Minutes: Meeting of October 19, 2005

Present:

Guests: Drs. Sue Baillie and Hy Doyle, and Louise Howard and Gezelle Miller.

Students: Justin Cheongsiatmoy, Ali Mohammed Khan, Steve Rad, and Zarin Tejani.

Announcements

Dr. Tormey announced that the Class of 2007 did well on the USMLE Step I exam. They did slightly better than the Class preceding them. However, students have been getting steadily better each year in terms of the actual scores. Dr. Tormey hoped that the MEC would see a breakdown of how students did in specific areas, which are broken down by traditional disciplines and organ systems, early next year.

Dr. Tormey welcomed the new Class of 2009 MEC student representatives, Justin Cheongsiatmoy and Ali Mohammed Khan. Introductions were made.

Minutes of August Meeting

The minutes were approved as written.

Fourth-Year Electives for Approval

Dr. Tormey commented that there is a more systematic review of these electives and that Dr. Baillie has been tracking student responses. Dr. Baillie informed the committee that there is about 95-96% students’ response rate (including externs) for the fourth year electives. Dr. Tormey asked for a report in the next meeting or two. Dr. Baillie agreed and mentioned that she has been working with Dr. Randolph Steadman and Gezelle Miller already.

Dr. Wilkerson added that Dr. Steadman has presented the results of the elective evaluation to the Department Chairs. When asked, the Department Chairs stated that they wanted to be responsible for distributing the evaluation data to the Chairs at the affiliated hospitals. They may need to be prodded to do so. Gezelle Miller reported that she sends out evaluation data (including those for supporting faculty) to all course chairs for review and distribution.

Ambulatory Medicine Peds, General Dermatology, and Interventional Radiology electives were approved.

Report from the Grading System Taskforce
Earlier on, the MEC decided that it would be time to work on the grading policy and structure of the third year. The MEC charged a Taskforce to look at the grading system issue. There were two 90-minute Taskforce meetings at which the members reviewed numerous data and discussed various options. They were considering the following options: pass/fail with LODs, pure pass/fail, pass/fail with honors, or letter grades. The Taskforce is recommending to the MEC following:

Years 1 & 2: Pure Pass/Fail

Year 3: Pass/Fail with LODs

Year 4: Pure Pass/Fail

The Taskforce had a lively discussion about presenting LODs numerically. The student representatives of the Taskforce were advocating this, as they wanted program directors to know how rare LODs are. Dr. Parker, however, felt that it would not be advantageous for students who did not receive LODs to provide such numerical data. It is mentioned in the individual student’s letters who have received LODs how many he/she has received. Dr. Devirgilio stated that LODs might help the student who received them than hurting the student that who did not. This is why the Taskforce members decided on not providing histograms or numerical data in the MSPE regarding LODs.

Dr. Devirgilio commented that he favored the recommendation of keeping the grading system as is for the third year but thought that LODs should be given in the fourth year. Dr. Wilkerson mentioned that Dr. Parker was concerned about timing issues when considering LODs in the fourth year. Dr. Sofroniew added that the first year course chairs unanimously did not want LODs in the first year.

The MEC student representatives agreed with the recommendations from the Taskforce.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the grading recommendations of the Taskforce that will be implemented for the Class of 2010. The motion was unanimously approved. This will be forwarded to the FEC next week.

Reexamining the Clerkships Phase of the Curriculum

Some of the questions that have been raised regarding the third year were as follows:

- Does our current approach train students for the competencies that we expect at graduation?
- What is the primary goal of the clerkship?

Dr. Stangl commented that the Clerkship Chairs Committee has been in discussion about where the gaps are in the third year. For example, they discovered that the back exam was not being covered well. Should there be an inventory of what is being taught where in the third year curriculum? Dr. Chodosh added that we should not only take a look at what
students should be taught but also how and where these things should be taught. Dr. Stuber commented that such an inventory was done for the LCME Accreditation.

Dr. Stuber stated that the MEC needs to have a charge for a small group of people to look at the third year. Dr. Tillisch thought the MEC to look at some good data that can guide and measure where it needs to go and how it should proceed. Dr. Devirgilio felt that it might be a good starting point to look at the USMLE Part II scores. Dr. Wilkerson informed the committee that there are years of data that the committee can review if they wish to do so (student opinion, Step II practice exam by topic, the actual Step II exam by topic, CPX by individual item, etc.).

Dr. Chodosh felt that the program directors should be surveyed to see how UCLA students stack up compared to other interns/residents in their programs. Dr. Wilkerson informed the committee that such a survey is done and program directors are asked to compare each individual graduate. Dr. Tillisch felt that this data should be reviewed by the MEC and not by a separate Taskforce.

Dr. Sofroniew wondered if the MEC should look also at the structure of the clerkships. In the first two years, there were major structural changes that took place that affected the content changes. Dr. Wilkerson shared what UCSF is doing. They have one Taskforce looking at some immediate small changes that need to be made. Then they have another Taskforce that looks at more longitudinal and structural changes for the future.

Dr. Tormey felt that the MEC was in agreement and that there is a consensus that this issue needs to be looked at. He asked if a few people should come back with a more concrete plan. Dr. Stuber wanted to revisit this issue as a committee next time. Dr. Tillisch asked that they look at which clerkships have not achieved the original goals and back this up with some data. Dr. Noah commented that a very clear charge needs to be given to the Taskforce. This discussion will be continued next time.

**Administrative Issues for HB&D Curriculum**

The MEC does not have a policy on how course chairs are appointment, how long such appointments are, what the criteria are for success, and who has authority to make changes. The MEC Executives looked at the appointment letters for the first and second year course chairs and none of them had indications of an end date. Because the first and second year courses are now non-departmental, we need to figure out who has jurisdiction over these. The current first and second year course chairs were selected by a group that consisted of representatives from the MEC (Drs. Stuber and Tormey), representatives from the Dean’s Office (Drs. Robinson and Wilkerson), and Departmental representatives (the chair or education chair). This was an iterative process.

Dr. Metten asked if there were job descriptions for course chairs and thread chairs. She thought it would be helpful to have some role definition.

The members also discussed how conflict between faculty would be handled. Dr. Tormey commented that problems arise when there is a clash of personalities. Dr. Krasne felt that
some issues need to be brought forth to the MEC. Collegiality needs to be emphasized and encouraged.

Dr. Tillisch felt that the MEC should be the body that decides on these issues. There could be a general review for course chairs similar to the department chair’s five-year review. The MEC has a broader perspective and so it is good group to have such responsibilities. Dr. Sofroniew asked when the MEC would review the first and second year curricula as they are well into their third year. Who will do this review and how will it be done? There needs to be periodic review for both the curriculum and the course chairs. Dr. Wilkerson asked how the MEC wants to handle immediate problems. Currently, they are being directed to Dr. Wilkerson. Everyone felt that the MEC is the place that these problems are addressed. Dr. Sofroniew proposed that Dr. Wilkerson be the filter that decides which problems and issues need to be brought up to the MEC. Dr. Wilkerson agreed to serve in this role.

**Drew Update**

Department of Dermatology received five years of full accreditation from the RRC. There will be a site visit by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education on January 17th. They will be reviewed by CMS in 60-90 days for the hospital accreditation. Ms. Antoinette Ep Smith started her tenure as CEO at Drew. Their third year students are doing very well and their fourth year students are in line for getting their residencies. There were some issues with the first year preceptorship but that is being addressed immediately. JACO site visit will take place after the CMS site visit. The Board of Visitors were very pleased with the report by Dr. Yoshikawa about what has been happening at Drew. They gave their support.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30pm.