Minutes: Meeting of February 9, 2005

Present:
Drs. Ronald Edelstein, Joshua Chodosh, Wendy Coates, Chris de Virgilio, Thomas Drake, Hugh Gelabert, Joan Kaplowitz, Sally Krasne, Shelley Metten, Susan Stangl, Randolph Steadman, Margaret Stuber (Co-Chair), Jan Tillisch, John Tormey (Co-Chair), and LuAnn Wilkerson.

Students: Aron Bruhn and Donna Zulman.

Guests: Drs. Sue Baillie, Hy Doyle, Gretchen Guiton, and Dotun Ogunyemi, and Patricia Anaya and Joyce Fried.

Minutes

Dr. Edelstein asked that a change be made to the Drew Update section of the minutes. The minutes should state that "the decision made by the Dean to temporarily move the general surgery clerkship to Harbor-UCLA starting January 10th was based on resource limitations and not on student feedback.

LCME Update - Dr. Wilkerson

The official report from the LCME will not be available until June of this year, but Dr. Wilkerson shared with the MEC some immediate feedback given by the LCME site visit committee.

There were well over a 100 standards, and the School met them all. The standards can be met with either full compliance, partial compliance, or in transition.

In Transition

1. Human Biology and Disease: The site visitors were very impressed with the commitment of the faculty to implement this new curriculum and with their commitment to teach.

2. Colleges: The site visitors inquired about the career advising done in the first two years. The college chairs informed them that they were starting to reach to the first two years, and the site visitors would like to see more on this topic in the future. They would also like to see more structure to the college system.

3. Martin Luther King Hospital: They clearly stated that it is not Drew University that they will be watching, but the Hospital. Joyce commented that Drew had a fantastic site visit session with the committee. The site visitors stated that the partnership between UCLA, Drew and UCR was a strength of this institution.

Partial Compliance

1. In our self-study report, we wrote that a weakness was that our students are not consistently observed in history taking and physical examination in the third year
clerkships. The site visitors saw in house data and GQ data on the topic. Although there has been a big improvement in the last year or two, they charged the School with designing a system that guarantees that every student on every required clerkship is being observed on a consistent basis.

2. Another partial compliance had to do with a particular service provided by the Student Affairs Office. They are already working to correct this problem.

Joyce Fried added that the site visitors were overwhelmed by the amount of resources that put into the curriculum. She thanked everyone for their hard work with this entire site visit process. Dr. Tormey on behalf of the MEC thanked Joyce for all of her hard work.

**Introductions**

Dr. Stuber welcomed our two new members, Drs. Hugh Gelabert (UCLA Surgery) and Chris de Virgilio (Harbor Surgery), and introductions were made.

**Life after LCME**

The members were invited to recommend future agenda items for committee discussion.

**Letters of Distinction**

Dr. Stuber commented that data would be collected to foster a more well-informed discussion of this topic. Donna Zulman asked if the committee would like students to collect some data. There should be careful coordination with this and a small evaluation subcommittee should be organized. Student input at the end of the fourth year would be valuable. Input from a broad spectrum of program directors would also be valuable. Dr. Stuber mentioned program directors are surveyed, but not every year.

From past discussion of this matter, there are a couple of proposals. The Year 1 and 2 block chairs do not feel that the LOD count for much, and that students view them as grades. They are not really necessary in the first two years.

Dr. de Virgilio, who is Surgery Program Director, commented that the more competitive residencies tend to look more at numbers. With UCLA being pass/fail with no honors, the program directors end up looking at the board scores. The other schools do not know what LODs are or what it means, so this distinction may not weigh as much outside of this institution.

Dr. Coates added that there is no distinction in the fourth year, and there are a lot of inconsistencies. Dr. Tormey added that more clarity is needed about how LODs are given.

**Admission Requirement**

Dr. Drake would like the committee to discuss the admission requirements in regard to required coursework. Dr. Wilkerson commented that there are some studies done about looking at interviews as a tool for admissions.
**Presentation**

Before reviewing the data, Dr. Wilkerson informed the committee that the School requires our seniors to complete the Graduation Questionnaire, however, we have never said they had to answer every question. So, even if a student answered just one question, it is counted as completed. Someone from the Common Cause, Ralph Nader’s group, filed a lawsuit against the AAMC saying that the use of the GQ by the AAMC for what constituted research has never been appropriately submitted to an IRB. They were particularly disturbed by questions that asked about levels of debt and mistreatment. Several things have occurred as a result.

At the AAMC, the GQ goes through an outside contractor IRB system, and every year, the data goes through this system. In the past, students could indicate whether they would allow their data to be shared by name with scores or opt to not have their data identified. With this practice, a study was done by Drs. Hodgson, Guiton and Wilkerson to determine whether there is a difference if someone gives permission to attach their name versus not permitting. They compared the means and SD for those items for UCLA and UCSF. The students who gave permission scored higher than those who did not.

Now, the AAMC asks students if they would be willing to share the data with their name attached for the purposes of program evaluation. Then they asked if the student would be willing to have their data used in a research study. The students answer these two questions before the fill out the questionnaire.

With this change, the number of our students giving permission and completing the questionnaire has dropped, and the comparison between 2003 and 2004 may or may not reflect a real difference due to this change.

With this background, Dr. Wilkerson presented data of the 2004 Graduation Questionnaire. Please review the attached slides for details.

**Discussion**

There were some questions about Drew’s Radiology Clerkship ratings, which Dr. Ogunyemi and others expected to be higher for 2005.

Family Medicine received an 81.5% in the item, "Sufficient Feedback Provided by Faculty." She informed the committee that they developed a midcourse required meeting for faculty and students to review the PDA log, mini CEX in Family Medicine and in Ambulatory Internal Medicine.

For Drew’s Ob-Gyn clerkship, Dr. Ogunyemi commented that students are given forms at the beginning and are told to get faculty to observe them. Students must turn in their forms.
Topics clustering around healthcare delivery systems are rated as items that are not adequately covered in the curriculum besides pain management. Dr. Ogunyemi suggested inviting experts in these areas to teach. Some members wondered if these are more resident-specific topics. Dr. de Virgilio guessed that these would be the same items that residents would think were not covered adequately for them as well.

Dr. Wilkerson informed the committee that there are about 12 objectives in health care services. The MEC would need to think about how to address this. We can either take it out of our objectives or think about how we can insert it more in the curriculum.

There needs to be an appropriate sequence and should be taught in an integrated fashion. There also needs to be assessment of the topics that are being taught in the curriculum.

**Clinical Program Evaluation - Dr. Gretchen Guiton**

**Presentation**

Dr. Guiton presented data of clinical program evaluation survey, which is given to students right before they start the fourth year. Please review the attached slides for details.

**Discussion**

Members liked the idea of having students take a more proactive approach in getting faculty to observe them in the clerkships.

**Drew Update - Dr. Edelstein**

Dr. Edelstein reported that several of the Drew faculty met with their students to give them an update on current events. Drew received notice from JCAHO that they are disapproved and they are now in the process of getting ready for the reapproval process. Drew is also notifying ACGME of what happened and individual RCs will make their decisions. They are implementing all of the changes necessary for the hospital and for these accreditations and everything will take place to build a better and stronger hospital. They are waiting for CMS to respond to the survey that was done.

There are four new members on the Board of Directors. The consultants working with Drew have made their set of recommendations for the inpatient and outpatient experiences. They found that Drew is an asset to King Drew Medical Center and they want to work with Drew more. Students are informed and reassured about the progress being made and also that there are contingency plans that can be utilized only when necessary.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30pm.