

Undergraduate Medical Studies Committee Meeting		<b>DATE</b>	February 18, 2015
		<b>ROOM</b>	M2M240
<b>CHAIR</b>	Dr. Sean Murphy,		
<b>MEMBERS:</b>  <b>2014 - 2015</b>	<p>Student Representatives (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Mark Hayward, Phase 1 – 3 Student Representative</li> <li>• Ms. Susan Wakeham, Phase 4 Student Representative</li> </ul> <p>Academic/Administrative Representatives (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Olga Heath, Faculty Representative</li> <li>• Dr. Carolyn Morris-Larkin, Faculty Representative</li> <li>• Dr. Sheila Drover, Faculty Representative</li> <li>• Dr. Lindsay Alcock, Faculty Representative</li> <li>• Dr. John Campbell, Faculty Representative</li> </ul> <p>Permanent Members (13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. James Rourke, Dean of Medicine</li> <li>• Dr. Donald W. McKay, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education</li> <li>• Ms. Elizabeth Hillman, Registrar's Delegate</li> <li>• Ms. Melody Marshall, UGME Coordinator</li> <li>• Dr. Alan Goodridge, Chair - Program Evaluation Sub-Committee</li> <li>• Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair – Student Assessment Sub-Committee</li> <li>• Mr. Stephen Pennell, Chair – Information Technology Advisory Committee</li> <li>• Dr. Kath Stringer, Clerkship Committee Chair</li> <li>• Dr. Victor Maddalena, Phase 1 Lead</li> <li>• Dr. Lisa Kenny, Phase 2 Lead</li> <li>• Dr. Joanne Hickey, Phase 3 Lead</li> <li>• Dr. Kath Stringer, Phase 4 Lead</li> </ul> <p>Non-Voting Corresponding Members (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Todd Lambert, Assistant Dean – New Brunswick</li> <li>• Dr. Mohamed Ravalia, Assistant Dean – Rural Medical Education Network</li> <li>• <i>Vacant</i>, Assistant Dean – Prince Edward Island</li> <li>• <i>Vacant</i>, Assistant Dean - Yukon</li> </ul>		
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	S. Murphy, V. Curran, V. Maddalena, K. Stringer, E. Hillman, D. McKay, M. Hayward, S. Drover, S. Pennell, C. Morris-Larkin, A. Goodridge, L. Kenny, S. Wakeham, M. Marshall		

<b>REGRETS</b>	O. Heath, L. Alcock, J. Hickey		
<b>RECORDING SECRETARY</b>	<i>Minutes Taped – Transcribed by Ms. Christine Russell</i>		
<b>GUESTS</b>			
<b>MINUTES</b>			
<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
#1 WELCOME		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The meeting was called to order at 1615h.</li> <li>• Most of the meeting will be dedicated to accreditation preparation</li> <li>• Addition of Student Report to the agenda</li> <li>• No new items of new business</li> </ul>	
#2 AGENDA APPROVAL		The agenda was adopted with the addition of Student Report.	
#3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES		The Minutes for the January 21, 2015 meeting were adopted with minor edits.	
#4 STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS	Item 4. a. PESC Report	<p>The need for formal subject leads and content expert groups was raised. Discussion ensued around the need for well-defined terms of reference and clearly outlined responsibilities and expectations for subject leads and content expert groups. The consensus was that Faculty members should be recognized for their work and a formal recommendation would provide support for the P &amp; T process. It was agreed to bring this back to a future meeting for discussion and a proposal. Recommendations will be brought forward to faculty council.</p> <p>Restructuring of Phase management teams is recommended in order to move away from the working groups, which were focussed on development and move toward a group focussing on course content with support from faculty.</p> <p>Clerkship reports have been reviewed.</p> <p>Review of Phase 2 course reports is ongoing.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: A proposal for terms of reference for subject leads and content experts to be presented at a future meeting, with the intent to bring forward to faculty council.</b></p> <p><b>S. Murphy will convene a small group to develop the proposal.</b></p>

	Item 4. b. SAS Report	<p>A review was conducted around the requirements for written assignments across Phases 1-3 and will be discussed at the next SAS meeting. Suggestions and recommendations stemming from the review may be brought forward to UGMS.</p> <p>A small working group is being set up to look at 'Test item format' across the curriculum, with consideration to look at the types of items we are using and adopting them to better reflect items on the MCC exams. Effort is being made to come up with a strategy to integrate fewer "type A" items in examinations.</p> <p>A system has been introduced for annual monitoring of assessment implementation across clerkship sites. This will require clerkship discipline coordinators to annually complete a form, checking off all areas identified to ensure the assessment plan for clerkship is being implemented across all sites. This form will be annually reviewed by SAS.</p> <p>The newly developed summative assessment policy and procedure will be reviewed at the next SAS meeting.</p>	
	Item 4. c. iTAC Report	<p>One new member is expected on the Committee to replace the current Eastern Health member who has been appointed director of CNC.</p> <p>Student feedback regarding C-Blue is positive.</p>	
#5 PHASE 4-CLERKSHIP REPORT/ISSUES		<p>K. Stringer reported that the Clerkship discipline reports are being reviewed.</p> <p>Discussion and planning for Phase 4 is ongoing with specific attention to ensuring the objectives include those not covered in Phase 3.</p> <p>Objectives will be mapped to ensure activity and assessments are matched.</p> <p>The AAMC entrustable professional activities (EPA's) are being reviewed for integration into the curriculum.</p> <p>An updated report to be available at the next UGMS meeting.</p>	
#6 PHASE 3 REPORT/ISSUES		<p>Phase 3 Report tabled until next meeting as J. Hickey not available.</p> <p>The student member reported concern (across Phases 2 and 3) regarding the use of tutorials and weightings on exams. Students suggest a review of the policy, which stipulates exams include two questions for every hour of teaching, in order to consider the number of questions per tutorial. Tutorial</p>	

		<p>sessions should cover the objectives and questions which are generated from them, with the intention of solidifying objectives, rather than teaching new material.</p> <p>Students often experience situations where tutor A and tutor B cover different material. To avoid this, students have been gathering in the large lecture room, rather than in smaller tutorial groups, such that the messages taken away are uniform across the entire group.</p> <p>There is currently no standard documentation available for tutorials. Students would likely not attend the tutorials if standardized materials were available.</p>	
#7 PHASE 2 REPORT/ISSUES		<p>Phase 2 course reports were received and reviewed. This is a prelude to the segment review for Phase 2.</p> <p>An issue has arisen with room bookings and computer lab availability, resulting in a scheduling conflict for Assessment #2. To resolve this issue, approval is being sought to administer Assessment #2 during an independent learning time slot.</p> <p>It was <b>Moved</b> by A. Goodridge, seconded by S. Murphy, that Assessment #2 be rescheduled during an independent learning time slot only if an equivalent number of free or independent learning hours are allotted elsewhere in the schedule.</p> <p>Looking forward, with approximately 80 students in each of the Phases, it is conceivable that scheduling conflicts will pose a greater challenge in the future. Acquisition of an additional 80 laptops would help alleviate and/or prevent such conflicts.</p>	<b>ACTION: Reschedule assessment #2 during an independent learning time slot, provided an equivalent number of free or independent learning hours are allotted to students elsewhere in the schedule.</b>
#8 PHASE 1 REPORT/ISSUES		<p>Phase 1 has ended and planning for the fall offering is underway.</p> <p>Some areas requiring attention include: Further discussion around the distribution of anatomy teaching across Phases.</p>	<b>ACTION: Proposal for modification of Independent Project Course to be brought to the table for approval.</b>

		<p>Bio-stats to go to a sub-committee for review.</p> <p>Changes to the upcoming Phase 1 will be minimal. Independent projects are expected to be modified; a proposal will be submitted to UGMS for approval. The current method posed problems around having an adequate number of projects. As well, the research ethics review aspect became complex and problematic. The proposal to be brought to UGMS will recommend that the components of 'how to do research' will be distributed and taught over the period of 4 years. By the 4<sup>th</sup> year students will be able to engage in a semi-independent small research project. Within each of the phases, students will learn a component of how to do research. Students will be encouraged to develop their own research ideas, while faculty will serve as mentors.</p> <p>The current evaluation for the Heathy Person Course averages 3.9; an improvement from the previous course evaluation which averaged 3.5. The Course evaluation was circulated for discussion. It was noted that issues raised in the report have either been resolved or are being worked on.</p>	
#9 SENATE, SCUGS, AND UNIVERSITY ISSUES		No update to report	
#10 SENIOR MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AND POLICY ISSUES		No update to report	
#11 ACCREDITATION ISSUES		The remainder of the meeting was dedicated to general discussion and preparation for accreditation.	
#11 UGME OFFICE REPORT AND ISSUES		The Intermediate Secretary position has been advertised as a permanent position. It is hoped that the selection process will be finalized by the next meeting.	
#12 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES		The Chair reported that MELT will dissolve in June 2015 when the development of Phase 4 is finalized.	
#13 NEW BUSINESS		No new business	

#14 ADJOURNMENT		The meeting adjourned at 1830h.	
Next Meeting		The next meeting of the UGMS is scheduled for March 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2015.	



Sean. W Murphy, MD  
Committee Chair