



DARTMOUTH MEDICAL SCHOOL
SENIOR ASSOCIATE DEAN OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION

Borwell 322W, Hinman Box 7506
HANOVER • NEW HAMPSHIRE 03756

TELEPHONE: (603) 650-7679

FACSIMILE: (603) 650-6841

David.Nierenberg@Dartmouth.edu

To: Members of Medical Education Committee
From: David W. Nierenberg
Subject: Minutes - Meeting held Tues., April 19, 2011 - 4:00 to 5:30 pm, Borwell 758

Voting Members Present: Matt Crowson (Year 2), Scottie Eliassen, Tom Frandsen (Year 4), Carolyn Koulouris (Year 2), Tim Lahey, Virginia Lyons, Dave Nierenberg, Bijan Osmani (Year 1), Todd Poret, Virginia Reed, Judy Rees, Eric Shirley, Erin Sullivan (Year 3), and Jonathan Zipursky (Year 3)
(n =14)

Voting Members Absent: Jessie Bay (Year 1), Kathleen Chaimberg, Rich Comi, Aniko Fejes-Toth, Sarah Johansen, Greg Ogrinc, and Laura Ostapenko (Year 3),
(n = 7)

Guests and Non-Voting Members: Paul Charlton (DMS 1), Nan Cochran, Ann Davis, Diane Grollman, Cynthia Hahn, Val Jacobs (MD/PhD), Mikki Jaeger, Geoff Noble, Cindy Stewart, and Kalindi Trietley.
(n = 10)

Scheduled Meetings:

Sept. 14	Oct. 19	Nov. 16	Dec. 21	Jan. 18	Feb. 15	Mar. 15	Apr. 19	May 17	June 21
Borwell 758	Borwell 758	Borwell 658	Borwell 758	Borwell 758	Borwell 758	Borwell 658	Borwell 758	Borwell 758	Borwell 758

I. Discussion and Vote Regarding Recommendations for the Inpatient Medicine Clerkship:

Dr. Nierenberg presented a summary of the Inpatient Medicine Clerkship review that was presented at the March meeting (see attachment) and requested that the membership vote on acceptance of three recommendations:

- A. The required “essential” conditions/diagnoses and skills the student must master during the clerkship;
- B. A requirement that the clerkship administration assess the comparability of teaching services at all sites; and
- C. That the clerkship administration work to remediate the problems cited by students in their clerkship evaluations.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the issue of where the handling of the details of a patient’s death should be taught. It was decided that this issue needed further study.

VOTE: The membership voted and passed unanimously the above mentioned three points.

II. Report and Vote Regarding the Changes Instituted in Year 1:

Carolyn Koulouris presented a report and recommendations generated by herself and Jessie Bay regarding the successes and weaknesses of the changes instituted to Year 1 in 2009. The followed issues were reported, discussed, and voted upon:

A. MEC approved that DMS offer occasional faculty development workshops in such subjects as how to improve large and small group teaching, preparing optimal PowerPoints, and writing exam items. The result was that none have occurred. The ensuing discussion included the following points:

- 1. That the preceptor development workshops might be used as a model;
- 2. That Dartmouth College offers a course that might be attended by DMS faculty;
- 3. The difficulty in getting faculty to attend faculty development workshops. Suggestions included:
 - a) The topic could be included in the annual reviews of the courses;
 - b) Dr. Nierenberg suggested that course and clerkship directors could be required to take an exam writing workshop, but conference leaders and lecturers cannot be mandated to take workshops;

- c) A difficulty in providing workshops is that there is no faculty development office, nor funds to create one.

PROPOSAL: That the MEC request the Year 1 Assistant Dean to offer at least two faculty development seminars a year. Suggested topics include effective use of PowerPoints, teaching small group sessions, and writing exam questions. Attendance should be highly encouraged by course directors/department chairs. The Year 1 Assistant Dean would report on these seminars to the MEC in one years time.

VOTE: The membership voted and passed unanimously the above mentioned proposal.

B. Several issues were included that did not require discussion or voting (see attached) or could be resolved with the administration of faculty development workshops.

C. DMS needs to better define the slightly different roles of the course director, Year 1 coordinator, Society leader, student tutoring program, Office of Learning and Disability Services (OLADS), and remedial groups within courses to help the student who is struggling academically. These functions vary widely between courses and students do not always understand this system. Some of the issues include:

1. The roles of these functionaries are not clearly defined;
2. Students have not been able to access student (peer) tutors in a timely manner;
3. There are no structured programs or faculty reviews for helping at-risk students within the departments or courses (other than anatomy);
4. That the term "Learning Disabilities" as part of the title of OLADS can be off-putting to non-LD students seeking academic support and help.
5. That in Pass/Fail courses, students would like to have access to the points and reasons that determine with their grades.

PROPOSAL: That communication be improved among first and second year course directors regarding students who are struggling (perhaps in the form of an annual meeting) and that the tutoring system be changed in the following ways:

1. Group tutoring and review sessions be formed by Year 1 course directors for students in the lowest tenth of class performance, including skills on how to approach each discipline;
2. The management and coaching of student tutors become more integrated into OLADS.

In addition, the membership proposed that the term "Disabilities" be dropped from the title of OLADS, creating the Office of Learning Services or Office of Academic Support Services.

VOTE: The membership voted and passed unanimously the above mentioned proposals.

There was also a proposal to revamp the evaluation system, but this was not discussed or voted upon.

III. Report on Clerkship Work Hours:

Tom Frandsen and Erin Sullivan presented their report on proposed changes to the policy of DMS medical student learning and work hours (see attached). The presentation included:

- A. the reasons for considering the changes;
- B. the policy mandated by LCME requirements;
- C. a summary of the current DMS policy;
- D. a survey of Medical School Deans on student work hour policy;
- E. the policies of eight comparable medical schools in the Northeast;
- F. the pros and cons of work hour restrictions;
- G. a summary of proposed changes to the DMS policy;
- H. suggestions for implementation.

The proposed changes are as follows:

- Clerkships establish frequency of call. No more than one night in three, on average.
- Clerkships should be designed to not exceed 80 hrs/week for all clinical and educational activities for each student. ~~In unusual circumstances, a student can exceed this target for a specific, unscheduled, unanticipated activity of significant educational value...~~
- Students should go home after 30 hours maximum on site. When post-call, patient care activities should be done by 1 pm and the student will be excused when the on-call team goes home. ~~However, if a student has had adequate (several hours of) sleep while on call, there is no prohibition to remaining later in the day.~~
- *Students should be allowed to stay past maximum hours at the specific request of the student to their supervisor in the event of an unanticipated and unscheduled event of significant educational opportunity. The student and supervisor must judge the student adequately rested to take advantage of this opportunity, without placing himself or a patient at risk.*
- ~~On average,~~ One full 24 hr period/week free and away from the hospital.
- Students should attend required teaching conferences, even when post-call, but said conferences should be scheduled to end by ~~4 pm.~~ 1 pm. (see 30 hour rule)
- On-call rooms will be available for post-call students

Discussion ensued that included the following issues:

- A. The “loophole” that allows students to stay past maximum hours at the student’s request might put pressure on the student to stay and could be made more restrictive.
- B. The deletion of the words “On average” could impact the opportunity for Saturday call.
- C. The affect of resident’s hours on the students’ hours.

Dr. Nierenberg suggested that the issues should be presented at Dr. Shirley’s monthly meeting of clerkship directors for feedback and took a straw poll to determine if that would be an acceptable course. The membership was in unanimous approval and the subject will be revisited at the May 17 MEC meeting.

IV. Agenda for May 17 meeting:

- A. Continuation of discussion and vote on student issues:
 - 1. Work Hours (Erin Sullivan & Jessie Bay)
 - 2. Medical Student Notes in eD-H (Matthew Crowson)
- B. Report on VIG: HCD Sciences (Greg Ogrinc)
- C. Other business.