



GEISEL SCHOOL OF MEDICINE  
AT DARTMOUTH

**MEDICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2013  
4:00 – 5:30 PM  
DHMC – AUDITORIUM A

**MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order - Virginia Lyons, PhD**

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 PM by Dr. Virginia Lyons as Dr. Richard Simons could not attend.

Voting Members Present: Mazin Abdelghany, Jonathan Barnes, Benjamin Colby, Matthew Crowson, Scottie Eliassen, Aniko Fejes-Toth, Sara Johansen, Carolyn Koulouris, Dean Madden, David Nierenberg, Todd Poret, Virginia Reed, Christiaan Rees

Non-Voting Members Present: Ann Davis, Diane Grollman, Michele Jaeger, Virginia Lyons, Geoff Noble, Glenda Shoop, Cynthia Stewart, Kalindi Trietley

Guests Present: Rand Swenson, Tim Lahey

**2. Approval of the January meeting minutes**

The minutes of the January meeting were approved as written.

**3. Announcements - Virginia Lyons, PhD**

- a. LCME Site Visit – March 18 – 20, 2013. Dr. Rand Swenson and Dr. Ann Davis presented information regarding the LCME and the upcoming LCME site visit, including the following points (see the attached PowerPoint for full details):

- Executive Summary and the Independent Student Self Study which can be downloaded from <https://geiselmed.dartmouth.edu/lcme/reports>
- Review of the Liaison Committee for Medical Education (LCME) Preparation for Geisel Site Visit website
- Flow chart demonstrating the Medical Education Committee's role (among others)
- Review of previous citations and the following responses
- Areas for improvement and the corresponding actions relative to Institutional issues.
- Initiatives for LCME
- Summary of what kinds of questions that LCME consultants may be asking. Note: This information was taken directly from page 35 of the executive summary which anyone with Dartmouth credentials can access.

**4. Revised Course Learning Objectives for Microbiology Course – David Nierenberg, MD**

Dr. Nierenberg presented explaining that after considering feedback from the Preclinical subcommittee and the MEC, Dr. Paula Sundstrom would like to revise one of the existing course objectives for the Year 1 Microbiology course.

Currently objective #30 reads: “To specify whether a microbial disease is caused by a toxin or by invasives.”

The revised version reads: “Describe for the most common infectious diseases whether the disease is caused primarily by a toxin (e.g. Tetanus), or by microbial growth and invasion of the host (e.g. Pneumococcal pneumonia).”

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised version of course objective #30 as written above. A vote was taken and the motion passed with 13 members in favor of the revision (4 students, giving a total of 11 votes in favor) and no votes in opposition.*

#### **5. Modification of Biostatistics Epidemiology course – Virginia Lyons, PhD**

Dr. Virginia Lyons presented the modification of Biostatistics Epidemiology course. See slides included at the end of these minutes for full details. Dr. Lyons covered the following points during her presentation:

- a. 28 hours in spring term; 1 optional session titled “Public Health Emergencies” by Dr. Jose Montero, the Director of Public Health Services in New Hampshire. In the past this has been the top-rated session of the course, 4.6/5.
- b. LCME standard ED-11: “It is expected that the curriculum will be guided by clinically-relevant biomedical content from, among others, the disciplines that have been traditionally titled anatomy, biochemistry, genetics... and public health sciences.”
- c. Population epidemiology is currently in the course notes, but does not receive its own lecture due to time constraints. Examples of public health emergencies show how clinicians and public health professionals interact during disease outbreaks and other urgent situations.
- d. The course director would like to add 1 additional hour to the course to accommodate this session.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the modification of Biostatistics Epidemiology Course. After some discussion, with the student representatives giving supportive feedback of the modification, a vote was taken and the motion passed with 13 members in favor (with 4 students for a total of 11 votes) and no votes in opposition.*

#### **6. Year 1 Overview – Virginia Lyons, PhD**

An overview of Year 1 was presented by Dr. Lyons. For full details see the slides included at the end of these minutes. Dr. Lyons presented on the following points:

- a. MD Curriculum for Year 1
- b. Instructional Methods
- c. Assessment
- d. Alignment between objectives/assessment
- e. Performance - USMLE Step 1
- f. Strengths of Year 1
- g. Weaknesses of Year 1

*A motion was made and seconded to accept the report as a description of year 1. A vote was taken and the motion passed with 13 members in favor (with 4 students for a total of 11 votes)*

*and no votes in opposition.*

**7. Student Health Care Policy on Potential Conflicts of Interest - Ann Davis, MD**

Dr. Ann Davis presented the policy which is compliant with LCME standards.

The policy reads as follows:

“Providers of student health care at Dicks House may not be involved in the assessment of Geisel Students (including grading or summative feedback) or a member of the Committee of Student Performance and Conduct (CSPC).

At their discretion, students may choose to be seen by consultants at partner institutions and therefore receive care from faculty members who are involved in assessment roles. In this case, the student may then choose to be assigned to another faculty member for assessment (including grading or summative feedback). The faculty member will recuse themselves if the student is discussed at the CSPC. Also, in rare situations where emergent care is necessary, this should be provided in accordance with best practices. In this situation, students will be assigned to other faculty members for assessments. The faculty member who provided the emergency care will recuse him/herself if the student is discussed at the CSPC.”

After some discussion the committee members made the following revisions to the Student Health Care Policy on Potential Conflicts of Interest:

“Providers of student health care at Dick’s House (the student health service) may not be involved in the assessment of Geisel Students (including grading or summative feedback) or a member of the Committee of Student Performance and Conduct (CSPC).

At their discretion and choice, students or their families may choose to be seen by consultants/providers at partner institutions; therefore, in some cases the provider might be involved in assessment roles. If this occurs, the student may request to be assigned to another faculty member for assessment (including grading or summative feedback). The student will make the request to the Dean in charge of that academic year.

All faculty members will recuse themselves from any CSPC discussions involving a student for whom they have provided care.

In rare situations when emergent care is necessary that precludes the choice of a provider, emergent care may be provided by a faculty member in accordance with best practices. If the emergent care provider is involved in assessment roles, the student who required emergent care will be assigned to other faculty members for assessment.”

***A motion was made and seconded to approve the Student Health Care Policy on Potential Conflicts of Interest as modified by the MEC. A vote was taken and the motion passed with 13 members in favor (with 4 students for a total of 11 votes) and no votes in opposition.***

**8. Student Feedback – Student Representatives**

4<sup>th</sup> Year – Carolyn Koulouris and Matthew Crowson presented an issue about the 4<sup>th</sup> year capstone courses. Two of the three capstone courses (Health, Society and the Physician, and

Advanced Medical Sciences) are graded using a Pass-Fail system, while the third course, Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics is graded using the Honors-High Pass-Pass-Fail system. After soliciting opinions from their classmates, the students propose that the grading system for the Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics course be changed to Pass-Fail to be more consistent with the grading system used for the other two courses and to help alleviate anxiety felt by students. When the question was asked whether this would have a negative effect on attendance Ms. Koulouris replied that it should not have any effect as this is a lecture based course. The students' suggestion was to implement this new system effective immediately. Registrar Michele Jaeger brought it to the groups' attention that changing the grading system immediately would create serious challenges as the course is already underway; this was reiterated by Dr. Ann Davis. Another concern is the impact this would have on students who have already taken this course and have earned honors. Kalindi Trietley suggested postponing any modification to the grading system until next school year to avoid impacting the course that is already underway. Dr. David Nierenberg feels ambivalent regarding the grading system of the course. While it was suggested that students may put less effort into the course with the changed grading system, Dr. Nierenberg disagreed with that suggestion. Dr. Rand Swenson mentioned that when the grading system changed to Pass-Fail for Year 1 and Year 2, his courses in anatomy did not see a falloff in grades. Dr. Davis brought it to the group's attention that should this pass, the Geisel Registrar would need to work with the College Registrar as this could be against their rules and possibly against Department of Education regulations.

***Dr. Sarah Johansen made a motion to accept the students' suggestion and change the grading system to Pass-Fail for both this year and next for the Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics course if possible. The motion was seconded and further discussion ensued:***

Dr. Madden brought up concerns he has with both feasibility and possibly a legality issue. Dr. Davis reiterated that this would take quite a lot of time to fully implement and the current course ends on March 4<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Koulouris agreed that there is legitimate concern about changing the expectation of other students as well. Dr. Lyons questioned where the anxiety is coming from that students feel about being graded using the current system, if this is something that "doesn't matter" (as suggested by the students). Ms. Koulouris responded to her question indicating that the grading system is out of step which leaves them wondering if there is more value placed on this course.

***Dr. Sarah Johansen amended her motion to table this suggestion/discussion until the next meeting. The motion to table was seconded and approved by a vote of 13 members in favor (with 4 students for a total of 11 votes).***

**9. March MEC Meeting Rescheduled due to LCME site visit**

- a. March 26, 2013 – 4:00 – 5:30 PM

**10. Other Business - None**

**UPCOMING SCHEDULED MEETINGS:**

Mar. 26	Apr. 16	May 21	June 18	July 16
Aud. F	Aud. A	Aud. A	Aud. A	Aud. A