

## **Monday July 14th**

### **8:30- 10:00 am Centralization of Curricula**

(Gordon Page, David Cook, Jill Gordon, Karen Mann, Wayne Davis, Rosalie Ber)

This session analyzed the role of directors of medical education offices in the processes of moving to and managing a centralized system of curriculum management. Small group discussions were stimulated by a role play of a meeting between a dean and a "task force" consisting of a clinical department head, basic sciences department head and head of an office of medical education. The dean charged the task force with responding to an accreditation review requirement to move to a centralized system of curriculum management. The subsequent discussions addressed the roles and goals of directors/offices in a centralized system, the principles that should guide the involvement of the director/office, and the practical strategies for dealing with people that impede a move to centralized curricula, and for dealing with the senior administration of the faculty in the process.

### **10:30-12:00 noon Curriculum Evaluation**

(Gwendie Camp, Jon Veloski, Summers Kalishman)

This session was structured around a discussion of four questions pertaining to the role of directors and their offices in curriculum evaluation: **1.** What kind of information do you collect and report? **2.** What kind of talent and team do you need and rely upon to deliver this evaluation? **3.** How do you report findings? **4.** How will you assess the efficacy of what you have done The "blended" discussion of these questions focused on general policy issues guiding data collection procedures, office roles in data collection and dissemination, budget requirements, incentives, information systems, data dissemination and who has access, opportunity to respond to evaluation data, use of normative data, providing a kind of data that will be accepted (e.g., qualitative vs. quantitative), etc., and permitted descriptions of specific strategies pertaining to these issues.

## **Tuesday July 15th**

### **8:30-10:00 am In Quest of Technology**

(Jack Nolte and colleagues)

This session was structured around a challenge to plan for the best way to spend \$300,000 for instructional technology across basic sciences education, clinical sciences education, and distance education, and on assessing the impact of technology use. A discussion group addressed each of these four areas, followed by a plenary discussion of their recommendations on the how to spend the \$300,000.

### **10:15-11:15 am Where to with the Web?**

(Diane Heestand, George Nowacek, and John Shatzer)

This session addressed a set of issues pertaining to the use of the Society's list-serv and Web site. George discussed the list-serv and how it might serve us better. Diane discussed the Web site. Several people indicated that the site was difficult to find with some search engines, which does not serve the society well if increased visibility is a goal of the site. John raised an issue of the need for search mechanism for journals which are not indexed by the National Library of Medicine. The general view was that the development of such a mechanism was beyond the resources of the SDRME. Diane and

George were acknowledged for their major contribution to the development of the Society's Web site and list- serv.

### **11:15-12:00 noon Teaching Incentive Programs**

(Frank Schimpfhauser and colleagues)

Frank Schimpfhauser arranged this session whose focus was on ideas and roles for developing successful faculty incentive programs. A role play between the "Dean" of anywhere Medical School and three faculty charged with developing a centralized curriculum was held two weeks after initial charge of ".. develop a plan". The Dean asked for suggestions for an incentive plan to encourage faculty participation in a new centralized curriculum. Sharon Krackov discussed the Cornell system for quantifying teaching efforts using a value system, Frank Stritter discussed teaching portfolios, and Frank Schimpfhauser discussed Buffalo's clinical educator track as a component of their promotion system, and the point system used for professorial level consideration. Small groups then discussed and listed other approaches, ideas for rewarding curricular participation which might work at other schools. Short list of ideas included: **1.** Financial (time/change of job description) **2.** Modify institutional values/expectations promotional rank **3.** Control at Dean Level - salary, merit, departmental allocations, appointments. to director positions **4.** Dedicated positions **5.** Quality focus as well as quantity (define participation and expectations) **6.** Departmental sharing of faculty **7.** Provide support staff and clerical support as a reward **8.** Develop a non FTE financial allocation system based on effort and productivity.

### **Wednesday July 16th**

#### **8:30-10:00 am Preparing for the Office Review**

(Bill Anderson and John Littlefield)

An actual review of the Office of Medical Education Research and Development (OMERAD) at Michigan State University was reviewed. The group was asked to address two questions relative to the review: (1) What actions should the director of this office take? and (2) What are some guidelines to prepare for a review? The answers to the first question included determining what the Dean wanted and his view of the report , rallying the troops and determining what they wanted, prepare a mission statement for the office, meet with department chairs to determine what they want from the office, develop a strategic plan for the office, and communicate it to Dean, chairs and faculty. Other responses were to set expectations for faculty and to establish annual contracts with Associate Deans. Responses to the second question included conducting internal reviews annually, develop expectations for all staff, carefully documented monthly staff progress reports and annual reports, negotiate what the review criteria should be and who should be part of the review process, and involve staff in the review and coach them.

#### **10:15-11:30 am Leadership Challenges for Directors**

(Gordon Page, Sheila Chauvin, Kristi Ferguson, Robin Harvan, Boyd Richards)

This session was a " sharing of collective wisdom" on a variety of office management issues. The following issues were discussed which were identified by SDRME members some months earlier when members were polled for suggestions for topics for the annual meeting. **1.** How are the roles and services of your office changing, and how does this effect you as director? **2.** How do you orient your

staff (and yourself)? **3.** How do you maintain morale (yours and your staff)? **4.** How do you help staff (and yourself) with professional development? **5.** What are the big challenges you now face as director, and how are you meeting these challenges? Small groups discussed these issues and then conveyed the outcomes of their discussion to the large group.

**11:30-12:00 noon Meeting Wrap-up**

Brownie Anderson provided a brief overview of the reorganization of the Group on Educational Affairs of the AAMC into four sections -- undergraduate, post-graduate, continuing, and Research in Medical Education. The existing RIME Committee whose role is to plan the AAMC Annual Meeting RIME Program is a part of the RIME section. Brownie raised the issue of what role the SDRME as an entity should play in the section on Research in Medical Education. She suggested for example that the SDRME could assume some responsibility for the medical education research fellowship program.

Louise Arnold also raised the issue of the proposed bylaws change to include osteopathic schools as eligible for SDRME membership. Brownie noted that osteopathic schools are eligible for GEA membership.

The meeting closed with a general evaluative discussion of the annual meeting.