

**Phase 3 Management Team**  
**April 5, 2017**  
**1600- 1730**  
**M2M240**  
**Minutes**

**Present:**

Joanne Hickey – Chair, David Stokes, Steve Shorlin, Diana Deacon, Lynn Morris-Larkin, Laura Gillespie, Maria Mathews, Rebecca O’Leary, Gerona McGrath, Jinelle Ramlackhansingh, Susan Mercer via teleconference, Vivian Whelan

**Regrets:** Gokul Vidyasankar, Don McKay, Carla Peddle, Katrin Zipperlen, Debra Bergstrom, Nadine Rockwood

**1.0. Review/Approval of Agenda**

**2.0. Review/Approval Minutes March 9, 2017**

Motion to accept: Maria Mathews

Seconded: Laura Gillespie

All in favour

**3.0. Business Arising**

**3.1. Tutorial/Small Group teaching guidelines/standardization**

- A workshop will be scheduled this spring. We will send out the tutorial guideline to disseminate to faculty through the UCL’s

**3.2. Research Curriculum**

- There are a number of students who have had problems completing their ethics application. Laura and Katrin have done a lot of work with the students to get them through their ethics and into data collection and analysis. This is the first iteration of this format and areas of improvement to avoid this in future iterations are being identified.
- Laura and Jinelle have a proposal of modified data collection and analysis assessment and Rubric for those students who will not be able to complete their data collection and analysis due to ethics approval delays. This will not affect the assessment map. It has been presented to SAS. The new deliverable demonstrates what they have done and what they have learned through their research process. They will present what they are going to do for their data collection and analysis. The deliverable includes timelines for completion. The goal is to have all students complete data collection and analysis before they start Phase 4. The proposal includes a plan for the student to submit an abstract of their findings to their mentor and the UGME office before the start of Phase 4. If the mentor is not available during the summer, it will be reviewed by the phase management team.
- There was an extensive discussion of the pros and cons of this approach and the potential ramifications to the curriculum and students. No formal motion was made as it was felt that it required discussion at UGMS. The discussion will be brought to UGMS.

**4.0. Standing Items**

**4.1. Integrated Learning Sessions – Report**

- Nothing to report

**4.2. Assessment Working Group – Report**

- Questions are being received consistently. Will look at timing of assessments and reassessments next time.

#### 4.3. Research Curriculum/Independent Projects Working Group – Report

- Research Day on June 22 will consist of 10 groups of 8 students with a 10 minute oral PowerPoint presentation. It is the same Rubric as last year. Peer assessment has two questions: 1. Name one thing that the speaker did particularly well, and 2. Name one area that needs improvement.

#### 4.4. Teaching/Learning Methods Working Group – Report

- See 3.1

#### 4.5. Clinical Skills – Report

- absent

#### 4.6. PESC – Report

- The main focus was on midterm evaluations for Phase 4. They have improved from the previous evaluation.
- Nothing directly related to Phase 3 to report

#### 4.7. Block Review

- Nothing to report.

#### 4.8. Student Issues - Discussion

- Students are under a lot of stress with the number of snow days and sessions rescheduled. Some protected time has been taken away from the students. The students want some of the sessions on the current block to be tested on the next block exam to alleviate some of the stress levels. This is reasonable.

#### 4.9. Faculty Issues - Discussion

- Public population health want to change the order of their content. They want to reorder the sessions in a logical order. The students will do critical appraisal and epidemiology before they start reading assignments. In Phase 3 there is on epidemiology session and one critical appraisal session with their own evaluation. They would like to move the sessions from Phase 3 into Phase 2. . The only impact in Phase 3 is that 9% of their physician competencies III will no longer be there. Phase 2 is ok with reordering.

- The reordering of sessions was discussed at UGMS.

Motioned by Joanne Hickey: We agree with the proposed changes as they apply to Phase 3.

Seconded: Laura Gillespie

All in favor

#### 4.10 Accreditation

- absent

## 5.0 New Business

### 5.1. MED 7740 Assessment Plan

- The format is similar to last year; one week on-site, one week virtual. The online modules are the same. Dr. Jones has been working with Dr. Leonard to try to line up the mandatory skills sessions with Advanced Procedural Competencies in Phase 4
- Most of the summative assessments are attendance based.

- There is no substitute for the Eastern Health component if they are not going to Eastern Health. Only a small portion of the orientation is for Eastern Health.

Motion to accept: Lynn Morris-Larkin

Seconded: Maria Mathews

All in favor

#### 5.2. QI Format

- Faculty – challenges with how QI is run. The previous format included students giving feedback during ILS. Now, losing positivity. It is not clear where the data is coming from when feedback is given beforehand.
- Propose to do less QI. When there is QI, half an hour of ILS is lost.
- In the beginning there were curriculum issues, now there are more minute issues. Valuable issues may be lost with the volume of QI sessions. Feedback may be a minority of the class.
- Student – Going back to themes is a good idea. The number of slides and overtime is an ongoing issue that doesn't need to be discussed every time. If faculty need more time, then they should go to the Phase lead or Jinelle. Length of lecture can't be based on the number of objectives.
- Students also use QRS. If a student is in crisis, he/she should go to the lead, UGME, or Student Affairs, not the student rep.

**6.0 Date Next Meeting: May 3, 2017**