

Curriculum Connections

*A newsletter of the Education Council
and the Office of Medical Education
October 2000*

Educational Committees

Dianne Durham, Ph.D. was elected chair of the Education Council for the 2000-2001 academic year.

Associate Dean for Student Affairs Named

Mark Meyer, M.D., was named Associate Dean for Student Affairs effective Sept. 1, 2000.

First Year News

Summary of Student Responses
(Spring 2000 – Class of 2003)

- The response rate was 91% and at least half of the students reported attending at least 60% of the lectures for all courses.
- The majority of students (65% or more) indicated that the courses within the Gastrointestinal, Renal, Endocrine, and Neuroscience blocks were generally well integrated.
- Most students (> 65%) agreed that the overall quality of Medical Biochemistry (BIOC), Human Anatomy & Embryology (ATMY), Medical Physiology (PHYS), Neuroscience (NEUS), and Clinical Skills (CLSK) was good. About one-third of the respondents indicated that the overall quality of Cell & Tissue Biology (CTB: 32%) and Social Basis of Medical Practice (SBMP: 38%) was good.
- Most of the respondents (> 71%) indicated that the clinical relevance of the lecture material was made clear in BIOC, ATMY, PHYS, NEUS, and CLSK. Less than half of the students agreed that the clinical relevance of the lecture material was made clear in CTB (40%) and SBMP (47%).
- Most students (> 58%) agreed that lecture time was used effectively in BIOC, ATMY, PHYS, NEUS and CLSK. About one-third of the respondents reported effective use of lecture time for CTB (33%) and SBMP (34%).
- The majority of respondents (64% or more) agreed that lab time was used effectively in

ATMY and NEUS. About half of the students reported effective use of lab time for CTB (46%)

- The majority of students (> 79%) agreed that the relevance of the small group sessions to clinical medicine was made clear in BIOC, PHYS, and CLSK. About half (54%) reported that the clinical relevance of the small group sessions was made clear in SBMP.
 - Most students (> 74%) indicated that small group time was used effectively in BIOC, PHYS, and CLSK. About half of the respondents reported effective use of small group time for SBMP (47%).
 - The majority of students (72% or more) reported that the amount of scheduled contact time was about right for BIOC, CTB, ATMY, PHYS, NEUS, and CLSK. About half (54%) of the students noted that the amount of scheduled time was about right in SBMP. About one-quarter or more of students also noted that too much time was devoted to CTB (24%), CLSK (22%), and SBMP (43%). About 20% of the respondents indicated that the amount of scheduled contact time was too little for PHYS and NEUS.
 - Most students (61% or more) reported that the length of all of the blocks was about right. Still, many respondents indicated that the length of the Renal (37%), Endocrine (24%), and Neuroscience (32%) blocks was too short.
 - The majority of students (70%) indicated that the number of examinations was about right. About half of the respondents (49%) agreed that the clustering of the examinations was helpful, while 28% disagreed.
-

Second Year News

Summary of Student Responses
(Spring 2000 – Class of 2002)

- The response rate was 66%.
- The majority of students (75%) agreed that the information presented across the courses within the Spring semester was well integrated.
- Most students (\geq 80%) agreed that the overall quality of the course was good in Systemic Pathology (PAON), Pharmacology (PHRM), and Behavioral Medicine (BMED). About one-half agreed that the overall quality was good in

Physical Diagnosis (PDx: 46%) and Medical Ethics (ME: 54%).

- In PAON, PHRM, PDx, and BMED, the majority of students ($\geq 81\%$) agreed that the relevance of the lecture material to clinical medicine was made clear. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the students agreed that the relevance of the lecture material to clinical medicine was made clear in ME.
- The majority of students ($\geq 56\%$) agreed that lecture time was used effectively in PAON, PHRM, PDx, and BMED. Thirty-eight percent (38%) agreed that lecture time was used effectively in ME.
- At least 65% of students agreed that the relevance of the small group sessions to clinical medicine was made clear in PAON, PHRM, and PDx. Forty percent (40%) of the students agreed that the relevance of the small group sessions to clinical medicine was made clear in ME.
- The majority of students ($\geq 55\%$) reported that small group time was used effectively in PAON, PHRM, and PDx. About one-third (31%) agreed that small group time was used effectively in ME.
- The majority of students agreed that the amount of scheduled contact time was about right in PAON (90), PHRM (75%), PDx (59%), ME (58%), and BMED (81%).
- While 86% of students agreed that the number of examinations during the Spring semester was about right, only 21% agreed that the clustering of the examinations, as in the first year, would be helpful.

Third Year News

Summary of Student Responses
(Spring 2000 – Class of 2001)

- The overall response rate was 83%; the response rate for Kansas City and Wichita was 81% and 88%, respectively.
- The majority of students ($> 51\%$) on both campuses reported that the Pediatrics (PEDS), Obstetrics/Gynecology (OB/GYN), Family Medicine (FM), Internal Medicine (IM), General Surgery (SURG), and Neuropsychiatry (NPSY) clerkships provided a good learning experience. Most KC students (63% or more) indicated that the Ambulatory Medicine/Geriatrics (AM/GER) clerkship provided a good learning experience. For the Wichita campus, about one-third (32%) of the respondents agreed that the AM/GER clerkship was a good learning experience.

- At least half (50% or more) of the respondents from both campuses reported that the objectives of the PEDS, FM, AM, IM, SURG, and NPSY were clearly specified. For the Ob/Gyn clerkship, about half of the students (50% for KC & 45% for W) indicated that the objectives were clearly specified. In KC, 68% of the students agreed that the GER section of the AM/GER clerkship clearly specified the objectives and in Wichita, 41% of the students agreed that the GER section objectives were clearly specified.
- For both campuses, 55% or more of the students indicated that patient contact was sufficient for training purposes for the PEDS, OB/GYN, FM, AM section, IM, SURG, and NPSY clerkships. For the GER section the majority of the KC (65%) students and 45% of the Wichita students agreed that patient contact was sufficient.
- The majority of students ($> 63\%$) from both campuses agreed that the didactic components enhanced the learning experience for the PEDS, OB/GYN, FM, IM, and SURG clerkships. For the NPSY clerkship, most of the Wichita (86%) and 24% of the KC students thought the didactic components enhanced the learning experience. The majority of the KC students (68%) indicated that the didactics enhanced the AM/GER learning experience and about 40% of the Wichita students reported the same for AM/GER clerkship.
- At least 55% of the respondents on both campuses indicated that they were able to complete the objectives of all of the clerkships within the allotted time.
- More than 54% of the students on both campuses reported that the methods used to evaluate their performance was clearly explained in the PEDS, FM, IM, SURG, and NPSY clerkships. Half (50%) of the Wichita and 38% of the KC students indicated that the evaluation methods were clearly explained for the OB/GYN clerkship. For the AM/GER clerkship, the majority of the KC students ($> 58\%$) and about 40% of the Wichita students agreed that the evaluation methods were clearly explained.
- At least 50% of the students on both campuses reported receiving timely feedback about their progress in the PEDS, FM, and IM clerkships. For the SURG clerkship, 74% of the KC students and 43% of the Wichita students indicated that feedback about their progress was timely and appropriate. For the NPSY clerkship, 41% of the KC and 64% of the Wichita students noted receiving timely feedback. For the GER section, 68% of the KC

and 27% of the Wichita students reported receiving timely feedback. For the AM section and OB/GYN clerkship, less than half of the students (36% to 46%) from both campuses reported receiving timely feedback.

- The majority of students (> 63%) on both campuses reported that the type and amount of faculty contact was adequate for the PEDS, FM, IM, and SURG clerkships. For the OB/GYN clerkship, 38% of the KC and 50% of the Wichita students reported adequate faculty contact. For the NPSY clerkship, 38% of the KC and 82% of the Wichita students reported adequate faculty contact. For the AM/GER clerkship, the majority of the KC (63% to 74%) and about half (41% to 45%) of the Wichita students reported adequate faculty contact.

Fourth Year News

Summary of Student Responses
(Spring 2000 – Class of 2000)

- The overall response rate was 54% with 54% for Kansas City and 56% for Wichita.
- The majority of students from KC (53% or more) and Wichita (79% or more) agreed that they were able to arrange an interview schedule that met their needs, had enough time to complete interviews, that the number & variety of electives was adequate, and that the information and advice they received about the residency application and interview process was adequate.
- For the Rural Preceptorship, the majority of students from the Wichita campus (> 68%) agreed that the overall learning experience was good, that the objectives were clearly specified, that patient and faculty contact was sufficient for training purposes, that the didactic components enhanced the learning experience, they were able to complete the objectives, that the evaluation methods were clearly explained, and that feedback about their progress was timely and appropriate. For the KC campus, most students (> 56%) agreed that overall learning experience was good, that patient and faculty contact was sufficient for training purposes, and that they were able to complete the objectives. About half of the KC students agreed that the objectives were clearly specified and that feedback was timely and appropriate. Less than half of the KC respondents agreed that the didactic components enhanced the learning experience

and that the evaluation methods were clearly explained.

- For Health of the Public, the majority of students (55% or more) from both campuses agreed that the overall learning experience was good, that the objectives and methods used to evaluate performance were clearly specified, that the didactic components enhanced the learning experience, that they were able to complete the objectives, that the type and amount of faculty contact was adequate, and feedback about their progress was timely and appropriate.
- In general, students from both campuses reported that their critical care selective was a good learning experience, that the objectives were clearly specified, that patient contact was sufficient for training purposes, that the didactic components enhanced the learning experience, that they were able to complete the objectives, that the evaluation methods were clearly specified, that the type and amount of faculty contact was adequate, and that feedback about their progress was timely and appropriate.
- In general, students from both campuses reported that their critical care selective was a good learning experience, that the objectives were clearly specified, that patient contact was sufficient for training purposes, that the didactic components enhanced the learning experience, that they were able to complete the objectives, that the evaluation methods were clearly specified, that the type and amount of faculty contact was adequate, and that feedback about their progress was timely and appropriate.



Announcement and Upcoming Events

The Student in Difficulty: Prevention and Intervention

Michael Magill, M.D.
University of Utah

**October 12, 2000
2:00-4:00 pm
1014 Orr Major**

International Association of Medical Science Educators (IAMSE) Annual Meeting

July 21-24, 2000

Rochester, Minnesota

**Joint-Sponsored by
Mayo Medical School**

<http://www.iamse.org/>

Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Annual Meeting

October 27-November 3, 2000

Chicago, Illinois

<http://www.aamc.org/meetings/annual/start.htm>

Central Group on Educational Affairs (CGEA) Annual Meeting Call for Proposals

<http://www.medlib.iupui.edu/cgea/call2001.html>

**Submission Deadline
December 1, 2000**

Academic Medicine

Call for Submissions

**In Progress:
Reports of New Approaches in
Medical Education**

**Submission Deadline
November 17, 2000**

Editorial Comments Invited

Curriculum Connections was developed by the Education Council to keep faculty and students informed about progress and procedures to reform the KU School of Medicine curriculum. *Curriculum Connections* will strive to keep faculty, students and staff up to date on the KU medical curriculum, and you are invited to submit comments, suggestions and/or newsworthy items relating to medical education. Please contact either Dr. Dianne Durham, Chair of the Education Council, or Dr. Giulia Bonaminio, Assistant Dean for Medical Education, with your feedback.