



LIAISON COMMITTEE ON MEDICAL EDUCATION

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES
2450 N STREET, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

David P. Stevens, M.D.
LCME Secretary, 2002-2003
Phone: 202-828-0596 Fax: 202-828-1125
E-Mail: dstevens@aamc.org

November 21, 2002

COUNCIL ON MEDICAL EDUCATION
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
515 North State Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Frank A. Simon, M.D.
LCME Secretary, 2003-2004
Phone: 312-464-4933 Fax: 312-464-5830
E-Mail: frank_simon@ama-assn.org

Roderick Fraser, Ph.D.
President and Vice Chancellor
3-1 University Hall
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2J9
Canada

Dear President Fraser:

The purpose of this letter of accreditation is to inform you of the action taken by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) at its meeting of October 16-17, 2002, regarding the accreditation status of the educational program leading to the M.D. degree at the University of Alberta Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, and to transmit to you the final report of the Secretariat visit of the program that took place on May 13-14, 2002.

After reviewing the report of the Secretariat team, the LCME voted to continue accreditation of the medical education program leading to the M.D. degree at the University of Alberta Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry for the balance of its current term. The program's next full survey will take place during academic year 2005-06.

The LCME concurred with the team's findings that most previously noted concerns have been satisfactorily addressed. To assess compliance with those issues that remain, it requests that the dean submit a progress report to the CACMS and both LCME Secretaries by May 1, 2004. The report should provide the information requested below.

1. Opportunities for self-directed learning. The team concluded that the Faculty has made little apparent progress in developing a curriculum that promotes self-directed independent learning. They noted that protected time for students to engage in reflective learning appears to be infrequent, and most instruction that occurs during scheduled hours is provided in a lecture format that demands rapid assimilation of knowledge. According to the report, "second-year students in particular felt that the hours of instructional time were exhausting."

To address this issue, the dean or his staff should provide a full and detailed analysis of the schedule of required learning activities in the first two years. The analysis should include a review of the amount of material that students are expected to assimilate, the methods of instruction used to convey that information, and the evaluation strategies employed (type and number) to determine student success in achieving content objectives. It should also include a course-by-course explication of pedagogical methods employed to stimulate active and independent learning by students, and summaries of the most recent student evaluations of courses offered in the first two years.

Roderick Fraser, Ph.D.
November 21, 2002
Page Two

2. Effectiveness of the Practice of Medicine and Dentistry course. The team noted that course leadership is undergoing a transition and that the second-year portion of the course appears to be functioning well. It noted, however, that the first-year component of the course has not shown evidence of substantial improvement since the time of the prior full and limited surveys. To address this issue, the dean should provide a narrative description of actions taken by the new course leadership to address ongoing issues with the first year of the course.

3. Effectiveness of faculty members as facilitators of small-group discussion. The report notes that faculty members now have numerous opportunities to improve their skills in the facilitation of small-group discussions. The report notes that students report variability in the approaches of small-group discussion leaders, however, perhaps stemming from differing perceptions about the appropriate roles and expectations of facilitators. To address this issue, the dean should provide a narrative summary of changes instituted in the introductory block of the curriculum to more clearly define the facilitators' role. The summary should also include student and/or peer evaluations of facilitator quality.

Accreditation is awarded to the program of medical education based on a judgment of appropriate balance between student enrollment and the total resources of the institution, including faculty, physical facilities, and the operating budget. If there are plans to significantly modify the educational program, or if there is to be a substantial change in student enrollment or in the resources of the institution so that the balance is distorted, the LCME expects to receive prior notice of the proposed change. Substantial changes may lead to re-evaluation of the program's accreditation status by the LCME.

A copy of this letter and the final report of the Secretariat visit are being sent to D. Lorne J. Tyrrell, M.D., Ph.D., Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. The report is held confidential by the LCME. The document is for the use of the medical faculty and the university, and any public dissemination or distribution is at the discretion of institutional officials.

Sincerely,



David P. Stevens, M.D.
LCME Secretary, 2002-2003

enc.

cc: D. Lorne J. Tyrrell, M.D., Ph.D., Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
David Hawkins, M.D., CACMS Secretary
Frank A. Simon, M.D., LCME Secretary, 2003-2004