

Phase 1 Management Team
February 25, 2016
1600- 1730
M2M240
Minutes

Present: Amanda Pendergast, David Stokes, Steve Shorlin, MacKenzie Turpin, Katrin Zipperlen, Maria Goodridge, Jon Church, Gerona McGrath, Diana Deacon, Laura Gillespie, Jinelle Ramlackinsingh, Vivian Whelan, Steve Darcy

Regrets: Cathy Donovan, Cecily Stockley, Cassandra Hawco, Carla Peddle

1.0. Review/Approval of Agenda

Added 4.4 Clinical Skills Leave

2.0. Review/Approval minutes from November 26, 2015

No changes

3.0. Business Arising

- Promotions met and all students passed Phase 1 and were promoted.

4.0. Standing Items – Course Reports

4.1. Healthy Person/Integrated Learning Sessions

4.1.1. Course evaluation – Healthy Person

- Healthy Person received 4.1. Last year it was 3.9.
- Students like formative assessment.
- The number of slides received negativity.
- Objectives don't always match the information taught. Some objectives are vague.
- There is a need for more Undergraduate Content Leads – they can review objectives. We can start with Biomedical.
- There are no UCLs for clinical disciplines yet.
- All anatomy objectives are going to be reviewed and where they will go (which Phase).
- Immunology, Pregnancy, Anatomy Pelvis and Reproduction, some Biochemistry and some Pediatrics are moving to Phase 2.
- There will be no community visit in January. On Wednesday afternoons the students will visit a metro family physician in Phase 1.
- The timeline for Phase 1 will be August to December.

4.1.2. Course evaluation - ILS

- Received a score of 3.4.
- Amanda thanked Steve Darcy for his help with ILS.
- The highest area of concern for the students is the peer assessment. This was discussed at SAS. There is going to be an across Phase working group on how peer assessment and how it can be made more affective. It is an issue across all Phases. Dr. McKay will take the lead. Peer assessment received a rating of 2.5.
- Students give each other 4 across the board. Students also felt that in the ILS groups they didn't get to know their peers as well as other areas.

- Students didn't like the fact that there wasn't much feedback on their assignments.
- They found ILS difficult at the beginning. They felt the small groups enhanced their learning.
- There is a working group that will meet next week to hear what the students liked and didn't like about ILS.
- Do the students need the first two ILS sessions?

4.2. Special Projects

4.2.1 Proposed changes for 2021

4.2.2. Course Evaluations (research pillars)

- The score last year was 3.7 and this year it is 3.8.
- The students thought it was very well organized, particularly Ethics and Professionalism.
- The students mentioned the fact about the Rubrics not being returned. The markers write a lot of comments on the Rubrics. The issue will be discussed at the SAS meeting.
- Mentors are not aware that the students doesn't see the Rubric. Some write personal comments on the Rubric.
-

4.3. Community Engagement

4.3.1. Physician Preceptors

- The course received 3.9.
- Students like the organization.
- The students felt that Healthy Sexuality should be broader. They felt it focused more on transgender.
- The Community Engagement course will be different in the next Phase 1 course.

4.4. Clinical Skills

- Received a score of 4.3. Last year was 4.2.
- The students enjoy the course content and small groups.
- Two students suggested the ophthalmoscope session was not placed appropriately relative to the other content.

4.5. Quality Improvement – Report

- .
- .

4.6. Student Issues – Discussion

- Most issues are related to the research block.
- The students were introduced to research pillars and what they were expected to do just a few days before the Winter break. Then they had to match with a mentor, figure out a research topic and what they were going to do with the literature review in a short time frame. A lot of mentors were already gone for the holidays.
- The students in the second research block felt disadvantaged, especially those with no research experience. They only learned on the Thursday before the research block. They had to submit a topic 10 days later. The students in the first block at about a month.

- There was also discrepancy among mentors of what was expected of the students. Some students submitted review with two articles and some with 53 based on what their research mentors allowed them to do. The students found this very stressful.
- In the next Phase 1 for the Class of 2020 the research curriculum will be in the first six weeks.
- What the librarians showed the students as being acceptable for a literature review was different than what some of the mentors think it should look like.
- There is a Rubric for the literature review.
- A mentor resource kit is needed. This would include what has been taught and what is expected.
- Mentorship continuity is going to be a problem. Many mentors in Phase 1 will not be able to mentor in Phase 2. The students are trying to find new mentors for clinical areas.
- The students looking for a mentor can email Katrin. She has a bank of mentors.
- It was suggested to have a research profiles page.
- The students were unhappy with the feedback they received.
- Is there anything in place to have a paper reread? There is, if someone is unhappy with how an assignment was marked they should contact the Phase lead. Then we can make arrangements to have it remarked by someone who is familiar with that area.
- There is also concern with the community profiles that have to be submitted. A number of students who had the same marker received a full typed page of feedback which was the same. Amanda will look into it.

4.7. Faculty Issues – Discussion

- There is a disconnect between instructors and the student assessment.
- Faculty are asked to provide 8 questions per hour of teaching. There has been 3 iterations of Phase 1 and every time an instructor is being asked to provide 8 questions. They don't know which ones were used or how many. They can ask Diana for the information.
- They would also like to know how well the questions are doing.
- Some faculty are being told they can only submit MCQ. Some are not aware of this.
- For the summative assessments, MCQs are what we are looking for. Fill-in-the-blank questions have been used but they are often problematic.
- Royal College exams have short answer questions. In our assessment we don't have much room for the questions to have much weight. We don't use any of those. It is difficult to give partial marks.
- If students do poorly on a question, the faculty member will be contacted.
- Need a report for each instructor of the stats of the questions.
- David will check to see if such a report can be created.
- We are asking for so many questions because we are trying to build a bank. Some are asking to use last year's.

5.0. New Business

5.1.

6.0 Date Next Meeting: April 28, 2016