

UGMS Committee

Minutes

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 at 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Professional Development and Conferencing Services Boardroom

PRESENT: Ms. L. Glynn (Chair), Drs. S. Murphy, C. Donovan, T. Adey, A. Dorward, Ms. E. Hillman, Ms. S. Ackerman, Mr. G. Beckett and Mr. S. Pennell

APOLOGIES: Dr. S. Shah and Mr. N. Sowers (Student Representative)

Review of Minutes of November 26, 2008

Page 2, under the heading “IPE Curriculum Proposal”, the second paragraph, second sentence should read “...questions regarding the survey results *presented by the Centre for Collaborative Health Education* and in response to this...”

The minutes were approved as amended.

Business Arising

IPE Curriculum Proposal

Ms. Glynn indicated that she had sent the letter regarding IPE as discussed at the last meeting and included the Committee’s concerns regarding the survey results as well as the positive feedback regarding their willingness to change the process as suggested by the students. A positive and understanding reply was immediately received from Ms. Kearney. Drs. Farrell and Adey will be meeting with her, and Dr. Drover will also be invited to attend.

Chair for Sub-Committee on Student Assessment

Ms. Glynn advised that confirmation has not yet been received regarding the chair for this Committee.

MELT

Members were advised that Dr. Peters is planning to attend the January meeting to discuss design and governance of the new curriculum. The MELT team is very interested in receiving comments from this Committee before the January meeting in order to be prepared to answer questions and address concerns, etc. In view of this, members were asked to take the time to post comments to the curriculum reform website under the discussion forum or on the UGMS Committee homepage.

As well, there is no clear idea with regards to the role of this Committee in the future and therefore clarification will be requested with regards to this.

New Business

Invigilation Policy

Members were advised that the Senate Committee for Undergraduate Studies has compiled a policy for invigilation and professional conduct which has been sent out to faculty for input. A response has been received from Faculty Council, however, Dr. Farrell and Ms. Neary have developed a document as an addendum which would be applicable to the medical school.

Dr. Farrell noted that there had been reports of cheating in the class of 2009, however, students were not willing to go on record. The addendum is an attempt to create a positive environment where students cannot cheat. The policy is meant to protect students as well as faculty.

After some discussion, the following items were noted as differences between the policy produced by the University and the addendum created for the medical school:

Medical School Policy:

- Chairs will invigilate examinations.
- There will be no extension for late arrivals.
- Water will be permitted in clear bottles only.
- Examinations will be distributed face down.
- Challenging questions will be permitted.
- Invigilators will be provided with a sheet containing student photos and names which will be signed as each student passes in the examination at the end.

University Policy:

- Examinations will be available to the invigilators one hour before the start of the examination.
- Cheating will not interrupt the examination.
- Students are to be escorted to the bathroom.
- Students who are taken ill during the exam will be referred to Student Health Services.
- Examinations will be written in a scent free environment (this is a current policy of Eastern Health).

Members were advised that this document will need to be approved at the level of this Committee and comments will be communicated to the Senate Committee for Undergraduate Studies where a vote will take place.

Dr. Farrell noted that there are some issues that will affect faculty therefore he requested that members think about the contents of the document before it was put forward for approval.

There was some further discussion regarding this document and concerns were expressed with regards to the number of invigilators that would be required which may be a problem for clinical faculty.

Some members also felt that it may not be appropriate to e-mail the question that has been challenged because it would no longer be valid. A formal answer to the challenge would be appropriate however, providing the actual questions could result in the invalidation of whole exams.

It was felt that this was a legitimate concern and Dr. Farrell agreed to make the appropriate changes. He also noted that if one clinical faculty was available to answer questions, etc. the other invigilator(s) would not need to be clinical.

Promotions Policy

Members were advised that when the new promotions policy was introduced it was intended that it would apply to the first year class next year but students who came in under the old policy would remain under that policy. After a student appeal, it was communicated by the Registrar's Office that a student could choose which appeal process he or she would like to use. There were questions regarding whether or not this type of decision would also apply to promotions as well and thus should all students now be considered under the new policy.

Discussion followed with some members expressing the sense that it would be better to specify that as of a particular date, there will be new promotions regulations and everyone will be assessed using those regulations. An expiry date can be included with the old documentation stating that after that date, everyone will be assessed using the new regulations. This will help provide clarity for students.

The earliest date that this could be effective is September 2009 because it would require prior approval by Faculty Council.

It was also noted that the new appeals process has been endorsed by the faculty as a fair and more transparent process.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Ms. L. Glynn
Chair

/mjm