

## **Phase 3 Management Team**

**May 4, 2016**

**1600- 1730**

**M2M240**

**Minutes**

### **Present:**

Joanne Hickey – Chair, Jinelle Ramlackhansingh, Diana Deacon, Gerona McGrath, Maria Mathews, Debra Bergstrom, Carla Peddie, Brian Harnett, Nadine Rockwood, Steve Shorlin, Don McKay, Gokul Vidyasankar, Vivian Whelan

### **Regrets:**

Katrin Zipperlen, Lynn Morris-Larkin, Susan Mercer, Laura Gillespie, David Stokes

#### **1.0. Review/Approval of Agenda**

No additions

#### **2.0. Review/Approval Minutes April 6, 2016**

Motion to accept: Maria Mathews

2nd: Brian Harnett

All in favour.

#### **3.0. Business Arising**

##### **3.1. Undergraduate Content Lead Recruitment**

- Recruitment of Undergraduate Content Leads has been going well. There is still no one from surgery.
- The list of UCLs will be added to the website.

##### **3.2. Tutorial/small Group teaching guidelines/standardization**

- There was a productive meeting held last week. We will encourage individual groups who are doing tutorials to form a tutor guide.
- Lynn is drafting a guide for the tutor guide which will include some tips for people who are doing tutorials. They are going to try to meet with individual groups to review different formats of tutorials.

##### **3.3. Schedule Class of 2019**

- The schedule is not ready to go out yet. There are a few edits to be done.
- The goal is, with the UCL help, to communicate the schedule well with those who are teaching.

##### **3.4. Peer Assessment**

- Joanne will have a lunch and learn with the students regarding Peer Assessment. She will provide some brief formal didactic words on why Peer Assessment is important. Have a QI session with the students to see what works and what doesn't. That information will be brought back to the Team.
- The Student Assessment Sub-committee has looked at the draft of the one45 form. They approved it to go to UGMS. It has two open ended areas where students are prompted to list two things that the person being evaluated did well and two things for improvement. There is a Rubric on the bottom with criteria and questions to ask to help guide the comments. This will be going to UGMS.

#### **4.0. Standing Items**

##### **4.1. Integrated Learning Sessions Working Group – Report**

- No issues

##### **4.2. Assessment Working Group – Report**

- One ongoing issue is lack of questions from instructors. On the last exam there were a few sessions not examined. Some faculty are hard to reach. We now have a question bank.
- We could have a review on the difficulty of the questions. Some questions may be above the student level. It was suggested to compare our questions to questions from other medical schools.
- If needed, we could have 'train the trainer' sessions to build our expertise.

##### **4.3. Special Projects/Independent Project Working Group – Report**

- Judges are in place. Logistics are good.
- Would like to move forward with peer assessment on presentation day. The paper form could be filled out on research day. UGME would collect the forms, scan them, to make sure content is appropriate, and distributed to the appropriate people. This would be an exercise on feedback. It has to be vetted but it wouldn't be transcribed.
- Everybody doesn't need to evaluate everybody. Everybody needs to give some feedback.
- Students may not feel as free with their comments on paper.
- Students need to feel comfortable giving face-to-face feedback.

*Action: Joanne, Carla and Katrin will meet to sort out some logistical issues and present a plan at the next meeting.*

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

- Discussed under 3.2.

##### **4.5. Clinical Skills – Report**

- There is one issue. Some students struggle with History and Physical during the summative. Some may struggle with one and be great with the other. They pass the OSCE based on their mark. Maria suggested to look at their clinical performance throughout Phase 3 to see if they are showing the same issues as on the OSCE.

##### **4.6. PESC/Quality Improvement – Report**

- There were two major issues discussed at the last PESC meeting.
- One issue is the evaluation of Phase 4. Evaluation was done six months into Phase 4. Most of the students are halfway through. All but one of the evaluations came back positively. One item they had trouble with is the EPA formats. The question was "Was the EPA helpful to your learning as a student?" received a score of 3.5.
- Another item that was discussed is the student experience survey. It is similar to the Canadian Graduate survey which all medical students complete at the end of their fourth year. The student experience survey would survey all of our students once a year to get more of a global picture. It was initially done in the Fall of 2014 but now it will be done every Spring. In terms of high and low items, for the students who are going through the new curriculum, learning environment is positively evaluated.
- The lowest one is the order of the curriculum, whether it is coherent and organized to help them with their learning. This has been consistently flagged in

both surveys as being the lowest item Phases 1, 2, and 3 students. The students feel they aren't prepared for Phase 4.

- The learning environment, Student Affairs, UGME scored quite high.

#### 4.7. Block Review/QI

- Only one comment received so far. That faculty member felt they had everything needed, no issues.
- The communication of the snow day was highly rated.
- In terms of what wasn't going well, there were some questions about the Days in Violence as part of Clinical Skills. One day was content heavy while the other day had a lot of down time. There was a survey given to students after those two days, which Maria Goodridge now has.
- The students also felt that the OSCE feedback was slow getting to them. Gerona checked on it and generally it takes about two weeks.
- A major issue is that the students want a list of what is going to be on the exams. The information is available on D2L so doesn't need to be emailed to the students.

#### 4.8. Student Issues - Discussion

- There was a lot of material missing on the last exam. Students are worried that the missing questions will be on the next exam. This will not happen.
- The students weren't sure about the journal they have to do for Palliative Care. They are hoping Dr. MacDonald will sort this out.
- The students were told that OSCE feedback can take some time. They were supposed to receive an email from Dr. Goodridge but they haven't received anything yet. Only the students that are developing can review their OSCE. Majority of students would like to see their results. Students should be able to review an OSCE if they request it. Debra will bring it up at the next meeting.

#### 4.9. Faculty Issues - Discussion

- There are questions about the type and nature of questions and evaluation exercises that faculty can use.

#### 4.10 Accreditation

- In terms of scheduling, we have to be mindful of independent learning time. We need to show that students are advancing in their self-directed learning skills.
- The Rubrics for ILS assignments have been adjusted to more of a graduated process in terms of requirements and how they are graded.
- Some faculty would like different formats than the MCQ. There is nothing formal saying that evaluations have to be the MCQ format. Different types of evaluations can be used such as an essay or a journal.

### 5.0 New Business

6.0 Date Next Meeting: June 1, 2016