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LCME Review
A medical school engages in **ongoing planning and continuous quality improvement processes** that establish short and long-term programmatic goals, result in the achievement of measurable outcomes that are used to improve programmatic quality, and **ensure effective monitoring of the medical education program’s compliance with accreditation standards.**
Describe the process used and resources available for quality improvement activities related to the medical education program. For example, is there an office or dedicated staff to support quality improvement activities at the levels of the medical school or university?

Describe how the medical school monitors ongoing compliance with LCME accreditation standards. The response should address the following questions:

- Which standards are monitored (e.g., all standards, a subset of standards)?
- How often is compliance with standards reviewed (mid-cycle, yearly, at some other interval)?
- What data sources are used to monitor compliance?
- What individuals or groups receive the results?
The LCME does not prescribe the characteristics of the CQI system the school must have in place. The decision of whether the school’s monitoring is “effective” will be based on the answers to the specific questions in the DCI.

Note that the purpose of the CQI system is to allow prospective identification and correction of areas not performing as expected in other elements.
A system for the ongoing monitoring of accreditation elements would benefit from the following being in place:

- Policy
- Personnel
- Resources
SELECTING ELEMENTS TO BE MONITORED

The LCME has not specified which elements to monitor or the timing of reviews. Schools will select the elements to monitor. There are potential categories that might assist a school’s in planning what to monitor:

- Commonly-cited elements
- Elements that include an explicit requirement for monitoring or involve a regularly-occurring process
- New or recently-revised elements or changes in LCME expectations related to elements
SELECTING ELEMENTS TO BE MONITORED (con’t)

- Elements that could be reviewed to ensure that policies are congruent with current operations
- Elements that directly or indirectly affect the core operations of the school
- Elements (prior standards) cited in the previous full survey
PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION AND REVIEW

A comprehensive work-plan would facilitate the monitoring process and ensure that it is appropriately resourced:

- The elements to be reviewed
- The data sources to be used for each element, the timing of data collection and review, and individuals/organizational roles responsible
- The individual(s)/committee(s) who will receive and act on the information
MANAGING DATA COLLECTION

• For efficiency, data collection processes and instruments already in place within the school (e.g., course/clerkship evaluations) or available from external sources (e.g., AAMC GQ) could be used/adapted.
  o Consider creating a catalogue of available data

• Schools can also use specially designed instruments, but take care to avoid “data fatigue.”
At the October LCME Meeting, the LCME approved the white paper titled, “Implementing a System for Monitoring Performance in LCME Accreditation Standards.”

The white paper is now available for download on the LCME website:

http://lcme.org/publications/
Continuous Quality Improvement as a Tool for Changing Culture
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1.1 Strategic Planning and Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)

- A medical school engages in **ongoing planning** and **continuous quality improvement processes** that:
  - establish short and long term programmatic goals;
  - result in the **achievement of measurable outcomes** that are used to **improve** programmatic quality; and
  - ensure **effective** monitoring of the medical education program’s compliance with accreditation standards.
Linking CQI to the new Strategic Plan

• GW SMHS was in the preliminary stages of revising its strategic plan when the LCME element 1.1 on CQI was introduced.

• GW leveraged the new element 1.1 (CQI) and included other LCME elements into the new strategic plan, specifically 3.3, 3.5, 6.6, 7.5, 7.6, and 7.9.
• **Leadership:** Promote a culture of excellence through leadership, performance improvement, professionalism, diversity and inclusion for students, faculty and staff.

• **Strategy:** Implement *Continuous Quality Improvement* (CQI) processes throughout SMHS programs that result in short- and long-term programmatic goals and the achievement of measurable outcomes that improve quality. [Develop a plan and performance metrics to facilitate achievement of diversity plan goals as they apply to students, faculty and staff].

• **Education:** [...]Leader in interdisciplinary and inter-professional education in response to changing health care systems [...] .

• **Community:** Commitment to health equity… through service, education, advocacy.
Resources for CQI (and other LCME related elements) became a requirement for the school under the strategic plan. Developing and reviewing plans with metrics to demonstrate effectiveness are now required under both CQI and the strategic plan, and are monitored routinely and separately.

In addition to CQI, resources were also allocated for other LCME related areas, including:
- Diversity (3.3), faculty professional development (4.5), and service learning (6.6).
- Other elements were funded indirectly through overall enhancement made to the Office of Medical Education, such as inter-professional collaborative skills (7.9), administrative offices (new staff in financial aid (12.1)), and further renovations to the study/lounge/storage spaces (5.11).

Resources (time) were also allocated for the development of a new curriculum and its evaluation and assessment.
• Sr. Quality Analyst hired in 2014.

• Individual dedicated to monitoring compliance of LCME standards/elements, including: on-going central monitoring of clerkship logging with real time reporting back to deans, clerkship directors and coordinators, and eventually to the Clinical Education Subcommittee regarding the status of logging. Logging is performed at the mid-clerkship, a week before the end-of-clerkship, and at the end of the clerkship. It is performed in conjunction with duty hour reporting. Year-end assessment of overall utilization of alternative clinical encounter methods is also performed and presented (6.2, 9.7, 8.6, and 8.8).
• Other additional LCME elements monitored include:
  – 1.4 Affiliation Agreements
  – 3.3 Diversity/Pipeline Programs
  – 3.6 Student Mistreatment
  – 4.3 Faculty Appointment Policies
  – 5.5 Resources for Clinical Instructions
  – 5.11 Study/Lounge/Storage Space
  – 8.1 Curriculum Management
  – 9.2 Faculty Appointments
  – 9.8 Fair and Timely Summative Assessment, and several more.
Sr. Quality Analyst:

- In addition to CQI monitoring, position also:
  - Collects data (DCI) for the actual LCME site visit and full mid-cycle review
  - Participates in monthly LCME calls
  - Prepares reports for AAMC (i.e. LSSR)
  - Participates in ad hoc LCME related operational and financial planning/brainstorming meetings
  - Prepares independent data reports on certain focus areas (i.e. student debt, grades, comparability)
  - Reviews the UME and Dean’s dashboard for accuracy/consistency (diversity, match, step scores)
  - Produces annual CQI report on activities, status of monitored elements
  - Gathers and produces report on institutional changes made based on student input “You Asked, We Listened.” Generates final report for dean.
  - Analyzes and disseminates AAMC GQ data.
Resources for CQI

Associate Dean for Health Affairs:

• In addition to CQI, position assumes responsibility for:
  – Strategic planning
  – Clinical expansion
  – Funds flow and negotiations with affiliates
  – Business intelligence
  – Research metrics
  – Dean’s dashboard
  – Board of trustees, etc;

• Participates in school and university meetings (i.e. deans, senior leadership, curriculum, board of trustees, financial, business intelligence, external consultants, clinical affiliates; and monthly LCME calls, etc.), thereby enabling identification of right people for brainstorming/solutions.
Associate Dean for Health Affairs:

- Participates in monthly LCME calls
- Reviews submissions for CQI and elevates for follow-up (discussion, action plan, and/or 1:1 meeting)
- Recommends review of an element based on input/concerns raised at meetings or communicates/elevates a recommendation for review obtained from various meetings/individuals
- Follows up with stakeholders regarding polices and procedures, congruity/validity/clarity, and dissemination of data and problem solving efforts
- Reviews/edits the entire LCME DCI for accuracy, congruity, integrity
- Maintains communication from LCME for dissemination at school/university level
- Leads action plan for focused review/follow-up/action on certain elements
- Prepares reports/dean’s dashboard on status of LCME elements [and strategic plan] for university president and board of trustees.
- Initiates and leads full mid-cycle LCME review process.
Sr. Advisor to VPHA:

- Has extensive LCME accreditation experience, including participation/leadership in:
  - Monthly LCME conference calls
  - LCME national and regional meetings/conferences
- Has previous LCME site review experience, and is regarded as a nationally recognized expert who can serve as a neutral and final authority on compliance
- Works with faculty on nuances of methods to achieve compliance and correct LCME interpretation of elements in order to facilitate root cause analysis, problem-solving; and to propose clear, reliable processes for follow-up
- Participates in curriculum meetings and serves as the final say in process recommendations and interpretations vis-à-vis LCME standards.
Alternatives to Sr. Advisor:

• Single designated faculty member:
  – Who has been a member of the LCME (if available)
  – With LCME site visit experience
  – Who attends Regional LCME Educational Meetings
  – Who attends AAMC national meetings
  – Who participates in monthly LCME phone calls
  – Who can contact LCME at the AAMC national meeting for private consultation and/or
  – Who can contact LCME directly for consultation/guidance
Core criteria for annual review includes elements recommended for review from LCME, based on the following:

- LCME elements frequently cited for “noncompliance”
- Elements frequently cited for “compliance with monitoring”
- 21 elements subsumed under “CQI process”
- Elements required for review based on conclusion of a full mid-cycle review and/or full LCME site visit
- Elements noted for monitoring from routine auditing or data sources (i.e. AAMC GQ, LSSR, student surveys)
- Elements recommended for monitoring by deans or any of the curriculum or student committees
- Elements recommended for monitoring after course review and/or any change (i.e. curriculum) that warrants monitoring.
CQI Processes

- CQI processes regarding selection, adding, and dropping of an element for review are formulated with input from the deans and then codified and disseminated.

- Annual report on status of effectiveness of CQI monitoring is prepared and disseminated.
11 Most Common “Noncompliance” Findings According to LCME:

• 1.4 Affiliation Agreement
• 3.3 Diversity/Pipeline Programs and Partnerships
• 6.2 Required Clinical Experiences
• 8.6 Monitoring of Completion of Required Clinical Experiences
• 6.3 Self-Directed and Life-Long Learning
• 8.1 Curricular Management
• 8.3 Curricular Design, Review, Revision/Content Monitoring
• 9.1 Preparation of Resident and Non-Faculty Instructors
• 9.4 Variety of Measures of Student Achievement/Direct Observation of Core Clinical Skills
• 9.5 Narrative Assessment
• 9.8 Fair and Timely Summative Assessment
7 Most Common “Compliance with Monitoring” According to LCME:

- 3.3 Diversity/Pipeline Programs and Partnerships
- 3.5 Learning Environment/Professionalism
- 5.1 Adequacy of Financial Resources
- 9.4 Variety of Measures of Student Achievement/Direct Observation of Core Clinical Skills
- 9.8 Fair and Timely Summative Assessment
- 11.2 Career Advising
- 12.1 Financial Aid/Debt Management Counseling/Student Educational Debt
21 CQI Elements with Need for Monitoring According to LCME

- 1.1 Strategic Planning and Continuous Quality Improvement
- 1.5 Bylaws
- 3.3 Diversity/Pipeline Programs and Partnerships
- 3.5 Learning Environment/Professionalism
- 3.6 Student Mistreatment
- 4.4 Feedback to Faculty
- 4.5 Faculty Professional Development
- 5.1 Adequacy of Financial Resources
- 6.2 Required Clinical Experiences
- 6.3 Self-Directed and Life-Long Learning
- 8.1 Curricular Management
- 8.2 Use of Medical Educational Program Objectives
- 8.3 Curricular Design, Review, Revision/Content Monitoring
- 8.4 Program Evaluation
- 8.5 Use of Student Evaluation Data in Program Improvement
- 8.6 Monitoring of Completion of Required Clinical Experiences
- 8.7 Comparability of Education/Assessment
- 8.8 Monitoring Student Workload
- 9.1 Preparation of Resident and Non-Faculty Instructors
- 9.4 Variety of Measures of Student Achievement/Direct Observation of Core Clinical Skills
- 12.1 Financial Aid/Debt Management Counseling/Student Educational Debt
• 2015-2016: There were 29 elements reviewed
  – 25 from the “LCME findings list”
  – 4 generated internally

• 2016-2017: There are 27 elements for review
  – 24 from the LCME findings list,
  – 2 generated internally,
  – 1 generated internally and from LCME findings list.
Monitoring/tracking should include:

- Threshold for compliance (DCI requirements);
- What data is collected and when, whom and how it is reviewed;
- Overall frequency of monitoring and associated timelines;
- Responsible individuals;
- Expected outcome contrasted to actual outcome (i.e. need for ongoing monitoring based on evidence submitted and when next review is scheduled); and
- Summary analysis of overall effectiveness of monitoring back to stakeholders (formal and informal).
• Develop a system that is practical with metrics

• Master matrix prepared with all of the LCME elements should include:
  – Element number
  – Complete element statement
  – Issues/notes
  – Metrics used for compliance
  – Outcome
  – Individual/groups responsible
  – Expected date of accomplishment/scheduled review
  – Status
  – Date last reviewed with follow up notes

In the following example, the grid is collapsed, color coded for status levels (noncompliant, compliant, and pending), and populated for operational use
### New LCME April, 2016 DCI - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) schedule for 2016-2017 -- "Sample" Matrix using LCME DCI as a Tool

**Criteria used to identify standards/elements for auditing:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCME Findings</th>
<th>LCME DCI Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCME Findings</td>
<td>LCME DCI Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria used to identify outcome:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elements with issues identified by SMHS or additions by LCME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Element Number</th>
<th>Element Title</th>
<th>Issue/Notes</th>
<th>Metrics used for compliance</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Individuals/ Groups Responsible</th>
<th>Expected Date of Accomplishment/ Audit/Interval</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Last Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCME Frequently Cited across all medical school</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>DIVERSITY/ PIPELINE PROGRAMS AND PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td>A medical school has effective policies and practices in place, and engages in ongoing, systematic, and focused recruitment and retention activities, to achieve mission-appropriate diversity outcomes among its students, faculty, senior administrative staff, and other relevant members of its academic community. These activities include the use of programs and/or partnerships aimed at achieving diversity among qualified applicants for medical school admission and the evaluation of program and partnership outcomes.</td>
<td>Plan saved in Supporting Document action folder 3/16/15. Need annual update on action plan from Office of Diversity and Inclusion.</td>
<td>See DCI 3.3. Audit data/tables trends annually to check increase in student and faculty diversity.</td>
<td>The Action Plan has specific outcomes and metrics; received 3/16/2015. Needs to be implemented. Quarterly memo in the CQI folder for Faculty.</td>
<td>NAMES</td>
<td>Review annually.</td>
<td>Satisfactory. Nov. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCME Frequently Cited for Monitoring across all medical school</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>LEARNING ENVIRONMENT/ PROFESSIONALISM</td>
<td>A medical school ensures that the learning environment of its medical education program is conducive to the ongoing development of explicit and appropriate professional behaviors in its medical students, faculty, and staff at all locations and is one in which all individuals are treated with respect. The medical school and its clinical affiliates share the responsibility for periodic evaluation of the learning environment in order to identify positive and negative influences on the maintenance of professional standards, develop and conduct appropriate strategies to enhance positive and mitigate negative influences, and identify and promptly correct violations of professional standards.</td>
<td>Need to review instruments in August 2016.</td>
<td>See DCI 3.5. Audit examples of instruments used to evaluate the learning environment. Updated survey received July 21st.</td>
<td>Learning Environment Survey audited.</td>
<td>NAMES</td>
<td>Review annually.</td>
<td>Satisfactory. Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New LCME April, 2016 DCI - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) schedule for 2016-2017 -"Sample" Matrix using LCME DCI as a Tool

### Mechanics: Functional Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Element Number</th>
<th>Element Title</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Issue/Notes</th>
<th>Metrics used for compliance</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Individuals/Groups Responsible</th>
<th>Expected Date of Accomplishment/Audit/Interval</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Last Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCME CQI</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>STUDENT MISTREATMENT</td>
<td>A medical education program defines and publicizes its code of professional conduct for the relationships between medical students, including visiting medical students, and those individuals with whom students interact during the medical education program. A medical school develops effective written policies that address violations of the code, has effective mechanisms in place for a prompt response to any complaints, and supports educational activities aimed at preventing inappropriate behavior. Mechanisms for reporting violations of the code of professional conduct are understood by medical students, including visiting medical students, and ensure that any violations can be registered and investigated without fear of retaliation.</td>
<td>Review GQ Data in August 2016. Mistreatment policy in place.</td>
<td>See DCI 3.6. Code of Conduct approved; Data on student mistreatment from GQ to be analyzed in August.</td>
<td>Reduction in student reported mistreatment in GQ.</td>
<td>NAMES</td>
<td>Review annually.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCME CQI</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>FEEDBACK TO FACULTY</td>
<td>A medical school faculty member receives regularly scheduled and timely feedback from departmental and/or other programmatic or institutional leaders on his or her academic performance and progress toward promotion and, when applicable, tenure.</td>
<td>Annual Performance Reviews are completed with all relevant information.</td>
<td>See DCI 4.4, Feedback to faculty. Policies are adhered to; template is provided.</td>
<td>Timely feedback to faculty with APT path made clear.</td>
<td>NAMES</td>
<td>Review annually.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New LCME April, 2016 DCI - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) schedule for 2016-2017 -- "Sample" Matrix using LCME DCI as a Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Element Number</th>
<th>Element Title</th>
<th>Issue/Notes</th>
<th>Metrics used for compliance</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Individuals/Groups Responsible</th>
<th>Expected Date of Accomplishment/Audit/Interval</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Last Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCME CQI</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>A medical school and/or its sponsoring institution provides opportunities for professional development to each faculty member in the areas of discipline content, curricular design, program evaluation, student assessment methods, instructional methodology, and or research to enhance his or her skills and leadership abilities in these areas.</td>
<td>See DCI 4.5. Audit a list/inventory of the faculty development programs and attendance annually.</td>
<td>Inventory of opportunities updated in DCI including research.</td>
<td>NAMES</td>
<td>Review annually.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCME Frequently Cited for Monitoring across all medical school</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>The present and anticipated financial resources of a medical school are derived from diverse sources and are adequate to sustain a sound program of medical education and to accomplish other programmatic and institutional goals.</td>
<td>See DCI 5.1 (LCME Part I-A AFQ) 1. Total revenues 2. Operating margin 3. Revenue mix 4. Market value of endowments 5. Medical school reserves 6. Debt service 7. Outstanding debt 8. Departmental reserves</td>
<td>Total revenues have grown approximately 4% per year from FY 2012 through FY 2014. Operating margins have consistently ranged between break even to positive 5% over the last three years.</td>
<td>NAMES</td>
<td>Review annually.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element with issue identified in AY 14-15</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>RESOURCES FOR CLINICAL INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>A medical school has, or is assured the use of, appropriate resources for the clinical instruction of its medical students in ambulatory and inpatient settings and has adequate numbers and types of patients (e.g., acuity, case mix, age, gender).</td>
<td>Analysis of clerkship by site performed 4.13.16 for the RTO to assess IQ related to INOVA. Need update on alternative sites July - August 2016. See DCI Tables 5.5.1 to 5.5.4 and Narrative 5.5. Overall assessment of adequacy of clinical sites for transition year 15-16.</td>
<td>On-going monitoring during the transition year 15-16 after launch of new curriculum. Identified as compliant but recommend alternative sites to INOVA.</td>
<td>NAMES</td>
<td>Review at the end of every rotation and annually.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New LCME April, 2016 DCI - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) schedule for 2016-2017 – "Sample" Mid-Cycle Review Matrix using LCME DCI as a Tool

### Criteria used to identify standards/elements for auditing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Issue/Notes</th>
<th>Metrics used for compliance</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Individuals/Groups Responsible</th>
<th>Expected Date of Accomplishment/Audit/Interval</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Last Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>The present and anticipated financial resources of a medical school are derived from diverse sources and are adequate to sustain a sound program of medical education and to accomplish other programmatic and institutional goals.</td>
<td>See DCI 5.1, LCME Part I-A. AFQ 1. Total revenues 2. Operating margin 3. Revenue mix 4. Market value of endowments 5. Medical school reserves 6. Debt service 7. Outstanding debt 8. Departmental reserves</td>
<td>Total revenues have grown approximately 4% per year from FY 2012 through FY 2014. Operating margins have consistently ranged between break even to positive 5% over the last three years.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Review annually</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 DEAN'S AUTHORITY/RESOURCES</td>
<td>The dean of a medical school has sufficient resources and budgetary authority to fulfill his or her responsibility for the management and evaluation of the medical curriculum.</td>
<td>See DCI 5.2, Updated Table of Org. Budgeted position and resources to support UME.</td>
<td>The senior associate dean for MD programs (SAD) provides primary oversight for the medical education programs including funding, faculty affairs, educational space, and educational infrastructure.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Review annually</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 PRESSURES FOR SELF-FINANCING</td>
<td>A medical school admits only as many qualified applicants as its total resources can accommodate and does not permit financial or other influences to compromise the school's educational mission.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 SUFFICIENCY OF BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>A medical school has, or is assured the use of, buildings and equipment sufficient to achieve its educational, clinical, and research missions.</td>
<td>See DCI 5.4, Annually audit classroom space to accommodate learning groups. Also audit inventory of faculty offices and research labs. List of renovation, construction in research or education space.</td>
<td>All new air handlers and thermostats as well as major duct-work within the Himmelfarb Library has been resolved. Renovated all classrooms/study rooms in Himmelfarb with new lighting and acoustic tile ceilings and soundproofing to reduced unwanted noises.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Review annually</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 RESOURCES FOR CLINICAL INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>A medical school has, or is assured the use of, appropriate resources for the clinical instruction of its medical students in ambulatory and inpatient settings and has adequate numbers and types of patients (e.g., acuity, case mix, age, gender).</td>
<td>Analysis of clerkship by site performed 4.13.16 for the BOT to assess risk related to INOVA. Need update alternative sites July - August 2016. See DCI Tables 5.5.1 to 5.5.4 and Narrative 5.5. Overall assessment of adequacy of clinical sites for transition year 15-16.</td>
<td>On-going monitoring during the transition year 15-16 after launch of new curriculum. Identified as compliant but recommend alternative sites to INOVA.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Review at the end of every rotation and annually</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CQI Process for Follow Up

1) Develop criteria for selection of elements for review and then prioritize focused review efforts after initial monitoring
   – Can perform routine review on many elements, but perform focused review on a few

2) Be explicit about CQI process and need for peer review and self-review

3) Convey process for adding elements as a means for problem solving and root cause analysis to stakeholders (i.e. present this as a resource, not as a negative)

4) Agree with stakeholders on metrics to be used and time expectations
5) Be clear about *threshold for compliance* at the start

6) Meet with “owners” of problem areas 1:1 until resolved

7) Perform root cause analysis when methods are ineffective

8) Discern need for continued monitoring

9) Question usefulness of existing or multiple sources of “data” when problems persist or compliance with an element is not sufficiently addressed. Propose new metrics/methods

10) Report successes back to deans and committees as a means of demonstrating *effectiveness*

11) Communicate results back to deans/committees/stakeholders.
3.3 A medical school has effective policies and practices in place, and engages in ongoing, systematic, and focused recruitment and retention activities, to achieve mission-appropriate diversity outcomes among its students, faculty, senior administrative staff, and other relevant members of its academic community. These activities include the use of programs and/or partnerships aimed at achieving diversity among qualified applicants for medical school admission and the evaluation of program and partnership outcomes.

Diversity Categories and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Senior Administrative Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offers Made to Applicants to the Medical School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-identified Diversity Category</th>
<th>2014 Entering Class</th>
<th>2015 Entering Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declined Offers</td>
<td>Enrolled Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effectiveness

3.6 A medical education program defines and publicizes its code of professional conduct for the relationships between medical students, including visiting medical students, and those individuals with whom students interact during the medical education program. A medical school develops effective written policies that address violations of the code, has effective mechanisms in place for a prompt response to any complaints, and supports educational activities aimed at preventing inappropriate behavior. Mechanisms for reporting violations of the code of professional conduct are understood by medical students, including visiting medical students, and ensure that any violations can be registered and investigated without fear of retaliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Mistreatment Procedures Among Students</th>
<th>Source: AAMC GQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School%</td>
<td>National%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Mistreatment Policies Among Students</th>
<th>Source: AAMC GQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School%</td>
<td>National%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 The faculty of a medical school define the types of patients and clinical conditions that medical students are required to encounter, the skills to be performed by medical students, the appropriate clinical settings for these experiences, and the expected levels of medical student responsibility.

8.6 A medical school has in place a system with central oversight that monitors and ensures completion by all medical students of required clinical experiences in the medical education program and remedies any identified gaps.

### Students with incomplete logs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerkship</th>
<th>Rotation 1</th>
<th>Rotation 2</th>
<th>Rotation 3</th>
<th>Rotation 4</th>
<th>Rotation 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBGYN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.8 A medical school has in place a system of fair and timely summative assessment of medical student achievement in each course and clerkship of the medical education program. Final grades are available within six weeks of the end of a course or clerkship.

Table 9.8-1 | Availability of Final Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Clerkship</th>
<th>AY 2012-13</th>
<th>AY 2013-14</th>
<th>AY 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob/Gyn</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each required core clinical clerkship, provide the average number of weeks, and the minimum/maximum number of weeks it took for students to receive grades during the most-recently completed academic year. Also provide the percentage of students that did not receive grades within 6 weeks. Add rows as needed.
Examples of Satisfactory → Unsatisfactory

None
12.0 A medical school provides effective student services to all medical students to assist them in achieving the program’s goals for its students. All medical students have the same rights and receive comparable services.

Table 12.0-5 | Medical School Indebtedness Among Graduates  
Source: LCME Part I-B Financial Aid Questionnaire, Section 6

Provide the total cumulative medical school educational indebtedness per class (excluding debt associated with enrollment in joint, dual, or combined degree programs) for each indicated academic year (as available).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates with Medical School Debt</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Graduate Debt</td>
<td>197,485</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>218,356</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates with Medical School Debt</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>197,292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Graduate Debt</td>
<td>216,782</td>
<td>197,292</td>
<td>197,292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. *Conventional models* will cause work groups to reject the new ideas and thus block the adoption process before it gets started.

2. *Lack of closure* reflects the academic tendency to argue endlessly over the fine points of proposed actions. Closure is produced by the need to deliver a timely project plan. Among other things, the plan should describe the actions to be taken and the criteria by which success will be gauged.

3. *Lack of engagement* causes the “doing” stage to falter partway through the trial period.

4. *Lack of feedback* prevents participants from achieving maximal benefit from the self-review. Peer review provides two kinds of benefits: the substance of the reviewers’ comments and the incentive to bear down during the self-review process.

5. *Lack of follow-through* prevents the findings from the self-study and peer review from producing action and organizational learning. The mitigation is to organize a process by which deans or other administrators review the department’s results and obtain new commitments about the way forward. Performance against these commitments should be tracked against agreed performance indicators whenever possible.

6. Lack of recognition for a job well done will dissipate commitment. The mitigation is obvious: administrators should celebrate successes, build the work into performance reviews, and, where the institution’s standards for scholarship can be met, include it in evaluations for promotion and tenure.

- The improvement cycle is designed to operate on an annual basis.

Evidence is different from things such as “information,” “data,” or “fact” in at least five subtle but important ways:

Evidence should:

1. Cover knowledge and skills taught throughout the program’s curriculum.
2. Involve multiple judgements of student performance.
3. Provide information on multiple dimensions of student performance.
4. Involve more than surveys and self-reports of competence and growth by students.
5. Be relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable.

### Capability-maturity scales for operating units and the [school] as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Value</th>
<th>Work Group Criteria</th>
<th>School-Wide Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No effort</td>
<td>There is no initiative-based activity.</td>
<td>There is no leadership from the central administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighting</td>
<td>Units respond to problems, but mostly with <em>ad hoc</em> methods.</td>
<td>More leadership from the central administration needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Effort</td>
<td>One sees initiatives by individuals and some experimentation with the principles, but the incidence is far from critical mass.</td>
<td>There is some leadership, and some groups have reached the &quot;emergent effort&quot; level on certain aspects of the initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized effort</td>
<td>Group-wide actions begin to be planned and tracked, methods are systematically rooted in the principles, and the unit has begun to develop performance metrics and norms.</td>
<td>The administration exerts active leadership, and some groups have reached the &quot;organized effort&quot; level on certain aspects of the initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature effort</td>
<td>The initiative is embedded in the group's culture, continuous improvement is a way of life, and organizational learning is fully established.</td>
<td>The initiative is a key results area for the central administration and all the work groups. Some groups have reached the &quot;mature effort&quot; level and the administration is working with the others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three elements of leadership are required:

1. The champion and his or her senior colleagues must make a strong case for changing the status quo: why faculty and staff members should reallocate time and effort [to participate in CQI].

2. They should lay out and fund a strategy for effecting the necessary changes: one that comes across as intrinsically practical and beneficial for the people involved.

3. They should set up a system for encouraging experimentation, initiating pilot implementations and rolling out successful results across the institution, spurring their improvement, and then, importantly, following up to see that the improvements are sustained over time.

Conclusion

• GW SMHS initiated CQI in 2014
  – Added/Hired Sr. Quality Analyst and Sr. Faculty Advisor
• At same time initiated process for completion of DCI (18 months prior to LCME site visit)
• LCME Survey Team → 2 findings:
  – 1 Satisfactory with Monitoring
  – 1 Unsatisfactory
QUESTIONS?
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LCME Accreditation: A Tool for Improvement

Herbert C. Smitherman, Jr., MD, MPH, FACP
Vice Dean, Diversity & Community Affairs
November 12th, 2016
LCME Accreditation: A Tool for Improvement of Diversity

Session Description/Objective:

• How we used Accreditation/LCME standards and elements:
  • As a tool for data-driven continuous quality improvement (CQI)
  • To bring about institutional cultural change, organizational transformation and innovation around Diversity
A medical school has effective policies and practices in place ... to achieve mission-appropriate diversity outcomes among its students, faculty, senior administrative staff, ......
WSUSOM URM Admissions Per Year

1990 - 2006 (Avg/Year)  2014

50  3

(Avg/Year)
Prop 2: MI since 2006

Affirmative Action Bans in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Legislatively referred constitutional amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Initiative constitutional amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Failed initiative constitutional amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Initiative constitutional amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Initiative constitutional amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Executive order by governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Initiative statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Initiative constitutional amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PEW RESEARCH CENTER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Medical Schools in States with Affirm Action Bans</th>
<th>Percentage of Class Underrepresented in Medicine* Class of 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles David Geffen School of Medicine</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis School of Medicine</td>
<td>24.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University College of Medicine</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan State University College of Human Medicine</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego School of Medicine</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona College of Medicine (Phoenix)</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida College of Medicine (Gainesville)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado School of Medicine</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma College of Medicine</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Riverside School of Medicine</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Michigan Medical Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University Herbert Wertheim College of Medicine</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona College of Medicine (Tucson)</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Irvine School of Medicine</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Health Morsani College of Medicine</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska College of Medicine</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida College of Medicine</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington School of Medicine</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wayne State University School of Medicine</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University Charles E. Schmidt College of Medicine</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University College of Medicine</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data taken from the most recent version of the MSAR publication (2015)
URM as % of Admitting Class - 2014

Under Same State-wide

Affirmative Action Ban

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AAMC Definition

Underrepresented Minorities = Underrepresented in Medicine (URM)

“Those racial and ethnic populations that are underrepresented in the medical profession relative to their numbers in the general population.”
Michigan Medical School Annual Admissions-
32% increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 and Earlier</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Schools</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oakland CMU
WMU 32% Increase
The ability of an organization to:

- Systematically & continuously identify challenges
- Rapidly determine & synthesize relevant information/data
- Diagnose root-cause of problems
- Develop & implement appropriate interventions
- Assess intervention effectiveness (measure results)
- Modify accordingly

Culture of Assessment and Continuous Quality Improvement
Getting Started:
Systematically & Continuously identify challenges

• **Step 1:** Form a team with knowledge of the system
  – School of Medicine Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) of the Dean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herbert C. Smitherman, Jr. MD, MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane R. Thomas, PhD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

» Medical Education/Diversity Admin (3)
» Associate Provost Diversity (1)
» Health System Partner CMO (1)
» Research Admin (2)
» Department Chairs (2)
» Faculty (6)
» Previous Dean (1)

» **Staffed by the Dean’s Chief of Staff**
Diagnose Root Cause Problems

- Uncommitted Leadership
- Lack of Mission focus
- Flawed application screening process
- Resource deficits (admission & diversity)
- Passive admission & recruitment strategies
- Poor marketing & branding
- Antiquated Med Ed Curriculum
- Lack of electronic automation

Lack of Vision & Clear Sense of Direction
Wayne State University School of Medicine faculty and staff will graduate a diverse group of physicians and biomedical scientists who will transform the promise of equal health into a reality for all.
Mission

We will educate a diverse student body in an urban setting and within a culture of inclusion, through high quality education, clinical excellence, pioneering research, local investment in our community and innovative technology, to prepare physician and biomedical scientific leaders to achieve health and wellness for our society.
Commitment

We are privileged to serve our community, state, nation, and the world as innovators in medicine, health, prevention and wellness.
Develop Remediation Plans: Leadership

• University President M. Roy Wilson
  – Personal & professional commitment to improve
  – $550,000 per year increase in Diversity budget
  – New $1.6 million Merit scholarships
  – Access: priority on his calendar
Develop Remediation Plans:
Leadership Changes

• WSUSOM Dean Jack D. Sobel
  – Appoint Vice Dean of Diversity and Inclusion at SOM level (new)
  – Appoint Associate Dean of Admissions
    – Personnel Change
    – Upgraded Position/Title
  – Recruitment of Richard S. Baker, Vice Dean of Medical Education
  – Support of staffing, process, personnel, & resource changes
  – Access: priority on his calendar

Transformational: Focused Leaders
Develop Remediation Plans: Admissions

Instituted holistic application review

– All Applicants receive Secondary Apps
– Individualized process
– All applications reviewed
Prior to 2016

Holistic Admissions

➢ Selection was based only upon:
  • MCAT (80\textsuperscript{th} percentile)
  • GPA (3.7)
    - >3,000 applicants denied w/o any review of their primary or secondary application
AAMC Data

GPA & MCAT

- AAMC 2016 national data
  - GPA > 3.6 with MCAT ≥ 78% = 4 year graduation rates from 90-100%

Source: AAMC 2016 Data Book percentage of 2007-2009 Students who graduated from Med School in 4 years
How are we Holisticly measuring WSUSOM applicants?

Holistic Review: Assessed in 4 ways:

- Secondary Application Questions
- 1-1 Long Form Interview with a Physician/Ph.D. (Admission Committee Member)
- 5 Multiple Mini Interview Stations
- Standardizing all interview questions & aligning the process/questions with our mission
Develop Remediation Plans: Admissions

• Heavy Recruitment, Outreach & Marketing
• Expanded Admissions Committee
• Created new office with Director of Enrollment Management Services
• Formed new SOM Admissions Executive Committee (Advisory to Associate Dean of Admissions)
Incoming URM Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>African-American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention: April 1, 2015

URM from 2.4% to 23% of Class
WSUSOM Average GPA & Average MCAT

Average GPA

Average MCAT

2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015

GPA

MCAT
Wayne Med-Direct Program

(New)
Accepting 10 high school students with minimum:

- GPA of 3.5
- SAT score: 1340 or ACT score: 30 (95th %tile)
- Preference will be given to:
  - Students from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds
  - Students interested in addressing urban health disparities
Benefits

• Four years paid WSU undergraduate tuition
• Four years paid medical school tuition
• Undergraduate room and board in university housing
• Acceptance and admission to WSU School of Medicine with successful completion of WMD Program (i.e., successful completion of the BS or BA degree and MCAT)
Admissions Changes for 2016

2015-2016

• Marketing and Branding Enhancements

• Staff Hires (Recruiter, Marketing Manager)

• Holistic Review of Applications

• Implemented Technology Enhancements
Admissions Changes 2017

2016-2017

• Continued Marketing Enhancements

• Staff Hires (Data Analyst)

• Continued Technology Enhancements

• Targeted Recruitment Plans

• Interview Day Changes

• Launched Community Partners (MMI raters)
Branding Enhancements

- Admissions hallway mural and office sign
- Light pole banners along Canfield and in SOM parking lot
- Digital signage in Scott Hall
- Wayne State logos and SOM mission statement signs throughout SOM campus
Technology Enhancements

• An application status page containing a checklist for materials that applicants need to submit
• Email notifications generated at every completed step in the process
• Online payment and materials (photographs, technical standards) uploaded directly to the system
• Interviews scheduled directly through a scheduling system with auto reminders
• New tools for reviewing applicants
• New tool for scoring applicants
Continuous Quality Improvement

• The process of accreditation required:
  – an in-depth self examination of our need for change
  – benchmarking ourselves against peer institutions and aligning with best practices in the field
  – Establishing a CQI process ensures that all facets of our Diversity, Admissions & Educational programs are of the highest quality
  – Ensures transparency & accountability
  – Adjusted our strategy, focus & our resources
“Disguised Blessing”

• LCME action was impetus to change

• Without it, WSUSOM would not have been able to do what needed to be done:
  – Leadership change
  – Resource commitment
  – Warning vs. Probation
## June 2015 LCME Sanctions

Students, **Faculty**, and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Hispanic, Latin, or of Spanish Origin</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>North African</th>
<th>Middle Eastern</th>
<th>Multi-Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>447</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently pivoting to address Faculty

6% of faculty URM; 33% of faculty Women!
Questions?