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I am pleased to introduce this symposium on nutrition in medical education,¹ to review the present status of this field, and to speculate on future prospects for its improvement. My views on this subject were formed during the ten years I taught nutrition to medical students and physicians in a program described in detail elsewhere (1, 2). These experiences constituted a classic case study of barriers to nutrition training and I will use them to illustrate some of the ways these barriers can be overcome.

More than a quarter of a century has now passed since the first conference was called in the United States to highlight the inadequate support and attention given to nutrition teaching in medical schools (3). This conference, held at Chicopee, Massachusetts, in the summer of 1962, developed in response to the increasing recognition that dietary factors are important in chronic-disease prevention and treatment but that existing nutrition instruction in medical schools ignored these relationships and focused instead on rare nutrient deficiency diseases. In short, clinical nutrition education for medical students and residents was largely ineffective and poorly integrated into departmental training programs.

To remedy this situation, the conference participants defined the nutrition concepts that are essential to medical practice, described specific methods to teach these concepts, and produced a series of recommendations for medical school action. The table presents these recommendations. They constitute a baseline against which to measure progress and, as I shall discuss later, remain relevant to this day.

Despite the best intentions of the Chicopee conference participants, little progress occurred during the next ten years, and a second conference was called in Wil-

¹ All but one of the papers that follow were presented at Nutrition in Medical Education: Meeting the 1990 Objectives, a symposium in observance of National Nutrition Month sponsored by the Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Public Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC, March 17, 1987. The paper by Dr. Winick is reprinted from the Washington Post, July 14, 1987.
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PROGRESS OCCURS, BUT SLOWLY

In fairness, medical schools have made some progress in teaching nutrition to their students. American Medical Association surveys in the late 1970s documented small but significant gains in hours of nutrition instruction (16, 17). Despite these gains, the 1980 AMA report indicated that nearly 70% of U.S. medical schools still lacked a separate required nutrition course, 25% did not offer an elective course, and less than half offered clinical nutri-
WHY ISN'T PROGRESS MORE RAPID?

The obstacles to teaching nutrition in medical schools are formidable and are described in detail by the NRC (13). Numbingly crowded course schedules and lack of trained faculty are difficult problems to overcome. So are anti-nutrition attitudes among faculty and administrators, expressed not only as statements that nutrition is not a discipline, has no basis in science, and is "flaky," but also as lack of support—or even as outright hostility—for inclusion of nutrition information in lecture hours, clinical training, or national board examinations. Many of the recommendations listed in the table are aimed at improving the stature of nutrition as a medical discipline, as are the efforts of the American Board of Nutrition which seeks to establish clinical nutrition as a medical subspecialty (19).

The most important barriers, though, are structural: lack of an administrative base, inadequate financial support, and focus on treatment rather than prevention of disease. My own experiences may shed some light on how these barriers operate in practice.

Lack of an administrative base. Without an established administrative base, the nutrition curriculum exists at the whim of individual course directors. In the medical school where I taught, departments controlled curriculum time, departmental committees controlled the course schedule, and lecturers controlled course content (once in front of a class, lecturers say what they wish). Under this system, nutrition faculty must compete for time in a host department’s course schedule.

My original 5-hour block of nutrition lectures, for example, was assigned to the basic science biochemistry course. When I became director of that course, I increased the time to 8 hours. A subsequent course director reduced these hours and eventually eliminated them altogether. They were rescued by the sympathetic director of the clinical medicine course which happened to have some open hours. I understand that the new director of that course recently decided to decrease the nutrition lecture hours and their fate is uncertain. At no time during these maneuvers did the school’s curriculum committee intervene, nor could it; departments control what is taught in their courses. This kind of ad hoc curriculum development explains the insistence on teaching nutrition as a required course.

Lack of financial support. In my experience, medical school faculty may do just about anything they want as long as they can pay for it. Our nutrition program was staffed by volunteers who were all employed by the university to do something other than teach nutrition. I administered an M.D./Ph.D. training program, and my colleagues ran a primary care clinic, performed gastroenterological procedures on pediatric patients, or planned...
hospital diets. Our career progress depended on these activities, and teaching nutrition took us away from them.

Surprisingly little money was needed to solve this problem. Because a portion of extramural funding goes into the department's discretionary budget, a federal curriculum development grant (11), and, later, a private gift purchased faculty participation with as little as 5 to 10% salary support. Even smaller amounts of funding for secretarial help, supplies, and travel were enough to make departments support efforts to obtain curriculum time and boost of their faculty's involvement in nutrition teaching.

Money also bought curriculum time. Course directors rarely responded to pleas for more hours for nutrition, but they listened when we said we were awarded a grant for nutrition instruction and wanted to work with them to implement it. Outside funding confers credibility, helps to overcome anti-nutrition attitudes, and remains a pressing issue.

Focus on disease treatment. Medical schools necessarily must train students to cope with the acute needs of a patient having a heart attack, and there is genuine gratification in helping someone survive such an event. It is more difficult and less immediately rewarding to provide advice that will not produce noticeable benefits for 20 years or more. Educating patients about dietary means to reduce chronic disease risk factors is slow, painstaking work, and it is not always successful. And when it is successful, doctors have less to do.

Nevertheless, medical schools are moving—albeit slowly—to correct this situation. The Association of American Medical Colleges' Report on the General Professional Education of the Physician (GPEP) strongly recommends increased training of medical students in health promotion and disease prevention (21). Dr. Swan- son, who directed preparation of this report, discusses this issue in his paper (20). The GPEP recommends that 30 to 50% of the time now devoted to lectures be used instead in active learning experiences administered by an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental committee. It specifically suggests that health promotion information be integrated throughout the curriculum rather than be taught as a separate course. If nutrition can be considered typical of subjects in health promotion, this suggestion is unlikely to prove effective without major changes in medical school organization.

LOOKING TOWARD THE 1990s

Fortunately, many signs suggest that fundamental changes in medical education are imminent and that these changes will create an environment much more receptive to nutrition education. Interest in nutrition on the part of the public and professionals, advances in nutrition research, changing methods of health-care financing, the aging of the population, and the increasing focus on health promotion all increase the need for nutrition training for physicians.

Public interest. It is evident from reading the newspapers that public interest in diet is at an all time high. Americans take nutritional supplements and buy diet books at unprecedented rates. They want information on the role of diet in chronic disease prevention, pregnancy, infancy, aging, and other aspects of health maintenance. They also want the best possible nutritional care when they become ill. They expect their doctors to be as expert in these areas as they are in other fields of medicine.

Professional interest. The demand for increased nutrition training also comes from within the medical profession. Medical students have consistently demanded better nutrition instruction (13). Increasingly, physicians are realizing the scope and complexity of nutrition in medical practice. Diet-related chronic diseases—coronary heart disease, cancer, stroke, hypertension, diabetes, obesity, renal disease, osteoporosis, and others—make up the bulk of primary-care clinical practice. Proper diet is an essential component of care for all pregnant and lactating women, infants, children, and elderly persons. Protein-calorie malnutrition occurs frequently among patients in hospitals and requires sophisticated treatment by parenteral or enteral methods (22). Physicians also need to know how and when to refer patients to nutrition professionals. It is not surprising that practicing physicians report feeling inadequate to treat patients' nutrition problems, and repeatedly express the need for further instruction (1, 23, 24).

Scientific progress. Research findings on the relationship between diet and chronic disease have accumulated rapidly. This information is by no means complete, but it has provided increasingly consistent evidence that high-fat—and, therefore, high-calorie and low-fiber—diets increase the risk of the common chronic disease conditions (13). Although diet is only one of many contributing causes of these conditions, this evidence suggests that consuming a diet lower in fat and higher in complex carbohydrates is a logical approach to preventing these diseases.

Economic and demographic changes. The economic and demographic environment of health care is changing rapidly, and medical schools need to adapt. Substantial increases in the following areas will affect medical training and practice: the cost of medical care, federal control over subsidized care for poor and elderly persons, numbers of patients joining health maintenance organizations, the number of doctors practicing medicine, numbers of elderly persons—and, therefore, of people with chronic disease conditions—and the belief that environ-
mental and lifestyle factors are more important determinants of health than medical interventions (21).

Interest in health promotion. Public and professional interest in health promotion has increased greatly since the 1979 Surgeon General's report (12). The CPEP recommends training physicians in health promotion as a response to economic and demographic realities. There are other reasons, as well. The gap between rich and poor is widening. At one end of the economic spectrum, low birthweight remains a major public health problem; at the other, chronic diseases are the leading causes of death and disability in the United States (25). Diet and nutritional status influence both kinds of problems.

The convergence of these forces at the present time create an environment that is driving medical schools to train students in health promotion and disease prevention. As these trends continue, nutrition will inevitably enter the medical curriculum, no matter how it is organized.

NEW POLICIES ARE NEEDED

What can nutrition educators do to hasten these trends? Because the methods of the past 25 years have not worked very well, we need to develop more effective policies and new strategies to achieve those policies. Avenues are available within medical schools as well as in the larger public policy arena for nutrition educators to help improve the training of physicians.

Within medical schools. With mounting public and economic pressure for more training in preventive health care, nutrition educators working in medical schools are in the right place at the right time to make needed curriculum changes. One tangible benefit of 25 years of effort has been the publication of a wealth of resources to aid this task: outlines of nutrition topics essential for education of medical students (26, 27) and postgraduate physicians (19), evaluations of general and specialized nutrition textbooks and resource materials (28, 29), and collections of nutrition test questions (30). Nutrition directors at many schools have described their student and postgraduate programs (for example, see 1, 11, 13, 31, 32). Eleanor Young describes the model program at San Antonio in her contribution to this symposium (33). Other individuals have outlined the specific steps needed to develop such programs (2). The NCR report (13) summarizes much of this information.

Does an increased focus on prevention mean that physicians will replace nutrition professionals as diet counselors in the health care system? This issue is addressed in Anita Owen's contribution to this symposium (34). Her paper describes how collaboration among nutritionists and other health professionals can improve patient care.

We should not be disheartened if improvements come slowly. The new focus on health promotion requires medical school faculties to think about education in ways that are unfamiliar and perhaps, as yet, uncomfortable. Changes will come with time.

Public policy arena. While waiting for medical schools to restructure their educational systems in response to the demands of the 21st century, nutrition educators can actively work to increase public and professional awareness of the importance of nutrition in health promotion. Here are some suggestions:

- **Become involved in development of national nutrition objectives for the year 2000.** A key objective for the year 1999 is that virtually all routine health contacts with health professionals should include some element of nutrition education and counseling (35). It is now time to design objectives that will establish the nation’s nutrition agenda for the next decade (see note).
- **Become involved in development of state and local nutrition objectives for the 1990s and the year 2000.** The Association of State and Territorial Public Health Nutrition Directors has developed model state nutrition objectives as well as a system to collect data on these and national health objectives (36). These provide an avenue for setting the nutrition agenda at the state and local levels.
- **Support development of dietary recommendations for health promotion and disease prevention by governmental and professional agencies and organizations.** These groups have achieved a remarkable consensus on the principles of healthy diets (37). Such consensus simplifies the work of nutritionists in educating physicians and the public.
- **Support national and local health promotion campaigns.** The National Cholesterol Education Program, for example, has called for dietary intervention for all persons with high-risk blood cholesterol levels (38). Doctors will need to refer patients to nutritionists for this advice, and such counseling requires training.
- **Conduct research on public and professional nutrition education.** We need to discover better ways to teach clinical nutrition, to help people improve their diets, and to demonstrate the effectiveness of nutrition teaching and dietary intervention.

Health promotion is an idea whose time has come. Nutrition has been an integral part of this campaign for a long time. The present convergence of public and professional interest, science, economics, and demographics establish an environment in which nutrition will surely achieve its rightful place in the medical school curriculum—to the great benefit of the public, of physicians,
and of nutrition professionals. It is not going to take another 25 years to see significant improvements.
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NOTE

Participation in development of nutrition and other health objectives for the year 2000 is through membership organizations. Readers seeking information on ways to participate should refer to the articles by Stephenson (JNE 19:155-58, 1987) and Clanz and Damberg (JNE 19:211-19, 1987) or should write to Dr. Michael Stoto, Institute of Medicine, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20418 (telephone (202)354-2083).
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NUTRITION OBJECTIVES FOR THE YEAR 2000: HOW TO GET INVOLVED

An important task of the U.S. Public Health Service is to establish national goals—and strategies to achieve those goals—in health promotion and disease prevention. The definition of specific, measurable goals and objectives for the year 2000 has proved useful in stimulating efforts by government, community, and private agencies to reduce controllable risk factors in the American population. The development of objectives in nutrition for the year 1990 established a national agenda in this field and has stimulated the development of programs and methods to evaluate them (see American Journal of Public Health 77:299-303, 1987 and JNE 19:211-19, 1987).

It is now time to begin development of new objectives for the year 2000. The Public Health Service, in cooperation with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, has established a process for the year 2000 objectives that provides opportunities for members of participating organizations to submit written comments or to testify in person at regional public hearings. The organizing committee is soliciting advice about specific health problems that should be addressed, methods to seek improvements in these problem areas, and ways to measure such improvements. Nutrition is included as one of the key target areas for development of objectives as are related areas such as chronic disease control, improvement of maternal and infant health, improvement of oral health, reduction of alcohol and drug abuse, improvement of physical activity and fitness, and maintaining the health and quality of life of older people.

Interested SNE members should not miss this opportunity to design objectives that address key issues of importance to nutrition educators. Hearings are scheduled from January through March 1988. Written comments may be submitted at any time during the next few months. The remaining hearings include:

Seattle February 5 and 6
Denver February 18 and 19
Detroit March 3 and 4
New York March 10 and 11

Inquiries about development of the year 2000 objectives, requests to testify at the hearings, and written comments and suggestions should be addressed to Dr. Michael Stoto, Institute of Medicine, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20418 (telephone [202]334-2383).
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