Minutes: Meeting of January 10, 2001

Present
Drs. Ronald Edelstein, Mark Noah, Margaret Stuber (Co-Chair), John Tormey (Co-Chair), Richard Usatine and Michael Wilkes, and Joan Kaplowitz.
Student Members: Lisa Rood, Jennifer Carnell, Sukey Egger, Dawn Ogawa and Apoor Patel.
Guests: Dr. Susan Baillie, Janice Contini, Dr. Kim Crooks, Valerie Florence, Joyce Fried, Elizabeth O'Gara, Dr. Susan Stangl, Paul Tang and Dr. Sebastian Uijtdehaage.

Clinical Performance Examination (CPX) 2000 - Dr. Susan Stangl

Dr. Stangl reported to the MEC on the performance of UCLA, Drew and UCR students in the 2000 Clinical Performance Examination and solicited input from the members on current and new cases.

Data for UCLA: % Correct Total Items (Hx, Px, IS, PPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores on history taking have improved, especially for Drew students; but scores on physical examination remain consistently below 70% for all students. Our medical students have consistently scored higher on patient-physician interaction than on the other categories. Students scored much higher on clinical courtesy in 2000 than in 1999. It is likely that students have learned about hand washing and other clinical courtesy items from the previous class. Fewer students required remediation (six UCLA students needed remediation, six Drew students and three UCR students).

The same eight patient cases were used in 1998, 1999 and 2000 with few exceptions, making the data highly comparable.

Data for California Consortium

The Consortium includes medical schools at UCSD, UCI, USC, Loma Linda, and UCLA. In most sections, all of the schools score similarly. However, Loma Linda always scores much higher in the physical exam section. All schools in the Consortium score below 80% in composite score and history taking; below 70% in information sharing; and below 60-70% in physical examination. However, they score above 80% in clinical courtesy and patient-physician interaction.
Dr. Wilkes asked if there was any evidence that this exam correlates with behaviors or practices that are important in residency or in real-life practice. He felt that this would be a great research question and one that should be studied carefully.

Members reviewed two cases and assessed the appropriateness of checklist items.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes are corrected to read under Medical Colleges Creative Project: "A creative project will not be required this year with the exception of Drew's Underserved College." The minutes were approved with the correction noted above.

**UCLA InfoShare - Janice Contini**

Janice Contini introduced the AAMC site visitors: Paul Tang and Valerie Florence, and described the National Library of Medicine IAIMS project dubbed UCLA InfoShare. This is a two-year planning grant funded by the National Library of Medicine. The overall goal is to enable excellence through information exchange, integration and sharing.

With UCLA InfoShare Project, it is hoped to share clinical data with researchers and educators and to make appropriate determinations on how clinical data can be made available for education and research within the constraints of HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act).

Dr. Alan Robinson is the Principal Investigator on the grant. Several subcommittees that have been formed to address various goals, including:

1. identification of methods for dissemination of information about InfoShare to secure broad-based support and collaboration.
2. identification of needs, existing problems and resources.
3. developing a plan to ensure data integrity, data ownership, data security and ethical use of information.
4. identification of methods for resolving problems identified in year one (current). This goal will be addressed in the second year, and will result in an implementation plan proposal.

The vision for the UCLA InfoShare project is to promote education, research and patient care at UCLA, and to make all relevant information available to all appropriate persons anywhere and anytime, enabling excellence through information exchange, integration and sharing.

*Click here for PowerPoint slides used by Ms. Contini for her presentation.*

**Discussion**
Patients have increasing demands for information and resources, and their needs should not be ignored. Although there are plans to do focus groups with patients, they have not talked a lot about how to meet patients' information needs. The focus has been on education and research. Janice Contini will take this suggestion to the InfoShare Committee.

Dr. Noah commented that there will likely be major costs to the institution involved and provisions should made beyond the grant funds. Janice Contini informed that if software is developed, it will be open-source software that can be freely shared.

Dr. Tormey commented that the MEC is an information consumer and needs more information than is currently available to fulfill its responsibility of overseeing the curriculum. It would be helpful to know what is being taught in the curriculum across all four years. It is hoped to have some of the MEC members participate in the Project's focus groups to address the needs of the MEC.

**Current and Potential Uses of Course Websites - Dr. Sebastian Uijtdehaage**

Course websites were developed about four years ago. The Instructional and Design in Technology Unit was established, the lecture halls and computer labs were upgraded, and a computer requirement was enforced. Recently, a proposal was passed to require all third year students to purchase a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), and our medical school curriculum will migrate into an integrated curriculum in the near future. These changes encourage us to review our web-based curriculum.

Currently, there are four different components of materials you can find on a web server: static course materials, interactive applications, external resources, and search engines. The strength of our web-based curriculum is the a great variety of web-based learning and teaching tools (self-study tools, simulations, online assessment, etc.) The weakness of these websites is assessing course and curricular content.

The original goal was to improve access to course materials by creating digital resources that might serve as a searchable curricular database across all courses. It was hoped that such multipurposing of information could achieve functionality similar to the AAMC's CurrMIT database. The school took on a decentralized approach to meet these goals. Faculty were encouraged to develop their own course websites, and IDTU was available to assist if needed. This approach had some drawbacks: varied information, varied formats, no systematic archiving and lack of quality and version control. The results have not provided an effectively searchable curricular database.

As a remedy over the next two years, the online static materials should be improved by improving consistency, quality control, management and searchability. Dr. Uijtdehaage suggested doing a needs analysis and organizing a committee that will set clear goals, a timeline and a budget.
Discussion

Dr. Usatine stated that he is in favor of having such a committee and would like to be involved. Dr. Noah commented that the web-based curriculum should be designed as an essential component of the curriculum, not as an optional component. If it is not essential, it will not be used.

A student commented that what is currently available is very useful but there is a problem in getting information onto the site on time. Another student commented that having course lecture notes on the Web is not as engaging as having notes on paper where you can highlight and make comments. He asked if there was any technology available where students can highlight and comment on the notes and save it as a personal file. It was noted that this was available.

Dr. Stuber asked members to email comments and suggestions to her or to Dr. Tormey and also to volunteer if they would like to be part of the committee to review this aspect of curriculum. A committee will be formed and this process will move forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30pm.