

Phase 3 Management Team

June 1, 2016

1600- 1730

M2M240

Minutes

Present:

Joanne Hickey – Chair, Gerona McGrath, Maria Mathews, Debra Bergstrom, Carla Peddie, Brian Harnett, Don McKay, Gokul Vidyasankar, David Stokes, Lynn Morris-Larkin, Katrin Zipperlen, Laura Gillespie, Susan Mercer, Vivian Whelan

Regrets:

Nadine Rockwood, Diana Deacon, Steve Shorlin, Jinelle Ramlackhansingh

1.0. Review/Approval of Agenda

No additions

2.0. Review/Approval Minutes April 6, 2016

Motion to accept: Maria Mathews

2nd: Gokul Vidyasankar

All in favour.

3.0. Business Arising

3.1. Undergraduate Content Lead Recruitment

- We will begin the process of engaging the UCL's. A UCL meeting has been set for later this month. Still trying to get a UCL for Surgery.

3.2. Tutorial/small Group teaching guidelines/standardization

- There will be a group meeting on June 14.
- Students need to know what is involved with the tutorials and there has been some confusion as to what is expected of the students. The goal is to develop tutorial guidelines for faculty developing small group sessions. This work is ongoing.

3.3. Schedule Class of 2019

- The schedule will be sent out soon. The timeline for the Class of 2020 will change to start in September and end in June.

3.4. Peer Assessment

- Joanne met with the class and explained why Peer Assessment is important. The students feel that if it was in clinical skills it would be more applicable than assessing leadership skills.
- SAS put forward a change in the style of Peer Assessment in ILS and it was accepted. It will be more of coaching tips. There will be a Rubric.
- Joanne will give a talk on Peer Assessment early next year. The reflective paper has been removed.
- Phase 1 and 2 have reflections. The students in Phase 3 have to show how they use it – discussion around potential formative coaching models that could be implemented. They have to learn how to use feedback they are given to improve their skills as well as improve their feedback delivery over time.
- Try to have more meaningful peer assessment toward the end with special projects. This year model the plan for SAS for next year. Every student will

assess every other student through one45. It can be done during the session. The student will be asked to make two coaching tips; one for what was done well and the other what area needs to improve. Once in one45 the students will receive it. The comments will be reviewed for appropriateness. This will be formative with no grade or penalty. Students will be given 48 – 72 hours to complete.

Motion to accept the proposal for this trial for formative peer assessment as part of the independent project presentation

Motioned by: Joanne Hickey

2nd: Gokul Vidyasankar

All in favour.

4.0. Standing Items

4.1. Integrated Learning Sessions Working Group – Report

- ILS is finished. There are no issues.
- Evaluation of ILS scored 4.0 overall.
- The ILS learning environment received 4.4.

4.2. Assessment Working Group – Report

- The last block finished well. Jennifer did a document summarizing all the sessions that were not evaluated this year. Should we be able to use banked questions without faculty permission? Sometimes it is hard to get a hold of faculty.
- Sometimes the response from faculty regarding tutorials is that they are tested on the lecture.

4.3. Special Projects/Independent Project Working Group – Report

- Everything is ready to go except peer assessment. Katrin is going to set it up on one45. Then an email will be sent to the students to explain the process and how it is going to work.
- The students questioned about how long the presentation should be. Last year it was 5 minutes but found it was too short. This year it is 10 minutes and then a 2 minute question period. The students will take turns being moderator.

4.4. Teaching/Learning Methods Working Group – Report

- Already discussed.

4.5. Clinical Skills – Report

- The mean score of clinical skills was 4.3.

4.6. PESC/Quality Improvement – Report

They met last week and discussed the following:

- The Chronic course received 4.1 overall. Last year was 3.4. The CanMeds competency was 4.2.
- Elective and selective evaluation. There hasn't been a formal process in the past and that has now been set up.
- There was also a quick presentation on the MCCQ1 scores from 2015. These were fourth year students on the old curriculum. In all but one category the majority of our students are in the lower half below the national average. 70% of our students are below the national average.
- They discussed what PESC material should go back to the UCLs. If there is specific issues or questions that you're not getting it's the UCL that needs to know that.

- Lisa Kenny, Phase 2 Lead, talked about whether it was worth while continuing the quality assurance session as an in-person session. She found it's becoming individual issues as opposed to group issues. There are many redundancies as to how feedback is provided to the Phase Team and how it's responded to. The Phase 4 Lead would like to have quality assurance. There needs to be a look at how quality assurance is done.
- QI feedback that is received from the students is most often just small number of students' opinion and not the majority. They need to be more structured.
- The Class of 2019 students have been submitting documentation beforehand.

4.7. Block Review/QI

- No feedback from the last block review.
- There was a lot of good news about the tutorials received from QI. Neurology, Rheumatology and GI went well.
- Some things that didn't go well was missing material for Block 7 on the exam.
- One area of improvement is Dermatology. The students would like to have more but they will have more in Phase 4.
- There were some suggestions about the Neuroanatomy Lab. There is a working group in place to correct some of the issues.

4.8. Student Issues - Discussion

- Some students who are just back from placement saw about 30% of patients with dermatology issues. They would like to have more dermatology.
- If students can review their OSCE will be reviewed.

4.9. Faculty Issues - Discussion

- Last time students had raised a concern of having the Environmental Health exam on its own. Maria brought it back to faculty. This has been addressed by moving the session to Phase 1. The Phase 1 evaluation has also changed so that the students will write fewer reflections. There will be two multiple choice exams.

4.10 Accreditation

- No issues.

5.0 New Business

6.0 Date Next Meeting: TBA