



DARTMOUTH MEDICAL SCHOOL

SENIOR ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

Hinman 7005

306D Remsen

Hanover, NH 03755-3847

Telephone 603-650-7679

Facsimile 603-650-6841

David.Nierenberg@Dartmouth.edu

Thursday, December 22, 2005

To: Members of Medical Education Committee
From: David W. Nierenberg
Subject: Minutes - Meeting held Tues., December 13, 2005 - 4:00 to 5:45 pm, 758 E/W Borwell

Members Present: Jamie Bessich, Narath Carlile, Brett Chevalier, Rich Comi, Barbara Conradt, Andy Daubenspeck, Leslie Fall, Bill Garrity, Brent Harris, Horace Henriques, John Hwa, Don Kollisch, Gene Nattie, Dave Nierenberg, Ben Northrup, Laura Reis, Eric Shirley, and Joao Tiexeira, = 18

Members Absent: Petra Lewis, Steve McAllister, Will Nugent, Roshini Pinto-Powell, Mike Price, Abigail Rao, and Brian Reid, = 7

Guests: Jeff Cohen, Joan Monahan, Alison Rudkin, and Kalindi Trietley = 4

Scheduled Meetings:

Sept. 27	Oct. 18	Nov. 15	Dec. 13	Jan. 17	Feb. 21	Mar. 21	Apr. 18	May 16	June 13
758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell	758 W Borwell

I. Special Topic: Clerkship Duty Hours Policy

By LCME mandate, a policy must be in force to provide reasonable “on duty hours” for students performing clerkships. Dave Nierenberg provided a draft of this policy, based on suggestions by students and clerkship directors. According to student member Brett Chavalier, the draft was discussed in three meetings of the student government and is supported by same.

Discussion ensued, including the following points:

- A. The policy, as written, allows for unanticipated educational opportunities;
- B. Only one department (surgery) is currently exceeding the hours in this draft;
- C. Students find clinical hours valuable and feel well-treated. A few fear that the new policy will cut them off from educational opportunities;
- D. A system needs to be set in place for clerkship directors to monitor duty hours;
- E. Students require flexibility that the policy may curtail;
- F. The policy does not protect students from themselves. Highly competitive students may ignore the policy;
- G. How does the policy affect off-site clerkships?;
- H. Should students be allowed to spend the time they deem necessary for a quality educational experience?

The MEC voted to adopt the draft as its new guidelines.

Dave Nierenberg stated that the guidelines are a good step in the right direction. He will finalize it, include it in the minutes (Attachment A), and the membership will revisit them in a year.

II. Review of the Curriculum: Year 2 Medical Neurology Course

Brent Harris reviewed the information he was given by Dave Nierenberg at the November meeting regarding the SBM/Neurology Course and found the following:

- A. Based on the student evaluations from last year, Brent reported the following strengths:
 - 1. Students praised the new course directors as committed and dedicated;
 - 2. Students felt that the course was a good overview of neurological diseases;
 - 3. Students found small group sessions and cases helpful;
 - 4. Students especially liked the patient demos; and
 - 5. Students found the course materials helpful.
- B. Based on student evaluations from last year, Brent reported a few minor areas that could be improved:
 - 1. Students felt the amount of material presented was sometimes "overwhelming;"
 - 2. Students suggested that uniformly structuring the lecture notes would be helpful;

Jeff Cohen, course director for Neurology presented the following points:

- 1. Improvements are being made in small group discussions;

2. More varied patient demos are being planned;
 3. Competencies are now being assessed in small groups;
 4. The exam (including slides) is being revised;
 5. Although the amount of information can be overwhelming, he and the lecturers strive to make it interesting; and
 6. The course directors try to make themselves available to students.
- C. According to attending student members some of the weak areas have already been addressed in this years' class, including:
1. Students found that access to notes before class is helpful;
 2. Small groups are well-received;
 3. Although there has been some improvement this year, there is little correlation between other classes;
 4. Although students found the timing of the exam not well coordinated with the quiz, the grading is fair; and
 5. Students found that a lot of clinical examinations, tests, and procedures are taught that may be better covered in another course.

III. Review of Curriculum: Year 2 SBM/Psychiatry Course

Due to lack of time and the unavailability of the course director, this review has been rescheduled for the January MEC meeting.

IV. Special Topic: ICT Literacy Project

Brent Harris stated that medical students and doctors use technology extensively and there is a need to assess Information and Communication Technologies in medical students. He, in association with Eric Shirley, Bill Garrity, Steve McAllister, and at least two medical students and/or residents have applied for a grant to to define physician specific ICT tools of importance and create an assessment exam based on general and medicine specific ICT skills. (Attachments B & C).

V. Key Metrics: USMLE Boards Policy

Given the failure of six DMS students in 2005 on the USMLE on Step II of the boards, Dave Nierenberg requested input on the current DMS policy, specifically, the following paragraph:

"DMS students must take USMLE Step I prior to beginning their first clerkship during Year 3. They must also take USMLE Step II (both CK and CS exams) prior to Class Day during Year 4."

He stated that a new policy, in preliminary or draft form, would be sent with the minutes (Attachment D) to be discussed at the January MEC meeting.

Discussion ensued, with the following issues raised:

1. Are students aware of the importance of Step I (as compared to Step II)?
2. What is the policy of other medical schools? (80% require passing, some will not let the student continue in his/her clerkship until Step I is passed. Dismissal from medical school and delayed graduation are also options exercised.)
3. Would a policy mandating passing raise the bar on DMS education?
4. Should DMS require students to pass Step I but not Step II?
5. Would it be helpful to set a deadline for passing so that the student is not too far removed from the material?
6. Could it be required that the student pass Step I before continuing on to Year 3?

Dave Nierenberg called for a nonbinding, preliminary straw vote. The membership was roughly divided between keeping the current policy, and including a new policy that requires passing the Boards.

Dave will create a list of pros and cons on the policy to present at the January meeting.

VI. Agenda for Jan. 17 Meeting

- A. Review: Rich Comi will review SBM/Psychiatry
- B. Key Metric: Draft of new policy on USMLE boards (continued);
- C. Key Metric: Report on AAMC Graduate Survey (continued).