Minutes: Meeting of June 9, 2004

Present:
Janice Contini, Drs. Craig Byus, Thomas Drake, Ronald Edelstein, Theodore Hall, Earl Homsher, Theodore Miller, Dotun Ogunyemi, Randolph Steadman, Margaret Stuber (Co-Chair), Jan Tillisch, and John Tormey (Co-Chair)
Student: Aron Bruhn.
Guests: Gary Diener, Joyce Fried, Louise Howard, and Drs. Susan Baillie and Andrew Leuchter.

Student Mistreatment Policy - Dr. Andrew Leuchter

A draft of the Student Mistreatment Policy was distributed at the meeting. Dr. Leuchter mentioned that much of the credit for this work is due to Joyce Fried and to the committee she worked with several years ago. For the 2005 LCME accreditation, Dr. Leuchter was asked to chair a task force charged to review and update their work. The task force met several times and received input from students and faculty. The product of their effort is the revised document (see attached handout). The task force defined mistreatment and abuse and provided examples for clarity.

The problem of mistreatment of abuse is too common and may involve a number of different interactions among faculty and students, staff and students, or residents and students. Therefore, the policy and implementation plan devised by the task force had to include education of residents, faculty, staff and students, resulting in a multi-part approach, outlined under number IV in the handout and described below.

1. There will be a mandatory training session for residents and fellows within their first year.
2. There will be a letter from the Dean going out to the entire faculty every year as well as discussions of mistreatment of abuse at department meetings on a regular basis.
3. There will be education of nursing, clerical and support staff as well as educational material to be developed, including posters, flyers, brochures, web-based materials, etc., which will be disseminated throughout the medical center.

The task force also established a Student Mistreatment Committee that is advisory to the Executive Associate Dean; it was suggested that the committee name be changed. This committee is not intended to supercede nor be duplicative of any other University disciplinary and review processes for faculty and staff. Complaints are forwarded to the committee for review, and if resolution is not reached there, then a subcommittee can be organized to investigate individual cases and make a recommendation to the Student Mistreatment Committee for review and forwarding to the Executive Associate Dean. If the Dean is unable to address the problem satisfactorily, then the involved parties may pursue the matter through University procedures via the Academic Senate.
The task force shortened the original timeframe established for investigation from several months a matter of a few weeks. An appeal procedure was also developed. The task force will present the proposed policy to the FEC for review and approval.

Joyce Fried added that the original committee that drafted the proposal three years ago included representatives of the faculty, residents, students, and administration. They reviewed student mistreatment policies from other medical schools; the draft before the committee is similar to that original.

The LCME mandates that each school must have a mechanism for students to find formal resolution to any mistreatment problems. Right now, the only way to make a formal complaint against a faculty member is to go through the Academic Senate, which students are hesitant to do. There are many informal resources and most problems are being resolved at this level. Informal resolution is highly encouraged, however, it is important to have a formal procedure in place if needed. The handout defines the procedure and lists campus resources.

Two sources of data indicate the number of times abuse was experienced by students: the AAMC Graduation Questionnaire and the Well Being survey (the latter is administered during the Clinical Performance Exam, end of third year). Dr. Tillisch requested that the MEC review these data yearly. Joyce Fried makes a presentation every year to students, faculty and residents, but agreed that the MEC should be informed annually. She will be invited to present the data in August or September.

Dr. Steadman suggested changing the title of the policy to state that this is an intervention policy. He also recommended changing the definition of "community" under number II to "where trainees are assigned". He found the vignettes that Joyce shows in her presentations to be very powerful and wondered whether some web-based tutorials could be used to educate people. Some educational tools should be developed and disseminated. Joyce was supportive of this idea.

Dr. Leuchter will most likely be on the agenda for next month’s FEC meeting to discuss this issue with them. He asked that the MEC members to review the handout and provide any additional comments to him. Dr. Leuchter was thanked for making the presentation.

**Minutes**

The minutes from the last meeting was approved as written.

**Changes to MEC Membership - Dr. Tormey**

Dr. Tormey noted the changes in the membership.
Outgoing members are: Janice Contini, Mailan Cao, Leslie Judd Hamilton, Dawn Ogawa, David Samimi, Sirach Selassie, Jason Tarpley, Drs. Stuart Slavin, and Earl Homsher.
Incoming members are: Joan Kaplowitz, Aron Bruhn, Jay Espejo, Jonas Green, Hrak Ray Jalian, Megan Morsheimer, Drs. Sally Krasne, Shelley Metten, Wendy Coates, Jonathan
Hiatt, and Joshua Chodosh. The students representatives will be involved not only with the main MEC but also with the subcommittees including the HB&D Chairs, Clerkship Chairs and the College Chairs Committees.

**Evaluation Policy - Dr. Baillie**

Dr. Baillie is the Director of Evaluation Program and Gary Diener is Assistant Director. Student response rates for evaluations have been outstanding: 100% in the first year, 98% in year two and year three is currently at about 75% but rotations have not ended. Gary has been very diligent in working with students to achieve a high response rate. Policy has not been specific regarding what surveys of students may be conducted and how. Dr. Baillie reviewed several policies for MEC to consider.

**Proposed policy for conducting ad hoc curriculum surveys**

The evaluation office is responsible for hosting and managing all curriculum questionnaires, surveys, and educational and curricular research studies.

- Any faculty member or student wishing to conduct a survey must contact the Evaluation Office.
- Students’ participation in surveys is optional (except in School-required evaluations).
- Requests for any survey must be made in writing to the Evaluation Program Office in a timely manner, using a format to be developed. Final approval will reside with the MEC Executive Committee consisting of the MEC co-chairs and the Senior Associate Deans for Education and Student Affairs.
- IRB approval is also required for all research surveys.
- The Evaluation Office assists faculty and students with survey design, data analysis, and hosting.
- The Office staff is available to meet with faculty and/or student originators of surveys to provide assistance in interpreting results.

Dr. Drake expressed reluctance to accept these policies for voluntary surveys as inhibiting the ability to conduct surveys and collect information. However, Aron Bruhn (Class of 2007) was concerned that conducting additional, voluntary surveys from the ED&R Evaluation Office could muddy the waters. We are getting great feedback right now with the required evaluation surveys, and a policy that appears to encourage additional surveys could create confusion.

Dr. Edelstein asked if there should be some discussion about the ownership and rights to data access. Dr. Baillie commented that the course evaluation data goes to the Course Chairs. It has been the policy of the Evaluation Program to facilitate access to data only with the Course Chair’s permission.
Dr. Parker shared that the concern is that students may be asked to complete too many surveys, or redundant information may be requested, imposing too much on students’ time. These policies deal only with educational and curricular surveys.

The word, "ad hoc", should be deleted from the title, and the word, "likelihood", should be deleted from the second paragraph.

**Proposed Policy on Student Non-Compliance on Completing Required Evaluation Surveys**

Students in all four years are responsible for completing online evaluations within two weeks of the end of each block, clerkship and elective. Failure to comply with this policy may result in the student receiving an incomplete grade and/or the submission of a professionalism evaluation form. One such citation requires remediation; receipt of additional reports may result a comment in the Dean’s Letter or other action. This policy became relevant because two students have not completed any of evaluations for a year (despite 12-15 reminders). This policy would apply to students who consistently do not complete evaluations.

The committee approved these policies in concept, but requested rewording to enhance the clarity to improve understanding and compliance. **It was moved and seconded to request the Evaluation Program to improve the wording on the first policy for re-review by the MEC, and to approve the second policy. The motion was approved unanimously.**

**Graduation Competencies - Dr. Tormey**

At the last LCME accreditation review, three sets of graduation competencies and three separate databases for UCLA, Drew and UCR were prepared. In preparation for the 2005 LCME accreditation, Dr. Wilkerson rearranged the graduation competencies and received feedback from the College Chairs, the Clerkship Chairs, and the Medical Education Committee. The Competencies as modified were approved by both the MEC and the FEC. Dr. Wilkerson reviewed the Drew EPCC-approved graduation competencies and found them somewhat different from those developed at UCLA. The two lists were compiled, eliminating redundancies and adding Drew-specific items. The revised list has also been approved by the UCR EPC. The MEC needs to review the refined document and determine whether to approve it with Drew-specific items, or adopt these as well, resulting in a single set of competencies for all three campuses.

Dr. Tillisch felt that what is genuinely unique to the mission of the Drew Program are the items dealing with their thesis program. He recommended adopting all of the Drew items except items #12 and 13.

Dr. Parker agreed with Dr. Tillisch and added that the two remaining Drew-specific items should be identified as such. He also felt that the word, "latest" should be deleted from Practice –Based Learning and Improvement item #12. Dr. Miller approved the changes
and the principle of having the additional Drew competencies adopted by UCLA and UCR. Dr. Edelstein asked that a revised version be presented to the Drew EPCC.

Dr. Tillisch moved to accept the suggested changes above and Dr. Edelstein seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:28 pm.