Medical Education Committee
Wednesday, June 20, 2012
Meeting Minutes
4:30pm – 6:30pm

Members Present
Dr. Daphne Calmes, Manuel Campa, Dr. Wendy Coates, Dr. Chris Cooper, Dr. Ron Edelstein, Dr. Esteban Dell’Angelica, Dr. Thomas Drake (Co-Chair), Dr. Iljie Fitzgerald, Amanda Freed, Dr. Michael Gorin, Dr. Jonathan Hiatt, Dr. Shelley Metten, Dr. Lee Miller, Dr. Mark Noah (Co-Chair), Dr. Catia Sternini, Dr. LuAnn Wilkerson, Lauren Wolchok, Angelica Zen

Guests
Dr. Jasminka Criley, Joyce Fried, Dr. Sally Krasne, Natalie Mourra, Dr. Neil Parker, Matthew Quirk, Christian Sanfilippo, Dr. Carl Stevens, Dr. Paul Wimmers, Dr. Kenneth Wolf

Staff
Gary Diener, Amy Frazier, Margaret Govea, Phil Klein, Rikke Ogawa, Zachary Terrell

1. **Review of May Minutes** – The May minutes were reviewed and approved.

2. **Graduation Questionnaire Survey – Dr. Paul Wimmers.** The graduation questionnaire for the classes of 2010 and 2011 was presented. The questionnaire is distributed by AAMC to graduating MS4s to evaluate and improve medical student experience. UCLA remained above national scores in a majority of categories. Areas in need of curricular emphasis included health care systems, managed care, health policy, and global health issues. Results for the Class of 2012 will be available in the fall and re-evaluated. [Link to presentation.]

3. **Specialty Service Choice and Match Results – Dr. Neil Parker.** Comparisons between UCLA students and national results were reviewed and trends of varying specialty choices over several years were examined. Notable increases included primary care, radiology, and anesthesia, with surgical specialties remaining relatively the same over the years.

4. **LCME Subcommittee Meeting for the Educational Program for the MD Degree –** Groups one through four met to complete the ED database questions. Then all groups convened to discuss the answers to two final questions:

   1. Summarize the medical education program’s strengths and challenges, including areas of potential non-compliance with accreditation standards and areas that may require monitoring due to potentially challenging
circumstances. Analyze changes that have occurred since the last survey visit. Have new strengths or problems emerged? Are changing conditions likely to cause problems in the near future?

2. Note major recommendations for future action. How can the program’s strengths be maintained and the most pressing problems addressed? Be brief, but specific in describing actions that will need to be (or already have been) taken.