



**Program Evaluation Subcommittee (PESC)
Chair: Dr. Alan Goodridge
Minutes**

Tuesday, March 21th, 2023
12:30 – 2 pm WebEx Virtual Meeting

Attendees: Alan Goodridge (Chair), Sandra Cooke-Hubley, Heidi Coombs, Dawn Curran, Norah Duggan, Amanda Fowler, Zhiwei Gao, Jasbir Gill, Atena Goudarzi, Taryn Hearn, Brian Kerr, Andrea McGrath-Janes, Bruce Sussex, and Katrin Zipperlen

Regrets: Ryan Elliott, Alison Haynes, Taryn Hearn, David Stokes

Topic	Details	Action Items
Welcome	A. Goodridge welcomed all members to the meeting.	
Agenda	No conflicts of interest were disclosed. The agenda was approved with no additions.	
Minutes	Review and Approval of the Minutes of Jan 17th, 2023: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moved: A. Goodridge - Seconded: S. Cooke-Hubley - All in Favor 	
Curriculum Review	A. Goodridge provided an update on the Curriculum Review. There have been challenges with student engagement and arranging the student focus groups – only 2 students volunteered to participate. Phase 4 students have limited availability because of their clinic schedules. The Curriculum Review team had also planned to attend a meeting of the APAs but that was cancelled due to a snowstorm. They will attend a later meeting. H. Coombs added that they were able to gather feedback from the APA's retreat last fall, which provides helpful information about their perspectives of Phase 4.	ACTION: H. Coombs to reschedule the student focus group.
Reports	S. Cooke-Hubley presented the Phase 1 Course Evaluation Reports, 2022-23: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MED5710: Patient I - MED5720: Clinical Skills I - MED5730: Physician Competencies I 	ACTION: A. Goodridge to follow-up about

	<p>- MED5740: Community Engagement I</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ H. Coombs discussed a comment on the excessive number of evaluations and noted that the Phase 1 students had specifically requested weekly evaluations but some found that it created survey fatigue. ○ With regards to reassessment, K. Zipperlen explained that learners receive an email indicating whether they achieved a passing score of 70% or not. Those who scored below 70% may need to reassess depending on the final pass mark determined by the reassessment coordinator. ○ A. McGrath-Janes addressed various issues related to the anatomy labs. She suggested having tutors on every station and better-labeled specimens, as well as access to materials beforehand. ○ There were concerns about students who have little to no experience in anatomy or physical sciences struggling with the curriculum. Overall, there is a recognition of the need to support students with varying levels of experience in anatomy and physical sciences to ensure their success in the program. <p>N. Duggan presented the Phase 4 MED8710 (Core) Reports, 2021-22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anesthesia ○ Emergency Medicine ○ Internal Medicine 	<p>the Anatomy lab issues.</p>
<p>Learner Representation</p>	<p>Phases 1-3 – A. McGrath had nothing to report.</p> <p>Phase 4 – D. Curran had nothing to report.</p> <p>Postgraduate – R. Elliott was not present.</p>	
<p>Updates</p>	<p>Phase 1 – S. Cooke-Hubley had nothing else to report.</p> <p>Phase 2 – A. Fowler provided an update on Phase 2, noting that the lectures and tutorials for the most recent theme of Patient II received positive feedback, although some noted that the theme had a lot of content.</p> <p>Phase 3 – J. Gill had nothing to report.</p> <p>Phase 4 – N. Duggan stated that the class of 2023 has recently finished up their clinical skills training, but there were challenges with the quality of the course due to a lack of dedicated course chair or faculty member to oversee the offering and respond to feedback.</p> <p>UGME – T. Hearn was not present.</p> <p>COS – B. Kerr stated that COS have reviewed a lot of feedback and will discuss it in more detail at their next meeting. They meet with the undergraduate content leads (UCLs) four times a year as a group and once a year individually. They forward feedback and information about sequencing to them for the upcoming year. There may have been challenges with sequencing this year due to the strike and snowstorms, and they hope to address any potential</p>	

	<p>issues. He also mentioned that they have discussed the possibility of adding orientations at the start of each phase to ensure a common understanding of how everything is supposed to be connected horizontally between courses and improve feedback based on a shared understanding of their goals.</p>	
New Business	<p>Community Engagement Feedback</p> <p>H. Coombs brought up the issue of feedback in the Community Engagement courses, noting that sometimes there is feedback on curriculum components that are specific to an individual faculty member.</p> <p>A. Goodridge added that it can be difficult to protect faculty anonymity on course evaluations if the feedback is related to a specific topic/faculty member. He suggested sharing the feedback with the faculty member’s unit head in cases where they could be identified – the feedback can be forwarded with a short covering letter stating that it will not be shared widely with the course committee, but only with the Phase Lead.</p> <p>There was general agreement to this proposal and H. Coombs suggested sending separate reports to the Phase Leads, one with the comments removed (for wider distribution) and another with the comments included.</p>	<p>ACTION: H. Coombs to revise their process and create separate reports for courses with identifiable faculty feedback.</p>
	Meeting adjourned at 2 PM	

Next Meeting: April 18th, 2023 – WebEx