

Members Present:

John Littlefield (Presiding), Bill Anderson, Ralph Block (Univ of Berne), Ted Whitley, J. Dennis Hoban, Mark Albanese, Emil Petrussa, Stewart Mennin, Jon Veloski, Robin Harvan, Mike Ravitch, Maurice Hitchcock, Christine Vu (Univ of Geneva), Liz Armstrong, John Shatzer, Sheila Chauvin, Wayne Davis, Diane Heestand, Kristi Ferguson, Frank Schimpfhauser, Wylie McNabb, Boyd Richards, Les Sandlow, Don Melnick (NBME), Hilary Schmidt, Jenny Blake, Paul Grand'Maison, Richard Reznick, Robert Cohen (Hebrew Univ), Dave Irby (UCSF), Louise Arnold, Carol Tresolini, Larry Gruppen (U of Mich), Fred Wolf, Deb Simpson, George Nowacek

Greetings & Update(s):

John Littlefield greeted SDRME membership and began the "One-minute Update". Themes that ran through the updates were: Accreditation, Curriculum Review and Revision, Faculty Productivity, and Growth and Shrinkages in our offices. As was case in New Mexico, this part of the program was well received and provided valuable information about our offices.

Reports Membership:

John Shatzer welcomed three new members to SDRME, Rhee Fincher (Med Col of GA), Peggy Murphy (LSU), and Jeff Turnbull (Univ of Ottawa).

Nominations: Wylie McNabb indicated that he will be sending out a "call for nominations" shortly.

Treasurer: Jon Velsoki reported that he, Louise Arnold, and Mike Ravitch would meet to assure continuity of financial records and accounts.

Bylaws: Frank Schimpfhauser reported that the Bylaws changes had been approved by the membership.

SDRME Exhibit: Gwendie Camp notified that the exhibit would be housed with the President of SDRME. The membership gave Gwendie a round of applause for her efforts to get the exhibit produced.

Interactive Session:

Maintaining Vitality in our Offices---led by Bill Anderson Bill introduced this session by highlighting four principles that OMERAD has identified in its 30 year history. These principles are:

1. Keep your unit the mainstream by having members be seen as faculty members.
2. Work hard at being visible.
3. Seek to have a value-added dimension to your school, e.g., faculty development, performance-based assessment, etc.

4. Recruit generalists to the unit so that they can engage in whatever the needs of the institution might be at any point in time. This session was followed by a small group interactive session in which members discussed matters that help units maintain vitality.

Update on SDRME Projects:

Gang Xu distributed his first draft of "The Changing Health Care System: A Research Agenda for Medical Education". He introduced his paper by reminding us that the changing health care in the US has tremendous implications for change in medical education. Thus, he concluded that empirical research is needed to help identify areas of needed change in medical education. Gang Xu was hopeful that his paper would be the lead paper in a special issue of Evaluation and the Health Professions. Emil Petrusa gave an update on the SDRME/AAMC Workshop for Associate Deans. This case-based workshop has had excellent attendance in the past two years. It emphasizes Leadership, Curriculum Change, and Evaluation. It will be offered again in 1998.

Update on Future SDRME Meetings:

The July 9-11 1998 meeting in Philadelphia will precede the 8th Ottawas International Conference also in our City of Brotherly Love. There will be a call for posters focusing on the research part of our jobs. The 1999 meeting will be in Spring Green, Wisconsin and the year 2000 meeting will be in British Columbia.

A reception followed.

November Minutes Evaluation Form Summary (N=16):

1. Rate the usefulness/value of the following sessions:

a.	One minute introduction/update			
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
			3	13
b.	Business meeting/committee reports			
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
		1	10	5
c.	Disease prevention in medical units			
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
		3	4	8
d.	Update on SDRME projects (Research reviews, SDRME/AAMC Workshop, RIME Handbook, Web Page)			
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
		6	6	3
e.	Update on other projects (MSOP)			
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
		1	3	2

Comments:

- I liked the short presentations
- Updates are very informative
- I would like more depth on those topics (i.e. The agenda for the SDRME/AAMC workshop).

2. Rate the usefulness/value of the meeting to you:

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
	2	6	7

Comments:

- Interactions could be better
- Room arrangements a problem
- Quite short meeting time. Don't try to put too much in. One minute reports are excellent for time management
- Too many people had to leave
- Need to find better time
- Get "updates" on a number of things
- Conflicts, as usual, are troublesome
- Informative and supportive of director's needs
- This was my first SDRME meeting and I liked the collegiality of the group

3. What characteristics of the meeting were MOST valuable to you:

- Conversations
- Networking opportunities and information
- Updates
- Face to face meeting
- Discussion
- Hearing what other people are doing
- Networking
- Small group breakouts
- One minute updates and presentation were both outstanding

4. What characteristics of the meeting were of LITTLE/LEAST value to you:

- Time slot was a conflict
- The disease session never really had any closure
- Committee reports - Although mercifully short

5. The theme of next year's annual meeting is "The Director's Role in Promoting Research in Medical Education." Please suggest specific topics (e.g. research areas) for sessions at that meeting, and identify people that should be invited to lead those sessions.

