Faculty of Health Sciences
School of Medicine Academic Council (SOMAC)
Minutes of Meeting, Monday, December 4, 2006
Etherington Hall Auditorium @4:30 p.m.

This was the inaugural meeting of SOMAC.

CHAIR: Dean Walker

Present: 85 members of the School of Medicine

Item for discussion: Accreditation of the School

D. Walker described the process of the accreditation by a combined group from LCME and CACMS. The site survey would occur on January 27 – February 1, 2007.

He introduced the panel of Chairs of the Self-Study component.

Drs. Drover
Moffatt
Tsai
Fisher
Pang
McCans

He then turned the Chair over to Dr. J. Jeffrey.

Dr. Drover described the self-study process and thanked the members of the committees and the task force.

He then asked each committee chair to report on the major finding of the self-study.

Dr. Moffatt (Education): Her committee interviewed course chairs, community & regional faculty and collected the material for the database. She listed some strengths and some areas that need work.

1. How to make faculty feel responsible for the undergraduate curriculum.
2. Need for increased resources and to distribute resources appropriate to needs.
3. Need to monitor the curriculum.

Dr. Tsai (Students): Excellent students who, overall, were pleased with their education.

4. Need for information – courses
   - bursaries
   - handling debt
5. Need for
   - infrastructure
   - space
   - classrooms
   - classroom size
   - technology
- space in CEC

Dr. Pang (Faculty):
6. Need increased faculty participation in administration of the School.
7. Deployment of faculty to match our goals.

Dr. Fisher (Resources): a lot of expansion since last accreditation in 1999.
Increased - students
- residents
- research
- faculty
- funding
8. Need for increased IT support.

H. Lindsay (Education committee): many strengths.
9. need clear objectives - implicit
   - less overlap
   - integration e.g. with PBL
   - a body to oversee objectives
   - students prefer case based approach

10. students would like 2 year clerkship
11. we must be sure to address all the recommendations in the report, not just the major ones.

A lot of useful and constructive discussion followed these reports.

The following are some of the points touched upon:
• Need for infrastructure
• Organization of groups
• Dissemination of new approaches
• Be difficult for students to attend school
• The value of teaching as seen in various departments
• Role of the various budgets
• Accountability – for Gov’t funding
   - for academic work
   - for departmental work
• role of SEAMO
• need for expert support of IT tools, web-based, interaction, designed well
• physical facilities for clinical teaching
• expansion at HDH
• conflicting demands – OR schedules & delays
  - teaching
  - research
  - administration
  - consider a “code” system to track types of teaching
  - alternative approaches to our current methods of teaching
- problem of overlapping year if we go to a 2 year clerkship
- could shift clerkship and have some lectures at the end.

D. Walker thanked everyone and pointed out we must remember all the good things we do as well as act to improve the others.

Meeting adjourned 6:00 p.m.

R. Wigle
Secretary to the Faculty