MEDICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES: MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2007

Members Present:  
Dr. Joshua Chodosh  
Dr. Wendy Coates  
Dr. Ronald Edelstein  
Dr. Shaleen Metten  
Dr. Mark Noah  
Ms. Rikke Ogawa  
Dr. Susan Stangl  
Dr. Randolph Steadman  
Dr. Margaret Stuber (co-chair)  
Dr. Jan Tillisch  
Dr. John Tormey (co-chair)  
Dr. LuAnn Wilkerson

Students:  
Wendy Liu

Guests:  
Dr. Richard Baker  
Dr. Daphne Calmes  
Dr. Lawrence ‘Hy’ Doyle  
Ms. Joyce Fried  
Dr. Chachi Fung  
Dr. Jonathan Hiatt

Staff:  
Margaret Govea  
Gezelle Miller  
Regina Richter  
Meredith Szumski

Time Called to Order:  4:37pm  
Time Adjourned:  5:30pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA/NAME</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of the November 14 Meeting</td>
<td>The minutes were reviewed.</td>
<td>The minutes were approved with revisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CPX Exam Results and Standards Setting – Drs. Chachi Fung and LuAnn Wilkerson | Drs. Fung and Wilkerson presented some findings of the 2007 CPX and interstations that students took in June. The CPX is administered to a consortium of schools in the state.  
• In the past students who scored two standard deviations below the mean of their school failed the CPX. One issue with this standard is that we are passing students who might score 40% for physical exam.  
• UCLA decided to develop another standard based on a list of critical essential items (CEI) that we expect of third year medical students and piloted this method this year in tandem with the two standard deviations method. A group of educators met to review how students performed on the same cases in previous years. Each group member was asked to select a certain number of essential items per case and then the group would talk about those items on which members were not in agreement and choose those items for the final list. This was an iterative process that resulted in a final list of critical essential items for each CPX case. None of the critical items included Patient-physician interaction because this involved a subjective evaluation by the standardized patient.  
• When Dr. Fung ran the CPX results with the first version of Critical Essential Item standard, too many students failed the exam. The team revised the list | Tabled for discussion at future MEC meeting |
and removed redundant items, and established that to pass the CPX based on the CEI standard, students had to pass five of seven cases.

- The results of failure rates of the two standards were as follows:
  - Nine students failed the two standard deviations standard.
  - 24 students failed with the CEI standard.
  - Five students failed both standards.

- Questions for the MEC:
  - Do we want to use both the two standard deviation and critical essential item standards to evaluate our students?
  - Does the two standard deviation method tell us something about thoroughness while the CEI say something about clinical reasoning?
  - Should we use both two scores? Or, try to combine the two results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA/NAME</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEC Leadership and Membership Changes – Dr. Margaret Stuber</td>
<td>Committee members and guests recognized change in MEC leadership and the ending terms of MEC members. Dr. John Tormey stepped down as co-chair of the MEC, and continues to be a member of the MEC. Drs. Theodore Hall, Shobita Rajagopal, Michael Sofroniew, and Randolph Steadman ended their MEC terms.</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>