

students are part of the team," "allows student participation and resident teaching is excellent," "daily lectures were phenomenal," and "I have never felt so prepared for an exam." Three students commented that the KDMC rotation was strong because of a dedicated course chair.

Weaknesses:

In general this rotation had a lower rating by 3rd year medical students than in the previous year by 4th year medical students. Comments for improvement included, "I spent a lot of time doing scutt work," "I was only able to assist in two vaginal deliveries and find this grossly inadequate preparation," "often the patient did not want a male / med student involved," "very limited discussion of anatomy," "the residents were rude," and "my evaluation came late after the Dean's letter was released." Nine students specifically commented that this rotation at Harbor-UCLA has an unfriendly student environment, resident morale is low, attendings were ineffective as teachers, and "the worst rotation offered at UCLA." Specific resident and attending names were also mentioned as being unfavorable to medical students.

Outpatient Surgery

Strengths:

The overall rating for this course by all students was 74%. One student commented that "the short amount of time in each subspecialty gave us great exposure."

Weaknesses:

Students generally commented that "one week for each subspecialty allowed for little patient care," "there was insufficient preparation for students to be involved in direct patient care," "I often ended up shadowing," "one week on each rotation is too short to immerse ourselves and too long to just get a feel," "not conducive to learning," "students should be allowed to select subspecialty exposure," "never felt like part of the team," and "little continuity."

Neurology

Strengths:

The overall rating for this course by all students was 73%. Three students stated that Neurology was the best clinical course with comments including, "attending rounds consistently involved teaching with daily imaging rounds that helped tie the patients presentation with the structural lesions," and "attendings made efforts to be enthusiastic, involved, and interactive."

Weaknesses:

4th year Drew students rated this rotation the lowest at 56%. Student comments included: "very little teaching," "we saw very few patients," "course syllabus was not helpful for the rotation or the exam," "little teaching and few formal lectures," "at CHS the service was too busy to include medical students," "faculty were uninterested in teaching," "minimal hands on experience," and "insufficient exposure to a variety of

teaching," "lack of focus on evidence based teaching," "students attend useless lectures for 8 straight hours on Fridays," "should allow students to perform more procedures," and "pressured students to see a large quantity of patients in clinic."

Ambulatory Medicine

Strengths:

The overall rating for this course by all students was 80%. Positive comments included that this rotation offered the best teaching, strong quality of attendings, a lot of one-on-one teaching and opportunity to work directly with patients. Harbor and Olive View were sites most commonly commented on for their strengths in ambulatory medicine.

Weaknesses:

Negative comments by students included that "the rotation was disorganized," "attendings and residents had difficulty fitting us into their schedules," "not enough cohesiveness," "could not see our own patients," and "no ambulatory component at KDMC."

Inpatient Surgery

Strengths:

The overall rating for this course by all students was 79%. Thirty students rated this course as their best clinical experience citing the following: "good balance of clinical exposure and didactics," "I was able to integrate and participate," "the course made me a harder worker," "a lot of independent clinical learning along with didactics," "excellent hands on experience in the ER and the OR (trauma surgery)," "residents/attendings ask more questions," "incredible operating room teaching," "I had the most responsibility for my patients," "good integration of medicine and surgery," and "enthusiastic residents." Multiple positive comments were made specifically about vascular and trauma surgery at Harbor.

Weaknesses:

The lowest rankings by students came in the category of conduciveness of environment to learning, which received an overall rating of 76%. Comments included: "could use greater emphasis on teaching," "residents were too busy to teach," "attendings provide minimal and incomplete teaching," "med students only served to get vitals in the morning," "negative attitude towards students," and "12 weeks is too long for students not interested in surgery."

Obstetrics and Gynecology

Strengths:

The overall rating for this course by all students was 76%. Seventeen students commented that OB/Gyn was the best clinical rotation. Personal comments included: "we were required to work hard but the focus was always on learning," "felt like I learned something everyday," "expectations are known and understood and medical

Weaknesses:

This course was rated lowest by 3rd year Drew students who gave it an overall ranking of 78%. Three students, all in the Drew program, commented that there was a lack of medical student teaching and the residents were rude and inappropriate.

Pediatrics**Strengths:**

The overall rating for this course by all students was 89%. Multiple positive comments by students included: "offered the best teaching," "great morning didactic rounds," "well organized," "good balance of clinical exposure and didactics," "provides an environment that promotes learning," "excellent resident and attending teaching," "diversity of experiences in the ER, nursery, inpatient," and "everyone was enthusiastic about teaching."

Weaknesses:

Three students commented that Pediatrics needed the most improvement. Their statements included: "residents lacked concern for medical students," "never felt like part of the team," "little continuity with attendings," and "variable experience between sites."

Psychiatry**Strengths:**

The overall rating for this course by all students was 85%. Students commented that: "this rotation was an eye opening experience," "we had plenty of time to see diverse patients and teaching was done after each patient interview," "had a lot of autonomy," and "residents and attendings tried to engage the students."

Weaknesses:

3rd year Drew students rated this rotation the lowest at 76%. Three students that commented that this rotation needed the most improvement also said, "evaluations were inconsistent with verbal feedback," "needed more attending teaching," "supervision was inadequate and didactic lectures were not helpful to clinical application."

Family Medicine**Strengths:**

The overall rating for this course by all students was 82%. Eleven students commented that Family Medicine was the best clinical rotation. Student remarks included: "this course offered the most patient contact," "I saw my own patients and worked one-on-one with an attending physician," "amazing and helped my understanding of medicine in general."

Weaknesses:

Thirteen students commented that Family Medicine was the course in most need of improvement with comments such as: "needs to be more committed to medical student

PRECLINICAL CURRICULUM – Class of 2007

David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA Overall

Students were overwhelmingly content with their decisions to attend the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, with 64% of all first-year students rating themselves as "very satisfied" and greater than 90% rating themselves as "satisfied" or "very satisfied."

The results of general questions regarding the pre-clinical curriculum are summarized in the table below:

% of First-year Students Rating Aspects of Curriculum as Adequate or Satisfactory

Aspect of Curriculum	UCLA & Drew/UCLA	Riverside
Lecture Time	90%	86%
Small Groups Time	71%	82%
Labs Time	57%	73%
Independent Study Time	56%	82%
Clinical Experiences	80%	68%
Pace of Curriculum	82%	82%
Sequence of Courses	69%	86%
Effectiveness of Problem-Based Learning	62%	64%
Integration of Course Material	62%	95%
Relevance of Basic Sciences to Clinical Medicine	91%	95%
Adequacy of Preparation for USMLE	57%	71%
Adequacy of Preparation for Clinical Years	84%	76%

Pre-clinical coursework – UCLA & Drew/UCLA

All courses were evaluated in the following criteria-Quality of Teaching, Content of Course, Workload, Organization, Quality of Labs, Clinical Application, and Appropriate Integration of Relevant Material. The following are the results of those surveyed:

Satisfactory ratings

Foundation of Medicine block, GI System, and Endocrine System received the highest satisfaction ratings, with over 90% of students rating these areas as favorable in the above-mentioned qualities.

Doctoring I, First-year preceptorship, Renal System, and Reproductive System all received a greater than 60% favorable rating in the various aspects of these courses.

Adequacy of curriculum as preparation for clinical years: 68% rated this as satisfactory

Basic Science Courses:

All courses were evaluated in the following areas: Quality of teaching, Content of course, Workload, and Organization.

Satisfactory Ratings

Anatomy, Neuroanatomy and Pharmacology received the highest ratings overall with a >84% satisfactory rating in all categories.

Histology, Biochemistry, Physiology, CABS, Doctoring 1, First-year Preceptorship, Pathology, Microbiology and Immunology, Pathophysiology of Disease, Medical Genetics, Doctoring 2, and Fundamentals of Clinical Medicine/Second-year Preceptorship all received a greater than 50% satisfactory rating (with most being 70-80% satisfactory).

A recurrent theme among comments regarding these courses was that they were well organized and integrated what had been learned in previous courses.

Unsatisfactory Ratings

Two courses received significantly lower ratings overall from students of all years. Psychopathology taught at UCLA received satisfactory ratings just above 50% in all four areas of evaluation. Students commented that the lectures were not structured enough and did not cover the important topics in Psychopathology. In contrast, about 80% of Riverside students felt satisfied with their Psychopathology curriculum.

Biomath taught at UCLA received unsatisfactory ratings in all four areas by 30-40% of the UCLA and Drew classes. Again, 70-80% of Riverside students were satisfied with their Biomath curriculum.

Riverside students repeatedly commented that Pathophysiology of Disease (taught at the Riverside campus) was poorly organized and repeated some topics while skipping others. Many commented on the disjunction of the course due to the large number of lecturers involved. However, a majority of the students rated the course as satisfactory in all four areas.

Are Faculty Responsive to Student Comments/Suggestions for Course Improvement?

The majority of all classes answered yes.

Students overall were pleased with the diversity of the administration and faculty with 72% and 73% of students respectively rating it satisfactory. It should be noted that Drew students were less pleased with the diversity of the faculty than students from other programs. 31% of Drew students found faculty diversity to be unsatisfactory. However, students from every year and program praised the diversity of the student body with 89% rating it as "good" or "excellent". Furthermore, 88% of students believe there is a satisfactory level of open mindedness to others of diverse backgrounds including culture, gender, and sexual preference.

A vast majority of students also felt that there was adequate recruitment of a diverse student body.

Curriculum

Overall Curriculum

Over three-quarters of all students in all years and programs were satisfied with the overall medical curriculum and the same number felt that the overall medical curriculum objectives were achieved.

Preclinical Curriculum

Due to the new first-year curriculum for the 2003-2004 academic year, separate Preclinical Curriculum questions were written for the Class of 2007 UCLA and Drew students. These results will be presented separately. What follows is the evaluation of the previous preclinical curriculum as rated by the Classes of 2004, 2005, and 2006 and the Riverside Class of 2007.

General

Time Allotment:

Lecture: 58% felt adequate time was allotted

Small Groups: 70% felt adequate time was allotted

Labs: 73% felt adequate time was allotted

Independent Study: 58% felt adequate time was allotted

Clinical Experiences: 74% felt adequate time was allotted

Faculty and Curriculum:

Availability of Pre-clinical faculty: 88% rated this as satisfactory

Responsiveness of Faculty: 87% rated this as satisfactory

Overall student interaction with Faculty: 85% rated this as satisfactory

Pace of curriculum: 74% rated this as satisfactory

Sequence of Courses: 75% rated this as satisfactory

Effectiveness of Problem Based Learning: 72% rated this as satisfactory

Integration of course material between departments: 50% rated this as satisfactory

Relevance of basic science course material to clinical years: 70% rated this as satisfactory

Adequacy of curriculum as preparation for USMLE: 57% rated this as satisfactory

Student Representation and Government

Students overall are satisfied with both the effectiveness of student government and student representation on key medical school committees (Medical Education Committee, Honors Council, Admissions Committee, Faculty Executive Committee, and Medical Student Council).

Academic Opportunities and Structure

Student Outreach

Access to student interest groups and community outreach activities was rated "excellent" by nearly 70% of students with 77% of students overall participating in a student interest group. Riverside students rated access to these opportunities lower, with only 22% of first and second year Riverside students rating access to student interest groups as "excellent".

Research Opportunities

Also favorably rated were opportunities for basic science and clinical research with approximately 50% of all students rating opportunities for basic and clinical research as "excellent". 76% of students overall were satisfied with the funding available for research. Riverside students were slightly less satisfied. Many students participated in STTP during the summer after their first year and 41% of students rated this as "excellent".

Evaluations (P/F System)

Students almost overwhelmingly found the pass/fail grading system beneficial to students and believed it should be continued. In particular, this was felt to contribute to positive student interactions and cooperation by the vast majority of students.

Evaluations (Honors)

The clarity of criteria for honors selection (Letters of Distinction, AOA honor society) was rated as "poor" by nearly one third of students.

Diversity

The self-reported ethnic makeup of the students responding to the student survey was as follows:

- 8% African American
- 34% Caucasian
- 14% Hispanic
- 24% East Asian/Pacific Islander
- 9% South Asian
- <1% Native American
- 11% Other

Health and Safety

Overall, only 62% of students were satisfied with student health services. 64% of medical students found student health coverage for themselves to be adequate and only 54% believed coverage to be adequate for spouses and dependents. Slightly over 60% of students were satisfied with occupational hazard and disability insurance coverage as well as education regarding occupational hazards. A major concern for medical students was the limited access to student health services due to limited hours of operation of the Ashe Student Health and Wellness Center.

The majority of students felt safe both on the main UCLA campus and at affiliated hospitals.

Facilities

Library

Students almost universally praised the scope of the library's collection and favorably rated the facility as well. Only the overall rating of library study space was slightly lower with 20% of surveyed students feeling that they were unsatisfactory. The other main concern was the insufficient number of photocopiers. However, the number of staff and hours of the library were commended.

Medical Center

Students reported overall satisfaction with both instructional (classroom and laboratory) and social facilities (space for student meetings and relaxation). The availability of 24-hour study space was also seen as satisfactory. The availability of computers was highly rated by all classes and programs. The main area of concern was the adequacy of classroom/instructional AV equipment which was found unsatisfactory by 19% of students.

Housing and Parking

Access to parking is of considerable concern to students at the UCLA main campus. This is particularly difficult for MSIII's and MSIV's who must occasionally park at UCLA for \$7 a day if a weekly permit is not purchased in advance for \$14.25. 54% of students rated access to parking as unsatisfactory and 36% of students felt that administrative efforts to resolve the parking issue were not effective.

An easy-to-use electronic Housing Database allows posting of vacancies and searches for potential roommates within the UCLA medical student population. However, housing in the vicinity of UCLA continues to be high-priced and only 44% of students were satisfied with administrative efforts to provide assistance in seeking housing.

Dean's Office and Medical School Administration

80% of students from all years and programs felt that the deans and administrators at UCLA were accessible and responsive to student concerns. About 80% of students expressed satisfaction with their overall interaction with the administration.

Riverside students expressed a similar level of satisfaction (about 80%) with the Riverside Deans Office and Administration as did the Drew students with the Drew Deans Office and Administration.

Counseling and Student Support Services

The UCLA Student Affairs Office which oversees most aspects of student life and counseling was viewed favorably by students in all years for their academic counseling and tutorial aid. 85% of students felt the Student Affairs Office had adequate hours and nearly the same number felt that the Student Affairs Office was responsive to student needs. The Riverside Student Affairs Office received similar ratings and the Drew Student Affairs Office was only slightly lower with about 74% of students feeling that that their hours were adequate and 78% feeling that the Student Affairs Staff was responsive.

The UCLA Financial Aid Office received high marks by students of all years, with 94% of students expressing satisfaction with the hours and the responsiveness of the staff. Approximately 90% of students felt they received adequate information about financial aid resources and that loans were disbursed in a timely manner. Riverside student surveys reflected dissatisfaction with the Riverside Financial Aid Office. Only about half of Riverside students felt their Financial Aid Office was responsive to their needs and providing adequate information about financial aid resources. The student budget was found to be adequate by most UCLA and Drew students but only 49% of Riverside students felt their student budget was appropriate to their actual needs.

The students overall are satisfied with the availability of faculty advisors and mentors. Career advising was satisfactory overall as well.

Increased awareness of the availability of mental health counseling has been stressed by the administration and most students rated the confidentiality and quality of mental health counseling favorably. 51% of all students felt the overall quality of student mental health counseling was "Excellent".

David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA 2004 LCME Reaccreditation Student Report

This report reflects the opinions of the medical students at the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA. The Student Survey and this Report were developed and approved by an ad-hoc student committee including the presidents of the Classes of 2004-2007, representatives of the Medical Student Council and student members of the LCME Task Force.

Efforts were made at all times to ensure broad representation of the student body, with students from all classes, races, genders and programs (including UCLA, Drew/UCLA, UCR/UCLA, and M.D./Ph.D.) participating.

Focus groups and the guidelines outlined in the LCME publication "The Role of Students in the Accreditation of Medical Education Programs in the U.S. and Canada" were used to generate a detailed 328 question student survey. The survey was given to all 696 students with 676 students responding for a 97.1% response rate.

Most questions were coded with the options of 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Neutral; 4=Good; 5=Excellent. For ease of analysis, the responses of "Good" and "Excellent" were grouped together and represent satisfaction with the stated topic, while "Fair" and "Poor" were grouped together to indicate dissatisfaction.

neurological patients." The sites most students commented had too few patients included WLAVA and Cedars.

Radiology

Strengths:

This rotation was rated the highest by Drew students at 83%. No students made positive comments about radiology as a third year clerkship, although positive comments were made about 4th year elective radiology rotations.

Weaknesses:

The overall rating for this course by all students was 64%. 3rd year UCLA and Riverside students rated this rotation the lowest at 49%. Forty students thought radiology was the rotation that needed the most improvement. Comments included: "there is no radiology program," "the longitudinal format is absurd and many lecturers didn't even show up," "needs more structure," "it would be better if we had a formal short rotation through radiology," "lectures were either too basic or too advanced," and "I taught myself."

Doctoring 3

The Longitudinal Doctoring 3 course was rated along parameters that included quality of teaching, pertinence of topics, organization, and quality of the course.

Strengths:

The overall quality of teaching in this course was rated at 73%. One student remarked that Doctoring 3 / Preceptorship was the best clinical course

Weaknesses:

The overall quality of this course was rated at 70% by all students. The pertinence of course topics was also rated at 70% by all students. Comments by individual students included "Doctoring III may not be necessary," "Doctoring 3 has been a terrible course," and "it is entirely leader dependent."

College Foundations

The college foundations was rated in parameters that included effectiveness of colleges, effectiveness of college foundations weeks, and quality of mentorship.

The overall rating for the effectiveness of colleges was 81%. However Drew students on average rated college foundations lower along each parameter, with a rating of 76% for the overall effectiveness of colleges.

Elective Courses

Fourth year medical student electives were rated in parameters that included variety of courses, availability of courses, and quality of courses.

Students rated both the availability and quality of courses at 92%, and the variety of courses at 96%.

Positive comments by students included: "a broad range of possible experiences," "all elective experiences were positive and worthwhile," "freedom to create electives is very helpful," "I appreciate the flexibility in designing your fourth year," "great however emergency medicine should be a required course," "a great deal of independence and hands on training," "some of the best subspecialty departments in the country," "excellent teaching by attendings and residents," "the electives outside my specialty were responsive to my desire to learn," and "I liked being able to see different hospital settings." Most students commented that their elective experience was great or excellent.

Negative comments included: "experiences were variable and course descriptions were often not up to date," "inability to explore electives prior to 4th year hinders career exploration," and "amount of patient care responsibility was inadequate."