Minutes: Meeting of October 11, 2000

Revised by MEC, 11/9/00

Present:
Drs. Ron Edelstein, Theodore Hall, Carol Hodgson, Joan Kaplowitz, Theodore Miller, Neil Parker, Michael Sofroniew, Margaret Stuber, Ron Tompkins, John Tormey (Chairman), and LuAnn Wilkerson.

Student Members: Sukey Egger, Ph.D. (MSIII), Karin Jacobson (MSII), Sarah Kennedy (MSI), Dawn Ogawa (MSI), and Lisa Rood (MS IV).

Guest: Dr. Kim Crooks

MEC Bylaws

In 1995, the FEC rewrote the School of Medicine Bylaws to be in closer conformity to those of the Faculty Executive Committees of the other UCLA schools. Each standing subcommittee of the FEC, including the MEC, was asked to rewrite its bylaws accordingly. A draft document was distributed ahead of the meeting and was discussed item-by-item, revised, agreed upon and recorded.

The revised document will be posted for final review by the membership prior to submission to the FEC for approval at its October 25th meeting.

It was noted that in 1991-92 Dean Shine appointed a task force to evaluate the mission and effectiveness of the precursor committee (the Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee). The task force recommended that three representatives from Drew sit on the committee. However, at that time there was inadequate and ineffective communication between Drew and UCLA. Relations are very much improved and two representatives are considered appropriate at this time.

Many faculty at Drew hold UCLA appointments. Biomedical Sciences Program faculty hold appointments at UC Riverside and cannot have appointments at more than one UC School.

Process for selecting new members: The Leadership Group will make recommendations to the MEC which will select and forward a slate of proposed members to the FEC for approval. The Leadership group will report its minutes to the MEC membership via email, but they will not be posted to the web. At the suggestion of the MEC student representatives, a student will be added to the Leadership Group.

It was moved and seconded to approve the new bylaws as modified. The motion passed on a unanimous vote (11 in favor).

Approval of minutes

The Minutes of the August and September 2000 meetings were approved without change, by a unanimous vote (12 in favor).
Members were reminded that minutes will be posted to the MEC website about one week ahead of the next meeting and should be reviewed in preparation. It was moved and seconded that minutes should also be emailed to members a few days prior to the next meeting. This motion was passed by a unanimous vote (12 in favor).

**Course Evaluation Reports**

At the August meeting, the MEC reviewed a compilation of three years of course evaluations and asked the Leadership Group to review and discuss data, and to make recommendations about use and distribution.

It was suggested that a complete book of detailed course evaluations should be made available to students through the Students Affairs Office. It would probably be even more useful to have a summary of the data on a Web version to demonstrate overall evaluation of courses indicating trends. In addition, the web-based reports should include statements from course directors about what changes have occurred in their courses, or why changes were not made in response to student evaluations.

Some faculty course chairs expressed concern that they are expected to jockey back-and-forth on some issues based on class sentiment, which can reverse itself from year to year. Probably the primary issue is to show that the faculty is paying attention, and if recommendations are not feasible or wise, this can be explained.

There was careful consideration and discussion of the pros and cons of putting complete, detailed evaluation information on a secure website. However, there was concern that notifying all the people who should know about the availability of the information on the website, and their actually reviewing and utilizing the information on a regular basis would be a huge and intense task. A paper-based distribution of the detailed information seemed more likely to reach the intended individuals. Paper copies can be shared more readily and some faculty may not have easy access to a computer.

It was recommended that a paper version should be mailed directly to all executive department chairs, chairs of all courses, clerkship site directors, members of the MEC and the FEC, and to the Dean’s Office and the Student Affairs Office. A cover note should accompany the reports advising the department and course chairs to whom the reports are being sent and what their responsibility is for further distribution. An advisory notice should be sent to students with the information when the detailed reports are available in the SAO.

The web-based information might include a summary of the data, as there is a great deal to digest. The format might reflect a spreadsheet with a row for each course and a column for each year of a "bottom line" evaluation figure. Figures derived from a low number of responses should be flagged. There should be a link to the course chair statement on course change.

The question was raised whether other measurements should be added. Peer review would be an important additional measurement of a course and could be added in juxtaposition to the student reviews as well as in faculty dossiers.
Drew faculty have been conducting peer reviews for some time and faculty in the UC Riverside Program recently began this process. They will be invited to share information on process and outcomes at a future MEC meeting. Program evaluation of courses was initiated several years ago at UCLA, to evaluate the curriculum on a regular basis, but it is very time consuming.

Student representatives were encouraged to notify their respective classes of the availability of the evaluation information on line as well as issues discussed by the MEC and to promote dialogues and exchange information.

Evaluation data is collected and distributed to facilitate quality improvement. It is shared with "family" involved in education for purposes of improvement. It would be inappropriate for anyone to share such information with outside faculty or students. There should be sensitivity that this information is internal for the school.

**Teaching Opportunities / Faculty Recruitment**

Faculty are often unaware of the variety of teaching opportunities that are available to them -- from different levels of preparation of the students, to different formats such as lecture or small group, and venues such as teaching here at UCLA or in one’s own practice. Dr. Hodgson proposed and implemented a brochure to describe teaching opportunities and to register interested faculty.

The brochure was sent last spring to all UCLA faculty at all sites and distributed at several faculty meetings. Forms were returned by 153 faculty expressing an interest in teaching (the denominator is not known). The majority was from faculty who have never taught here or who have not been teaching recently.

The brochure should also be used by junior faculty mentors to share information on the various opportunities for teaching.

Many respondents were interested in tutoring and precepting. Matches were made with four new tutors for Foundations and 43 new preceptors for Doctoring. Dr. Hodgson considered the response very good and recommends that the mailing should be continued in future years.