

Phase 3 Management Team

April 6, 2016

1600- 1730

M2M240

Minutes

Present:

Joanne Hickey – Chair, Jinelle Ramlackhansingh, Diana Deacon, Gerona McGrath, Maria Mathews, Lynn Morris-Larkin, Debra Bergstrom, Carla Peddie, Brian Harnett, Nadine Rockwood, Laura Gillespie, David Stokes, Vivian Whelan

Regrets:

Katrin Zipperlen, Steve Shorlin, Don McKay

1.0. Review/Approval of Agenda

2.0. Review/Approval Minutes March 2, 2016

Motion to accept: Lynn Morris-Larkin

2nd: Maria Mathews

All in favour.

3.0. Business Arising

3.1. Undergraduate Content Lead Recruitment

- UCL Recruitment is going well. Dr. McCarthy has agreed to be the UCL for Oncology.
- Dr. Gillespie is a UCL for Biomedical, along with Dr. Gendron. There are a total of 15 confirmed so far. Obs/gyne and Surgery are still outstanding.

Action: UCL recruitment is going well. Phase 3 informal meetings need to be set up with Joanne, Jinelle, and the UCLs.

3.2. Tutorial/small Group teaching guidelines/standardization

- They have a list of all tutorials in all three phases. A schedule will be communicated out soon for a faculty development workshop on teaching and learning methods that are small group oriented. The workshop will be on May 19.
- Some sort of committee is needed to look at the different options for teaching tutorials. Look at what has been working and not working from a faculty and student point of view.

Action: Set up a meeting with Jinelle, David, Steve, Gerona, Joanne, Lynn to discuss tutorials and how to organize them. Invite the Phase leads. Jinelle will organize the meeting.

3.3. Schedule Class of 2019

- There is a draft schedule for Phase 3, Class of 2019. Classes will start on October 3, 2016. The next step is to review the schedule.
- The schedule will then be sent to the UCLs for confirmation and review.

3.4. Peer Assessment

- Peer assessment with ILS has not continued to go well. Feedback has settled but the engagement is not there.

Action: Joanne will have a meeting with the students to give an update on peer assessment, maybe as a lunch and learn.

- It is late now to make any changes for the current cohort, but could talk to students to tell them the importance of peer assessment.
- If the students had the opportunity to give real time narrative feedback it would be more meaningful for both sides. And it would take the burden off of having to do it later. Diana has a new draft form for peer assessment in the ILS that has taken some of those suggestions into account. It has a couple of open-ended questions and a Rubric to help guide students. This will go to SAS on April 27 and it will be shared with the Phase leads.
- We need written feedback. It could be done on one one45.
- Independent Project Presentation Day a good opportunity of peer assessment
 - If everyone gave one tip it could help the student's presentation next time. It is important for students to give and receive input. Students can fill out a form on a select number of students. A report is then done on each student after the presentations.
 - We would monitor what any one student gives.
 - Will discuss logistics of how this can be accomplished

3.5. Independent Project Rubric

- Two Rubrics were presented last month.
- The first category would be background/introduction and the second category would be project (methods and results).

Motion: Accept the two Rubrics with the changes to the presentation Rubric.

2nd: Maria Mathews

All in favour.

4.0. Standing Items

4.1. Integrated Learning Sessions Working Group – Report

- Only two sessions left.
- Gerona ran some focus groups about what went well or not. Students like problem based learning. Maybe ILS can be changed to more problem based learning.
- The group leader seems to be doing the majority of the work. Everyone is meant to participate. It was discussed to not assign a group leader in advance so everybody would have to do preparatory work. A group leader would be assigned the morning of ILS. No decision has been made.
- The Class of 2020, Phase 1 will be assigned a leader and receive the stems the day of ILS. The current Phase 2 students know who the leader is ahead of time but they don't know what the stems are until they arrive.

4.2. Assessment Working Group – Report

- Questions have been coming in fairly smoothly. There hasn't been any issues with exams.
- A process is being developed for material that is missed on exams. Go back to faculty and ask again for questions that can be put on future exams. When multiple people are teaching, faculty don't know who is responsible for submitting questions. These people are being identified.

4.3. Special Projects/Independent Project Working Group – Report

- Everything is set. 10 faculty have been confirmed. Laura will send the list of faculty to Katrin.
- Katrin is updating students with deadlines and reminders.
- A suggested date was added for submitting to the mentor. This date is flexible as long as the mentor has time to grade. The date for submission of presentations was also added. These dates are on the assessment map.

4.4. Teaching/Learning Methods Working Group – Report

- The focus will be tutorial/small group teaching.

4.5. Clinical Skills – Report

- The feedback forms are being used. There is no feedback received yet.
- The OSCE is this week.

4.6. PESC/Quality Improvement – Report

- PESC's policies were reviewed. Gerona presented the results of the focus groups.
- There was discussion about ILS in Phases 1 and 2. Dr. McKay reminded them that ILS is an important issue for life-long learning for accreditation.

4.7. Block Review/QI

- The next block review will be sent soon.
- There was a lot of input about the visit to the Miller Centre and Geriatrics in general.
- There was also a lot of feedback about the Environmental Health exam. The students would like to have it incorporated into the regular summative assessment instead of alone. Environmental Health is a part of Special Projects and not Chronic Health. Environmental Health and AHS are using multiple choice exam as opposed to a self-reflective essay. The Environmental Health exam only has 10 questions. Maybe some of the special projects and community health exams can be combined.

4.8. Student Issues - Discussion

- Students enjoyed the tour of the Miller Centre. But there was a lot of repetition from IPE sessions and Phase 1 communications material. It was a revisit of material that was covered in Phase 1. The students found the tour and what they do with patients useful.
- Students are wondering when they will find out more about Phase 4 Prep. There isn't a schedule yet. Dr. Hickey will follow up with Dr. Jones.
- The students have heard that the Neuroanatomy Lab in Phase 3 is much the same as the Neuroanatomy Lab in Phase 2. Students are wondering why they have to do it again. Going forward all of Neuroanatomy will move to Phase 2. Students feel that it is too close to the exam.
- Students were happy with the Psychiatry OSCE session but left the session not really knowing what was going to be on the Psychiatry OSCE. The Psychiatry station seems to be the most artificial station. It is a skill that the students will be expected to do at the end of clerkship.
- Students would like more information about what the station will be like. The students don't have any information, such as where to go to prepare for it. Debra Bergstrom will see what she can find out.

4.9. Faculty Issues - Discussion

- No issues

4.10 Accreditation

- Dr. McKay absent

5.0 New Business

6.0 Date Next Meeting: May 4, 2016