. Students must complete the evaluation of faculty and courses in seven days from the last day of exams. Currently, they are given four weeks.
4. Evaluations completed by students will not be shared with course directors until student grades are submitted.

MEC members felt that these recommendations are reasonable. Dr. Larmon recommended that grade forms should be available on line and should include a picture of the student being evaluated. It was noted that the Student Affairs Office recently purchased a module to implement on line evaluation in the future.

These recommendations are only for Years 1 and 2; these issues have not yet been addressed for the third year. The grade submission window needs to be shortened so that students will have time to remediate courses if required to do so.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00pm.