Phase 1 Management Team
Minutes

Thursday, March 25, 2021
4:00 p.m.
Webex

Attendees: Amanda Pendergast (chair), David Stokes, Jon Church, Katrin Zipperlen, Joel Koops, Laura Gillespie, Michelle Simms, Renee Mercer, Steve Shorlin, Alison Haynes, Georgia Darmonkow, Pam Pike, Rick Audas, Carla Peddle, Brian Kerr, Debra Bergstrom

Regrets: Tanis Adey, Stephanie Atkinson

Recording secretary: Vivian Whelan

Topic	Details	Action Items and person responsible
Introduction and Welcome		
Agenda review - Review for Conflict of Interest - Confirmation of Agenda	No conflicts Add Fiona and Georgia to the agenda	
Review and approval of prior minutes Action items	Motion to approved November minutes: Jon Church Seconded by: Laura Gillespie All in favour	
1. Evaluation Report MED 5710	The response rate was lower than previous at 36%. It is usually at 60 – 70%. Time was given to complete the evaluations. The overall mean is 4.0. Overall assessment is 4.2. Recorded and pre-recorded were the preferred modes of delivery. There were glitches sometimes with live lectures. There is a lack of support for those without a science background. This might be because of remote learning. Next year, Dr. Pendergast will ask if anyone doesn't have science. A science boot camp is not feasible.	Laura Gillespie Pam Pike Katrin Zipperlen

Our Vision: Through excellence, we will integrate education, research and social accountability to advance the health of the people and communities we serve.

Phase 1 Management Team Minutes

	The availability of online material scored lower. The highest score was lots of self-directed learning. The course was well organized. They like Monday exams. Comments – feeling isolated. Not seeing people is adding to stress and fatigue. They are not learning from peers. There were four exams. The lowest pass was 65%. Relativity co-efficient was lower on exam 4. The mean was 85.4% which is similar to other years. The response rate was 36%. Reflective of objectives mean was 4.0. There was a survey on one45 for students to complete. Online fatigue could be the reason for the low response rate. Amanda will bring to PESC regarding the length of the survey. Not everyone has not statistics. Felt it was at a Masters level for Biostats. Stress may have compounded. The assessment has 12-14 questions. The ILS assignments was reduced from two to one.	
2. Evaluation Report MED 5720	The response rate was 30%, which was lower than previous years. The overall score was 4.4. Assessment received 4.5. Learning materials were available in advance.	Joel Koops Maria Goodridge

	The learning environment was positive. CanMED overall was 4.0. Mode of delivery via PowerPoint only received the lowest rating. Zoom breakout rooms were hard to follow. Blood pressure needs to be done in person. This is the first time learners were virtual for history taking. When learning virtually, losing body language and non-verbal cues. You can see some of the facial cues. Students didn't always have their equipment or able to practice on someone. The CanMED skills were all higher than 4. Everyone passed the course. 38% were exemplary. 61% were competent. Similar to other years. Response rate was 30%, which is down.	
3. Evaluation Report MED 5730	The response rate was 28%. Biostats and Epidemiology scored the lowest but was higher than previous years. Power point only received 2.9. The overall score was 4.2. Assessment received 3.9. There was a lot of assignments and one MCQ exam. There were a lot of assignments due towards the end of semester. Questions were not matching the Rubric. Amanda and Katrin will have a look. Evaluation of Biostats and Epidemiology scored the lowest.	Jon Church Rick Audas

Phase 1 Management Team Minutes

Thursday, March 25, 2021
4:00 p.m.
Webex

	IPE didn't seem to work as well. Felt this course could be best one for virtual

Assessment – overall average was 91.6%. Students did better than in the last couple of years.

There was a concern with Research supervisors but it was worked out. The assignment was heavy. Can assignments have formative and summative? Deadlines are posted online in September. Some learners had their assignment done before the deadline. | | |
| 4. Evaluation Report MED 5740 | The response rate was lower at 28%. The overall mean was 4.2. The assessment mean was 4.2. The lowest rate at 4.00 was material not being available. There were some issues with how the exam was delivered. The wording of the exam questions was a bit ambiguous.

Preceptors didn't know what they were supposed to talk about. The debrief with 10 class reps went well.

Assessment was above average at 85%. There were a couple of reassessments for Community Health.

ECE sessions were good but they were repetitive. Groups were ok. | Rick Audas
Norah Duggan | |
| 5. Evaluation Report ILS | ILS are now after exams. They will continue this way. | Debra Bergstrom | |

Phase 1 Management Team Minutes

Thursday, March 25, 2021
4:00 p.m.
Webex

6.	Evaluation Report Research Workshop	The overall score is 3.7, same as last year. The response rate was 80%. Delivery scored 3.8. Should it be placed earlier? Mid-semester might be ok. The proposal is done in Phase 2. The learners didn't know what they were supposed to be talking about. There was a lack of correspondence. They were overwhelmed with writing an abstract. Clarify that it has nothing to do with lit review. There were no major changes this year. Do we need a focus group with the class in Phase 2? They might not remember Phase 1.	Brian Kerr Alison Haynes
7.	Curricular Issues	The focus is on content, sequence and integration.	Alison Haynes Brian Kerr
8.	Other Faculty Issues		
9.	Other Student concerns		Fiona Landells Georgia Darmonkow Ian Janes
10.	New Business		
11.	Next Meeting	TBD	